



Speed Camera Audit - YourSAy Survey Outcomes Summary Report

Background

The South Australian Government's 100 Day Plan includes a commitment to conduct a speed camera audit. An audit of speed cameras has been undertaken to ensure they are operating for safety purposes and not to raise revenue. The Government wants to ensure that speed cameras are located in the right locations for the right reasons. To help achieve this, the public were invited to share their thoughts and comments on speed cameras. The survey was available on the YourSAy website between 24 June and 15 July 2018. The results from this survey were considered within the speed camera audit, along with previous surveys of the community's attitudes to speed and enforcement more generally.

Consultation

The public was consulted online through the YourSAy website. The website contained information on speed management research, and crash risk related to travelling speed. The site selection criteria for fixed cameras was also included as background information. Respondents were asked demographic questions including age, gender, road user status and postcode. They were invited to submit additional criteria they would like the Government to consider in relation to the site selection of speed cameras. Respondents were also asked to comment or make suggestions for improvement on specific sites in five areas of metropolitan Adelaide. In addition they were asked if there were other sites not mentioned in the survey that they would like to comment on. Finally they were invited to leave other comments or feedback.

The focus of the survey and the associated information was on fixed cameras with some reference to mobile cameras but these were not the subject of site-specific questions.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

In total 342 logged on to the survey. Of these 102 went no further than inputting their demographic information, either opting out of the survey or choosing not to enter any comment. They do not form part of this summary report.

The tables below summarise the 240 respondents who answered more than just the demographic questions.

Age – The majority of respondents (47.9%) were aged 45 – 64 years of age. The younger driver and older driver age groups were not well represented.

Age	Response count	Response percent
16-24	6	2.5%
25-44	70	29.2%
45-64	115	47.9%
65-74	41	17.1%
75+	7	2.9%
Unspecified	1	0.4%
Total	240	100%

Gender – The majority of respondents (69.2%) were male.

Gender	Response count	Response percent
Male	166	69.2%
Female	69	28.8%
Unspecified	4	1.7%
Other	1	0.4%
Total	240	100%

Location – The majority of respondents (82.1%) resided in metropolitan Adelaide.

Location (postcode)	Response count	Response percent
Metro	197	82.1%
Rural	37	15.4%
Interstate	2	0.8%
Unspecified	4	1.7%
Total	240	100%

Road user – Respondent were asked to define what type of road user they were (multiple responses were permitted). All but one described themselves as a car driver.

Road user	Response count	Response percent
Car driver	239	99.6%
Van driver	3	1.3%
Heavy vehicle driver	13	5.4%
Motorcyclist	34	14.2%
Cyclist	59	24.6%
Pedestrian	60	25.0%

Selection criteria for placement of speed cameras

Of the 240 respondents 199 responded to the question ‘Are there other things you think we should consider in relation to site selection of speed cameras’. Responses were collated and recurring themes (those mentioned at least 5 times) are summarised below;

- 55 (28%) of the responses were general comments and did not relate to any specific criterion that could be implemented, these responses were considered as part of the ‘general feedback’ question instead.
- 37 (19%) simply said ‘no’ there was nothing else they thought needed considering.
- 21 (11%) believed resident feedback/complaints or history of speeding including speed surveys should form part of the criteria.
- 16 (8%) believed speed cameras should not be placed on a downhill slope.
- 15 (8%) responded with things that already formed part of the selection criteria.
- 9 (5%) mentioned the number of cyclists or other vulnerable road users not just pedestrians should be considered.
- 6 (5%) mentioned that the condition of the road should be considered.

- 5 (3%) believed child safety should be considered.

Support / Non support

While respondents were not directly asked if they supported or did not support speed cameras, analysis of their responses were broadly categorised into support, non-support or unclear.

Of the 240 respondents, 33% (80) were deemed to be supportive of speed cameras, 28% (68) were deemed to be non-supportive, and it was not clear if 38% (92) of the respondents were supportive or not.

Age – Those aged under 45 were more likely to support speed cameras than not, as were those aged 65 – 74. Those aged 75+ had the highest percent of non-support but only seven respondents fell into this age group.

Age	Support	Support (%)	Non-support	Non-support (%)	Unclear	Unclear (%)
16-24	2	33%	1	17%	3	50%
25-44	27	39%	19	27%	24	34%
45-64	33	29%	36	31%	46	40%
65-74	16	39%	9	22%	16	39%
75+	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%

Gender – There was similar support for speed cameras across genders, both males and females recording more support than not. The percent of females supporting speed cameras was slightly higher than males. The proportion that were classed as neutral was the same.

