

23 December 2025

FOI Ref 22219

Request - You asked Staffordshire Police (SP) the following:

I am seeking information relating to the average-speed camera enforcement system on the A519 through Woodseaves, which operates as a three-camera system. Staffordshire County Council have confirmed that they do not hold this data and have directed me to Staffordshire Police as the authority responsible for enforcement.

To assist you, please include in your response any reference numbers or fixed-camera IDs associated with this installation that you hold.

Timeframe

From the date the system first became operational to the most recent month for which data is available. (If possible, please confirm the "go-live" date.)

1) Offence Volumes and Outcomes

a) Monthly totals

For each month/year in the defined timeframe, please provide:

Total number of speeding offences detected

Breakdown by outcome:

- Fixed Penalty Notices issued
- Speed Awareness Course offered/attended
- Court prosecutions
- No further action / cancelled (with reason, if recorded)

b) Speed metrics

For each month/year:

Highest recorded average speed leading to enforcement

The 85th-percentile average speed, if held

c) Compliance

Monthly compliance rate (percentage of vehicles at or below the limit), if held

2) Trigger Logic & Partial-Link Exceedances



a) Enforcement method

Please confirm whether the system records any instantaneous speeds at individual cameras, or whether enforcement is solely based on average speeds between the camera links.

b) Partial-link data

If recorded, please provide monthly counts of vehicles that:

Exceeded the enforcement threshold between Camera 1–2, 2–3, and 1–3; and

Exceeded the threshold at one or two cameras, but did not exceed the averaged offence threshold across the full enforced link.

If this data is not collected or held, please confirm this explicitly.

3) Speed Distributions

If readily available, please provide monthly or quarterly speed distribution summaries (e.g., counts within bands: $\leq$ limit, +1–5 mph, +6–10 mph, etc.). A CSV is acceptable.

4) Operational Details

a) Posted speed limit

The posted limit(s) in force for each enforced link and any changes during the timeframe (with dates).

b) Downtime

Records of any calibration, maintenance, or downtime which caused the system to be partially or fully out of service (month/year or exact dates if available).

c) Enforcement threshold policy

Any internal or partnership document describing the tolerance/enforcement threshold used at this location. If the exact thresholds are exempt, please provide:

- the policy title,
- the date, and
- the reason for exemption.

We received your request on 05/12/2025 and have processed this under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Staffordshire Police's response to your enquiry is as follows:

Staffordshire Police holds some of the requested information.



- I am seeking information relating to the average-speed camera enforcement system on the A519 through Woodseaves, which operates as a three-camera system. Staffordshire County Council have confirmed that they do not hold this data and have directed me to Staffordshire Police as the authority responsible for enforcement.

To assist you, please include in your response any reference numbers or fixed-camera IDs associated with this installation that you hold.

Timeframe

From the date the system first became operational to the most recent month for which data is available.

(If possible, please confirm the “go-live” date.)

- 1. Offence Volumes and Outcomes

- a) Monthly totals

For each month/year in the defined timeframe, please provide:

Total number of speeding offences detected

Breakdown by outcome:

- Fixed Penalty Notices issued
- Speed Awareness Course offered/attended
- Court prosecutions
- No further action / cancelled (with reason, if recorded)
- **Withheld, please see the below exemptions.**

- b) Speed metrics

For each month/year:

Highest recorded average speed leading to enforcement

– **Withheld, please see the below exemptions.**

The 85th-percentile average speed, if held

– **No information held.**

- c) Compliance

Monthly compliance rate (percentage of vehicles at or below the limit), if held

– **No information held.**

- 2) Trigger Logic & Partial-Link Exceedances

- a) Enforcement method

Please confirm whether the system records any instantaneous speeds at individual cameras, or whether enforcement is solely based on average speeds between the camera links.

– **Disclosed, it is solely an average speed system so only measures and records average speeds.**

- b) Partial-link data

If recorded, please provide monthly counts of vehicles that:



Exceeded the enforcement threshold between Camera 1–2, 2–3, and 1–3; and
Exceeded the threshold at one or two cameras, but did not exceed the averaged offence threshold across the full enforced link.

If this data is not collected or held, please confirm this explicitly.

– **Withheld, please see the below exemptions.**

- 3) Speed Distributions

If readily available, please provide monthly or quarterly speed distribution summaries (e.g., counts within bands: $\leq$ limit, +1–5 mph, +6–10 mph, etc.). A CSV is acceptable.

– **Withheld, please see the below exemptions.**

- 4) Operational Details

- a) Posted speed limit

The posted limit(s) in force for each enforced link and any changes during the timeframe (with dates).

– **Disclosed, 30mph for the whole enforcement section which has not changed since the cameras were implemented.**

- b) Downtime

Records of any calibration – **Withheld, please see the below exemptions.**

maintenance, or downtime which caused the system to be partially or fully out of service (month/year or exact dates if available). – **No information held.**

- c) Enforcement threshold policy

Any internal or partnership document describing the tolerance/enforcement threshold used at this location.

