

Document 3

Minutes of meeting with
complainant Mr Det
Supt Smith and DS French
16/05/13



Hampshire Constabulary

Station : PHQ Area : PHQ
Department : Professional Standards Date : 17 May 2013

Subject : Meeting with Mr [redacted] and Hampshire Constabulary Professional Standards department - 16th May 2013 1300hrs at Poole Police Station

Attendees:

- Complainant

Detective Supt Colin Smith (Hants Police)
Detective Sgt Sally French (Hants Police)

Det Supt Smith opens the meeting by introducing everyone and stating the purpose of the meeting was to identify Mr [redacted] concerns, and to agree clear objectives as to how the matter was to be progressed. He gives Mr [redacted] a copy of the terms of reference to read, and explained the requirements of Police regulations and IPCC guidance which regulates Police action in relation to investigation of complaints against Police. Det Supt Smith states that he wants to explore in particular the wording in italics on the terms of reference.

Mr [redacted] read the Terms of reference and agreed that he was satisfied with them. Mr [redacted] then gave an overview of the basis of his complaint against Dorset Police. He is a professional engineer, who has experience of looking at safety concerns, and for the last ten years has had concerns about Dorset Police safety issues and statistics in relation to road safety and in particular the use of speed cameras. He states he has tried over the last ten years to obtain information from Local authorities and the police in order to get answers to his questions and to find out whether what the Police are doing actually benefits road safety. He states that his requests have been refused or ignored and he couldn't believe how ineffective the Police were as they were not able to answer his requests. He reiterates that he is a successful engineer who wants to know if things are working and if they are not is keen to improve things.

Det Supt Smith sets out what he believes are the key areas which Mr [redacted] wants to be addressed;

- 1) Driver awareness course and funding - Are the costs correct and does it achieve what it sets out to.
- 2) Siting of mobile cameras and its funding – what is the rationale behind where these are sited. He believes that Mr [redacted] has concerns that this is a process for profit only, and that the area where the motorcyclist [redacted] died was not an accident blackspot.



Mr [redacted] states that he believes that Dorset Police are using the mobile cameras in order to protect their jobs and ego's. He states that there is no statement of what they are doing or how or why and that there is incompetence, dishonesty and conflicts. He states that Police are making their decisions around how to make money. Also, that similar organisations are actually closing down their operations. Mr [redacted] feels that if the money doesn't keep coming in then certain people will be out of a job. He gives the names Pat GARRETT (SEES enforcement), Brian AUSTIN (No Excuse campaign), and Johnny STEVENS, who vanished after Mr [redacted] made a previous complaint.

Mr [redacted] made an application under FOI after the motorcycle death, asking how many deaths are due to speed. He was told that Dorset Police don't hold records regarding this. He asks how can it be that Dorset do not hold records of accidents?

DS French explains that this may have been due to the fact that they do record accidents, but that they do not record on their records if the accident is due to speed.

Mr [redacted] states that 7% of accidents are due to speed according to the DFT website, and this information is on his website also. He states that Cameras only cover 1% of road space.

Det Supt Smith clarifies that Mr [redacted] issue is questioning what Dorset's position is - ie is it Road Safety or is it enforcing speed limits.

Mr [redacted] states that Dorset Police have always said that their cameras are about safety. Mr [redacted] just wants them to be honest about what they are doing.

Det Supt Smith clarifies that Mr [redacted] would like a proper honest breakdown of the costs of the Driver awareness course.

Mr [redacted] states that Dorset is the most expensive course for driver awareness and there is no correlation.

Det Supt Smith clarifies that Mr [redacted] concern is that there is a lack of transparency around costing for the awareness scheme and would like to know details of the finance and objectives.

Mr [redacted] agrees, and states that he believes that there is a breach of duty of care by Dorset Police, and that they are trying to maximise money rather than thinking about safety. He believes that they site cameras where they will make the most money, not to provide road safety and the fact that they refused to give him the information proves this. He states that they have now also labelled him as a vexatious complainant.