Gender	Support	Support (%)	Non-support	Non-support (%)	Unclear	Unclear (%)
Male	55	33%	48	29%	63	38%
Female	25	36%	18	26%	26	38%

Location – The proportion of support between metro and rural was fairly even. Non-support was higher in rural areas.

Location (postcode)	Support	Support (%)	Non-support	Non-support (%)	Unclear	Unclear (%)
Metro	67	34%	53	27%	77	39%
Rural	13	35%	13	35%	11	30%

These differences need to be considered with some caution as the survey was not a random sample but relied on individuals choosing to participate. For example, males appeared to be more willing to participate than females. The low overall response from rural residents is understandable with the survey's focus on metropolitan camera sites. Differences such as these may have led to biases in responses.

Specific sites mentioned

Respondents were also asked to comment or make suggestions for improvement on specific sites in five areas of metropolitan Adelaide, they were also asked to comment on any other sites that were not listed. Sites singled out are outlined below (those mentioned at least twice).

- 15 – South Eastern Freeway
- 13 – Glover Avenue
- 5 – Montague Rd, Ingle Farm (all are unclear if this is the midblock or intersection camera)
- 5 – Prospect Rd - outside Blackfriars Priory School
- 4 – King William Road
- 3 – West Tce/ Hindley Street
- 3 – Port Wakefield Road
- 3 – Greenhill Road / Hutt Street
- 2 – Montefiore Road / War Memorial Drive

In addition there were 21 comments made requesting speed cameras, some at specific sites and some requesting more in general.

Concerns about South Eastern Freeway and Glover Avenue sites generally covered issues of revenue raising and unfairness, due to the locations on a down slope. There were also comments relating to uncertainty of the speed limits prevailing at the time.

General Comments

General comments made throughout the survey were grouped into themes presented below:

There were 80 respondents who wrote comments of support for speed cameras. These supportive comments were varied but safety was a big theme, and many commented that if drivers did not speed then no revenue can be raised from the cameras.

“Speed cameras don’t raise revenue because only those who speed have to pay. If they don’t want to pay the fines then they should stick to the limit, everyone else seems to manage without any troubles.”

Some comments reflected the fact that speed has a direct link with crash severity and slowing the traffic down was an important safety measure.

60 respondents used the term ‘revenue raising’ or similar:

- 29 referred to specific sites as being revenue raisers
- 26 referred to speed cameras in general as revenue raisers
- 3 mentioned mobile speed cameras only being revenue raisers
- 1 mentioned cameras in low speed zones as revenue raisers
- 1 mentioned midblock cameras as revenue raisers.

Some of these were generally supportive of cameras but had concerns about the revenue raising aspect

“Cameras should only be placed in black spots and intersections with a crash history, I have no issue with fixed cameras ... I am totally against the revenue raising principle of placement”.

Other general themes raised were:

- 17 respondents mentioned there could be better signage around speed cameras, either the speed camera itself or the speed limit.
- 12 respondents did not consider speed cameras were situated in high crash risk locations.
- 8 considered speed cameras were a distraction while driving.
- 8 mentioned there could be better traffic light sequencing in relation to intersection cameras
- 4 considered improved road design would lessen the need for cameras.
- 4 mentioned more on-road policing would have a greater impact on slowing traffic down.
- 3 respondents mentioned that cameras should not be placed where speed limits are inconsistent or close to a speed limit change.

Negative comments about revenue raising were frequently associated with comments indicating that there was no apparent crash problem at that location. This in turn led to the respondent's conclusion that the cameras must therefore be installed for the purpose of revenue raising. Reinforcing this view, comments were also made suggesting that the location of the cameras (such as on down slopes or near speed limit changes) or design of the intersections (such as providing inadequate green time) were deliberate steps taken to increase revenue. One respondent stated:

"Short cycle at peak times and no green arrow turn should have green arrow signals as cars are caught trying to turn right an obvious money maker by design"

On the other hand, visible sites, in locations that could be seen to be potentially risky, received the greatest support. A camera's role in alerting drivers and providing them with an opportunity to slow down was understood. The role of cameras to moderate speed more broadly was not generally understood, as illustrated by this comment:

"Need to be boldly displayed. the idea should be to alert us so that we slow down. Pointless if we have sped past and get a ticket in the mail."