

Our ref: 01/FOI/24/013728/S

Please quote our reference
number when responding

Friday, 20 December 2024

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/24/013728/S

I write in connection with your request for information dated 25/11/2024, I note you seek access to the following information:

- 1. A list of all instances where motorists were captured travelling in excess of your interpreted speed limit in both directions of travel by this camera location, as well as their speed for the period of June 1st to October 31st 2024 so that it is possible to determine whether the lack of signage in my direction of travel has a statistically provable impact on the number and scale of perceived offences by assessing the differences in both directions.*
- 2. Whether a traffic speed and/or accident study has been performed for this location (as per DoT guidelines for traffic camera placements). If so, that it be provided and, if not, reasons for it not being performed and justification for this camera's placement.*
- 3. An explanation or statement as to why other DfT guidelines for camera placement (visible housings, speed reminders, camera indicators) were not implemented at this location.*
- 4. A figure around the public funds expended for the purchase and installation of this camera and a statement from GMP why a need was felt to spend these public funds on a camera to enforce a speed limit which is not posted, when cameras are intended, as per the UK government, to be a last resort of enforcement for particularly high risk locations, and if you have any statistical evidence showing that this is more effective than visibly displaying the speed limit. If the data shows otherwise, why is this position held when it is in conflict with the stated goals of protecting motorists?*

Result of Searches

For Parts 2 to 4 - Please direct your request to TfGM.

Part 1

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 (or in this case, list of offences and speed) 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 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 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 38(2)

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 Part 1 of this request.