

Central Bedfordshire Council

06 November 2025

Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Enforcement of Moving Traffic Offences (MTO)

Report of:

Cllr John Baker, Executive Member for Finance and Highways,
john.baker@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

Responsible Director:

Lorna Carver, Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Place and Communities
lorna.carver@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk

The following sections of this report are exempt: None

This report relates to a decision that is: Non-Key

This report relates to a decision that is urgent/exempt from call-in: No

Purpose of this report

This report sets out the initial results of the Moving Traffic Offences (MTO) Trial and presents options for future enforcement of MTO.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Committee is asked to:

- Note that the Council has made a successful application and were given powers to enforce MTO.
- Note that CBC conducted a trial at five sites as part of our application for the powers. Officers have been asked to report the initial findings from the first seven months of the trial.
- Note that the MTO trial ends on 21st April 2026 in line with the end of the contract for the camera software and maintenance. There is no budget for installation of new sites, relocation of existing cameras or maintenance of existing cameras. Should Executive wish to maintain any of the existing trial sites, or pursue other MTO sites, a budget would be required.

- Note that based on the initial findings, officers found three trial sites to be ineffective due to limited impact on safety but would recommend two sites for potential continued intervention.
- To support the proposed site selection criteria for identifying potential future sites and consider a recommendation on the preferred option from those set out in this report (paragraph 52-73). This will enable officers to consider the use of MTO cameras as one of the many tools available to CBC to improve road safety.

Executive Summary

1. In December 2024, CBC launched a trial enforcement programme for Moving Traffic Offences (MTO) at five locations across Central Bedfordshire agreed by the previous Administration in June 2022. The initiative utilised Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras, with the primary objective of enhancing road safety.
2. The trial is scheduled to end on the 21st of April 2026 in line with the end of the ANPR software and maintenance contract with Yunex.
3. Analysis of the trial to date, has shown that the costs largely outweigh the safety impacts, suggesting that this approach may not be the most effective method for wider implementation across Central Bedfordshire.
4. ANPR cameras are not only used for MTOs and remain one of a range of tools we can utilise to improve road safety. ANPR cameras may be suitable for specific road safety schemes, where appropriate, rather than as a widescale MTO programme.
5. Based on data from the first seven months of the trial, officers recommend retaining two of the five sites to the end of the trial in April 2026. A full review will commence in January 2026 after one year of operation, in line with the original scope of the trial.
6. Based on data from the first seven months of the trial, it is recommended that three sites be decommissioned due to their limited safety impact.
7. A list of options for MTO next steps is included in this report. There is currently no specific budget allocated for installation of new sites or relocation of existing cameras. There is no budget for maintenance of existing cameras and software beyond April 2026. Should Executive wish to maintain any of the existing trial sites or pursue future MTO sites a budget would be required.
8. If a budget is allocated, equipment from the three underperforming sites could be relocated to new locations that meet the updated site selection criteria.
9. The committee is asked to consider the outcomes of the trial and the options for next steps, specifically noting the budget implications.

Background

10. On 27th January 2022, The Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (England) Regulations 2022 were laid in Parliament. These regulations approved powers under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to enable local authorities to improve safety and tackle congestion by enforcing moving traffic contraventions (for full list see background papers) such as:
 - driving through a 'No Entry' sign
 - turning left or right when instructed not to do so i.e. banned turns
 - entering yellow box junctions when the exit is not clear
 - driving where and when motor vehicles are prohibited

11. Each site enforced by CBC must help achieve at least one of the following objectives:
 - improve road safety
 - tackle network congestion
 - increase public transport reliability
 - improve air quality
 - increase lifespan of highway asset

12. The legislation requires enforcement by specialist fixed ANPR cameras. The cameras can only be used to enforce MTO where all other methods of deterrent have been tried, but further measures are still required.

13. The ANPR cameras used for MTO are not like standard ANPR cameras that record only number plates. MTO cameras are specially calibrated to capture contextual evidence, include scheme analysis software to detect violations, video recording to provide time-stamped evidence, and connect with the local authority enforcement systems to enable the issuance of Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs). MTO ANPR cameras can also be site specific and only used for the specific offence for which they are created, e.g. School Keep Clear.