If the exact thresholds are exempt, please provide:

- the policy title,
- the date, and
- the reason for exemption.

– **No information held.**

The following exemptions have been applied:

In accordance with Section 17(1) of the Freedom of Information Act, this letter represents a refusal notice for parts of this particular request.

- Section 31 (1)(a)(b) Law Enforcement

Information is exempt from disclosure under S31(1)(a)(b) where the release of Information would, or would likely to, prejudice the prevention and detection of crime and/or the apprehension or prosecution of offenders. This exemption is qualified and prejudice-based and, as such, SP are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

- Section 38 (1)(a)(b) Health and Safety

Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to (a) endanger the physical or mental health of any individual, or (b) endanger the safety of any individual. This exemption is qualified and prejudice-based and, as such, SP are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

Harm:

Safety cameras are not always active and the police rely on the perception of drivers that camera housings could be active and would therefore adjust their speed so as not to contract a fine. To confirm whether specific cameras were or were not active or how many motorists have been captured by these cameras would diminish the effectiveness of safety cameras in the SP area and undermine police enforcement. To release the requested information could have a detrimental impact on how motorists drive, which would lead to an increase in offending and road traffic collisions; therefore, placing the public at a greater risk of harm.

To provide details regarding the operational use of safety cameras and any further information of specific cameras could potentially put the safety of drivers and other road users at a significantly increased risk of harm by members of the public who choose not to abide by the speed restrictions. Disclosure of the specific details regarding these specific cameras would enable individuals to speed without possibly getting caught which would increase the danger to the public significantly.

Public Interest Test**Factors favouring disclosure under Section 31(1)(a)(b)**

The public are entitled to know how public funds are spent and how the use of speed cameras can have an effect on drivers using the road. Disclosure of the information would show that SP supports transparency and accountability, also showing that appropriate measures are being taken to improve public safety and reduce offending.

Factors favouring non-disclosure under Section 31(1)(a)(b)

Any release of information under the FOI Act is a disclosure to the world, not just to an individual applicant. Safety cameras are used to protect the community that we serve and deter motorists from exceeding the speed limit. Disclosure would allow the public to take action to frustrate the operational tactics adopted to enforce road traffic law and this would undermine the police's key function of preventing and detecting crime. Disclosure may also encourage motorists to fail to adhere to the speed limit and would put lives at risk. Disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice substantially the apprehension or prosecution of offenders and interfere with law enforcement. Therefore, this could lead to an increase in road traffic collisions.

Factors favouring disclosure under Section 38(1)(a)(b)

In addition to the basic premise of being open and transparent, disclosure of the details regarding specific safety cameras and speed restrictions would allow for greater public awareness around these vehicles used by SP and inform public debate upon how public funds are being spent.

Factors favouring non-disclosure under Section 38(1)(a)(b)

The details of these specific cameras are kept confidential for safety reasons; this is to ensure the safety and security of other road users. Disclosure of detailed information regarding these cameras could cause harm and unnecessarily place the wellbeing of drivers and other road users at significant risk.

Balance test

When considering whether disclosure is appropriate, SP must weigh the strongest reason for disclosure against the strongest reasons for non-disclosure. In this case, whilst the factors favouring disclosure are important in that it would adhere to the basic principle of being open and transparent, SP believe when weighed against the risk of disclosure undermining SP's ability to prevent and detect crime and hindering the ability to protect the public, then non-disclosure takes precedence.

Please be advised that all Freedom of Information request responses are published on the SP website although personal details are not included.

Freedom of Information Request Appeals Procedure

1. Who Can Ask for a Review

Any person who has requested information from Staffordshire Police, which has been dealt with under the Freedom of Information Act, is entitled to complain and request an internal review, if they are dissatisfied with the response they received.

2. How to Request a Review

Requests for review of a Freedom of Information request must be made in writing within two months of the date of receipt of this email, and should be addressed to:

IAT@staffordshire.police.uk

Or by Post to:

Information Access Team
Staffordshire Police HQ
PO Box 3167
Stafford
ST16 9JZ

The reference number, date of the request and details of why the review is being requested must be included. Requests for review should be brought to the attention of the Information Access Team within two months of the Force's response to the original FOI request.

3. Review Procedure

Receipt of a request for review will be acknowledged in writing. The review will be conducted by a Supervisor who is independent from the original Decision Maker. The Information Access Team will set a target date for a response. The response will be made as soon as is practicable with the intention to complete the review within 20 working days. In more complex cases the review may take up to 40 working days.

The independent Supervisor will conduct a review of the handling of the request for information and of decisions taken, including decisions taken about where the public interest lies in respect of exempt information where applicable. The review enables a re-evaluation of the case, taking into account the matters raised by the complaint.



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

4. Conclusion of the Appeal

On completion of the review the Independent Supervisor will reply to the appellant with the result of the review. If the appellant is still dissatisfied following the review they should contact the Information Commissioner to make an appeal. The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following link:
<https://ico.org.uk/make-a-complaint/foi-and-eir-complaints/foi-and-eir-complaints/>

Freedom of Information
Information Access Team