

Committees:	Dates:
Corporate Projects Board – For Decision Projects Sub Committee – For Decision Planning and Transportation Committee - For Decision	08 July 2020 30 July 2020 14 July 2020
Subject: Gateway 1-5 Traffic Enforcement by CCTV Unique Project Identifier: <i>Project ID to be confirmed</i>	Gateway 1-5 Authority to Start Work Regular
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Ian Hughes	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Recommendations

<p>1. Approval track, next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Project Description: Support the Transport Strategy through self-financing procurement of additional CCTV cameras to enforce existing traffic restrictions</p> <p>Next Gateway: Gateway 6 Outcome Report</p> <p>Next Steps: Acquire cameras and deploy in support of the Transport Strategy through existing procurement and works contracts and resources.</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That budget of £257k for Phase 1 and £113k for Phase 2 is approved for completion of the project 2. The annual revenue budget increase on the On-Street Parking Account is increased by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Equipment Maintenance: £24.5k pa for Phase 1 and £13.5k for Phase 2 b. Expected Works: 5k pa for Phase 1 and 3k pa for Phase 2 3. Note the total estimated cost of the project is £370k (excluding risk and on-going maintenance / works costs) 4. Note that a Costed Risk Provision is not required due to the high degree of cost certainty 5. That Option 3 is approved (implement both phases on an equipment purchase basis)
---	--

2. Budget

For recommended Option 3, the table below is separated between camera installation costs, on-going annual equipment maintenance and expected works costs. At this point, it is not anticipated that additional resources will be required to support this enforcement or the associated representations & appeals process.

To be clear, on the basis of past experience and location surveys, it is expected that the income generated from Penalty Charge Notices issued through these cameras will be sufficient to cover both the initial outlay and the on-going maintenance costs, still factoring in the increase in compliance over time. Note that timing for this proposal is post-lockdown for COVID-19 and we have reviewed traffic volumes which are much increased and confirmed that the expectation of self-financing:

Project Costs - Purchase and Installation Costs

Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
Phase 1 Camera equipment installation	Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) to enforce traffic contraventions	On-Street Parking Account (OSPA)	257k
Phase 2 Camera equipment installation	ANPR as above	OSPA	113k
Total			370k

Revenue Implications - Annual Maintenance

Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
Phase 1 camera maintenance	Ongoing revenue cost implication	OSPA	24.5k pa
Phase 2 camera maintenance	Ongoing revenue cost implication	OSPA	13.5k pa
Total			38k pa

Revenue Implications - Annual Works Costs

Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
Phase 1 camera relocation	Ongoing revenue cost implication	OSPA	5k pa
Phase 2 camera relocation	Ongoing revenue cost implication	OSPA	3k pa
Total			8k pa

This proposal was contained and approved within the Fundamental Review and has since been value engineered to reduce costs by more than £500k by moving from fixed to relocatable cameras for most locations.

Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: Nil (see Risk Register – Appendix 3).

No costed risk is required as there is a very high level of confidence based on previous implementations of CCTV ANPR

	cameras and existing procurement and implementation methods and resources.
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Committee: Planning & Transportation • <i>Senior Responsible Officer: Carolyn Dwyer, Director of the Built Environment</i> • No project board is required, delivery is negligible risk, uses existing procurement and implementation resources / methods and has been proven in successful implementations in recent years including at Bank junction.
4. Progress reporting	Six monthly progress reports to Spending Committee and any project changes will be sought by exception via Issue Report to Spending and Projects Sub Committees