14. The legislation requires specific criteria to be met including a consultation period for each proposed site. Public consultation is intended to communicate the rationale for, and benefits of, MTO enforcement to residents and businesses to promote compliance.

15. The legislation also requires that for a period of six months following implementation of moving traffic enforcement in practice, at each individual camera location, local authorities must issue warning notices for first-time moving traffic contraventions. This also applies to any new camera location in the future.

Previous consideration by Executive

16. On 7th June 2022 the Executive agreed to apply for MTO powers and implement trial sites across the authority and gave delegated authority to the Director of Place and Communities in consultation with the Executive Member for Community Services, the Director of Resources, and the Executive Member for Corporate Resources the authority to approve the next decision points in the project.

MTO Trial Aims

17. The MTO trial was introduced to improve road safety, reduce congestion, and encourage long-term behavioural change among drivers through targeted enforcement of existing traffic restrictions. The aims of trial were to:
18. Improve road safety, reduce the risk of accidents, especially in areas with vulnerable road users such as school zones, pedestrianised high streets, and narrow or one-way streets.
19. Increase compliance with traffic regulations, where signage and previous mitigation have failed to change driver behaviour, the presence of automated enforcement (e.g. ANPR cameras) was expected to lead to better adherence to rules.
20. Reduced congestion and improve traffic flow, the trial aimed to improve overall traffic flow, particularly at known congestion points or routes near schools, town centres, and residential areas.
21. Behavioural change through consistent enforcement. The trial sought to embed long-term behavioural change by showing that non-compliance has consequences. The aim was not to issue penalties for their own sake, but to act as a deterrent and encourage lawful, considerate driving.

Site Selection

22. Due to the limited timeframe for submitting applications to the Secretary of State, the initial sites were selected based on DfT criteria, supplemented by officer insights drawn from Member and customer engagement and identified offence patterns. Site prioritisation also considered key safety concerns. Site surveys were not undertaken at this stage.
23. Between 23 June 2022 and 4th August 2022 there was a public consultation on the proposed nine trial sites:
 - Biggleswade, Sun Street – One Way System
 - Cranfield, Lodge Road – No Left Turn
 - Houghton Regis, Tithe Farm School – School No Waiting
 - Leighton Buzzard, Clipstone Brook – School No waiting
 - Leighton Buzzard, High Street – Pedestrian Zone
 - Barton-le-Clay, Barton Road and Bedford Road – no right turn A6
 - Dunstable, Sainsbury's one way route – no stopping in yellow box junction
 - Brogborough, Bedford Road – goods vehicles exceeding weight limit

- Silsoe, Barton Road/High Street – goods vehicles exceeding weight limit

Discounted Sites

24. Following a review of the consultation responses (Consultation report available on the website – see link in background papers) and further technical assessments by officers, four sites were discounted:

Barton-le-Clay, Barton Road and Bedford Road – no right turn A6

25. The public consultation found limited support for this site with 49% of respondents in favour and 49% of respondents against the site. On-site assessments identified a lack of nearby power sources which would lead to substantial construction costs and time delays. Therefore, this site was discounted from the trial.

Dunstable, Sainsbury's one way route – no stopping in yellow box junction

26. The public consultation returned a negative response, with 52% of respondents opposing the site. Respondents were concerned that the junction could unintentionally 'catch people out,' with vehicles easily becoming trapped due to layout and traffic flow. The primary focus of the trial was to improve road safety and while this site was legally enforceable it was felt that other sites better met the objective of improving road safety. Therefore, this site was discounted from the trial.

Brogborough, Bedford Road & Silsoe, Barton Road/High Street – goods vehicles exceeding weight limit

27. The sites received positive public feedback and were supported by local Councillors. However, both weight limits cannot be enforced with ANPR as they cover too wide an area and were not designed with the use of ANPR enforcement in mind. Technical requirements for enforcement were prohibitive involving multiple cameras, tailored software solutions and manual interventions regarding exemptions that were not immediately practicable. Consequently, weight restriction MTO were removed from the trial. The challenges regarding using ANPR for the enforcement of 7.5 tonne weight limits in the context of Central Bedfordshire are set out, in detail, in the report to Executive regarding the Freight Strategy on 3rd June 2025 (Appendix A).

