



Mr. Fisher

Humberside Police
Corporate Development Branch
Information Compliance Unit
Humberside Police
Priory Road
Kingston upon Hull
HU5 5SF
Tel: 101

Your Ref:
Our Ref: F-2018-00430

16 March, 2018

Dear Mr. Fisher,

FREEDOM of INFORMATION ACT 2000 Reference No: F-2018-00430

Thank you for your request for Information in which you requested details of the following:

Having received a response to a previous request, I have been able to access the data I need to request further clarification as to the effectiveness of the data you gather and who reviews that data to effectively say whether an operation is effective and who takes the decision (or should take the decision) to cease a failing operation.

With regard to the cameras you site on the A1033 Main Road at Thorngumbald. I note from your published data that during the baseline surveys taken through years 1999, 2000 and 2001 there were 3 KSI Casualties, 15 slight casualties and 10 slight injuries (assume slight casualty could be as little as a small scratch on the car or broken plastic bumper and slight PIC to be a bruise or seat belt mark from suddenly stopping.)

After nine years of further operation by Safer Roads Humber in Thorngumbald I note only two further KSI accidents reported, however during the period 2011, 2012 and 2013 I note there were a total of 7 KSI Casualties, a further 21 slight casualties and a further 7 PIC's

Could you therefore explain how the effectiveness of the operation improved the road safety over that period and if in fact the operation (from your data) why the operation did not prevent/effectively reduce these accidents /deaths/serious injuries.

Was this ever brought up in conversation regarding the effectiveness / suitability and cost of this operation and if so would those minutes be available for public review/debate.

I am informed that the data recorded is reviewed and debated by the powers that be and cameras are shut down/site permissions removed if they are indeed found not sufficiently effective.

Finally I note that within the offence data provided for that period there were a total of 22 alleged offences that had no further action taken, as such the reason for no further action will be a matter of record that you will hold on file. Would you kindly advise the "reasons" only why those alleged offences were withdrawn.

The Freedom of Information Act requires that this request is dealt with in a manner that is motive and applicant blind. A disclosure under this legislation is considered a disclosure to the world and is considered to be on the basis that it is in the public interest.





This response is unique to Humberside Police and you are advised not to compare this like for like with any other force's response you receive.

Humberside Police Response

Having received a response to a previous request, I have been able to access the data I need to request further clarification as to the effectiveness of the data you gather **and who reviews that data to effectively say whether an operation is effective and who takes the decision (or should take the decision) to cease a failing operation.** *As explained in a previous FOI response, for all core camera sites, all available site specific injury collision, casualty, speed and offence data for the previous calendar year is reviewed annually by the Partnership Analyst. The data is then added to the site specific reporting template which already contains the data for previous years and is published on the partnership website. Sites that perform particularly well or where the casualty profile shows points of interest are discussed with the local authority road safety engineers/ officers with a view to either decommission them or to identify ways how to resolve continuous casualty issues further, e.g. via engineering measures. This occurs as part of the day to day running of the partnership, but can also be discussed at quarterly Engineering Meetings. Local authorities as the highways authorities have the final say on whether they wish to decommission camera sites as local sensibilities also need to be taken into account. Please see the partnership's decommissioning policy (part of the Enforcement, Signing & Speed Management Policy) for further details.*

With regard to the cameras you site on the A1033 Main Road at Thorngumbald. I note from your published data that during the baseline surveys taken through years 1999, 2000 and 2001 there were 3 KSI Casualties, 15 slight casualties and 10 slight injuries (assume slight casualty could be as little as a small scratch on the car or broken plastic bumper and slight PIC to be a bruise or seat belt mark from suddenly stopping.) After nine years of further operation by Safer Roads Humber in Thorngumbald I note only two further KSI accidents reported, however during the period 2011, 2012 and 2013 I note there were a total of 7 KSI Casualties, a further 21 slight casualties and a further 7 PIC's. **Could you therefore explain how the effectiveness of the operation improved the road safety over that period** and if in fact the operation (from your data) **why the operation did not prevent/ effectively reduce these accidents /deaths/serious injuries.** *Our data shows that the annual number of injury collisions occurring in Thorngumbald has reduced over the last four years (2014 – 2017), standing again at on average 1.5 per annum, compared to 4 per annum for 2010 – 2013. In 2017, only one slight injury collision occurred within the camera site extents, following 2016 when no injury collision was recorded.*

Clearly, despite the regular presence of mobile camera vehicles, road users are still behaving irresponsibly, drive inconsiderately or even dangerously, don't pay attention or make mistakes, which is why injury collisions continue to occur. There is only so much the authorities can do to keep road users safe – everyone also has to take responsibility for their own actions and aim to keep themselves and others safe.

