

Request reference: 3441/10

Reference Issue 3, undeclared enforcement sites and KSI data, this has been partially obstructed on the grounds that information will be published at a future date.

The use of the word 'obstructed' in this sentence is inappropriate, unless you feel Section 22 has been applied inappropriately. If this is the case please ask for an internal review using the process attached (appeals procedure.pdf).

Please confirm that the data for future publication only consists of KSI data and that the number of undeclared mobile sites is complete at 24.

It is disappointing to learn that some of these sites have been operating for six months and yet the information has not been displayed on the website despite it being updated in January 2010. Please advise when accurate data is expected to be published on the website.

24 was correct. The list of mobile sites on the website has been updated to reflect those currently in use, including the KSI data for 20 of those previously supplied. The remaining four are not in use and have not been included.

Reference Issue 5, apparently all personnel know the DfT Regulations but I would appreciate clarification as to how they are being interpreted.

For example, on the undeclared mobile list there is identified enforcement(40mph) westbound on Little Aston Road. Please advise why there are no black and white camera signs(BWCS)on approach to this enforcement zone, and yet there is false BWCS after the zone when there is no enforcement within 1km ahead. False signs undermine credibility. Is mobile enforcement being implemented on routes without the use of BWCS and, if so, why and when was this policy commenced?

Secondly, there is a DfT Guidance on the use of signs 880 within the same field of view as fixed cameras but I noticed the use of a mobile sign on the Yardley Wood Road, near Mackenzie Road, about 500 metres ahead of the enforcement vehicle and well out of view. There are also no BWCS on the route. I would appreciate knowing the WMCRP policy on the location of signs 880 relative to camera enforcement.

DfT guidance states that co-located camera and speed limit reminder signs should be placed in the same view as fixed speed cameras. This can either be a single diagram 880 (join speed limit and camera sign) or a combination of either diagram 878 or 879 (safety camera sign) and diagram 670 (speed limit sign) depending on the speed limit. This only applies to fixed cameras, not to mobile sites.

At mobile sites a co-located sign should be placed in advance of the point of entry to the site. As above, this can either be a single diagram 880 or a combination of

West Midlands Police in complying with their statutory duty under sections 1 and 11 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to release the enclosed information will not breach the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. However, the rights of the copyright owner of the enclosed information will continue to be protected by law. Applications for the copyright owner's written permission to reproduce any part of the attached information should be addressed to The Force Solicitor, West Midlands Police Headquarters, Lloyd House, Colmore Circus Queensway, Birmingham, B4 6NQ.

diagram 878 or 879 with diagram 670 depending on the speed limit. Additional 878 or 879 signs should then be placed at intervals of around 1 km throughout the site.

In the West Midlands, an appropriate co-located mobile sign is placed by the operator to mark the start of the enforcement zone. In accordance with the guidance, this does not have to be within the same view as the mobile van. If the enforcement zone exceeds 1 km, additional fixed signing may be placed at 1 km intervals. No enforcement takes place without a co-located sign in advance of the van.

Reference Issue 5, knowledge of Regulations and Standards within the partnership, I am sure there will be familiarity with the ACPO Guidelines but please advise if anyone on the Partnership board has completed a Certificate of Competence in the use of enforcement equipment.

Information not held. The Partnership Board is made up of elected members from each local authority. Since they do not participate in enforcement, there is no requirement for the Board to have completed and/or show to the Partnership any such certificate.

Conversely, as it is their job, all our mobile enforcement staff have completed the necessary training and have reached the required standard necessary and have attained the relevant certificate that allows them to be an enforcement operator.

Reference Issue 6, membership of the partnership board, I would appreciate knowing the people who represent HMCS and Highways, as this data is still missing.

The Partnership Board consists of elected members from all seven local authorities and representatives of the Police and Fire & Rescue Authorities. These are the only individuals who are considered board members and they are listed on our website. In addition, officers from partnership members attend meetings. Only those officers involved with supervising the Casualty Reduction Scheme are listed on the website.

The Highways Agency representative is Rob Price but he is classed as an officer and not a voting member.

An invitation has been made to HMCS and it is hoped that they will have a representative in future.