

Report subject	Keeping BCP Moving Safely - Moving Traffic Enforcement
Meeting date	22 July 2026
Status	Public Report
Executive summary	This report seeks Cabinet approval to establish Moving Traffic Enforcement as a new function within the Parking Operations and Enforcement Service. The proposal would provide a structured framework for introducing and managing enforcement at appropriate locations, with the aim of improving road safety, reducing congestion, supporting public transport reliability and encouraging compliance with existing traffic restrictions. Implementation would require procurement of compliant camera technology, development of policies and procedures, and continued adherence to statutory guidance to ensure enforcement remains proportionate, transparent and targeted at problem locations.
Recommendations	It is RECOMMENDED that cabinet recommend to Council to: a) Approve the introduction of Moving Traffic Enforcement as a new function. b) Approve the net income budget allocation of £1.3 million in 2027/28 increasing to £1.5 million in 2029/30 with ongoing reviews to refine forecasts. c) Approve use of remaining net income budget from moving traffic enforcement after repayment of total capital investment of £700,000 over 3 years, as investment in car parks maintenance or other allowable investment under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. It is RECOMMENDED that cabinet: d) Approve temporary use of £500,000 from repair and maintenance reserve to fund upfront capital investment during 2026/27. e) Approve first call of the net income budget from moving traffic enforcement to repay the 2026/27 upfront investment of £500,000 and annual capital investment of £100,000 per annum for 2027/28 and 2028/29, a total

	capital investment of £700,000 over 3 years. f) Delegate to the Director of Commercial Operations in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Destination, Leisure and Commercial Operations the delivery of the Moving Traffic Enforcement function
Reason for recommendations	This option would enable the development of the required policies, procedures and procurement arrangements to support delivery. It would allow new enforcement sites to be brought forward efficiently under an established framework.

Portfolio Holder(s):	Cllr Richard Herrett - Cabinet Member for Destination, Leisure and Commercial Operations Cllr Andy Hadley - Cabinet Member for Climate Response, Environment and Energy
Corporate Director	Glynn Barton – Chief Operations Officer
Report Authors	Zak Cusens – Parking Framework Delivery Lead
Wards	Council-wide
Classification	For Decision

Background

1. Currently BCP Council uses camera enforcement at Coach House Place to ensure compliance with a bus route, and some schemes to ensure compliance with “SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR” zig zag markings within the Bournemouth area. Until recently (April 2025) BCP Council had one mobile enforcement vehicle used primarily in the Poole area to enforce school zig zags and bus stop clearways; this was retired as a cost saving due to the age of the technology, the cost to maintain it and the low financial value it provided.
2. On 31 May 2022, regulations were introduced that allowed all Local Highway Authorities in England to apply for moving traffic enforcement powers under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. Until then, this option was only available to LHAs within London. The guidance notes that cameras should only be used as a last resort where other methods of securing compliance have been exhausted and where continued non-compliance is problematic, for example it is causing road casualties or having a significant impact on traffic flows.
3. In order to obtain approval and receive these powers BCP Council had to chose one or more sites and follow the prescribed steps set down by the DfT, which include a 6 week public consultation. BCP Council received powers to enforce moving traffic regulations under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) in July 2023.
4. BCP Council allocated capital funding for 5 enforcement cameras at one location, Horseshoe Common, from its Local Transport Plan programme in 2023/24.
5. Civil enforcement of moving traffic restrictions is based on utilising established Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera technology as is commonly used for bus lane enforcement across the country.