Project Summary

5. Context	<p>In 2006, the Planning & Transportation Committee, Policy & Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council agreed for a number of specific vehicle-related traffic offences to be decriminalised under powers granted by the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003.</p> <p>Those contraventions included banned turns, box junctions and one-way streets, and since that time, the City's parking enforcement contract has used CCTV cameras to enforce those restrictions, thereby helping to reduce road danger and minimise congestion.</p> <p>Most of the cameras used for this purpose form part of the City's Police's fixed network, which have inherent limitations in terms of their positioning for enforcement purposes. In addition, mobile vehicle-based cameras supplied by the City's contractor are limited to locations where the enforcement vehicle can itself park legally and safely.</p> <p>As a result, the enforcement of these restrictions has been effectively limited by those constraints, but in order to support the Transport Strategy objectives of reducing road danger and congestion, it is now appropriate to use a small number of fixed and re-deployable cameras at key locations across the City. In addition, a CCTV Camera contract was signed with Siemens in October 2019 which enables us to make better use of CCTV ANPR technology and this proposal will be implemented through this existing contract.</p> <p>The proposal is well placed to support the recently approved Transport Response to COVID-19 which involves introducing temporary measures to increase pedestrian space and economic recovery in the City. With fewer roads open and</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>concerns with public transport, we can expect a high degree of traffic post lockdown, and these relocatable cameras can be moved to encourage compliance with restrictions where it is most needed.</p>
<p>6. Brief description of project</p>	<p>Purchase and implement CCTV Automated Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) Cameras to enforce existing traffic restrictions such as Banned turns and Yellow Box Junctions.</p> <p>This proposal was approved by Resource Allocation Sub Committee in Oct 19 as part of the Fundamental Review (RASC ID 1.11 Traffic Restriction Enforcement through improved camera technology, including Beech Street) and in view of COVID-19 delays, is now being submitted for Member approval.</p>
<p>7. Consequences if project not approved</p>	<p>If not approved, the non-enforcement of these contraventions will continue, leaving road safety and congestion issues outstanding and will adversely impact both the Transport Strategy and the City's response to COVID-19.</p>
<p>8. SMART project objectives</p>	<p>Phase 1 – deploy two fixed and five relocatable cameras within three months</p> <p>Commence enforcement of traffic contraventions to drive adherence.</p> <p>Evaluate location and timing requirements for Phase 2 based on Phase 1 results and COVID-19 response requirements.</p> <p>Phase 2 – deploy three additional relocatable cameras within a further three months.</p> <p>Monitor operational running of new cameras in accordance with BAU and existing contract KPIs to ensure they are functioning according to contract specification.</p> <p>Monitor impact on road danger, congestion and air quality through existing tracking methods used by the Transport Strategy and Network Management.</p>
<p>9. Key Benefits</p>	<p>Support the Transport Strategy by reducing contraventions in existing restrictions including Banned Turns and Yellow Box Junctions, thereby increasing road safety & reducing congestion.</p> <p>Project is self-funding, capital, works and maintenances will be paid for through Penalty Charge Notice income to the On-Street Parking Account.</p>
<p>10. Project category</p>	<p>1. Health and safety</p>
<p>11. Project priority</p>	<p>B. Advisable</p>

12. Notable exclusions	Not applicable
-------------------------------	----------------

Options Appraisal

13. Overview of options	<p>Option 1- Do Nothing. Would adversely impact both the Transport Strategy and the City’s response to COVID-19. Not recommended</p> <p>Option 2 – Approve Phase 1 only Purchase and deploy 2 fixed and 5 relocatable cameras. Purchasing the camera equipment is more cost effective than leasing and has been used in the previous implementations of ANPR CCTV cameras. However, based on experience of similar enforcement systems both in the City and elsewhere, it is expected that the evaluation at the end of Phase 1 will demonstrate that the additional cameras delivered in Phase 2 will be a worthwhile addition to this enforcement resource, meaning that implementing Phase 1 alone is not recommended</p> <p>Option 3 – Approve Phase 1 as above and Phase 2, purchase and deploy an additional 3 relocatable cameras. The City’s response to COVID-19 is introducing temporary measures to increase pedestrian space. We can expect a high degree of traffic post lockdown, and these relocatable cameras will drive adherence to traffic restrictions across more locations. We will evaluate the results of phase 1 and COVID-19 response to define priorities for Phase 2 cameras. <u>Recommended</u></p> <p>Option 4 – Approve Phase 1 & 2 as above on a lease basis rather than purchase. Leasing outsources some equipment risk but is not cost effective. Not recommended</p>
14. Risk	<p>Overall project risk: Low</p> <p>Project risk is low because planning and estimating is based on previous implementations of CCTV ANPR cameras and existing procurement and implementation methods and resources.</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 3) and Options Appraisal.</p>

Resource Implications

15. Total estimated cost	For recommended option Total estimated cost (excluding risk): Capital: £370k (installation); Revenue: £38k pa (maintenance); £8k pa (camera relocation works). Total estimated cost (including risk): As above									
16. Funding strategy	Partial funding confirmed	Internal - Funded wholly by City's own resource Recommended option <table border="1" data-bbox="533 954 1353 1245"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="533 954 1161 1010">Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1161 954 1353 1010">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 1010 1161 1099">Purchase Fixed and Relocatable Cameras On-Street Parking Account (self-financing)</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1010 1353 1099">370k</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 1099 1161 1189">Ongoing Revenue of 46k pa (OSPA – self-financing)</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1099 1353 1189"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 1189 1161 1245" style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1161 1189 1353 1245">370k</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Purchase Fixed and Relocatable Cameras On-Street Parking Account (self-financing)	370k	Ongoing Revenue of 46k pa (OSPA – self-financing)		Total	370k
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)									
Purchase Fixed and Relocatable Cameras On-Street Parking Account (self-financing)	370k									
Ongoing Revenue of 46k pa (OSPA – self-financing)										
Total	370k									

