

## Summary

Action Vision Zero (AVZ) welcomes the London Assembly Police and Crime Committee's inquiry into serious injury collision investigation. Whilst police investigations, in general, are known to be overstretched and under-resourced, we believe there are additional factors that compromise outcomes from serious injury collision investigations. These include the

- Fragmented responsibility with different police units involved in collision investigation.
- Lack of transparency and accountability with no overall responsibility identified.
- Road crime not given sufficient priority by borough police as it rarely involves criminal intent.
- At scene investigation appears the same for serious injury collisions as for slight injury collisions, despite the potential significance of the evidence to civil compensation claims.
- Complications caused by the large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists seriously injured, including by hit and run drivers and the disproportionate online reporting by seriously injured cyclists.

For more information on London, see AVZ blogs on [collision investigation](#), [hit and run](#), and [online reporting](#).

### AVZ calls

Our calls listed below are intended to improve investigation so that criminal offending is detected, civil compensation is fair and timely, the suffering of victims mitigated, road danger is reduced and the confidence of the public, especially people walking and cycling is improved.

#### *Improving evidence gathering and investigation practices*

##### **1. Updated Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)**

Officers attending the scene of a serious injury collision should be required to conduct a minimum level of investigation. The more serious the injury, the higher the standard of investigation should be. Existing SOPs are not public and the varying quality of investigations suggests they are not being adhered to. The Met should consult on SOPs with victims' groups and solicitors, and they should be made public. Standards should be made available to first response officers as a check-list easily accessible on their tablets. A system should be put in place to ensure that police are held to account on these standards being met.

##### **2. Improved collision investigation training (at-scene and follow-up)**

Training should be rolled out to borough officers to train them on obtaining the minimum standards of evidence for serious injury collisions, and the impact of the training measured. Considering the proportion of victims who were walking and cycling, training on investigating collisions with vulnerable road users should be given to all police and police staff involved.

##### **3. Local council support**

Lambeth Council has proposed to fund a Met Police officer to ensure adequate resourcing is available for collision investigation. Such investment should be encouraged with other councils.

#### *Ensuring fair and consistent charging decisions*

##### **4. Review officers appointed.**

To ensure consistent and accurate/fair charging decisions, dedicated officers should be assigned to review serious injury collision investigations (as done within the Serious Collisions Investigation Unit).

##### **5. Independent No Further Action (NFA) review**

A review of NFA decisions should be undertaken, starting with collisions involving seriously injured cyclists.

#### *Improving the transparency of procedures and outcomes*

##### **6. Investigation outcomes reported, including NFA reasons**

There is no data linkage between collision reports and court records. The Met should publish this data, and include reasons for NFA (e.g. lack of evidence, or liability of injured party)

## **7. Level of satisfaction surveys**

The police should be confident enough to survey injured victims on their level of satisfaction with the collision investigation and how well informed they were kept. An annual survey should also be conducted with solicitors (although this could be conducted by campaigners, not police).

## **8. Impact of not using FCIs for the c.100 life threatening collisions reviewed**

Those suffering life-threatening injuries no longer routinely have the expertise of a Forensic Collision Investigator (FCI) investigating their collision. Yet these will include victims in most urgent need of civil compensation to help pay for the care they need. Solicitors report the absence of FCI expertise impacts access to civil compensation. Given that the Forensic Science Regulator has had such a significant impact on the number of collisions the SCIU can attend, a review and report should be commissioned as to whether the planned introduction of regulation is appropriate given the impact it has upon current investigations, but also the requirement that will be placed on in the investigation of any serious road traffic collision.

### *Improving liaison with victims and their solicitors*

## **9. Self-Administered Interview statement should replace current questionnaire**

The paper form seriously injured victims are now required to complete is too generic and contributes to cases being dropped. Better already exists. The Road Safety Trust has funded the development of a [Self-Administered Interview](#) which improves recall.