He states that the siting of the mobile speed vans is the issue, and that Dorset Police target areas for example where the 70 mph limit has recently been reduced to 50 mph, ie easy targets, and confirms that [redacted] died at one of these sites. He talks about the [redacted] road death on the A31, and says that Police should also be targeting uninsured drivers. He says that Speed limits in some areas are now too low, due to the fact that Dorset



Police want to make money and that no one has done any analysis and says that no analysis has been done for the A31.

Det Supt Smith questions if there is a legal requirement to consider safety.

Mr [] considers how much it would cost to introduce a 50 mph limit, and what analysis is done in relation to this. Do they consider what the cost is and what would be the most cost effective way to reduce speed? His view is that councillors raise the issue and drum up support rather than it being based on actual statistics.

Det Supt Smith states that the purpose of our review is to look at Conduct of Dorset Police to assess this against Standards of Professional behaviour. ie Police have a legal duty requiring them to provide road safety. Areas which may be considered for review are freedom of information, openness and transparency and values.

Mr [] states that he has brought three documents with him;
Document 1 - Original complaint – covers general issues, adverse effects of speed cameras and breach of duty of care. Also that Mr [] has asked for a declaration of interest and not had any reply. He states that he had a meeting with Chief Supt Colin Searle 2 years ago who told him that he would like Mr [] to be present at Road Safety meetings; however he then heard that he wasn't allowed to be present and didn't hear back from Colin Searle and believed he was off long term sick. Mr [] states that Dorset won the Prince Michael Award which was due to the outcome of the KSI figures which showed a turnaround in performance. He states that the claim was that this was all due to camera use, ie they have lied in their submission for the award. He asked for details on the figures, but none were received. Mike Glanville (Head of Partnership) did not reply to Mr [] Mr [] was referred to as a Vexatious complainant, and wanted to know why he was not allowed to go be party of the road safety meetings.

Det Supt Smith clarifies with Mr [] that he believes Mr [] wants transparency, wants to know why he didn't get the information, and wants Dorset to provide information of the financial breakdown. He suggest that this is a potential outcome for Mr []. Also he suggests that Mr [] could be involved in the review of current Road safety measures.

Mr [] agrees.

Det Supt Smith asks if Mr [] would like to meet with Mike Glanville

Mr [] states hat he would like this but only if some good can come out of it. He states that his complaint against Mike Glanville had identified nothing wrong, his complaint against Martin Baker was ignored which then led to the PCC and IPCC review. Document 2 – is a PDF of figures and details what he believes shows fraud in relation to the course figures.

Document 3 is a follow on from document 1 and is also on Mr [] website. He talks about a FOI request which he says was not provided and states he was labelled as vexatious. The FOI request went to tribunal.



Det Supt Smith states that the FOI requests will need to be viewed,

Mr () states that the history of the FOI requests is on a link on the above documents. The tribunal does not criticise the FOI objectives. Also that Annette Brooks MP is concerned with the costs of the driver awareness course.

Det Supt Smith summarises some objectives;

- Review what Mr () has told us and the associated documents.
- Set out objectives that Hampshire PSD will look at
- Liaise with the PCC and then come back and agree objectives with Mr ()
- Identify any failings and make recommendations

Mr () states that the main things he is concerned about are

- Driver awareness course costs
- Performance figures, are Dorset's figures based on making money, or protecting life/safety

Det Supt Smith asks if there is anything else Mr () would like to discuss before the meeting ends (Mr () says no) Det Supt Smith discuss how we will contact Mr () via email, and that he will be updated every 28 days at the very least, and when anything of significance occurs. That Hampshire Police will aim to achieve the deadline, but will be reliant on people providing information to us, and that we will report to the PCC.

Suggested Lines of enquiry to look at are;

- How much money Dorset Police are receiving from the Driver awareness course and what they are spending that money on.
- Siting of mobile cameras in Dorset, where and why and what process/legislation is adhered to.

Meeting ends