Appendices

Appendix 1	DRAFT Project Briefing Coversheet
Appendix 2	Options Appraisal Matrix
Appendix 3	Risk Register

Contact

Report Author	Ian Hughes
Email Address	Ian.Hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1977

Appendix 1: DRAFT Project Briefing (in internal review)

Appendix 2: Options Appraisal Matrix

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3 Recommended</i>	<i>Option 4</i>
1. Design Summary	Do Nothing	Approve Phase 1	Approve Phase 1 and in addition Approve Phase 2	Approve Phase 1 and 2 but Lease rather than purchase
2. Scope and exclusions	Do not implement cameras as directed by RASC Oct19	Purchase and deploy 2 Fixed and 5 Relocatable Cameras	Purchase and deploy 2 Fixed and 5 Relocatable Cameras with additional 3 Relocatable Cameras	Lease rather than purchase cameras
Project Planning				
3. Programme and key dates	Not applicable	3 months elapsed: Deliver 2 Fixed and 1 Relocatable within 1 month of budget approval Deliver remaining 4 cameras and embed over following two months	Phase 1 <u>3 months elapsed</u> as per Option 2 Evaluate Phase 1 and identify requirements for Phase 2 Cameras over the following 3 months Expected Phase 2 camera implementation <u>within the following six months</u> , depending on Transport Strategy Requirements GW6 Outcome report expected 3-4Quarters from initiation depending on required pace of implementation of Phase 2.	
4. Delivery Team	Not applicable	DBE Highways		
5. Risk implications	Overall project option risk: Medium if not approved Non-approval reduces support for the Transport	Overall project option risk: Low Risk is low because of experience with previous implementations of CCTV ANPR cameras and existing procurement and implementation methods and resources. Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 3)		

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 Recommended	Option 4
	Strategy, with not achieving reduced road safety and congestion.			
6. Benefits	Not applicable in this Option	Support the Transport Strategy objectives to improve Road Safety and reduce congestion. Relocatable cameras well placed to support Covid-19 response Project is self-funding.		
7. Disbenefits	Lack of support to Transport Strategy and Covid-19 pedestrianisation response	Minimal – higher contravention volumes but expectation is current BAU staffing is sufficient		
8. Stakeholders and consultees	Not Applicable	Public consultation not required, project enforces existing, embedded, signed traffic restrictions		
Resource Implications				
9. Total estimated cost	Total estimated cost 0 High Confidence Total estimated cost: (including risk): 0	£ 257k High Confidence Total estimated cost: (including risk): £257k	£ 370k High Confidence Total estimated cost: (including risk): £370k	£653k over 5 years (£100k higher than purchasing over same time timeframe) High Confidence Total estimated cost: (including risk): £653,000
10. Funding strategy	Not applicable	OSPA, self-financing		

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3 Recommended</i>	<i>Option 4</i>
11. Estimated capital value/return	Not applicable	Self-financing		
12. Ongoing revenue implications	nil	Annual Maintenance £24.5k pa Annual Relocation Works £5k	Annual Maintenance £38k pa Annual Relocation Works £8k	Year 1 £150k Years 2-4, £10k pa Year 5+ £153k pa
13. Investment appraisal	<i>Not Applicable</i>			
14. Affordability	Not applicable	Self-financing	Self-financing	Significantly more expensive
15. Procurement strategy/route to market	Not applicable.	Existing contract for camera procurement, Siemens, effective October 2019 Existing contract for works, Riney, effective 2011		
16. Legal implications	None	In 2006, the Planning & Transportation Committee, Policy & Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council agreed for a number of specific vehicle-related traffic offences to be decriminalised under powers granted by the London Local Authorities and Transport for London Act 2003		
17. Corporate property implications	None			
18. Traffic implications	Not applicable	Positive impact expected by enforcing existing traffic restrictions	Positive impact expected by enforcing existing traffic restrictions with broader scope achieved by additional relocatable cameras	

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3 Recommended</i>	<i>Option 4</i>
19. Sustainability and energy implications	N/A			
20. IS implications	N/A			
21. Equality Impact Assessment	Not applicable	Project is extending existing enforcement principles and is not new. Using existing providers and principles, no impact expected on protected group(s) or individuals. However, not progressing the proposals could negatively impact pedestrians in protected groups by failing to achieve the road safety benefits.		
22. Data Protection Impact Assessment	Not applicable	Project is extending existing enforcement principles and is not new. Using existing controls which comply with Camera and Information Commissioner and related regulation and legislation and are managed accordingly. No project specific requirement or impact		
23. Recommendation	Not recommended	Not recommended	Recommended	Not recommended

Appendix 3: Project Risk Register