## APPEARIX 2



## Introduction

Across Derby, there are 19 fixed camera housings and 13 operational motrile camera routes. Fixed cameras were first installed in the mid-1990s, prion the establishment of the Unitary Authority and Road Safety Partnership. Most fixed and all mobile sites have been created from around 2003 onwards. $>$

Prior to 2001, fixed and red light cameras were installed based on a number of criteria set up by the individual Highways Authorities in collaberation with Derbyshire Constabulary. These included: evidence of speeporpbrem, local residents concerned about speed, high casualties, proximity to zulnerable road users including children and the elderly.

From the introduction of the Partnerships in 2000, the Department for Transport provided a series of guidelines for camerandatlation, based specifically upon numbers of injury collisions and tratifespeeds.

This report investigates performance at three fix \&admera sites within Derby, by comparing injury collisions before and after cameras were installed.

The three sites which were chosen are:

1. Site number 1088, Burton Road (Wuyelo)
2. Site number 1074, Nottinghar Rgad (near Pentagon roundabout) (Truvelo)
3. Site number 61, Chellaskon Road, Shelton Lock (Gatso)

Furthermore, a trial was carrie (outs at these three sites regarding speeds and offences, as follows:

- Average speeds (Naralready available for two of the sites prior to this trial. The third suectad no recent speed data.
- During the periox 24 September 2010 to 8 November the three housings wredreactivated and covered with a bag. A speed indicating device (S $\mathrm{S}^{1}$ syas installed nearby. Average speeds were measured during this week period, to compare the effectiveness of speed indicatigg devices.
- Betweenro November and 17 December, both the housings and speed in disading devices were covered, to measure speeds with no measures on site.
Agrror, the bags were removed from the housings during the period 81 November 2010. This accounts for the dip in traffic speeds on the pollowing graphs.


## Casualty data

## Site number 1088, Burton Road

During the three year period prior to establishing this housing there were slight casualties and no people killed or seriously injured.

In the most recent three year period, there were 9 casualties resoiting in 8 slight and one serious injury.

This equates to an 18\% reduction in casualties, saving the community around £61,200 per annum**.

## Site number 1074, Nottingham Road (near Pentagônedurdabout)

During the three year period prior to establishing thousing there were 10 slight casualties and no people killed or seriousle iedigred.

In the most recent three year period, there weas casualties resulting in 3 slight and one serious injury.

This equates to a $70 \%$ reduction in cas $21 t$ s, saving the community around £183,000 per annum**.

## Site number 61, Chellaston Road, Shelton Lock

During the three year period diono establishing this housing there were 9 slight casualties and 3 peopte or seriously injured.

In the most recent three period, there were 9 casualties resulting in 7 slight and two seriousyimivives.

This equates to a $55_{0}$ ) yeduction in casualties, saving the community around £91,000 per anm (4nt.

These figures relate to injury collisions reported to or attended by D9grbyshire Constabulary, within a 300 m area of the safety camera housing.
(O)** The Department for Transport gives the total cost of a collision at approximately $£ 91,810$ in a Built-up environment (2007 figures). From Reductions in the numbers of casualties, we can gauge the savings that can be achieved.

## Speed and offence data

The following information gives a summary of averaged 85\%ile speeds, anted the number of people exceeding Police guidelines.

In Derbyshire, the Police enforce at or above 37 mph in a 30 mph see
In this instance, drivers caught between $37-42 \mathrm{mph}$ are currently offered a speed awareness course. This usually accounts for around 90\% <d aH offences registered. Above 42 mph , drivers will face a fixed penaytyanatice with penalty points, and the possibility of Court action if speeds axe excessive.