6. These additional powers have potential to reduce network congestion and improve highway safety. Targeted enforcement of certain types of restrictions may also help bring about improved journey times for public transport and emergency service vehicles.
7. It is important to note that in a communication to local authorities, the DfT have highlighted the need to assess locations where contravention of restrictions could be avoided by reasonable improvements to the highway or to traffic signing before camera enforcement is considered. The following is an extract of the recent DfT email:

*"Individuals and businesses should be allowed the opportunity to raise any concerns about proposed enforcement schemes. Concerns might relate to any location where contraventions could be avoided by reasonable improvements to the highway or to traffic signing. **Where this is found to be the case, such improvements should be made, and appropriate monitoring carried out before enforcement action is considered. Local authorities are not required to enforce every applicable traffic sign or road marking. Instead enforcement should only be used to target problem locations.***

*The 2004 Act does not provide for the list of traffic signs on a selective basis, so all the contraventions will be available to local authorities taking on moving traffic enforcement. However, in line with the general principles of good regulation, any enforcement should be carried out in a way which is transparent, accountable, proportionate and consistent; and should be targeted **only where action is needed.**"*

8. Unlike Civil Parking Enforcement, the new powers do not pass the sole responsibility of enforcement onto local authorities, the Police are still be able to undertake enforcement of the offences in addition to the Highway Authority although it is possible that the police may decide not to enforce restrictions at sites where cameras have been installed.
9. Historically, in Dorset, including in the BCP Council area, camera enforcement has mainly been carried out by Dorset Police for speeding offences at fixed, mobile, core and adhoc enforcement sites. This activity has been mainly focussed at locations that have a poor road safety record or a high record of public complaints and the enforcement work has been a viable method of reducing casualties and addressing community concerns. In this way most members of the public have been predominantly supportive of enforcement work as they can understand the rationale for it and any net income has been ringfenced to road policing activities which is also positive in securing public support.

10. Although enforcement should reduce network congestion and improve highway safety there is a risk that the public will be less supportive of enhanced enforcement of prohibitions where there is no, or a very limited road safety justification, however any income would be ringfenced to uses outlined in section 55 RTRA 1984 which includes improving roads and promoting road safety.

Promotion at MTE Sites

11. DfT have stipulated the need for public engagement before moving traffic enforcement takes place. The following is an extract of the recent DfT email to local authorities:
12. This public engagement is intended to communicate the rationale for, and benefits of, moving traffic enforcement to residents and businesses to promote compliance. The Government sees the Part 6 powers as key tool in reducing congestion and improving air quality, while promoting the attractiveness of active travel by keeping vehicles out of cycle lanes. In addition, by keeping junctions clear the policy also aims to improve punctuality of bus services making travel easier for all, including disabled people. Increasing compliance through targeted enforcement at problem locations, will also bring benefits to lives of pedestrians including people with sensory impairments, older people, children, those looking after children, as well as carers.
13. Local authorities should consider the full range of media available to them when communicating with the public, for example using local press, issuing email newsletters and social media. They should consider telling every household in the affected area when they propose changes. Publicising forthcoming enforcement schemes should continue up to the start of enforcement and for a reasonable period thereafter.
14. It should be noted that there is no requirement for newspaper advertising of proposed enforcement schemes.
15. Individuals and businesses should be allowed the opportunity to raise any concerns about proposed enforcement schemes. Concerns might relate to any location where contraventions could be avoided by reasonable improvements to the highway or to traffic signing. Where this is found to be the case, such improvements should be made, and appropriate monitoring carried out before enforcement action is considered. Local authorities are not required to enforce every applicable traffic sign or road marking. Instead, enforcement should only be used to target problem locations.

Enforceable Restrictions

16. A number of different types of restrictions are included within the Part 6 regulations. A full list of enforceable restrictions is included within Appendix A but the following provides a summary of restrictions available to be assessed for camera enforcement:

- Banned Turns
- One-Way Streets
- Yellow Box Markings
- Weight Restrictions
- Structural weight limits
- Mandatory Cycle Lanes
- Restricted Access
- Prohibition of Driving
- Access restrictions
- School Keep Clear Markings
- Red Routes

17. As they always have, bus stop clearways, bus stands, and school zig-zags remain enforceable via authorised devices (cameras).

18. A number of traffic contraventions are not included within the Part 6 TMA Powers as their severity means they will remain as criminal offences. These include exceeding speed limits, overtaking on double white line systems, failing to stop at pedestrian crossings and red-light violations at traffic signals.