## **10. Disclosure procedures and practices improved**

All staff and officers should know and adhere to NPCC's guidelines on disclosure. In additions:

- Pre-paid accounts should be set up for solicitors, as is done with the courts system, to mitigate against delays and time taken for individual payments to go through.
- 'Disclosure experts' should be appointed, or a dedicated team set up, to ensure there are people within the organisation that colleagues can refer to if they are unsure about disclosure policies.
- Name of driver and vehicle number should be given out without charge to victims/solicitors
- Police should share a list of all the evidence they have.

## **11. Guide for seriously injured victims should be published.**

A guide for seriously injured victims should be developed so that victims and families know what to expect from police and understand the process of how a serious injury collision is investigated. The guide should be developed in consultation with victims, campaigners, and solicitors.

### *Ensuring collision investigation contributes to road danger reduction*

## **12. Contributory factors recorded at the end of an investigation**

Currently, contributory factors in serious injury collisions are recorded at the scene. This should be done once an investigation is concluded, to ensure that data on the causes of crashes is correct. In 2019, speed was initially reported as a contributory factor in 17.5% of fatal collisions in London. However subsequent analysis of investigation reports by Met found that speed was a contributory factor in 49.2% of fatal collisions. Road safety policy would greatly benefit if the causes of crashes were accurately recorded.

### *Overarching*

To support these changes, AVZ makes two further calls:

## **13. Collision investigation strategy and action plan**

As part of Met' and TfL's commitment to Vision Zero and 'post-collision learning and response', a strategy and action plan should be developed to outline how Met will improve and monitor serious injury collision investigations in London. Given people walking and cycling in London make up over 50% of the serious injuries, ensuring collision investigation is able to detect offending and help ensure fair and timely compensation is key.

**14. Serious Injury Collision Investigation Working Group.** . A working group with solicitors, campaigners, victim representatives, as well as police, TfL and boroughs, should be established to help develop the strategy and monitor the action plan.

## London Serious Injury Collision Investigation Call for Evidence

### *1. Have you been affected by serious injury collisions in London? What impact have you experienced?*

This response is from Action Vision Zero (AVZ). AVZ is a community interest company which is dedicated to ending road danger. Personal responses have been provided separately.

### *2. What is your experience of the Met's investigation of serious injury collisions in London?*

AVZ's response is based on our experience of trying to understand collision investigation by the Met. This included in 2019 under a Trust for London funded project undertaken by RoadPeace where AVZ staff then worked. A baseline review of collision investigation in London was conducted and the final draft shared with the Met and TfL and feedback provided. Following discussions with the Met, the baseline review was not published. Then covid happened and we believe this stopped the improvements in investigation which had been focused on the Met's Roads Transport and Policing Command (RTPC), rather than borough officers.

In 2022, AVZ began inquiring again about collision investigation in London, including how it varied by crash severity, and how it was quality assured. Several meetings were held in 2023 with TfL and the Met participated. This confirmed our fears, that due to the lack of transparency, there was no reason to be confident in how serious injury collisions were being investigated.

### *3. In your view, are serious injury collisions in London adequately investigated? Why?*

We do not believe there is any evidence that shows serious injury collisions are adequately investigated—at least not shared with campaigners or the public. Our response focuses on the 95% of serious injury collisions which are not investigated by the Met Police Serious Collision Investigation Unit (SCIU). This unit is only involved in fatal and life threatening collisions (subject to the caveats outlined below).

