



APPG Cycling & Walking Justice inquiry: Good practice and better coordination

June 2023

Key points

- Police services are independent and can determine their own enforcement strategies and priorities.
- Good practice needs to be identified by the police, ideally in collaboration with road safety professionals, academics and active travel campaigners. Monitoring can be done at the national or local level.
- An Active Travel Justice Working Group would help ensure that traffic law enforcement and the wider justice system support government's commitment to active travel..

Background

Police services are largely independent. There are very few national requirements or standards imposed on the police with Traffic Law Enforcement (TLE). Police pursuits is one exception. But other examples, such as drink drive testing after casualty collisions are agreed policies, and not mandatory. Roads Policing has recently been incorporated into the [Home Office Strategic Policing Requirement](#) but this is to help the police achieve their critical national threats (these include public disorder), not for the [purpose of safer roads](#).

Evaluation

Roads Policing is not included in Her Majesty's inspectorate of the Constabulary, Fire, and Rescue Service (HMICFRS) annual [PEEL \(Policing Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Legitimacy\) evaluations](#). Their report [Roads Policing –Not Optional](#) was their first report on roads policing in over 20 years and only inspected seven of the 43 police services in England and Wales.

Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) represent the community in holding the police to account. In developing their police and crime plans, they consult with communities, with speeding and dangerous driving consistently identified as local priorities. AVZ's review of current police and crime plans found all but two included safer roads as a priority. But the actions and indicators varied widely. There are no frameworks or standards to help the PCCs evaluate roads policing efforts.

AVZ coordinates a monthly meeting of local Roads Policing campaigners where information is shared and members updated on developments elsewhere. We have compared police services on key RDR offences (speeding, careless driving, mobile phone, uninsured vehicles) on a per KSI basis as well as a per capita basis. But basics such as baselines (e.g. latest year or three year average, etc) and indicators (per KSI or per capita) should be agreed with police and academics.

Good practice

Good practice has not been defined by the police. The NPCC has published recommendations for "third party reporting" which could be the basis for identifying good practice with online reporting. Our 2021 PCC Manifesto Commit to Act on Road Danger¹ called for good practice to be identified. AVZ has collated [examples of good practice](#) with road danger reduction by police. AVZ has also

¹ The PCC manifesto was developed with RoadPeace and 20's Plenty for Us and supported by British Cycling, Cycling UK, Living Streets, Sustrans and the Road Danger Reduction Forum.

previously drafted good practice indicators for campaigners, including with Community Speed Watch and online reporting, initiatives where community participation is key.

Better coordination

Coordination is key. This includes within individual police services as different units help reduce road danger. Roads Policing or road crime teams are centrally organised and do not have local contacts. Borough/local police investigate the vast majority of injury collisions and are responsible for Safer Neighbourhood Teams. They work much closer with communities and do have local contacts. Yet such information as online submission of bad driving is not regularly shared with local police.

Coordination between the police and CPS appears lacking. Most offences are sanctioned out of court but the CPS is responsible for prosecuting the most serious offences at court. As noted in our briefing on data gaps, there is no reporting of which organisation (police or CPS) makes the charging decision, as police can decide there is insufficient evidence for a prosecution without the need for CPS confirmation. In addition, the CPS no longer have a dedicated policy lead on road crime.

Wider coordination is also needed, both between government departments and with campaigners.. Some 16 government departments (inc. DfT, Home Office, NPCC, etc) are reported to be working together on DfT's Roads Policing review but little information on this has been shared with the public. The DfT has yet to report back on the consultation held in 2020. There are nine pilots but it is unclear how they apply to active travel. No active travel advocates are thought involved in the pilots. This is similar to the local Safer Roads Partnerships whose membership tends to be restricted, and not include local community representatives. In London, the Vision Zero Enforcement Reference Group membership is wider, including TfL, police, borough representatives as well as local campaigners. The West Midlands PCC has also spoken of setting up a similar group with local campaigners included.

The DfT previously coordinated a Justice for Vulnerable Road User Working Group. This included representatives from the DfT, Home Office, ACPO, Ministry of Justice, Sentencing Council as well as from active travel and victim groups. Key topics included linking data between collision records and court reports as well as defining careless driving. This group ceased functioning over ten years ago. Any future effort should try to tackle issues consecutively with only key parties involved, i.e. the Sentencing Council was not needed at meetings discussing collision investigation or data linkage.

Action Vision Zero Key calls

Evaluation and good practice

1. **Evaluation framework.** Police, road safety professionals, academics and active travel campaigners should work together to develop an evaluation framework that prioritises reducing harm to others, especially those more vulnerable (i.e. walkers & cyclists), with KPIs.
2. **Good practice.** Examples of good practice should be collated and wider shared, e.g. PCCs funding bike and dash cams, or increased transparency with enforcement data.

Better coordination

3. **Roads Policing Review.** The DfT should publish the 2020 Roads Policing consultation response and share progress of its pilot projects and how they benefit active travel.
4. **Local groups.** Local safer road working groups should be set up in police services, with representation from communities and active travel groups.
5. **Justice Working Group.** DfT and/or Active Travel England should establish a Justice Working Group to address concerns of walkers and cyclists, including collision investigation and criminal prosecutions. If this is not possible, then they should at least support a Working Group set up by active travel campaigners.

Note: This briefing was written by Amy Aeron-Thomas, Jeremy Leach and Victoria Lebec from Action Vision Zero. It highlights the concerns and calls in our Roads Policing campaign aimed at reducing road danger. Amy previously represented RoadPeace on DfT's Justice for Vulnerable Road Users Working Group.