19. DfT guidelines state;

“for a period of 6 months following implementation of enforcement of moving traffic contraventions, at each particular camera location, local authorities outside London should issue warning notices for first-time moving traffic contraventions. This also applies to any new camera location in the future.

The warning notice should set out the 6 month period and advise that any further moving traffic contravention at the same camera location would result in the issue of a PCN.”

20. During November 2025 21 sites were monitored 24 hours a day for a week, and the table below shows actual and projected contraventions at those sites. Across the 21 sites 121,386 vehicle movements were observed 5,234 of these were in contravention of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), this is a 95% compliance rate.

Code	Contravention		Locations	Contraventions		Traffic Volume	
				Observed	Annual (Proj.)	Observed	Compliance
			Number				%
50	Performing a prohibited turn		7	2,019	51,312	8,931	77.4%
31	Entering and stopping in a box junction when prohibited		5	1,461	37,078	99,959	98.5%
52	Failing to comply with a prohibition on certain types of vehicle		4	619	2,068	2,929	78.9%
34	Being in a bus lane		2	1,018	26,908	6,026	83.1%
33	Using a route restricted to certain vehicles		1	1	**	1,909	99.9%
51	Failing to comply with a no entry restriction		1	39	1,138	546	92.9%
53	Failing to comply with a restriction on vehicles entering a pedestrian zone		1	77	2,292	1,086	92.9%

Options Appraisal

21. The options available currently are:
22. Implementation of Moving Traffic Enforcement as a New Function
23. Cabinet may approve the introduction of Moving Traffic Enforcement as a new function within the Parking Operations and Enforcement Service. This option would enable the development of the required policies, procedures and procurement arrangements to support delivery. It would allow new enforcement sites to be brought forward efficiently under an established framework for both static and mobile cameras.
24. Approval of Selected Sites Only
25. Cabinet may approve implementation of Moving Traffic Enforcement solely at the initially identified sites. Under this option, any future sites proposed for enforcement would require individual approval by Cabinet or Full Council prior to implementation, resulting in a more iterative decision-making process. This approval would also be required to move cameras as pre-approved sites reach compliance,
26. The “Implementation of Moving Traffic Enforcement as a new function” is the recommended option as it allows for a quicker reaction to sites reaching compliance or new sites needing a quick response to improve road safety.
27. This option is also in line with the existing enforcement procedures that result in a penalty charge notice as consent to enforce is given at the time the Traffic Regulation Order is approved for implementation.
28. Do Nothing
29. Cabinet could decide not to introduce Moving Traffic Enforcement at this time. Under this option, the Council would continue to rely on existing arrangements and police enforcement only, meaning identified issues such as congestion, non-compliance with restrictions, impacts on bus reliability and road safety

concerns at problem locations may remain unaddressed or only partially addressed. This option would avoid immediate implementation and staffing costs, but it would also mean the Council would not make use of the powers already obtained under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Summary of financial implications

30. A procurement exercise will need to be carried out to ensure that the equipment used is up to standard and cost effective.
31. It is estimated that a simple site consisting of one camera will have an initial install cost of between £20,000 and £25,000 with an ongoing maintenance and licensing cost of between £5,000 and £10,00 a year, with a more complex site costing between £25,000 and £40,000 to install and with a maintenance cost of £8,000 and £15,000.
32. A simple site becomes financially viable after the 6-month warning period if it generates approximately 200 paid Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) per year (about 17 per month), assuming most are paid at the £35 discounted rate; this excludes recouping capital costs.
33. Other councils report mixed financial outcomes: some sites fail to cover costs, while others can generate large surpluses (≈ £200k per site). Predicting performance is difficult; busy locations with many vehicle movements tend to produce more contraventions. Forecasting for the first 3 years is provided in the table below.
34. Any surplus income generated from fines, must be spent in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
35. Surplus income, should there be any, will need to cover all costs related to enforcement. This includes the administration staff involved in collecting the fines, maintenance of cameras and the associated signs and markings together with energy, data and software costs. Money will also need to be set aside for the eventual replacement of equipment once it becomes unserviceable. Any surplus remaining after deduction of costs may go towards:
 - further enforcement sites,
 - measures to improve public transport or
 - other highway associated improvements
36. The regulations do not permit surplus income generated from fines to be used to fund routine highway maintenance activities.
37. The initial capital investment of £500,000 to support implementation ahead of the scheme becoming operational (including initial procurement, mobilisation and staffing costs) will be met with temporary use of the repair and maintenance reserve during 2026/27.
38. Thereafter, the service is intended to become self-financing as soon as practicable through ongoing enforcement income, in line with statutory guidance. The repair and maintenance reserve will therefore be replenished