Reasons for our lack of confidence include:

- **Lack of transparency renders it difficult to believe serious injury collisions are well investigated.** Whilst it is mentioned in the Vision Zero Action Plan, no strategy exists for monitoring how serious injuries are investigated in London. No performance indicators are known to exist for police on collision investigation. Nor are the reasons for No Further Action published, nor victims surveyed on their level of satisfaction with the police investigation or communication with them. This means campaigners are left to speaking to road crash victims and solicitors, where bad examples are more likely to be highlighted.
- **Whilst no outcome data exists, court statistics indicate prosecutions are low.** In 2022, there were only 37 convictions for causing serious injury by dangerous driving in London (43 prosecutions). Another 3,212 drivers were convicted of careless driving (3,761 prosecutions) but this charge does not require that an injury is sustained, let alone a serious one (MoJ, 2023). As the new charge of 'causing serious injury by careless driving' only came in last year, we do not know how often in London it is being prosecuted. [London's Vision Zero Enforcement Dashboard](#) does not yet include any data on arrests for this new charge.
- **Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) do not result in sufficient evidence gathering.** Much of the problems with serious injury investigations arise from evidence not being gathered at the scene. This includes witness contact details and statements, CCTV and dashcam/headcam footage, photos of the scene and body-worn camera footage. If this evidence is not gathered immediately, it is often lost – rendering a follow up investigation by Marlowe House impossible and resulting in a 'No Further Action' decision. Whilst SOPs exist for the different injury severity types, victims and solicitors report that evidence which existed is not always being captured, which makes criminal prosecutions very unlikely and civil action more difficult. SOPs are not publicly available.
- **The quality of the investigation is a postcode lottery.** Whilst some serious injury collisions investigated by borough officers and Marlow House are investigated well, this is reported to be

down to the individual investigating the case, as there is wide variation in the quality of investigations.

#### **Comparison with the life threatening collisions investigated by the SCIU**

- **Difference between SCIU and non-SCIU.** Whilst c.100 out of the of 3,873 reported serious injuries (London, 2022) are investigated by the SCIU, the remaining (and vast majority) are investigated by borough officers, police staff at Marlowe House, or a combination of both. Some of the more serious injuries not investigated by SCIU are attended by RTPC officers with some training in investigating collisions, these RTPC officers do not retain the investigation. It is also not known how many they attend, although it will be a small minority. Whilst the SCIU are believed, on the whole, to investigate collisions to a high standard, victims and solicitors report that many cases not investigated by the SCIU are poorly investigated.
- **But even the most serious injuries investigated by SCIU are no longer routinely being investigated by Forensic Collision Investigators (FCIs).** Whilst fatalities continue to be investigated by FCIs, changes in regulation by the Forensic Science Regulator has meant that involvement of FCIs in cases is much more resource intensive. The Met's SCIU is one of many in England and Wales who now no longer utilise FCIs regularly in serious injury collisions, and many units across the country only attend fatal collisions.

#### *4. How do investigations of serious injury collisions affect road crash victims and their families?*

A quality investigation is necessary for

- **Civil compensation with victims better able to cope and recover from their injuries.** Unlike the vast majority of European countries who have presumed/strict liability systems, we have a fault-based compensation system in the UK. This means that victims need to prove they were not at fault to access civil compensation. Seriously injured victims often do not know they need to instruct a solicitor, or are too unwell to do so immediately. As such, it is crucial that evidence from the scene is gathered and preserved by police. If witness contact details aren't taken, photographs of the scene captured, and CCTV evidence obtained, the outcome for the victim is that their claim is financially reduced and/or much more delayed. The impact of this on victims and their families is that their settlement to pay for much needed rehabilitation is delayed or not sufficient to cover the costs. This can lead to a number of hardships:
  - Financial difficulties, including loss of home, as victims are often out of work for an extended period of time. This will also impact any of the victim's dependents.
  - Limited recovery from injuries with lifelong impact, as early rehabilitation is essential for maximum recovery
  - Reliance on the NHS for rehabilitation which should be paid for by the insurer of the party who caused the crash. Stretched NHS resources should not be spent when it is not necessary to, and the quality and extent of the rehabilitation on offer in the private sector surpasses that of the NHS in most cases. Both crash victims and the NHS benefit from having their rehabilitation paid for privately.
- **Criminal prosecution.** Without a quality investigation, drivers who cause serious injury will not be detected. Not only does this contribute to a wider failure of deterring criminal driving behaviour, inability to ban drivers who pose a risk, and punish law-breaking, it also leaves victims unable to access justice. Victims report they are left feeling failed by the system if their case is inadequately investigated.
- **Ensuring lessons are learnt to prevent future collisions.** After suffering a serious injury, victims overwhelmingly want to ensure that the circumstances which led to their crash are not repeated and are mitigated against. Without a quality investigation, it is not possible to know what has caused a crash to happen, and road safety policy or infrastructure changes which could prevent death and injury in the future do not get implemented.

