

Trial of camera equipped enforcement vehicle

1. In November 2014, the Authority was offered the opportunity to trial an enforcement vehicle equipped with a CCTV camera to objectively assess the extent of parking contraventions on school zig-zags. The vehicle was loaned to the Authority for 2 weeks and was used by staff from the Central Processing Unit (CPU) who undertook to populate the software system with the restrictions and develop efficient beats to maximise the number of visits made to schools.
2. The car is equipped with an intelligent enforcement system that uses GPRS to recognise where restrictions begin and end as the vehicle is driven through a restriction zone. Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras (ANPR) record vehicles from all sides and create a segment of video to enable staff in the office to review the footage and determine if PCNs will be issued via post to the vehicles concerned and subsequently determine any appeal against the PCN.
3. School keep clear markings are now supported by a restriction that prohibits stopping and consequently the camera simply needs to establish that the stationary vehicle is within the restrictions.
4. The staff established enforcement beats which started at their base and predominantly concentrated on schools within Bassetlaw with the addition of some sites in Ashfield and Mansfield. After the schools had opened the car was used for some enforcement of bus stops that are also protected by no stopping restrictions in many locations.
5. No actual PCNs were issued during the trial; the vehicle collected evidence on PCNs that would have been issued if the vehicle was 'live'. The results indicated that there were a significant number of occasions when PCNs would have been issued at an approximate rate of 2 per hour. There were some technical issues around the accuracy of the restriction zones but these would be resolved with full access to a vehicle. On average, the vehicle gathered data that would have led to approximately 40 PCNs in 16 visits although due to technical issues with the software potentially many more would have been identified.
6. Nationally there has been recent focus on the use of remote cameras for parking enforcement and this had led to the introduction of the Deregulation Bill to limit the use of cameras for enforcement. However, the Traffic Management Act 2004 allows cameras to be used in situations where normal enforcement is difficult to achieve. The intention of the Act was undoubtedly that cameras would only be used as a last resort to tackle dangerous short-term parking such as that on school markings or bus stops. The lack of detail within the legislation and the undoubted efficiencies of cameras led to a proliferation of their use in many cities across the UK for a variety of contraventions. Central Government initially proposed a blanket ban on the use of any cameras for enforcement but lobbying by Local Authorities has led to changes included within the Deregulation Bill that permits camera use for certain contraventions including school parking. It is recognised that camera enforcement of this dangerous but short-term practice is the only real efficient and effective means of control.
7. An appropriate vehicle equipped with an ANPR camera would cost £47,000. The annual vehicle running costs of fuel, vehicle and software maintenance would be in the region of £12,000. If the vehicle is deployed for 4 hours a day the annual staffing costs would be in the

region of £10,000 as a direct cost. Based on the trial results it is expected that with effective deployment at schools in the morning and afternoon and at bus stops in between that attract parking contraventions, the vehicle would collect data leading to the issue of a minimum of 2 PCNs an hour. Based on existing payment rates this would in turn generate approximately £50,000 income annually. This very modest issue rate and deployment would therefore generate sufficient income to meet the operating and maintenance costs and repay some of the capital costs over the 5 year life of the vehicle. Other authorities who have used camera vehicles report issue rates in excess of this once beats are well established. The table below tests a few scenarios based on issue rates varying from 1 per hour to 4 per hour on a 4 hour daily deployment beat. It is expected for Nottinghamshire the rate will be 2-3 per hour.

| Average Issue rate per hour | Annual staffing & maintenance costs inc processing costs(£) | Expected income | Surplus/deficit | Contribution to capital costs (47,000) | Years to pay off capital |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------|
| 1 | 28,000 | 25,000 | -3,000 | 0 | |
| 2 | 34,000 | 50,000 | +16,000 | 16,000 | 3 |
| 3 | 40,000 | 75,000 | +35,000 | 35,000 | 1.5 |
| 4 | 46,000 | 100,000 | +54,000 | 54,000 | 0.9 |
| 5 | 52,000 | 125,000 | +73,000 | 73,000 | 0.6 |

8. It is important to emphasise though that the primary purpose is not to raise revenue but to address the growing problem of dangerous and inconsiderate parking near schools. If approved, it is proposed to deploy the vehicle across the county area visiting all schools where parking issues have been identified and undertaking this on a rolling programme that ensures repeat visits. Visits can also be co-ordinated with the work of the Road Safety Officers to help re-enforce educational messages about safe travel to school.
9. There is an option to use the existing enforcement contractor to provide a vehicle and operational staff to the County Council. This would have the advantage of simplifying the issues of vehicle storage and supply. The indicative quote is based on 1000 deployed hours each year over a five year contract as a minimum and would cost £40,000 annually. In addition processing costs at £6 per PCN would increase the annual costs in the second column above to £52,000 based on 2 PCNs per hour.
10. The CPU provides the PCN administration for 22 other Local Authorities across the East Midlands and some of these may also be interested in utilising the vehicle in future which would help meet the operating and maintenance costs.

It is recommended therefore that in view of the increased costs of using a contracted vehicle coupled with the potential for the County Council to offer the vehicle to other partner authorities the County Council purchases and operates a vehicle in-house.

Press release

Government bans use of CCTV 'spy cars' for on-street parking

Use of closed circuit television spy cars on their own to enforce on-street parking made illegal.



In a victory for drivers and shoppers, the government will make it illegal to use closed circuit television (CCTV) 'spy cars' alone to enforce on-street parking ending the plague of parking tickets by post, Communities Secretary Eric Pickles and Transport Secretary Patrick McLoughlin announced today (21 June 2014).

The announcement is one of a range of measures that will give hard working people and local shops a fairer deal by reining-in over-zealous parking enforcement practices, which often force people to shop in out-of-town centres or online.

The long-called for ban will now become law through the Deregulation Bill, following a 3-month [consultation](#). Tickets will have to be fixed to the windscreen by parking wardens, making it illegal for councils to issue penalty charge notices to drivers using just the CCTV spy cars that currently patrol roads for on-street parking enforcement.

Parking officers will now carry out all essential enforcement, limiting the use of CCTV to issue tickets by post to critical routes such as schools, bus lanes, bus stops and red routes where public transport must be kept moving for safety reasons.