

<b>Title of meeting:</b>	Cabinet Member for Traffic & Transportation Decision Meeting
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> July 2016
<b>Subject:</b>	Camera Enforcement of School Zig Zags
<b>Report by:</b>	Alan Cufley, Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support
<b>Wards affected:</b>	All wards
<b>Key decision:</b>	No
<b>Full Council decision:</b>	No

---

**1. Purpose of report**

To seek approval for the purchase of 2 enforcement cameras to be available at various locations in the city to enforce parking contraventions on school zig zag road markings.

**2. Recommendations**

That the Cabinet Member approves the option to purchase the cameras and authorises the ongoing costs of operation as laid out in the Financial Appraisal shown at Appendix 1.

**3. Background**

Yellow Zig Zag lines outside schools are a safety measure. They are designed to be kept clear of stopping vehicles, ensuring good visibility for school children entering and leaving school grounds.

Road Safety experts across the country support measures to reduce or eliminate vehicles stopping on Zig Zags. In the majority of cases those in contravention of the Zig Zags are in fact parents and guardians of children at that school.

Traditional (pedestrian) methods of enforcement by the councils Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) are only effective when they are present; once potential offenders see the CEO they tend not to park on the Zig Zags.

A Portsmouth City Council scrutiny panel looked in to Road Safety in 2015. A survey was conducted as a part of that review with parents, teachers and school governors asked about their perception of risk. The result was that 84.17% of respondents said that they felt pupils are at risk on the roads immediately outside their children's school at the start and/or end of the school day.

In December 2015 the council introduced Bus Lane Enforcement cameras. The technology used for the system is identical to that required for the enforcement of school Zig Zags with a slightly different camera. It is the purchase of that technology for bus lanes that now makes the cameras for Zig Zags an enhancement of that system with no new technological systems required.

It is intended that any contraventions identified by the cameras will only be enforced outside schools from 30 minutes before a school day to 30 minutes after. It is not intended the cameras should be used at any other times for the purposes of Zig Zag enforcement.

The cameras will be used at the schools considered to be the highest risk for children and where it is felt such technology can be effective. They will be deployed as an addition to current council efforts to manage the issue, not as an alternative.

The penalty for being 'stopped in a restricted area outside a school' (on Zig Zag lines) is £70 (discounted to £35 if paid within 14 days). The penalties will accrue to the council's On Street revenue budget.

It is not anticipated that the cameras monitoring the Zig Zags will be self-financing and so an ongoing operating cost will exist as shown in the financial appraisal at Appendix 1.

As the technology is similar, during school holidays the system may be redeployed to bus lanes with some minor additions.

It is anticipated that the deployment of the cameras to the first locations will be during the forthcoming autumn term.

#### **4. Reasons for recommendations**

To improve the safety of children outside schools, camera enforcement will be another tool used by the council to encourage motorists not to put children at high risk, and to penalise those that do.

Portsmouth has high child pedestrian casualties (50% higher than national average) when considering population size.

Since 2004 we have seen an overall downward trend in child pedestrian casualties from an average of 56 per year down to an average of 35 per year since 2011 (up to 31st December 2014).

The most common environmental factor in the collisions is crossing from behind parked cars. The keep clear parking restrictions outside schools are in place to prevent large numbers of children being subject to this risk.

Feedback from schools, suggests parents infringe the parking restrictions when enforcement officers are not present and, whilst educational initiatives do impact parents' behaviour, this is most effective when partnered with a viable means of enforcement.

## 5. **Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)**

An EIA is not required as this is a change to the method of gathering information and will not affect the function performed or service delivered.

## 6. **Legal Implications**

The report presents a realistic and proportionate response to a potential set of risks associated with school parking. The restrictions sought are clearly aimed at key points in the day and are such that a proposed restrictions fall within the current TRO and as such are enforceable.

## 7. **Director of Finance's Comments**

The Financial Appraisal (Appendix 1) has shown that the outright purchase of the equipment is the most cost effective option as opposed to renting the apparatus.

The initial set-up costs associated with the purchase of two enforcement cameras is estimated to be £54,000. This is the total cost and includes the On Street equipment and all back office systems and hardware. This will be funded from the Off Street parking reserve.

The running costs of the proposal are estimated to be £21,000 per year. This estimate includes additional staff required to process the PCN's as well as software licences and maintenance costs. This annual cost will be met from the On Street revenue budget.

The amount of income generated is dependent on the number of PCN's issued for contraventions. It is estimated that each camera will generate 1 PCN per weekday during the 39 week term-time operation.

This is not a decision being made for financial reasons, but to improve the safety around schools.

.....  
Signed by:

Alan Cufley Director of Transport, Environment and Business Support

### **Appendices:**

- 1) Summary Financial Appraisal - Camera Enforcement of School Zig Zags

**Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972**

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
TECS Scrutiny Panel Report	Appendix 1

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/ rejected by ..... on .....

.....  
Signed by:  
Councillor Jim Fleming, Cabinet Member for Traffic and Transportation