



Shakespeare Business Centre
245a Coldharbour Lane
London SW9 8RR

info@roadpeace.org
www.roadpeace.org
Tel: 020 7733 1603

Joint response to HMIC's proposed 2017/18 inspection programme and framework

Thank you for consulting on the HMIC's proposed 2017/18 inspection programme and framework.

This is a joint response coordinated by RoadPeace on behalf of British Cycling, Cycling UK, Living Streets, London Cycling Campaign, Road Danger Reduction Forum, Sustrans, and 20s Plenty for Us, all organisations working to reduce the danger posed by law breaking drivers (includes riders).

1. *Do you agree that leadership in the police should be assessed as part of the HMIC effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy inspections rather than as a separate inspection?*

Yes, it is logical to include it within HMIC's Police Effectiveness, Efficiency, Legitimacy (PEEL) programme. We understand that HMIC's PEEL programme contains three main pillars:

- Effectiveness which assesses how well forces are
 - preventing and investigating crime and anti-social behavior;
 - tackling serious and organized crime; and
 - supporting victims and protecting those who are vulnerable
- Efficiency which reviews the cost effectiveness of the police
- Legitimacy which considers the level of confidence communities have in their police

2. *Are there significant new or emerging problems for policing which HMIC should take into account in the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy inspections?*

Yes. HMIC's PEEL programme should be extended to include roads policing with a thematic inspection of how the police prevent road traffic crime and anti-social behaviour by drivers, investigate road crashes and near misses, and support crash victims. All police services should be included and inspected.

Why the need?

Because the HMIC and HMCPsI *Joint Inspection of Fatal Incident Investigation and Prosecution*, published in February 2015 was very limited in scope, with

- Only six police areas visited
- Only a small sample of fatal files reviewed, with the sample dominated by those involving criminal prosecution (this is not representative as the majority of fatal crashes do not result in a prosecution).
- The investigation files reviewed were often missing information which led to the report's first recommendation being about ensuring the thoroughness of road death investigation files.

In addition there has been no reporting on the extent to which the 2015 report's recommendations have been implemented.

And the HMIC has never conducted an inspection of injury collision or near miss investigations. DfT estimates that some 2000 people are injured every day. The majority of these do not bother reporting to the police, even when serious injury is involved. The extent to which this is due to lack of confidence in

the police ability to conduct a thorough and fair investigation is unknown. We do not even know how thorough are the investigations into hit and run collisions as the outcomes are not reported.

But of those casualty collisions reported to the police, the vast majority are not investigated by a collision investigator. Specialist collision investigators are only used in fatal and life changing collisions. And each police service sets its own standards for collision investigation.

In its 2016 report on *Road Traffic Law Enforcement*, the HoC Transport Committee called for the Home Office to research how police services responded to crashes and near misses.

And the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group's ongoing inquiry into *Justice for Cyclists* has received many submissions of investigation failures. This evidence could provide the HMIC with an understanding of the issues from the victims' perspective.

3. *Do the proposed thematic inspections of hate crime, counter-terrorism, child protection and crime data integrity cover areas that are of most concern to you at the moment?*

We acknowledge that these are serious concerns, however we do not believe they should be prioritised over issues which are more likely to affect most people in their daily lives. We are most concerned about how the police protect us on the road. On the roads is where most of us are most vulnerable. Our priority is on how the police reduce the risk of injury and intimidation posed by drivers.

Roads policing, including the police response to road crashes and near misses should be a priority for HMIC.

4. *How else could HMIC adapt the way in which it acquires information to take full account of current circumstances and risks to public safety?*

Key suggestions include:

- Do not restrict the HMIC's focus to notifiable crime. Instead, include those driving offences that pose risk of injury to others.
- Monitor the level of confidence the public have in the police ability to keep them safe on the road, particularly when they are walking and cycling and more vulnerable to harm posed by drivers.
- Extend the level of satisfaction surveys currently conducted with crime victims to crash victims.
- Ensure the Crime Survey of England and Wales covers victims of road crime as well as other crime.
- Consider the total number of people estimated injured in crashes, including seriously injured, and not be restricted to police reported casualty statistics.
- Consider the extent to which the police collaborate with other agencies on setting and enforcing speed limits, as we do not think it acceptable that some police refuse to enforce 20mph speed limits.



20's Plenty for Us
...making your place a better place to be

