



City of Westminster

# Cabinet Member Report

**Meeting or Decision  
Maker:**

**Cabinet Member for Business**

**Date:**

**28 August 2013**

**Classification:**

**General Release**

**Title:**

**LaneWatch Phase 2 Proof of Concept Trial**

**Wards Affected:**

**To Be Confirmed**

**Better City, Better Lives  
Summary**

**Enforcing moving traffic contraventions in a more effective and efficient way will improve compliance across the City. The use of automated cameras will deter drivers from carrying out dangerous manoeuvres on Westminster's roads, improve safety, and reduce congestion.**

**Key Decision:**

*Added to the list of forthcoming Key Decisions on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2013. A decision can be taken from 5<sup>th</sup> August 2013.*

**Financial Summary:**

**The estimated cost for a full 12 month proof of concept trial is £80,000 based on utilising eight automated cameras at locations across the City.**

**Report of:**

**Strategic Director, City Management**

## **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1 This report provides an overview of the LaneWatch CCTV Trial which was conducted earlier this year and recommends that the trial is extended to a full operational trial for a period of 12 months, for the reasons detailed in Section 4 of this report.

## **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Cabinet Member for Business approves the proposal for the use of automated cameras as set out in Section 4 of this report at an estimated cost of £80,000. This will provide eight cameras which can be deployed at various locations across the City in order to improve compliance, for a period of 12 months.

## **3. Reasons for Decision**

- 3.1 Existing technology deployed by Westminster Council does not allow Parking Services to effectively and efficiently manage certain moving traffic contraventions (MTCs). Effective enforcement of MTCs reduces dangerous manoeuvres on Westminster's roads, improves compliance and reduces congestion. It also leads to reduced complaints from residents, businesses and other stakeholders.
- 3.2 Following the success of an initial four week proof of concept trial Parking Services are seeking to further validate the proposed benefits of automated camera equipment with a full proof of concept trial over a period of 12 months. The proposed trial will provide eight cameras; to be deployed at various locations across the City, and include the issue of Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs).

## **4. Background, including Policy Context**

- 4.1 Previous approval was granted for a four week, free of charge, proof of concept trial of the LaneWatch CCTV system in two locations in the City: St Georges Drive, to measure contraventions of the coach ban; and Carlton Hill, to observe vehicles that contravene the 7.5 tonne weight restriction at the junction with Maida Vale.
- 4.2 The trial was used to quality assure the technology from the point of capture to what would be the point of issue. No actual PCNs were issued. Both locations related to code 52 contraventions, namely "*failing to comply with a prohibition on certain types of vehicle*".
- 4.3 The cameras were installed, tested and were fully operational from 11 February 2013 to 10 March 2013 inclusive.
- 4.4 All captured evidence was transmitted, stored and reviewed by NSL's

CCTV Operations Team based at Lisson Grove to review both the quality of the images and the accuracy of the capture.

- 4.5 The trial resulted in high levels of accurate capture of non-compliant vehicular movements at these locations, compared to the current enforcement tools of mobile CCTV, ANPR vehicles and wireless CCTV.
- 4.6 The Zenco Systems' ZenGrab LaneWatch camera(s) used in the trial proved to be highly accurate and reliable, automatically capturing contraventions with over a 99% degree of accuracy.

**Evaluation of the Initial Trial**

- 4.7 During the proof of concept trial a total of 1,076 contraventions were captured at the two locations. 355 contraventions (33%) were captured at Carlton Hill and 721 (67%) at St Georges Drive.
- 4.8 Full details of contravention by location, by week, can be found in the table below.

<b>Week start</b>	<b>St George's Drive Coach Ban Restriction</b>	<b>Carlton Hill Weight Restriction</b>	<b>Total</b>
11/02/2013	139	83	222
18/02/2013	156	87	243
25/02/2013	233	91	324
03/03/2013	193	94	287
<b>Total</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>1,076</b>

- 4.9 The capture of contravening vehicles is extremely high compared to current enforcement methods deployed by Parking Services. The table below shows PCNs issued in Carlton Hill and St Georges Drive from 1 Apr 2012 to 31 March 2013 through the current enforcement methods of wireless cameras, mobile CCTV and ANPR vehicles. Only 271 code 52 contraventions were captured during this period and only 284 PCNs in total. All 271 code 52 contraventions were captured using the smart mobile CCTV solution.

Row Labels	Carlton Hill	St George's Drive	Grand Total
01 (Parking in a restricted street during prescribed hours)	7	2	
32 (Failing to drive in the direction shown by an arrow on a blue sign)	2	0	
52 (Failing to comply with a prohibition on certain types of vehicle)	259	12	
53 (Failing to comply with a restriction on vehicles entering pedestrian zone)	2	0	
62 (Parked with one or more wheels on or over a footpath or any part of a road other than a carriageway)	2	0	
Grand Total	272	14	

4.10 The low number of PCNs across both locations is due to significant limitations with wireless CCTV enforcing MTCs; primarily the reaction of the camera to zoom is not fast enough to match the speed of vehicles to capture sufficient evidence for a definite contravention to be ascertained. It is also extremely difficult for CCTV operators to ascertain by the naked eye whether the vehicle in question exceeds the weight restriction in place, and a number of PCNs have been cancelled as a result of proof being provided by the owner that the vehicle is within the weight restriction.