Enforcement is only one tool in making our roads safer, roads engineering (which is the responsibility of the Highways Authority, in this case East Riding of Yorkshire Council) as well as road safety education and training also have a role to play. Realistically, even if every police officer was a traffic officer and there was even more camera enforcement, unsafe use of our roads with the potential to result in injury collisions would still occur.





Was this ever brought up in conversation regarding the effectiveness/ suitability and cost of this operation and if so would those minutes be available for public review/debate. I am informed that the data recorded is reviewed and debated by the powers that be and cameras are shut down/site permissions removed if they are indeed found not sufficiently effective. *Camera sites are decommissioned in line with the partnership's decommissioning policy (part of the Enforcement, Signing & Speed Management Policy), which is publicly available on our website. The decision to decommission or maintain a camera site is made by the partners that have an interest in that site, in particular the relevant local authority and Humberside Police.*

Thorngumbald continues to be a camera site as injury collisions are still occurring and East Riding of Yorkshire Council (who own the road and have a statutory duty for road safety) have not requested for camera enforcement to cease).

Finally I note that within the offence data provided for that period there were a total of 22 alleged offences that had no further action taken, as such the reason for no further action will be a matter of record that you will hold on file. **Would you kindly advise the "reasons" only why those alleged offences were withdrawn.** *A small number of offences (32; data for mid-2012 onwards when current offence recording system came into force) was not progressed with due to the following reasons:*

*Keeper/ driver could not be traced (6)
Foreign driver/ driver lives abroad (3)
Administrative errors when processing the notice (14)
Emergency Services vehicle exemption (1)
Discontinued as not in public interest (3)
Statutory time limit has expired (5)*

Email to PC dated 9th January 2018:

With regard to my initial question re pedal cyclists breaking the law and being let off, I am of the opinion that **you will hold on record the locations when they were stopped on the roads and indeed which road that was.** In much the same way as you know where you issue the tickets for the motor car drivers who inadvertently stray over the speed limit momentarily for whatever reason. (coming out of a side street up an incline to merge into main road traffic being my reason for not settling my speed immediately.) as I suspect you well knew from the location of your unmarked covert operations in Thorngumbald on the day I was unfortunately delivering Christmas cards to my friends in the village from which I moved 12 years ago, and in which village I and my wife lived and drove for thirty years without ever being accused of speeding, as records will verify. *Pedal cycle riding on footpath offence information by location as well as 30mph speed offence information by location for the last three years 2014-2016 (as per initial correspondence on 28th December 2017).*

Still, it is obviously your right to take this approach and your right as 'bastions of society' of our society. As it will be my right as a citizen, to question your 'modus operandi' which is my intention. I see no logic whatsoever as a health and safety professional not to include ALL factors that relate and affect the outcome of any accident and or incident. Similarly, I believe that when collating figures that allow you free licence to operate covertly, then there are questions to be asked in the house.





So if you could assist me a little further I would like to know the following: **Does a police covert operation require a definitive permission from any higher authority within the police and if so, would siting an unmarked police vehicle need a location specific permission to undertake covert operation?** I ask that because the main road through Thorngumbald has permissions to site standard cameras vans with their livery displayed as such, and there is a specific hard standing for that vehicle. In fact it was sited the following day and I took a photograph of it. *As per our Enforcement, Signing & Speed Management Policy, which is publicly available on our website, Safer Roads Humber operates both marked and unmarked vehicles. For the purpose of law enforcement police vehicles may park legally in any location providing they do not cause a hazard or obstruction. Dedicated hard standings can be used, but this is not mandatory. The enforcement officer has discretion in deciding where to park and enforce from. In order to undertake enforcement, the enforcement vehicle can park anywhere where it is safe and legal to do so. Humberside Police reserve the right to use covert and overt enforcement techniques if deemed appropriate. Enforcement can take place at any location at any time.*

The A1033 Thorngumbald is a long established and well known camera site that has been enforced since 2003. Like all other core camera sites, this site is clearly signed as such with camera terminal signs and camera repeater signs dotted along the whole stretch of the site, on both sides of the carriageway. These signs are there to inform and remind motorists that they are entering a camera enforcement site and provide ample warning that enforcement can take place on any day and at any time within the site extents. Those who exceed the speed limit risk prosecution.