during 2027/28 with income generated from the moving traffic enforcement scheme as shown in table 2 below.

39. In addition, some sites may be supported through specific external or capital funding sources, including Local Transport Plan (LTP), Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and Section 106 contributions. The tables below set out the anticipated budget for the first three years of the service.
40. Table 1 shows the total capital investment of £700,000 incurred over a 3 year period.

Capital Investment - 2026/27 to 2028/29

Table 1

	Year 0 2026/27 £	Year 1 2027/28 £	Year 2 2028/29 £	Year 3 2029/30 £	Total £
Hardware and Installation	£500,000	£100,000	£100,000		£700,000

41. Table 2 shows the revenue income and expenditure for the scheme. Over 3 years there is an estimated net income of £4.2 million of which £0.7 million will be used as first call to repay the capital investment and the remaining £3.5 million will be invested in car parks maintenance or other allowable expenditure under Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
42. As the function develops and grows there will be need for additional staff to manage and administer the function, this is reflected in the expenditure assumptions below.

Revenue income and expenditure - 2027/28 to 2029/30

Table 2

	Year 1 2027/28 £	Year 2 2028/29 £	Year 3 2029/30 £	Total £
Gross Revenue	(1,742,000)	(1,800,000)	(2,080,000)	(5,622,000)
Software and Maintenance	319,000	356,500	394,000	1,069,500
Staffing	100,000	120,000	160,000	380,000
Total Expenditure Moving traffic enforcement	419,000	476,500	554,000	1,449,500
Net Income moving traffic enforcement	(1,323,000)	(1,323,500)	(1,526,000)	(4,172,500)
Repayment of capital investment	600,000	100,000	0	700,000
Reinvestment into Parking Service	723,000	1,223,500	1,526,000	3,472,500
Net scheme position	0	0	0	0

43. Within [Traffic Management Act 2004: statutory guidance for local authorities outside London on civil enforcement of bus lane and moving traffic contraventions - GOV.UK](#) it states that:

For good governance, enforcement authorities need to forecast revenue in advance. But raising revenue should not be an objective of civil enforcement of bus lane or

moving traffic contraventions, nor should authorities set targets for revenue or the number of PCNs they issue.

Enforcement authorities should run their enforcement operations efficiently, effectively, and economically. The purpose of penalty charges is to dissuade motorists from breaking traffic restrictions. The objective of civil enforcement should be for 100% compliance, with no penalty charges.

Local authority civil enforcement should be self-financing as soon as practicable; but compliant applications for civil enforcement of bus lane or moving traffic contraventions will be granted without the scheme being self-financing. However, authorities will need to bear in mind that if their scheme is not self-financing, then they need to be certain that they can afford to pay for it from within existing funding. The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit

44. It is anticipated that the use of camera enforcement at sites across BCP Council will bring about behaviour change and that contravention levels currently seen (with no enforcement) will reduce once cameras are implemented.