5. *What level of support is in place in London for victims of serious injury collisions and their families? What more is needed?*

No support exists for the vast majority of the over 3800 people seriously injured in London each year.

- **97% of seriously injured Londoners do not qualify for TfL/MOPAC's pilot project supporting crash victims.** Only bereaved families and those with life threatening injuries qualify for this pilot.<sup>1</sup>
- **A quality investigation can be much more important than access to support services.** Emotional support does not pay the bills, and the most pressing issues for seriously injured Londoners are often financial support if they are unable to work, and access to rehabilitation to recover from their injuries. Without a quality investigation and improved communication, victims' access to civil compensation is delayed and impaired.

So what is needed is

- better communication with victims and their solicitors
- timely release of information to start compensation claims
- guide for those seriously injured
- online and peer support as the numbers of seriously injured are too large for Family Liaison officers or caseworkers to be assigned.

6. *How well does the Met communicate its serious injury collision investigation work, including information to victims concerning the investigation process, timeline and charging decisions?*

- **Lack of information about investigation procedures means victims often do not know what to expect from police.** Whilst Marlowe House has a leaflet it gives to victims, there is no guide for the seriously injured. Such guides do exist for bereaved families and those with life threatening injuries—these have been funded by MOPAC whilst national guides, funded by central government, also exist.
- **Victims and solicitors report the Met do not adhere to the Victims Code of Practice.** Whilst the Victims Code<sup>2</sup> outlines particular rights that victims have in terms of being kept informed, victims and their solicitors have reported that this is not always adhered to. Victims have reported having to call 111 from hospital to find out who their investigating officer is, and are not always kept informed on charging decisions and the progress of the investigation.
- **No data is gathered on how well victims are communicated with.** Whilst victims of some crimes in London are surveyed on their level of satisfaction with the investigation<sup>3</sup>, including on how well they were kept informed, this is not the case with road crime victims.
- **Questionnaire sent to victims too generic and contributes to cases being dropped.** There is one standard questionnaire that is sent to victims, drivers, and witnesses involved in a collision. The form is far too generic and is only sent out by post. Many seriously injured victims will be in hospital for a long time, or unable to read or write, and there are instances of victims not being able to return the form and the case being dropped as a result. Ideally the questionnaire would be available online and adaptable to different collision types. At a bare minimum it should be able to be sent, completed and returned over email to allow for seriously injured victims to complete it. See our call for the [Road Safety Trust funded Self-Administered Interview](#) statement to be used.
- **Reasons for 'No further action' not given.** Most serious injury collision investigations by the Met are believed to result in a 'No Further Action' (NFA) decision. The reasons for NFA i.e. lack of evidence, evidence not gathered, victim at fault etc. are neither communicated to the victim nor recorded. As such neither victims nor the public know why the police have taken a decision not to prosecute. This not only leaves victims in the dark about the circumstances of the serious injury they sustained, but also makes it difficult to monitor how well the police are investigating collisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/media/press-releases/2023/september/tfl-mopac-announce-victim-support-service-to-improve-support-for-those-affected-by-road-traffic-collisions-in-london>

<sup>2</sup> <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/60620279d3bf7f5ceaca0d89/victims-code-2020.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://data.london.gov.uk/mopac-pcp-dashboard/support-victims-and-witnesses-dashboard/>

7. In your experience, how easy is it to acquire information from the Met, when it is necessary for victims' access to civil compensation following a collision?