28. In September 2022 there was a Delegated Decision (see link in background papers) regarding the final sites to submit to the Secretary of State and an application to enforce MTO was submitted.

Trial Sites

29. In June 2023 MTO enforcement powers were granted to CBC. Following this award a procurement exercise was undertaken with contracts awarded to Yunex for the ANPR cameras and Imperial for the IT software needed to process the Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs). The contract with Yunex runs until the end of the trial on 21st April 2026.

30. Between May and November 2024, the project moved into delivery phase engaging all partners, Yunex (cameras), Imperial (PCNs) and M Group Ltd (site infrastructure). The following five trial sites were erected in December 2024, and we began issuing warning notices to motorists contravening the regulations.

- Biggleswade, Sun Street – One Way System

- Cranfield, Lodge Road – No Left Turn
- Houghton Regis, Tithe Farm School – School No Waiting
- Leighton Buzzard, Clipstone Brook – School No waiting
- Leighton Buzzard, High Street – Pedestrian Zone

Results

31. Before the ANPR cameras were installed, surveys were conducted at each of the five sites on the 19th and 20th of November 2024 to provide a base level for contraventions. In future, should further sites be considered, site surveys would be included in the initial site selection, prior to consultation.
32. The initial expectation for the trial was to report after the sites had been operational for a period of one year. However, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested that officers reported back earlier. Therefore, the results included in this report relate to the period from December 2024 to the end of June 2025. This includes the six-month warning period and therefore a full analysis of the trial cannot be made at this time. Officers would recommend undertaking a review at the planned one-year mark, giving a full year of data and allowing for more comprehensive analysis.
33. The initial findings of the trial are as follows:

Site	Recommendation
Biggleswade, Sun Street One Way System 1 camera	Remove due to limited safety impact
Leighton Buzzard, Clipstone Brook School No waiting 2 cameras	Remove due to limited safety impact
Cranfield, Lodge Road No Left Turn 1 camera	Remove due to limited safety impact
Houghton Regis, Tithe Farm School School No Waiting 4 cameras	Consider retention due to improved safety impact
Leighton Buzzard, High Street Pedestrian Zone 2 cameras	Consider retention due to improved safety impact

Biggleswade, Sun Street – One Way System – recommend removing

34. Site surveys recorded only ten contraventions over two survey days. While this confirms that offences were occurring, the volume falls well below the threshold for further intervention set out in the revised site selection criteria (see paragraph 48-53).
35. Between December 2024 and June 2025, only eight offences were captured by the ANPR cameras, with seven of these occurring during the six-month warning notice period. As a result, only one PCN has been issued for this site to date.
36. Given the very low level of enforcement activity and the high opportunity cost, officers recommend removing this site because it does not align with the updated criteria for site selection and safety improvements have proven to be minimal.

Leighton Buzzard, Clipstone Brook – School No waiting – recommend removing

37. Site surveys identified nineteen contraventions over two survey days. While this confirms that offences were occurring, the volume does not meet the threshold outlined in the revised site selection criteria for further intervention.
38. Between December 2024 and June 2025, a total of sixteen offences were recorded by the ANPR cameras. At the time of writing, only two PCNs have been issued at this location, both involving repeat offenders.
39. Given the very low level of enforcement activity and the high opportunity cost, officers recommend removing this site because it does not align with the updated criteria for site selection and safety improvements have proven to be minimal.

Cranfield, Lodge Road – No Left Turn - recommend removing

40. Site surveys identified only nine contraventions over two survey days. While this confirms that offences were occurring, the volume does not meet the threshold outlined in the revised site selection criteria for further intervention.
41. Between December 2024 and June 2025, a total of 304 offences were recorded by the ANPR cameras. 215 of the offences took place during the six-month warning notice period. Therefore, at the time of writing 89 PCNs have been issued for this site. While considerably higher than the two sites above, enforcement activity is still low, with fewer than two offences a day being recorded. Therefore, officers recommend removing this site.

