

ORIGINATOR: CHIEF CONSTABLE

PAPER NO: AP13/47

**SUBMITTED TO: ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE PANEL
- 31 OCTOBER 2013**

SUBJECT: THE OPERATIONAL APPROACH TO SPEED ENFORCEMENT

SUMMARY:

1. This reports provides an outline to the operational approach to speed enforcement and proposed transparency in enforcement procedures.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Accountability and Performance Panel is asked to note the content of the report and the issues raised.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. OVERVIEW

- 1.1 Following the PCC's survey relating to speeding, the Chief Constable directed a review of Suffolk Constabulary's operational approach toward speed enforcement. Within that review, he sought to ensure both transparency and fairness through effective deployment of resource.
- 1.2 It is clearly evidenced that speeding is one of the "fatal four" contributory factors to collisions involving death or serious injury. The others are; the use of mobile telephones, failing to wear seatbelts and drink driving. Over the past twelve months, 28 people have lost their lives on the roads of Suffolk and 319 people have been seriously injured.
- 1.3 As a result of the review, proactive speed enforcement will now only take place where there is an evidence based need. In addition, the sites where such requirement for proactive enforcement is identified will be publicised on the force internet to ensure the communities of Suffolk are aware of the sites that are causing concern and allow people to address their own driving behaviour. Where drivers are caught speeding, they will be treated fairly in accordance with national guidelines, ensuring they are provided alternatives to prosecution where appropriate. Nothing in this paper will prevent officers reacting to situations where, as part of their routine patrol, they observe drivers exceeding speed limits.

2. THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

- 2.1 Suffolk Constabulary will work within the guidelines produced by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). Two elements of these guidelines are relevant to the discussion in this paper; enforcement thresholds and the national speed awareness course.

2.2 Enforcement Thresholds

- 2.3 The current arrangements in Suffolk regarding how our staff deal with offences are consistent with ACPO enforcement thresholds as set out in the guidelines '*Joining Forces for Safer Roads*' republished earlier this year. This advises forces on how drivers should be dealt with and enables a range of interventions from education through to attendance at court. The following table summarises this.

Legal speed limit	Device tolerance	Fixed Penalty when education N/A	Speed awareness if appropriate		Summons in all other cases and above
			From	To	
20 mph	22 mph	Under review	Under review		40 mph
30 mph	32 mph	35 mph	35 mph	42 mph	50 mph
40 mph	42 mph	46 mph	46 mph	53 mph	66 mph
50 mph	52 mph	57 mph	57 mph	64 mph	76 mph
60 mph	62 mph	68 mph	68 mph	75 mph	86 mph
70 mph	73 mph	79 mph	79 mph	86 mph	96 mph

2.4 National Speed Awareness Programme

- 2.5 Suffolk Constabulary is part of the National Driver Offending Retraining Scheme (NDORS) which allows eligible offending drivers to elect to attend a speed awareness course as an alternative to a fixed penalty ticket. Within Suffolk, there is a 55% take up of such education where it is offered.

3. SUFFOLK SPEEDING OFFENCES

3.1 The number of speeding offences detected in Suffolk over the past three years is outlined below:

Year	Fixed	Mobile	Police Officers	Total
2010	9,427	33,832	4,209	47,468
2011	8,022	40,658	5,409	54,089
2012	4,340	33,029	5,602	42,971

4. SPEED DETECTION DEPLOYMENT PLANS

4.1 As a result of the review directed by the Chief Constable, proactive speed enforcement will now only take place where there is an evidence based need and will either be included following analysis of collision history or where there has been a substantiated complaint from the public, roads policing officers, safer neighbourhood teams, elected members or the Police and Crime Commissioner. The process used to enable such operational activity is outlined within appendix A and is précised below.

4.2 Collision History

4.3 The review includes a reassessment of all camera enforcement sites to ensure only those areas identified as possessing an on-going risk of fatal or serious collisions are included and is based upon the history of collisions involving injury at each site over the past five years.

4.4 The collisions are weighted, with most recent history scoring highest, to produce a hierarchical list of sites based on the weighting criteria.

4.5 The rationale for the prioritisation of each site is clearly articulated within the table below, and the full list of sites, along with their grading will be published on the Suffolk Constabulary internet site

RED	high priority enforcement site with a higher collision history (4 or more injury RTC in last year or >50 weighted score)
AMBER	medium priority enforcement site with less high collision history (3 RTC in last year or 35-49 weighted score)
GREEN	no enforcement (less than 3 RTC last year or score <35)

4.6 Complaints

4.7 The second strand for enforcement activity is in relation to recent complaints which may arise from the community, elected representatives, parish councils and Safer Neighbourhood Teams.

