

**28/3/2017 by email to Hants CC office**

**Dear Amanda,**

Thank you for your response, unsatisfactory though it is for these reasons.

a/ You wrote that you "*confirm this is the first time your correspondence has been received by the Chief Constables office*".

**Fact No 1.** I first sent the letter and file of data as attachments to my email timed at 03.51 on 15th March to the only relevant email address I could find on your web site, postmaster@hampshire.pnn.police.uk, but the subject line included the words "For the personal attention of the Chief Constable".

**Fact No 2.** Later that morning I received an email timed at 10.14 am, acknowledging the Freedom of Information request included in my letter to the Chief Constable. I will copy that email to you alongside this one.

**Fact No 3.** If the email/letter clearly marked for the attention of the Chief Constable, clearly received by your Postmaster early on the 15th of March had **still** not reached the Chief Constable's office by 12.23 on the 28th (the time shown on your email to me) it would seem that you have some sort of internal communication problem that needs investigation.

**Fact No 4.** I sent the same email again, also to the postmaster, at 18.21 on Wednesday 22nd March. If that too failed to reach the Chief Constable's office by 12.23 on the 28th (the time shown on your email to me) it would seem that your internal communication problem is even worse than I thought.

**Fact No 5.** I telephoned the Chief Constable's office and spoke to a lady who told me that the matter would be looked into. You do not mention that phone call, though I know it took place and I also know that by the time I sent my email for the 3rd time at 15.41 yesterday, Monday the 2th, nothing had happened.

All of the above gives the impression of an organisation attempting to ignore inconvenient facts in the hope that they will go away. **I assure you that they will not.**

Now that I have your response:

b/ You wrote that you "*confirm that the Chief Constable will not be responding personally to your correspondence*".

**Fact No 6.** That you fail to tell me that anyone else will respond strongly suggests that **no one else will respond either, despite the obvious importance of the analysis I provided that your own data confirms that collisions increase after camera are installed.**

**Fact No 7.** Any such intention to ignore this clear evidence is surely **(a) astonishing (b) bizarre (c) futile (d) disgraceful (e) unprofessional and (f) in clear breach of your Force's duty of care to the public - and particularly road users - it serves.**

**Fact No 8.** I do not understand why your own response to my letter bringing evidence of the failure of your cameras was to **treat it as if it were a complaint** under the heading of "Professional Standards" - it was not written or intended as such.

**Fact No 9.** If you and/or your colleagues will now give to the compelling evidence I have provided the close attention it surely deserves, I will not file complaint.

**Fact No 10.** If you continue to choose to ignore it, I will most certainly will and at the same time seek the widest possible publicity for the failure of your Force and Chief Constable to abide by the rules governing their conduct.

I am sure you will understand that knowing that continued use of your fixed cameras is likely to lead to deaths and injuries that would not otherwise happen gives me no alternative but to pursue this matter.

**Yours sincerely,**

**Idris Francis**