Houghton Regis, Tithe Farm School – School No Waiting – recommend keeping

42. Site surveys recorded 174 contraventions over two days, exceeding the threshold set out in the revised site selection criteria and indicating a need for intervention. Between December 2024 and June 2025, 39 offences were captured by the ANPR cameras. At the time of writing, four PCNs have been issued at this location, all involving repeat offenders.
43. Site surveys indicated that, prior to intervention, an average of 10 offences occurred per hour. Since the installation of ANPR cameras, this figure has reduced to an average of 0.2 offences per hour. This significant reduction demonstrates that the site is successfully meeting key trial objectives: improving road safety, increasing

compliance with traffic regulations, encouraging behavioural change through consistent enforcement, and reducing congestion to improve traffic flow around the school site.

44. Given the positive safety impact observed, officers recommend that the site remains operational until the end of the trial in April 2026, with a full review of outcomes to commence in January 2026, once the site has been active for a full year. Should a budget be available, this site may be suitable for continued ANPR enforcement beyond the end of the trial.

Leighton Buzzard, High Street – Pedestrian Zone – recommend keeping

45. Site surveys recorded 158 contraventions over two days, meeting the threshold for intervention under the revised site selection criteria and indicating a need for intervention. Between December 2024 and June 2025, the ANPR cameras captured 2,531 offences. To date, 437 PCNs have been issued, with repeat offences frequently observed throughout the six-month warning period.
46. Due to the volume of offences continuing to occur at this site, officers recommend that the site remains operational until the end of the trial in April 2026, with a full review of outcomes to commence in January 2026, once the site has been active for a full year. Should a budget be available, this site may be suitable for continued ANPR enforcement beyond the end of the trial.

Proposed Future Site Selection Process

47. A key component of the MTO trial was the development of a robust site selection framework for potential future enforcement locations, underpinned by an objective, data-driven prioritisation matrix. Should funding be confirmed for future MTO sites, the proposed site selection process comprises four stages:

Stage 1

48. Stage 1 includes five pass/fail questions, answering 'No' to any will lead to the site being discounted as not suitable for an MTO site as set out by the DfT requirements:

Question	Answer
Is the offence in the list of Moving Traffic Offences CBC has the power to enforce?	Yes/No
Is the site capable of being enforced by ANPR cameras?	Yes/No
Have other methods of deterrent been utilised and proven to be ineffective?	Yes/No
Is ANPR enforcement expected to do one or more of the following? - Improve Safety - Tackle congestion - Improve Public Transport Reliability - Improve Air Quality - Improve the lifespan of the Highway	Yes/No
Are the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders, signs and lines in place to make the site enforceable?	Yes/No

Stage 2

49. Stage 2 is a weighted prioritisation matrix that scores against the following criteria:

Criteria	Assessment	Score
Improve Safety	1-5 slight incidents	1
	6+ slight incidents	2
	1-2 Killed or seriously injured (KSI) incidents	2
	3+ KSI incidents	3
Tackle Congestion	U or C Class Road	1
	B Class Road	2
	A Class Road	3
	On a junction with A Class Road	1
	On a junction with B Class Road	2
Improve Public transport reliability	Supports buses	1
	Supports pedestrians	1
	Supports cycling	1
	Supports sustainable travel to school	1
	Other positive impact on sustainable transport	1
Improve Air Quality	Within air quality monitoring area	5
Increase the lifespan of the highway	Annual cost of repair, £1 to £999	1
	Annual cost of repair, £1000 to £4,999	2
	Annual cost of repair, £5,000 to £9,999	3
	Annual cost of repair, £10,000 +	4

	A prioritised school street where other enforcement methods would be less cost effective	5
--	--	---

50. The scores are then weighted to give a final score out of 5. Sites must score a minimum of 1.5 to be considered for Stage 3.