## Site number 1088, Burton Road

Average 85\%ile speeds prior to trial starting: 28.8m


Average $85 \%$ ole speeds while housing bagged with $(\xi \mathbb{R}$ in use: 28.5 mph
Average $85 \%$ ole speeds with housing and SID bagged 29.6 mph
Average number of people exceeding the enfonceatre speed limit threshold per day:-
Prior to the trial: 55 (typically 0.54\% of totatic flow)
while housing bagged with SID in use: 163 44 epical $1.94 \%$ of total traffic flow)
with housing and SID bagged: 129 (ty p)(11) $1.4 \%$ of total traffic flow)
Site number 1074, Nottingham Road(near Pentagon roundabout)
Average 85\%ile speeds prior to 4 rià子starting: no data available
Average 85\%ile speeds while (Bowsing bagged with SID in use: 28.9 mph
Average 85\%ile speeds with housing and SID bagged: 28.7 mph
Average number of peote exceeding the enforceable speed limit threshold per day:-
Prior to the trial: dateravailable
while housing bagsedyhth SID in use: 112 (typical $1.49 \%$ of total traffic flow) with housing and Bl,

Site number 6(1,) ghellaston Road, Shelton Lock
Average $85 \%$ i)
Average $85 \%$ pile speeds while housing bagged with SID in use: 30.3 mph
Aver 20 85\%ile speeds with housing and SID bagged: 29.9 mph
A perday:-
Prior to the trial: 37 (typically $0.3 \%$ of total traffic flow)
While housing bagged with SID in use: 216 (typical $2.53 \%$ of total traffic flow)
with housing and SID bagged: 167 (typically $1.72 \%$ of total traffic flow)
The following graphs show the data in an easier format...





The average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed whilst the camera housing was bagged was 28.9 mph . Once the bag was removed from the camera housing, the average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed decreased to 26.8 mph . The camera housing was then re-bagged four days later which showed the average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed increase to 28.7 mph .



[^0]
## CONCLUSIONS

## Burton Road

When we consider the speeds before the trial compared with speeds usin SID and no measures, there was less than 1 mph difference. The survey figures show that compliance with the speed limit is fairly well respected at this location. The reduction in casualties was minimal.

Most of the collisions took place at the junction with Farley R pad. apdd the accident trends have continued since this housing was instaked.
Although this housing has slightly reduced the casualty n\&inbers, a different measure may prove to be more successful. During the Abyum of 2010, a pedestrian refuge was installed near this location to telpedestrians, slow traffic, and protect right-turning traffic at the junctiont(TkeJeffectiveness of the refuge will be monitored by the City Council casuaterduction team.

It is proposed that the camera be removed from this location. The effect of the pedestrian refuge on vehicle speeds and casualty statistics will be monitored. Burton Road should remain a orove camera enforcement route and this type of enforcement should be $4 s e<1+0$ target situations where inappropriate speed is a threat to road eqty

## Nottingham Road (near Pentagon)

There is no doubt that this site (Tassenjoyed some success with a safety camera, this is demonstrate three years. However, the squevey figures show that there was minimal change in speed during the trial anocompliance was fairly good. This leads me to believe that other factermay have contributed to casualty reduction at this location.

It is proposed thetthe Camera be removed from this location. The location will continue to be meritbred and should concerns emerge then the option to reinstate the caney should be available. In this situation the post and electricity supply for the camera should be retained.

Enforcementby mobile speed cameras, targeting situations where inappropkiate speed is a threat to road safety, should be pursued.

Again, there was little change in speeds during the trial. However, there was 486\% increase in vehicles exceeding the speed enforcement threshold once the housing was covered. Compliance prior to the trial was extremely high, with only $0.3 \%$ of vehicles exceeding the threshold in a typical day. This rose to $2.53 \%$ once the housing was covered.

This location has not seen a reduction in casualty numbers since the camera
was installed although there has been a slight change in the level of injury sustained.

It is proposed that the camera should be removed from this location.
 location will continue to be monitored and should concerns emerge the th option to re-instate the camera should be available. In this situation the post and electricity supply for the camera should be retained.

## Further surveys



It is recommended that we carry out further surveys for theremaning 16 housings within the City, throughout 2011/12.

This could entail a simpler survey to find speeds before after the covering of a housing, and probably for a shorter period, say would find locations which are meeting their aims, also identify fixed camera locations which haven't proved as successful) as anticipated.


[^0]:    The average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed before the camera housing was bagged was 29.1 mph . Once the camera housing was bagged, the avet \&eb percentile speed increased to 30.3 mph . Once the bag was removed from the camera housing, the average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed decreasedto 27.8 mph . The camera housing was then re-bagged four days later which showed the average $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed increase to 29.9 mph .