What criteria do the police use to differentiate between a routine operation (with livery displayed to the oncoming motorist) and the necessity for a covert operation (unmarked without prior warning) in Thorngumbald, there will have been sufficient accident / injury KSI's to permit the siting of a standard speed camera vehicle and appropriate signage to suit. Those camera's were supposed to be effective in reducing the numbers of accidents/injuries/ ksi's along that stretch of the highway. *As above.*

It appears that from the positioning of the covert camera, there has either been some "shortfall" in the effectiveness of those visible cameras that has necessitated hiding the camera, or there is an aspect of revenue coming through.

To this end could you kindly provide a pdf showing over the last three years the numbers of people caught speeding in motor cars along the route through Thorngumbald, and the number of motor cyclists (motor propelled vehicles as per your mandate) for the same period. *Answer already provided in FOI F-2017-02281. We do not record the information by vehicle type, make or model, so we cannot distinguish between vehicle types (cars, motorcycles, vans etc) retrospectively. All speed offences recorded reflect all motorised vehicles, regardless of vehicle type.*

Also there will be green stripe records of the numbers and types of vehicles that pass along that road for the same period, would you kindly send me a pdf of the volume and types of vehicle that are passing through the village. *Speed and average annual daily traffic flow data for all motorised traffic for the core site on the A1033 Thorngumbald up to and including 2016 is already published on our website. 2017 information will be published once all 2017 data has been processed and verified and all 2017 databases have been closed. We do not record the information by vehicle type.*

<http://www.saferroadshumber.com/safety-camera-sites/>

Scroll down to the camera site map and zoom into the camera site you are interested

Click on the camera van icon

The pop up box gives information on the site name, speed limit and when the site was set up





Click on the 'Click here for more information' link which will open up a PDF with more detailed information on injury collisions, casualties, speed data and offences detected

Obviously as you show an improvement in the number of hits, you should show an equal volume of traffic per year to maintain the status of the site, as the two go "cap in hand". If you double the traffic flow and only have a five percent increase in speeding fines, there are obviously questions to be asked. I think for now that information would assist me greatly.

I believe if you have say 10,000 motor cyclists passing through Thorngumbald per year, then you "should" have a record of the numbers of motorcyclists caught speeding as per your mandate. *Answer already provided in FOI F-2017-02281. We do not record the information by vehicle type, make or model, so we cannot distinguish between vehicle types (cars, motorcycles, vans etc) retrospectively. All speed offences recorded reflect all motorised vehicles, regardless of vehicle type*

Also I believe you will / should hold on record the numbers of pedal cyclists caught breaking the law on the road and also the footways adjacent to those roads in Thorngumbald. Again if you could pass to me that public information I would be very appreciative. *Pedal cycle riding on footpath offence information by location as well as 30mph speed offence information by location for the last three years 2014-2016 (as per initial correspondence on 28th December 2017)*

The pedal cyclist are moving onto the footways in their droves, the main reasons being I believe as follows:

- 1 - Worries about the traffic (not particularly speeding) along the main roads, the driving techniques of bus driver, lorries and van drivers.
- 2 - The condition and safety of the road surfaces which form a major part of "Road Safety" yet which is never advertised by "Safer Roads Humber" I would suspect you dare not mention it, the roads presently are in a dreadful condition, yet it is apparently the driver that strays momentarily over the speed limit that causes the "unsafe" situation?? These pot holes, cracks, fissures are a "permanent feature" and as such are "permanently unsafe" a momentary lapse of reason or attention is NOT a deliberate act, however diverting funds from road repairs IS. Perhaps you should film the Council Depot for activity or address the road surfaces in your glossy web brochures?
- 3 - Laziness of the cyclist. Not purchasing lights and riding on the footway instead without lights (now that is NOT safe) but it is allowed.
- 4 - Lack of police officers and SPO's on the streets (if the cyclists are not fined, they will naturally grow in numbers)
- 5 - Police deliberately waiving the penalty of riding a pedal cycle on a footway.