Criteria	Weight
Improve road safety	50%
Tackle congestion on roads	10%
Increase public transport reliability	25%
Improve air quality	5%
Increase lifespan of highway assets	10%

Stage 3

51. Stage 3 is a two-day site survey monitoring the number of moving traffic offences occurring at the proposed site. It is recommended that a minimum average of 20 violations per day should be recorded to justify enforcement. If this threshold is met, the average number of violations per day will be added to the score from Stage 2 to give a final score for the site. If there are multiple sites they will be prioritised according to this score.

Stage 4

52. Following Stage 3, a six-week public consultation would take place. Officers would then consider the responses and report to Traffic Management Meeting with their recommendations. The Chair of Traffic Management Meeting makes the final decision, in line with the process for other road safety interventions.

Options for consideration

Option 1: Opportunity for continued ANPR MTO enforcement

53. Officers recommend removing cameras and associated infrastructure from the three sites that have not demonstrated significant impact. The recovered cameras could then be redeployed to new locations across Central Bedfordshire, identified using the updated site selection criteria.

54. Note, due to the long lead-in time for the creation of new sites, with no new sites being able to be installed before the end of the trial period, it is recommended that all the existing sites be retained until the end of the trial. This will enable the continuation of income from PCNs being issued at the sites.

55. While ANPR cameras can be relocated, they are not necessarily interchangeable with some specific to the type of offence. The cameras are fixed units that require supporting infrastructure at each site. This includes appropriate housing and calibration to ensure accurate operation.
56. Each proposed site must undergo a full assessment to confirm enforceability. This includes reviewing signage, road markings, and existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs), as well as evaluating power availability and the feasibility of installing the necessary infrastructure. Consequently, relocating cameras incurs both capital and revenue costs, including decommissioning, installation, and calibration at the new sites.
57. The contract with Yunex for camera software and maintenance ends on 21st April 2026. To maintain the existing camera stock, a new contact with Yunex would have to be negotiated. There is no budget beyond the end of April 2026 for maintenance of MTO sites. It is anticipated, the cameras and software would cost approximately £69k per year to maintain, although this may be higher.
58. While there is currently no budget for the installation of future MTO sites, we have £66k grant funding from Active Travel England to install ANPR cameras for 'School Streets'. More information about 'School Streets' can be found in the report to Overview and Scrutiny on Sustainable Modes of Travel to Schools and Active Travel Strategies (Background papers D).
59. It may be possible to utilise the Active Travel funding for relocation of the existing cameras, if the cameras can be suitably calibrated for this purpose. However, a budget for the maintenance of the cameras would need to be found.
60. There is a revenue budget of £70k for the processing of PCNs and an income budget of £48k from PCNs. However, for 25/26 income is currently forecast at £17k and expenditure at £85k creating a pressure of £46k. The trial has found that while school sites may be successful in improving road safety, the increase in compliance means they do not generate significant income from PCNs and thereby a worsening revenue pressure is expected.
61. Decommissioning the three unsuccessful sites is expected to cost around £15k.
62. If this option is selected it will create a pressure for the decommissioning of unsuccessful sites, ongoing enforcement activity and maintenance. Providing a budget is made available, this option is recommended by officers, as it makes the best use of the camera stock we have purchased and enables the continued ANPR enforcement of MTO sites.
63. This proposal assumes the use of current camera stock only; any expansion beyond this would require additional funding for new equipment. Purchasing additional cameras is not recommended by officers.
64. It is important to note the long lead in time for the development of new MTO sites. From inception to go live takes a minimum of eight months with a subsequent six-month notice period where PCNs can only be issued to repeat offenders.
65. Should the Executive wish to support any option that includes the provision of new sites, an indicative timescale for delivery could be as follows:

Action	Estimated Date
The Executive determines to seek new MTO sites	October 2025
Call for sites	October-November 2025
Initial site selection and traffic counts	December 2025
6-week public consultation	Spring 2026
Officers report to Traffic Management Meeting with recommendations for sites to take forward	26 th May 2026
Contracts to be arranged for relocation of cameras and software set up for new sites	April/May 2026 (this can only be done if funding is confirmed)
Order physical works (3 month lead in time for any traffic management and utility connections)	May/June 2026
On site delivery	September/October 2026
Anticipated Go Live	October 2026
Warning notices for first offences issued for first 6 months	October 2026-April 2027
PCNs issued for all offences	May 2027-October 2027
Review of sites	November 2027

