

Date: 17/06/2026
Our ref: 01/FOI/26/017020/Z

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE NO: 01/FOI/26/017020/Z

I write in connection with your request for information dated 08/06/2026, received by Greater Manchester Police (GMP) for the following information:

I request the following information relating to the M60 near Junction 23 (Audenshaw/Tameside) on 26 February 2026 at approximately 10:35.

- 1. The variable mandatory speed limit displayed on each relevant gantry in the vicinity of Junction 23 between 10:00 and 11:00.***
- 2. Any records showing when the displayed speed limit changed during that period.***
- 3. The identification numbers or references of the gantries displaying the speed limits.***
- 4. Any fault, maintenance, inspection, or incident records relating to those gantries or associated signage on 26 February 2026 and the seven days before.***
- 5. Any records indicating signs were unavailable, obscured, malfunctioning, or operating under restricted service.***
- 6. Any recorded reason for the speed restriction being displayed during the period concerned, including congestion, incident management, roadworks, or traffic flow management.***

Request 2.

Please provide aggregate enforcement data for the temporary 50 mph speed restriction at or near M60 Junction 23, marker post 48.3, Audenshaw, Tameside.

Please provide the following:

1. For 26 February 2026, the number of vehicles detected exceeding the temporary 50 mph speed restriction at this location, broken down by:

- each 5-minute period between 09:00 and 12:00;
- recorded speed bands, if held, using 50–55, 56–60, 61–65, 66–70, 71+ mph.

2. For the same location and same time window, please provide the same data for:

- 19 February 2026;
- 20 February 2026;
- 24 February 2026;
- 25 February 2026;
- 27 February 2026;
- 3 March 2026;
- 4 March 2026.

3. Please provide the date and time, if held by GMP, when enforcement of the temporary 50 mph restriction began at this location.

4. Please state the type of enforcement equipment used at this location on 26 February 2026, for example fixed camera, average speed camera, mobile enforcement, or other.

5. Please provide any aggregate record, log, summary, or report held by GMP showing daily enforcement volumes at this location during February and March 2026.

I do not request personal data, vehicle registrations, photographs, names, addresses, or individual case files. If any part of this request would exceed the cost limit, please provide advice and assistance on how it may be refined.

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 (or in this case, specific sets of average speed cameras) 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 any 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.