

Appendix 1 – Cabinet Report: Moving Traffic Enforcement. January 2026

Financial breakdown and working assumptions for commencement of the trial

The implementation of MTE at the proposed 3 locations, subject to grant funding agreements, is estimated to cost as set out below.

Site	Enforcement considerations	Yr 1 – Draft TBC	Yr 2 + Annual Revenue – DRAFT TBC
Armitage Rd, Armitage Bridge	Weight restriction signage at either end with single access at either end. Anticipate two cameras required – one at each end- and timed journey capture (no stopping allowance). Whitelist required for effective exclusion of legitimate use. Based on - 4 cameras (2 units), 2 RDS, 4 licences.	£80,000 (Capital)	£20,000
Barnsley Rd, Flockton...	Weight limit one direction. Two camera units required. Per above and strategically located as relates to businesses that have legitimate use. Whitelist required for effective exclusion of legitimate use. Signage is compliant but may benefit from additional signage at access points.	£80,000 (Capital)	£20,000
Heckmondwike Bus Hub	Yellow box enforcement – neighbouring council recommend specific cameras with an est. cost £30-40k . This includes Installation, calibration, Traffic management etc. Two cameras required.	£80,000 (Capital)	£20,000
'Imperial' Ticketing Software (Kirklees existing system)	Progression path addition to add MTE to existing bus gate function (360 or web option)	£20,000 (Revenue)	£10,000
	TOTAL	£260,000	£70,000

The grant award will cover capital set up costs and revenue for the first two years. This is based on the model Leeds, Bradford and Calderdale used, all of whom were granted awards by the Combined Authority.

Cost estimates are based on research with peer districts who are slightly further ahead than Kirklees in their trials of these new powers and from liaison with WYCA colleagues who have offered costs based on bulk order of equipment in conjunction with WY Police for benefits of scale.

Discussion with Leeds officers at length has helped establish software and back-office costs along with understanding from Kirklees officers about the existing facilities within our gift from existing enforcement and ticketing functions we already operate.

With so few sites the electricity and internet costs are negligible in scale.

It is anticipated that annual scheme operating costs, including the capital costs of the equipment, will be funded by income generated from PCNs issued on a net nil basis. The economic viability of the enforcement at these locations will be reviewed and the trial will help identify minimum viability thresholds, below which this solution would not be financially sensible. In these cases alternative enforcement solutions would need to be considered.

Depending on the location and type of restriction to be enforced, traffic enforcement cameras can cost between £35,000 and £40,000. Some types of restriction might also require more than one camera for effective enforcement. Kirklees may require additional street furniture for at least one site, and annual licence costs from year two are £10,000 per unit, all of which are budgeted for here.

There are additional costs associated with dealing with representations against PCNs and adjudication. For the purposes of the trial however, this would be low scale, and there would be no additional staffing allocation sought at this time. PCNs will be managed by the existing parking enforcement team staff who have informed the work so far.

In liaison with Kirklees Appeals Officer we can be confident that we perform on par with national trends in successful recovery of penalty charge notices (PCNs). This is to say that 70% of penalties are recovered by deadline, the majority settled within the first two weeks. 25% require chasing letters with 20% of fines recovered in full. An average of 1/10 warrant requests are issued per year of which a significant proportion are persistent / known offenders. It is understood this matches national statistics and performance by other authorities in pursuit of PCNs.