

Friday, 10 July 2026

Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017149/P

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017149/P

I write in connection with your request for information dated 30/06/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

During 2025, January to December, how many speeding tickets were issued in Boothstown, Worsley, along the 30mph section of the A572 Leigh Road, Simpson Road, Mosley Common Road, and Chaddock Lane up to the East Lancs Road?

Result of Searches

Greater Manchester Police can neither confirm nor deny that we hold any information relevant to 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, specific stretches of roads) 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) & 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 31(3)

Confirming or denying the existence of the requested information would allow individuals to map out 'safe zones' or enforcement gaps within the force area. This would likely lead to an increase in speeding offences in areas deduced to be unmonitored or inactive, thereby directly prejudicing the primary purpose of Section 31, which is the prevention and detection of crime.

While a single confirmation or denial regarding one specific location might appear harmless in isolation, the authority must consider the cumulative 'mosaic effect' of such disclosures. If the authority confirms or denies whether information is held in this instance, it would be expected to do so for all subsequent requests.

Over time, this would allow individuals to build a comprehensive, real-time map of the force's tactical enforcement capabilities. The public interest is heavily weighted in favour of maintaining the NCND position under Section 31(3) to preserve the deterrent capability of the camera network, ensure widespread compliance with traffic laws, and protect the efficiency of policing resources.

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 or specific roads would reveal periods of inactivity. This would lead to people assuming, correctly or incorrectly, where certain cameras are likely to be inactive and could encourage drivers to exceed the speed limit at these areas. 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 transparency, 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.

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.