- **Ease in acquiring information varies dramatically.** Solicitors report that whilst some borough officers and staff at Marlowe House are forthcoming in supplying information, many are not. Although this reluctance to share information no doubt is caused by not wanting to jeopardize criminal proceedings, NPCC guidelines exist on disclosure to mitigate this. Unfortunately these guidelines are not always known or are being adhered to.
- **The process is time-consuming and costly.** Unlike any other crime, victims and the solicitors representing them have to pay to get access to evidence on their case. This includes individual fees for the name of the driver, registration number, collision investigation report, witness statements etc.<sup>4</sup> These costs will need to be paid before a victim knows whether they even have a strong case for a civil claim. The time taken for the information to be released – 12 weeks from when the payment is made – also has a negative impact on the victim in that it can mean access to much needed rehabilitation is delayed whilst liability is contended.
- **Information is often released piecemeal.** Solicitors report that difficulties lie in not knowing what evidence the police have collected, and therefore not knowing to request it. Equally the piecemeal release of evidence also impacts on the length of time it takes to resolve cases for victims. Without knowing all of the evidence the police has, solicitors do not know what evidence they need to try to get themselves, and the longer it is left the harder it is to get it. For example, delays in releasing witness statements can cause problems in tracking down witnesses the more time has passed following a collision (with people moving addresses etc).
- **The system puts the most seriously injured at a disadvantage.** In some cases, the injured will be able to get the vehicle registration and name of the driver at the collision scene. However more seriously injured people will often be unable to do so due to the gravity of the injuries they have sustained. In these cases, victims will have to pay a fee to Marlowe House to access to this information. Meaning those in most need of civil compensation to cope and recover from their injuries have additional hurdles and costs to access the information they need to start a claim.

8. What more could the Met be doing to increase confidence in the police investigation and charging decision after a serious injury collision?

*Improving evidence gathering and investigation practices*

- **Updated Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).** Officers attending the scene of a serious injury collision should be required to conduct a minimum level of investigation to allow, if appropriate, both criminal prosecutions and civil proceedings. The more serious the injury, the higher the standard of investigation should be. Existing SOPs are not public and the varying quality of investigations suggests they are not being adhered to. The Met should consult on SOPs with victims' groups and solicitors, and they should be made public. Standards should be made available to first response officers as a check-list easily accessible on their tablets. A system should be put in place to ensure that police are held to account on these standards being met.
- **Improved collision investigation training (at-scene and follow-up).** Whilst the Met provided training for Roads Transport Policing Command (RTPC) officers during 2020/21, the vast majority of serious injury collision scenes are attended by borough officers, not RTPC officers. Training should be rolled out to borough officers to train them on obtaining the minimum standards of evidence for serious injury collisions, and the impact of the training measured. Police staff investigating crashes should also be reminded/trained of the National Police Chief Council's guidance on disclosure following a collision, to ensure victims' early access to rehabilitation. Considering the proportion of victims who were walking and cycling, training on investigating collisions with vulnerable road users should be given to all police

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.met.police.uk/rqo/request/cr/v1/request-collision-report/>



and police staff involved. And all police should be reminded that road crash victims qualify as victims of crime whilst their crash is being investigated under the Victims Code of Practice.

- **Local council support.** Lambeth Council has proposed to fund a Met Police officer to ensure adequate resourcing is available for collision investigation and pursuit of criminal liabilities. It should also help ensure that contributory factors within the borough's control e.g. infrastructure, traffic signals etc are flagged and remedied more quickly. Such investment should be explored by TfL and the Met and encouraged with other councils.

#### *Ensuring fair and consistent charging decisions*

- **Review officers appointed.** To ensure consistent and accurate/fair charging decisions, dedicated officers should be assigned to review serious injury collision investigations (as done within the Serious Collisions Investigation Unit).
- **Independent No Further Action review.** A review of No Further Action (NFA) decisions should be undertaken, starting with collisions involving seriously injured cyclists.