Summary of legal implications

45. The Council has legal authority to undertake civil enforcement of moving traffic contraventions under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004, together with the supporting 2022 Regulations governing approved devices, penalty charge procedures, representations and appeals. In exercising these powers the Council must have regard to the Secretary of State's statutory guidance issued under section 87 of the Act. Any enforcement regime must therefore be supported by valid and enforceable Traffic Regulation Orders, lawful and adequate traffic signing and road markings, certified camera equipment where required, and fair procedures for issuing Penalty Charge Notices, considering representations and enabling appeal to the independent adjudicator. Key legal risks include challenge on the basis of inadequate signage, failure to follow statutory guidance, procedural impropriety, or enforcement at locations where engineering or signing improvements should first be considered. These risks can be mitigated through legal review of the scheme documentation, site-by-site assessment, compliance with consultation and publicity expectations, robust operational procedures, and ongoing monitoring to ensure enforcement remains proportionate, transparent and targeted at problem locations.

Summary of human resources implications

46. Internal resource will be required to run the MTE implementation and monitor its effectiveness; an MTE Team Leader role is built into the Parking restructure due to be launched later this year at BCP band 9 (£53,200 per annum including on costs)
47. There will be an increase in PCN activity, therefore the Parking Officers will see an increased level of appeals relative to the number of PCN's issued. It is

anticipated that 1FTE Parking Officer (BCP band 6 £42,500 including on costs) will need to be recruited per 15 sites implemented

Summary of sustainability impact

48. It is anticipated that Moving Traffic Enforcement will lead to behaviour change. The enforcement of bus lanes and reduction in congestion from non permitted movements will encourage modal shift as the buses will be more reliable and safety when walking or cycling should improve, reducing fossil fuel usage and road wear

Summary of public health implications

49. Implementing Moving Traffic Enforcement powers is expected to deliver significant public health gains through improved air quality, reduced collisions, increased activity levels, and enhanced wellbeing. These benefits align closely with BCP Council's Public Health Strategy, Active Travel objectives, and wider place-making ambitions.

Summary of equality implications

50. An Equalities impact assessment screening was carried out, the outcome of this was as follows;
51. The proposed changes impact all service users, however the changes only seek to enforce existing moving Traffic Regulation Orders that all members of the community should currently be already complying with. There is a partial argument that those on lower incomes could be disproportionately penalised by the imposition of a flat rate penalty charge. However, there is no requirement to pay the charge at all if an individual obeys the road rules. Parking charge notices for contraventions of static TROs (e.g. parking restrictions) operate on the same basis and if the fines were means tested in some way this would be likely to make the enforcement process unaffordable to operate. Individuals who disobey moving TROs tend to place themselves and others at risk of physical injury or death due to the risk of a road traffic collision arising from a dangerous or unexpected prohibited traffic movements, eg driving the wrong way down a one-way road or passing a road closed sign or ignoring a no left, no right or no entry sign (TRO), etc. It is known that injuries arising from collisions disproportionately impact males, younger people, pedestrians, cyclists, scooterists and motorcyclists. As those are also affordable travel modes they may also impact individuals who are economically disadvantaged and therefore improving compliance and lawfulness on the public highway may have positive benefits to those same groups. These impacts can all be regarded as secondary and no group with protected characteristics appears to be directly impacted by this decision.

Summary of risk assessment

52. Implementation of Moving Traffic Enforcement introduces several key risks. Public perception may be negatively affected if enforcement is viewed as punitive or revenue-driven rather than focused on safety or congestion management. Financial uncertainty also exists, as some sites may not generate sufficient income to cover operational and equipment costs, particularly once driver behaviour changes and contraventions decline.
53. There are legal and compliance risks associated with ensuring all enforcement activity aligns with statutory guidance, consultation requirements, and appropriate traffic signing. Operational pressures may arise from increased PCN volumes, requiring additional staffing and administrative capacity.
54. Delays or challenges in procuring and maintaining compliant ANPR technology could impact delivery timelines and service reliability. Additionally, enforcement at locations where engineering or signage improvements would be more appropriate may lead to challenge or public dissatisfaction.
55. Overall, the introduction of this function carries reputational, financial, legal, and operational risks that require careful consideration as part of decision making.

Background papers

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Form 1 EIA Conversation Screening Tool MTE

Appendix 2 – Risk assessment MTE