4.8 Response to areas of complaint will firstly involve the use of Speed Data Recorders (SDR) to provide an evidence base for operational activity. In other words, it provides tangible data to either prove or disprove that speeding is of concern. A graduated response can then be determined ranging from;

4.9 Community Speed Watch (CSW)

4.10 The Constabulary are keen to develop CSW to empower local communities to be involved in speed reduction. If community activity highlights high levels of non compliance then this will be identified at the reviewing stage and may escalate, through the tasking process to enforcement.

4.11 A review of CSW will now take place to ensure it is supported appropriately. This will include an assessment of the equipment available to support them including speed detection devices and speed indicator devices.

4.12 Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNT's)

4.13 Community complaints are dealt with in a number of ways utilising local police officers trained in the use of the speed enforcement device. Specialist roads policing officers will provide advice and support where appropriate.

4.14 Specialist Roads Policing Officers

4.15 Specialist officers are tasked on a daily basis to patrol specific areas at key times determined through continual analysis of collision data and will target enforcement of the 'fatal four' outlined above. Proactive speed enforcement using speed detection devices will only take place during these tasks if those areas are also on the sanctioned enforcement lists. However, officers may very well have to deal with any driver they witness speeding as part of this targeted patrol.

4.16 Additionally, Operation 'Quarter', has been devised following analysis of the PCC's speed survey and will involve both local officers and specialist roads policing officers. It will target specific towns and villages in areas determined through the speed detection deployment plan and will be a broad operation that will target not only the 'fatal four' but will also address community concerns relating to anti-social driver or rider behaviour, including cyclists riding on pavements or noise nuisance from stationary vehicles.

4.17 Mobile Cameras.

4.18 Suffolk Constabulary currently employs staff to use three mobile camera vans. In line with the revised deployment strategy, these will only be deployed to areas that warrant their use.

5. PRIORITISATION AND TASKING

5.1 Following assessment of tactical options, all deployments, be they from the analysis of collision data or a substantiated complaint, will be determined at a monthly tasking and co-ordination meeting chaired by the Assistant Chief Constable (Protective Services).

5.2 In addition, collision history will be reviewed, due to its nature, on an annual basis and substantiated complaints will be reviewed after three months to ensure any deployment is still both necessary and proportionate.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Following this review, the Chief Constable has directed that the resource we currently dedicate towards keeping our roads safe is assessed. Should there be a

requirement for more resource a discussion will take place with the Police and Crime Commissioner.

7. OTHER IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

- 7.1 There is no doubt that the risk of harm inflicted upon our communities by drivers who speed is significant. Failure to deal appropriately with the issue of speeding could lead to this harm being elevated, with an increased number of people who are either injured or killed on our roads. This fact has to be paramount in the decision making process.
- 7.2 However, this needs to be balanced against the need to ensure policing remains legitimate in society so that we retain the respect and consent of our communities. This paper has outlined a process that balances these two important factors.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Examination of the PCC's speed survey has enabled the Constabulary to listen to the comments made by the public and has led to a radical review of its policy and practice surrounding speed enforcement.
- 8.2 The processes that have now been agreed ensure the communities within Suffolk, and those who travel through the County, are dealt with in both a fair and transparent way, with proactive speed enforcement only taking place in those areas that truly warrant such activity. The Constabulary will ensure transparency of decision making, with all sites being identified on the force internet site.

ORIGINATOR CHECKLIST (MUST BE COMPLETED)	PLEASE STATE 'YES' OR 'NO'
Has legal advice been sought on this submission?	No
Has the PCC's Chief Finance Officer been consulted?	No
Have equality, diversity and human rights implications been considered including equality analysis, as appropriate?	Yes
Have human resource implications been considered?	No
Is the recommendation consistent with the objectives in the Police and Crime Plan?	Yes
Has consultation been undertaken with people or agencies likely to be affected by the recommendation?	Yes
Has communications advice been sought on areas of likely media interest and how they might be managed?	Yes
In relation to the above, have all relevant issues been highlighted in the 'other implications and risks' section of the submission?	Yes

Speed Enforcement Site Selection Criteria