#### *Improving the transparency of procedures and outcomes*

- **Investigation outcomes reported, including NFA reasons.** There is no data linkage between collision reports and court records, so it is not possible to know which collisions (e.g. the number of pedestrians) resulted in a prosecution. The Met should publish this data, and include reasons for NFA (e.g. lack of evidence, or liability of injured party)
- **Level of satisfaction surveys.** The police should be confident enough to survey injured victims on their level of satisfaction with the collision investigation and how well informed they were kept. Level of satisfaction surveys would allow for the impact of investigation policies and procedures to be measured. An annual survey should also be conducted with solicitors (although this could be conducted by campaigners, not police).
- **Impact of not using FCIs for the c.100 life threatening collisions reviewed.** Those suffering life-threatening injuries no longer have the expertise of a Forensic Collision Investigator (FCI) investigating their collision. Yet these will include victims in most urgent need of civil compensation to help pay for the care they need. Solicitors report the absence of FCI expertise impacts access to civil compensation. The SCIU should work with solicitors to identify how this can be mitigated.

#### *Improving liaison with victims and their solicitors*

- **Self-Administered Interview statement should replace current questionnaire.** The paper form seriously injured victims are now required to complete is too generic and contributes to cases being dropped. Better already exists. The Road Safety Trust has funded the development of a [Self-Administered Interview](#) which improves recall. At present it is only available in hard copy but an online version is being trialled, and this could be extended to London.
- **Disclosure procedures and practices improved.** Current procedures and practices on disclosure contribute to delays and can reduce civil compensation for seriously injured victims. All staff and officers should know and adhere to NPCC's guidelines on disclosure. To ensure this and improve procedures:
  - Pre-paid accounts should be set up for solicitors, as is done with the courts system, to mitigate against delays and time taken for individual payments to go through for individual types of evidence.
  - 'Disclosure experts' should be appointed, or a dedicated team set up, to ensure there are people within the organisation that colleagues can refer to if they are unsure about disclosure policies.
  - Name of driver and vehicle number should be given out without charge to victims and their solicitors, to avoid penalising those suffering the most serious injuries.
  - Police should share a list of all the evidence they have – currently solicitors receive information piecemeal, as they don't know what to request.

- **Guide for seriously injured victims should be published.** A guide for seriously injured victims should be developed so that victims and families know what to expect from police and understand the process of how a serious injury collision is investigated. The guide should be developed in consultation with victims, campaigners, and solicitors.

#### *Ensuring collision investigation contributes to road danger reduction*

- **Contributory factors recorded at the end of an investigation.** Currently, contributory factors in serious injury collisions are recorded at the scene. This should be done once an investigation is concluded, to ensure that data on the causes of crashes is correct. In 2019, speed was initially reported as a contributory factor in 17.5% of fatal collisions in London. However subsequent analysis of investigation reports by Met found that speed was a contributory factor in 49.2% of fatal collisions. Road safety policy would greatly benefit if the causes of crashes were accurately recorded.

#### *Overarching*

To support these changes, AVZ makes two further calls:

- **Collision investigation strategy and action plan.** As part of Met' and TfL's commitment to Vision Zero and 'post-collision learning and response', a strategy and action plan should be developed to outline how the Met will improve and monitor serious injury collision investigations in London. Given people walking and cycling in London make up over 50% of the serious injuries, ensuring collision investigation is able to detect offending and help ensure fair and timely compensation is key.
- **Serious Injury Collision Investigation Working Group.** A working group with solicitors, campaigners, victim representatives, as well as police, TfL and boroughs, should be established to help develop the strategy and monitor the action plan.