Option 2: Do nothing

66. Retain existing trial sites and do not seek to develop new sites. This option is not possible as the contract with Yunex for the camera software and maintenance ends on 21st April 2026. Therefore, to maintain the existing cameras, a new contact with Yunex would have to be negotiated. There is no budget beyond the end of April 2026 for maintenance of MTO sites. It is anticipated, the sites would cost approximately £69k per year to maintain, although this may be higher.
67. There is a revenue budget of £70k for the processing of PCNs and an income budget of £48k from PCNs. However, for 25/26 income is currently forecast at £17k and expenditure at £85k creating an in-year pressure of £46k. As the sites continue to be operational it is expected that the number of contraventions would continue to reduce, thereby worsening the pressure.
68. If this option is selected, this will create a pressure for the ongoing enforcement activity and maintenance at the sites. This option is not recommended by officers due to the ongoing costs and the limited perceived benefit of many of the sites.

Option 3: Rotational use of existing cameras across the network

69. This option involves creating new enforcement sites and periodically rotating the existing ANPR cameras between them, while leaving infrastructure in place at all locations.
70. Although previously suggested by Members, this approach is not considered viable. Retaining infrastructure at inactive sites conflicts with the *Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016*, which discourages unnecessary street clutter.
71. While ANPR cameras can be relocated, the cameras are not interchangeable. Some cameras are specific to the type of offence. The cameras are fixed units that require supporting infrastructure at each site. This includes appropriate housing and calibration to ensure accurate operation.
72. In addition to the potential £69k maintenance costs and the £46k pressure related to the processing of PCNs, relocating cameras incurs a cost of £2,000 - £15,000 per camera, per move, making frequent moves impractical. The costs vary depending on the site set up requirements at each site. Each new site would also require a six-month consultation and a six-month warning notice period, meaning enforcement, and any associated income, would not begin until at least one year after site selection. Therefore, this option is not recommended by officers.

Option 4: Decommission sites at the end of the trial

73. This option would bring the MTO trial to a close, with all existing sites decommissioned and related infrastructure removed after the trial end date 21st April 2026. The cost to decommission the sites is estimated at £25k.
74. There is a revenue budget of £70k for the processing of PCNs and an income budget of £48k from PCNs. For 25/26 income is currently forecast at £17k and expenditure at £85k creating an in-year pressure of £46k. Should the sites be decommissioned the pressure would be removed and impact to the base budget would be an efficiency of £22k. If funding for future maintenance of existing sites and/or maintenance and installation of new sites is not available, officers recommend this as the most appropriate option.

Reason/s for decision

75. The scope of the MTO trial included the implementation of trial enforcement sites, with the expectation that each site would operate for a minimum of one year, before a full review of the trial was undertaken to inform future options. Officers have been asked to report the initial findings of the trial early. This report sets out the initial findings of the trial.
76. The scope of the trial included the creation of a data-driven site selection and prioritisation matrix to inform potential future enforcement locations. The committee is asked to recommend that the Executive endorses the proposed site selection criteria.
77. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the options outlined above and make comments to Executive.

Council priorities

78. MTO sites support the core aim of the Council to '*Be ambitious in our plans towards improving and maintaining the roads and travel network*'. The continued use of MTO enforcement at specific sites will improve road safety and ease congestion on our road network.

Implications

Legal Implications

79. The Traffic Management Act 2004, Part 6, allowed local authorities who already have Civil Enforcement powers for parking to introduce measures to enforce moving traffic restrictions. The legislation sets out the traffic restrictions which would be enforceable (under Schedule 7, Part 4 of the Act) and the authorities will be able to enforce all of these contraventions where appropriate.