I mention this because I am advised over and over again that the police simply tell the cyclist to dismount and don't do it again (which they inevitably do) whereas the motorist who exceeds a 30mph limit momentarily, could be stopped and told the same, or written to advising he had been caught, however that would involve expenditure. And why not a letter for 34mph, a stop and warn for 36 mph and points for say 40mph? This would be fair, if in fact you are going to ignore Pedal Cyclist laws, rules and regulations and ignore motor cyclists in your vehicle speeding and breaking the law data.

Finally. I would like to know how you maintain a record of speeding motor cyclist versus accidents in which a motor cycle is involved. If you have a PDF of that data I would be most grateful. *Information not held.*



Should you need to discuss this further please contact Sian Boynton, Information Compliance Officer on the above details.

Yours sincerely,

Sian Boynton
Information Compliance Officer





Humberside Police – Freedom of Information Complaints Review Procedure

Why Have A Complaints Process?

Humberside Police is committed to delivering an open and transparent service whenever possible and it is our intention to commit to the principles of openness embodied in the Freedom of Information Act. We will release information to the greatest extent possible, consistent with the public interest, however we may withhold information if we consider its release would cause significant harm.

If information within a document is withheld, it will be clearly marked to show where information has been removed and the legal exemption we have used. If we decline to supply all or part of any information you have asked for we will notify you in writing giving our reasons based upon legal exemptions contained within the Freedom of Information Act.

If you are not satisfied about the way in which your Freedom of Information request has been handled you have the right to appeal. This information has been designed to help you to understand how to complain to Humberside Police. Using this process will not affect your right to complain directly to the Information Commissioner if you feel we have not complied with our obligations under the Freedom of Information Act.

How Long Do I have to Raise A Complaint?

Once we have responded to your Freedom of Information Request you will have 40 working days in which to raise your complaint.

Who Can Complain?

Anyone who has made a Freedom of Information request in writing to the Force can complain. If you have requested information and you are not satisfied with the way we have dealt with it, you can use the complaints process to have it looked at again. If someone who requested information would like to complain but cannot do so themselves, you can complain on their behalf but it will help us if you make it clear that you are doing so.

What Can I Complain About?

If you are not satisfied with the way we have handled your request, with the fee we have charged, or with the reasons we have given for refusing to provide information, you have the right to appeal. You can complain about the range, amount and format of information we have sent following a request. You can also complain about the way a request was handled, for example, the time it took to respond.

How Do I Complain?

To deal with your complaint as quickly as possible, it will help if you can give us as much information as you can about the original request made and the reason for your complaint. Please put your complaint in writing and address it to:

FOI Appeals

[Humberside Police Information Compliance Unit](#)

Police Headquarters

Priory Road

Hull HU5 5SF

What Happens To My Complaint?

Once we have enough details to identify the request, we will begin the review. The Head of The Information Compliance Unit will normally review your complaint. In the more complex cases a review





panel consisting of a number of senior personnel from the Force will re-examine your complaint. We aim to complete the review process within 20 working days of receiving your complaint. Upon completion we will send you the findings.

How Will I Be Notified?

Where we have not followed procedures or have failed to provide acceptable quality of service, we will apologise and explain what we will do to ensure this doesn't happen again. If our original decision to withhold information is over-turned on appeal we will send you the additional information immediately. If we believe that our original response was correct we will let you know, and inform you of your options (see below).

What If I'm Still Not Satisfied?

If we have been unable to resolve your complaint and you are not satisfied you can approach the office of the Information Commissioner, who may investigate the matter on your behalf. This option is open to you at all times, but we will endeavour to address your complaint initially, as this may lead to a speedier resolution. It is the Information Commissioner who decides whether to investigate or not. We will co-operate fully with the Information Commissioner.

If you have any further questions about the complaints process, please contact the Information Compliance Unit on 01482 578039 or alternatively you can write to:

Head of Information Compliance Unit
Humberside Police Headquarters
Priory Road
Hull HU5 5SF
Email: Informationcomplianceunit@humberside.pnn.police.uk

Requests for a review by the Information Commissioner should be made in writing directly to:

The Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Phone: 01625 545 700
www.informationcommissioner.gov.uk