#### *9. In your view, is the Met sufficiently resourced and trained to carry out investigations into serious injury investigations? Why?*

- **More training required on evidence gathering.** As outlined in question 3, the key issue impacting the quality of serious injury investigations is a lack of evidence gathering at the scene. Whilst borough officers have access to a system called 'PRIMROSE', this does not facilitate better evidence gathering as it is reported that it does not direct officers enough on what evidence they should be gathering. A checklist with minimum standards of evidence e.g. CCTV, witness statements, drink and drug test etc, should instead be implemented, and officers trained on how to gather that evidence. Outside of London, Roads Transport Policing Command (RTPC) officers are trained in collision investigation through an 'AI Light' course (previously named TRAFFAC), and it is only RTPC officers who attend serious injury collisions (not a borough officer equivalent). This training is not to the extent that Forensic Investigators are, but nonetheless is reported to be sufficient for a level of evidence gathering to support criminal prosecution. In London, serious injury collisions are mostly attended by borough police who have not received this training. Whilst traffic police (those operating out of the four traffic garages, but not SCIU) within London's RTPC are trained in AI light, they are called in by borough officers when a very serious injury is not investigated by SCIU, but the borough officer feels the case warrants more expert investigation. The AI light trained RTPC officers do not retain an investigation, their function is purely at the scene before the case is passed on to Marlowe House. We do not know how many RTPC officers are trained in AI light, how many collisions they attend, nor how it is decided what collisions they will attend. A review should be conducted to answer these questions, and whether the provision of AI light trained RTPC officers is sufficient to delivering quality investigations. From reports by victims and solicitors, we suspect that they attend a very small percentage of serious injury collisions, and as such, barring a huge increase in resourcing, the training focus must remain on borough officers gathering basic evidence for police staff at Marlowe House.
- **More training required on disclosure practices.** As outlined in question 7, the NPCC guidelines on disclosure are not being adhered to in all cases. Police staff at Marlowe House and borough officers should receive regular training on disclosure practices or several key people in the organisation trained on disclosure, who can act as 'experts' within Marlowe House or Borough Command Units.



- **Training required on Victims Code of Practice.** As outlined in question 6, the Victims Code is not being followed when it comes to keeping victims informed on their cases. It is quite possible that police do not think the code applies to road crash victims, however at least whilst a case is being investigated, seriously injured victims qualify under the code.
- **Training required on investigating collisions with people walking and cycling.** Over half of people reported seriously injured in road crashes in London were people walking or cycling. Not only due to their vulnerability are they likely to suffer more serious life-changing injuries, people walking and cycling are also unlikely to have personal injury insurance. Training should be conducted in investigating these collisions to ensure justice is possible for this particular group of Londoners.

#### 10. How could the Met's serious injury collision investigation work best contribute to achieving the Mayor's Vision Zero target of eliminating deaths and serious injuries from London's roads?

##### **To support the delivery of Vision Zero, the following are recommended**

- *Contributory factors to be collected at the end of the investigation.* Thanks to the Met pioneering this approach with fatal collisions, we know how much more accurate these factors can be. Contributory factors in serious injury collisions should also be collected at the end of the investigation.
- *Identify which KSI collisions were caused by human error (mistakes) and which were result of risk taking.* This should be required for Safe Systems approach which expects the former to be designed out as humans are fallible.
- *Lorry and bus KSI collisions should have annual review to see what more TfL could be doing to prevent repeat occurrences.*

##### **Key for instilling confidence in active road users includes:**

- *Identify and meet best practice and publish investigation outcomes and NFA reviews.* Transparency is critical to road user confidence in the police investigation and charging decision—justice needs to be seen to be believed.
- *Ensure consistent and fair charging of careless driving.* Lower level careless driving can be difficult to determine but without this, offenders are let off.
- *Improve information sharing with solicitors and victims for insurance claims .*
- *Include RDR training in police (RTPC as well as borough police).* This is so they can better understand the importance of the evidence they collect at scene and the priority given to tackling danger at source.