

Date: 15/11/2024
Our ref: 01/FOI/24/013627/O

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/24/013627/O

I write in connection with your request for information dated 12/11/2024, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I would like access to information relating to speeding offences on the M60, specifically the detection by camera on the Eastbound carriageway between J11 and J12, between the 1st January 2024 to 1st November 2024.

***Please provide to me the number of Notices of Intended Prosecution and as much of the following data as possible?
Date of alleged offence, time of alleged offence, speed limit in place and recorded speed limit.***

Result of Searches

Greater Manchester Police can neither confirm nor deny that we hold any other information relevant to the whole of your request by virtue of the following exemptions:

Section 31(3) – Law Enforcement

Section 38(2) – Health and Safety

Evidence of Harm

Any disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is a disclosure to the world at large and confirming or denying any information relating to specific speed cameras and in this case the number of detections by cameras at J 11 and 12 would prejudice law enforcement and endanger the safety of road users.

Conversely, if information was not held by the force, and a denial was issued, this would suggest to individuals intent on driving at excess speed on this stretch of road (whether correctly or not) the limitations of police capabilities in this area, which may further encourage speeding by exposing a potential vulnerability.

Disclosure of the information could prejudice the ability of the force to police this area which would lead to a greater risk to the public. Any information identifying the focus of policing activity could be used to the advantage criminals. Information that undermines the operational integrity of these activities will adversely affect public safety and have a negative impact on both law enforcement and the safety of the public.

Public interest considerations favouring neither confirming nor denying whether the information is held - Section 31(3)

By confirming or denying whether any information is held would mean that law enforcement tactics would be compromised which would hinder the prevention and detection of crime.

Greater Manchester Police is charged with enforcing the law, preventing and detecting crime and protecting the communities we serve. The ability to protect uphold and protect law enforcement capabilities within the country is of paramount importance and the police will not divulge whether any information is or is not held if to do so would place the safety of an individual at risk or undermine law enforcement capabilities due to adverse disclosure.

Public interest considerations favouring confirming or denying whether the information is held - Section 31(3)

Confirming or denying whether any information is held would allow Greater Manchester Police to demonstrate increased openness and transparency.

Public interest considerations favouring neither confirming nor denying whether the information is held – Section 38(2)

To confirm or deny details relating to specific speed cameras would reveal details about periods of inactivity. This would lead to people assuming, correctly or incorrectly, when certain cameras are likely to be inactive and could encourage drivers to exceed the speed limit at these times. This could lead to more collisions and as a result, more serious injuries, or death of road users.

Balance Test

When balancing the public interest test, GMP consider whether to confirm or deny if we hold such information relating to your request. Arguments need to be weighed against each other. The most persuasive reason for confirming or denying is GMP's accountability, which needs to be compared to the strongest negative reason for neither confirm nor deny, which in this case is the health and safety of road users and GMP's ability to effectively execute its duties. The public interest would not be served by confirming or denying the requested information exists or not.

On consideration of the above, I believe the factors favouring neither confirm nor deny outweigh those favouring confirming whether the information is held or not, therefore the balance of public interest favours maintaining the application of the above exemptions. This should not be taken as an inference that there is or is not any information held which could be provided in responding to this request.