80. The Council must be satisfied that it has suitable signs and lines (in line with The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016) and relevant new signage as necessary under the legislation. Checks of relevant sites will need to be maintained, and all corrective actions taken in a timely manner to ensure that enforcement can continue.

81. In addition, the Council must follow the requirements of The Civil Enforcement of Road Traffic Contraventions (Approved Devices, Charging Guidelines and General Provisions) (England) Regulations 2022 to ensure that all devices are calibrated correctly with relevant documentation to defend any challenges to enforcement.

82. Any income generated from the fines must be spent in accordance with the requirements of Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, following the restrictions already imposed as part of the Civil Enforcement practices applied.

Financial and Risk Implications

83. The cost to purchase and implement cameras at the five trial sites was £329k. This included the cost of reviewing existing signs, lines and the traffic regulation orders, and implementing new signs where required. It also included the infrastructure needed to house the cameras, associated power supplies, the cameras, calibration, and the software needed to operate them.

84. The trial had an income budget expected at £48k from PCNs in 25/26. Each PCN or warning notice costs £8 to process. For the first six months PCNs can only be issued to repeat offenders, meaning CBC pays £8 per warning notice and receives no income. PCNs are charged at £70 reduced to £35 for early payment. The initial results of the trial suggest the £48k income target will not be met, with current forecasted income for 25/26 being only £17k.

85. There is a revenue budget of £70k for the processing of PCNs, expenditure is currently forecasted at £85k creating an overall pressure of £15k in 25/26 for PCN processing. As compliance improves this position may worsen.

86. The contract with Yunex for camera software and maintenance ends on 21st April 2026. To maintain the existing camera stock, a new contact with Yunex would have to be

negotiated. There is no budget beyond the end of April 2026 for maintenance of MTO sites. It is anticipated, the cameras and software would cost approximately £69k per year to calibrate and maintain.

87. In addition to the potential £69k maintenance costs and the £46k pressure related to the processing of PCNs, relocating cameras incurs a cost of £2,000 - £15,000 per camera, per move. To continue with the two more successful sites and relocate the cameras from the three less successful sites, it would create a total revenue pressure of at least £116k plus the capital costs of relocation and creation of new sites.
88. While there is currently no budget for the installation of future MTO sites, we have £66k grant funding from Active Travel England to install ANPR cameras for 'School Streets'. It may be possible to this funding for relocation of existing cameras. However, a budget for the maintenance of the cameras and processing of PCNs would need to be found.
89. There is a high risk that any future ANPR MTO enforcement will not cover the initial cost of capital investment or ongoing support and maintenance charges for the service. The recovery rate is different for each location and type of offence. Any new site would also require a six-week public consultation, which would require resources to run and evaluate.

Equalities and Fairness Implications

90. As part of its decision-making process, under Section 149 Equality Act 2010, the Council, must have "due regard" to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in order to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.
91. The protected characteristics are age, gender reassignment, disability, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, marriage, civil partnership, sex and sexual orientation. The Council is required to give serious, substantive and advance consideration of what (if any) the proposals would have on the protected group and what mitigating factors can be put in place.
92. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) was carried out following the consultation to assess the impact of the introduction of new civil powers.

Biodiversity and Sustainability Implications

93. Enforcing moving traffic offences aims to improve road safety and facilitate active travel, which will influence, support and enable residents and local businesses to adopt more sustainable behaviours.

Conclusion and next steps

94. The Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to comment on the initial findings of the trial and to support the proposed site selection criteria for identifying potential future enforcement locations.

Appendices

Appendix A: Freight Strategy, Executive Report

Background Papers

Background Paper A: Annex A – Traffic Signs Subject to Moving Traffic Enforcement (PDF)

Background Paper B: Provided by electronic link - [Consultation on new powers to improve road safety | Central Bedfordshire Council](#)

Background Paper C: Delegated Decision Notice for Submission of Request for MTO Powers (PDF)

Background Paper D: Provided by electronic link- [Sustainable Modes of Travel to Schools and Active Travel Strategies](#) (item 15)

Report author(s):

Jade Jones, Head of Commercial and Business Improvement

Jade.jones@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk