

Meeting date: 6 July 2023

Report to: STRONGER COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
SERVICES SCRUTINY BOARD

Report title: Mobile Speed Camera – Community Concern Site review 2023

Report from: Head of Highway Management

**Report author/lead
contact officer:** Paul Tovey / James McNeil / David Keaney

Wards affected:

- ☒ All Wards | ☐ Bickenhill | ☐ Blythe | ☐ Castle Bromwich | ☐ Chelmsley Wood |
☐ Dorridge/Hockley Heath | ☐ Elmdon | ☐ Kingshurst/Fordbridge | ☐ Knowle |
☐ Lyndon | ☐ Meriden | ☐ Olton | ☐ Shirley East | ☐ Shirley South |
☐ Shirley West | ☐ Silhill | ☐ Smith's Wood | ☐ St Alphege
-

**Public/private
report:** Public

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 To provide an overview of speed enforcement activity in Solihull.
- 1.2 To provide details of the locations of operational mobile speed enforcement cameras in Solihull and to consider future priorities for the service provided by the West Midlands Police Safety Camera Unit.

2. Decision(s) Recommended

- 2.1 Scrutiny Board are asked to:
- (a) Note the contents of the report,
 - (b) Comment on the proposed priorities for the future deployment of the mobile speed enforcement camera vehicles when undertaking “community concern” activity in Solihull, as set out in Appendix B
 - (c) Support the continued deployment of redundant camera housings as a speed management tool, until alternative solutions come forward or the equipment becomes unsafe.

Report Title: **Enter report title here**

3. Matters for Consideration

- 3.1 West Midlands Police (WMP) enforce speed limits on Solihull's highway network, with support from the Council.
- 3.2 The WMP Safety Camera Unit work closely with the Council's Highway Management Team to support the region's road traffic casualty reduction target.
- 3.3 The 3 types of speed enforcement activity taking place in the Borough are:
- Average speed enforcement (ASE)
 - Mobile speed enforcement (MSE)
 - In person with a handheld prolaser device
- 3.4 Prior to the introduction of ASE digital technology, Solihull had an extensive network of fixed speed enforcement locations. These were associated with the yellow camera housings and closely spaced line markings on the carriageway. This technology is now obsolete; however, the camera housings remain at several sites which help to deter speeding.
- 3.5 The ASE project is currently under review by partners across the West Midlands and therefore does not form part of this review. Similarly, the use of handheld equipment does not form part of this review.
- 3.6 The focus of this report is on the MSE service which has two key elements:
- Operational priorities led by WMP
 - Community concern sites
- 3.7 The main emphasis of the Police resource focuses on the emerging road traffic casualty data around the region, mainly on the classified road network where the highest number of casualties occur.
- 3.8 For over 15 years, a small element of the available resource has been offered to each local highway authority in the West Midlands to be used at "community concerns" sites.
- 3.9 Appendices A and B provide details of the locations in Solihull and the latest operational data which is the evidence base used to consider if any changes to the deployment strategy are required.

4. What options have been considered and what is the evidence telling us about them?

- 4.1 This review is based on information from the public and traffic and casualty data. In summary, residents are concerned about traffic travelling at speed and that in certain

locations, road traffic collisions are still occurring due to excessive speed.

4.2 The options under consideration:

- **Do Nothing** - Retaining the thirteen current community concern sites would provide continuity of the long-term impact of the service. However, as the table shows in Appendix B, changes have taken place at several of these sites, meaning the road safety value of deploying a camera is now of limited benefit.
- **Relocate to the redundant static camera enforcement sites** – Speed related collisions are still occurring at some of these sites, which together with historic data, suggests that there would be a road safety benefit in deploying the camera at some of these sites, as shown in Appendix B.
- **New community concern sites** – The Environment and Infrastructure portfolio receives regular complaints, petitions and individual enquiries relating to inconsiderate and potentially dangerous driving. These have been captured, grouped by locality, and prioritised in Appendix B.
- **Combination** - Taking the highest priority from the three categories above to create a new programme of sites would increase the exposure of the service to more passing traffic, have the greatest potential to contribute to the casualty reduction target and address some community concerns.

4.3 The road safety value of the existing yellow static housings has been considered. The policy to date has been to retain, where possible, the housings to remind motorists of the importance of complying with the speed limit. The housings will continue to be inspected and will only be removed if they become un-safe or an alternative speed management solution is introduced. The associated verification markings will not be replaced if the carriageway is resurfaced.

5. Reasons for recommending preferred option

5.1 Officers have conducted an evidence based review of the service and considered the value of retaining the existing community concern sites compared with other options. As a result, it is recommended that the following locations should form the mobile camera deployment programme going forward in 2023:

Priority	Location	Type	Locality
1	A452 Collector Road	Fixed / Mobile	North
2	A452 Kenilworth Road	Fixed	Rural
3	A45 Coventry Road	Fixed	North
4	High Street, Solihull Lodge	New Community	Central
5	Warwick Road, Olton	Existing mobile	Central
6	Damson Parkway	Existing mobile	Central
7	Streetsbrook Road	Fixed	Central
8	Chelmsley Road	New community	North
9	Blossomfield Road	Fixed	Central
10	Warwick Road, Chadwick End	Existing mobile	Rural

11	Kenilworth Road, Knowle	Existing mobile	Rural
12	Four Ashes Road	New community	Rural

- 5.2 These locations have been prioritised as they have a road traffic collision record and high traffic speeds.
- 5.3 It is also recommended not to change the policy relating to the yellow static camera housings, as set out in paragraph 4.3.
- 5.4 Scrutiny Board is asked to consider and make comment on the proposed changes to the deployment programme for the mobile speed enforcement cameras in Solihull, and the policy relating to the redundant yellow static camera housings.

6. Implications and Considerations

- 6.1 State how the proposals in this report contribute to the priorities in the [Council Plan](#):

Priority:	Contribution:
People and Communities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improving outcomes for children and young people in Solihull. Good quality, responsive, and dignified care and support for Adults in Solihull when they need it. Take action to improve life chances and health outcomes in our most disadvantaged communities. Enable communities to thrive. 	<p>The use of high-profile speed enforcement activity will reduce the likelihood of people being injured in road traffic collisions and improve their health outcomes.</p>
Economy: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and promote the borough's economy, with a focus on revitalising our town and local centres. Maximising the opportunities of UK Central and HS2. Increase the supply of affordable and social housing that is environmentally sustainable. 	<p>Reducing the number of people injured on the roads in Solihull reduces costs and helps create a safer place to support economic growth.</p>
Environment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance our natural environment, improve air quality and reduce net carbon emissions. 	<p>Speed enforcement activity helps to lower traffic speeds which in turn reduced vehicle born pollution, thereby creating better air quality for everyone.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Promote employee wellbeing 	<p>No impact.</p>

6.2 Consultation and Scrutiny:

- 6.2.1 The recommendations set out within this report have been developed in consultation with colleagues in the WMP Safety Camera Unit and will be invited to attend the scrutiny board meeting on the 6th July.

6.3 Financial implications:

- 6.3.1 No direct financial implications at this stage of the review process.
- 6.3.2 The council will be responsible for providing safe places for the mobile speed camera to operate from. If approved, and the new sites require hard standings and signage, then these costs will be funded from an un-allocated element of the Local Network Improvement Plan capital fund. This expenditure would be subject to Cabinet Member approval and cost estimates.

6.4 Legal implications:

- 6.4.1 Speed enforcement is delivered in accordance with the requirement of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Road Traffic Act 1988

6.5 Risk implications, including Risk Appetite:

- 6.5.1 No significant risks have been identified at this stage in the review process.

6.6 Equality implications:

- 6.6.1 None.

6.7 Linkages to our work with the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA), Local Enterprise Partnership or the Birmingham & Solihull Integrated Care System (ICS):

- 6.7.1 None.

7. List of appendices referred to

- 7.1 Appendix A – Map of the Speed Enforcement locations
- 7.2 Appendix B – Evidence base used to inform the recommendation

8. Background papers used to compile this report

- 8.1 None.

9. List of Other Relevant Documents

- 9.1 None.