### Conclusions of Initial Trial

- 4.11 Automated capture has proved more effective and more efficient in identifying and recording non-compliance than other traditional enforcement measures. The cameras seamlessly record all contraventions, and the process required very little manual intervention.
- 4.12 Automated cameras ensured coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at specific locations.
- 4.13 Automated cameras have demonstrated that they can provide an efficient and cost effective way of capturing moving traffic contraventions.
- 4.14 Case studies from other local authorities provided suggest that once automated cameras are installed contravention levels remain at base levels for around an eight week period before improving. Within a three month period, authorities have seen contravention levels reduce by 75% in some locations, as compliance improves.
- 4.15 If a similar pattern of compliance improvement was mirrored in Westminster for example, then in St Georges Drive and Carlton Hill alone we would reduce annual contraventions by 8747 in the first year; a reduction of total of 63% from current recorded levels.
- 4.16 This improvement in compliance would lead to improvements in road safety and traffic flow, helping reduce congestion.

### Recommendations from the Initial Trial

- 4.17 A longer trial of automated cameras including the issuing of PCNs will allow the Council to fully evaluate the effectiveness of LaneWatch in improving behaviour in locations where compliance with the regulations is low.
- 4.18 Commissioning cameras to additional locations will allow the City to evaluate the effectiveness of LaneWatch in enforcing a number of additional types of MTC, and its ability to improve compliance. Case studies from other local authorities suggest that compliance can be improved by up to 75% after an 8 week bedding in period.
- 4.19 Following the success of the initial proof of concept trial, it is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Business approves an extended 12 month full operational trial of LaneWatch using eight cameras to fully enforce MTCs through the issuing of PCNs at the cost of £80,000.
- 4.20 The trial should be extended to also include further types of MTC. This will allow Parking Services to further test the feasibility of using automated cameras to enforce other MTC's such as banned turns and no entries using fully video analytics in addition to ANPR technology.
- 4.21 Compliance surveys are currently taking place to identify priority sites where compliance levels with moving traffic regulations are low. Following these surveys, appropriateness tests will then be carried out for the locations where compliance and safety issues are identified, for approval by the CCTV Governance group. Technical site surveys would need to take place in new proposed locations to establish suitability and the availability of power and street furniture.
- 4.22 Should compliance improve at these locations as a result as it is expected it will, the cameras could be quickly and easily moved to alternative suitable locations (subject to traffic orders and certification).

## **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 LaneWatch cameras are available to both purchase and rent.
- 5.2 The cost of purchasing a camera is £17,430 with annual maintenance and support charges of £1,600 in year one, and £2,975 per annum from year two of the contract onwards
- 5.3 As we are proposing a 12 month proof of concept trial, it is recommended to rent the cameras. Subject to a minimum commitment of six months, cameras can be rented for £805 per month inclusive of all maintenance and support. The cost also includes installation and site survey costs. The only additional caveat is that adequate insurance must be taken out to cover damage to the camera including vandalism up to the value of £20,000 per camera.

- 5.4 Based on renting eight cameras for a period of 12 months the total cost of the proposed trial will be £77,280, including insurance.
- 5.5 All back offices costs associated with the processing of PCN's will be absorbed by the existing back office operation.

## **6. Legal Implications**

- 6.1 MTCs are listed in the Highway Code. They include contraventions such as entering a road through a 'No entry' sign, driving into pedestrian zones, and making right or left turns when advised not to do so. Details of Westminster City Council enforcement of banned and regulatory movements can be found on the council's website (see link below). Enforcement of further appropriate locations will not involve new traffic management orders (TMOs) as the restrictions will already be in place. There are also no TMO implications from the use of the LaneWatch technology.

<http://www.westminster.gov.uk/services/transportandstreets/parking/parkingtickets/cctv/movingtrafficcontraventions/>

- 6.2 MTCs are enforced under the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003. Vehicle Certification Agency (VCA) approval for the camera device(s) is a requirement of the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 only. As the TMA 2004 provisions for MTCs have yet to be brought into force, VCA approval is not currently needed for MTC enforcement-related devices,

## **7. Consultation**

- 7.1 The exact locations of the proposed LaneWatch cameras are currently being finalised and will not be known until the completion of all relevant site surveys. Sites will then be subject to change when compliance improves in a particular location. Parking Services will consult with the relevant ward Councillors once locations are determined should there be a need to do so.

**If you have any queries about this Report or wish to inspect any of the Background Papers please contact:**

**Sara Sutton on 020 764 6916**

**[ssutton@westminster.gov.uk](mailto:ssutton@westminster.gov.uk)**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**

LaneWatch CCTV Trial Cabinet Member Report – 22 November 2012

LaneWatch Proof of Concept Trial Evaluation Paper – June 2013

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Business**

**Declaration of Interest**

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed:

Date:

NAME: **Councillor Daniel Astaire**

State nature of interest if any

.....  
.....  
.....

*(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)*

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation(s) in the report entitled

**LaneWatch Phase 2 Proof of Concept Trial** and reject any alternative options which are referred to but not recommended.

Signed .....

Cabinet Member for Business

Date .....

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Chief Operating Officer and, if there are resources implications, the Director of Human Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy and Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.

**Other Implications**

- **Resources Implications - None**
- **Business Plan Implications - None**
- **Risk Management Implications - None**
- **Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment including Health and Safety Implications - None**
- **Crime and Disorder Implications – None – the LaneWatch devices will be used only to detect moving traffic contraventions.**
- **Impact on the Environment - None**
- **Equalities Implications - None**
- **Staffing Implications – None**
- **Human Rights Implications - None**
- **Energy Measure Implications - None**
- **Communications Implications - None**

Note to report authors: If there are particularly significant implications in any of the above categories these should be moved to the main body of the report.

