

5 October 2026

FOI Ref 23449

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

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I would like to request information regarding speeding offences recorded by speed cameras within your Policing area during the calendar years 2023, 2024 and 2025.

I am particularly interested in the following areas:

- Stoke On Trent
- Stafford
- Tamworth
- Staffordshire (as a whole)

For each of these towns/cities, please provide the up to five individual speed camera locations which recorded the highest number of speeding offences during 2026 (year to date so far).

For each of these locations, please provide:

- The road name / location of the camera.
- The type of enforcement (for example fixed, mobile or average speed).
- The total number of speeding offences recorded at that location in:
 - 2023
 - 2024
 - 2025
 - 2026 (year to date so far)

The intention is to allow comparison of speeding detections at the same locations over the three-year period.

If readily available, I would also be grateful if you could provide, for the 2025 figures only, the number of recorded offences which resulted in:

- a fixed penalty notice;
- a speed awareness course; and
- prosecution/court proceedings.

Let me know if you have any questions

Thank you for your assistance.

SP received your request on 30/09/2026 and have processed this under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

SP's response to your enquiry is as follows:

SP holds the requested information.

- Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, I would like to request information regarding speeding offences recorded by speed cameras within your Policing area during the calendar years 2023, 2024 and 2025.

I am particularly interested in the following areas:

- Stoke On Trent
- Stafford
- Tamworth

Staffordshire (as a whole)

For each of these towns/cities, please provide the up to five individual speed camera locations which recorded the highest number of speeding offences during 2026 (year to date so far).

For each of these locations, please provide:

- The road name / location of the camera.
- The type of enforcement (for example fixed, mobile or average speed).
- The total number of speeding offences recorded at that location in:

--2023

--2024

--2025

-- 2026 (year to date so far) – **Partially disclosed, please see the accompanying file titled 'FOI 23449 Speeding Offences Data.xlsx'.**

- If readily available, I would also be grateful if you could provide, for the 2025 figures only, the number of recorded offences which resulted in:
 - a fixed penalty notice;
 - a speed awareness course; and
 - prosecution/court proceedings. – **Partially disclosed, please see the accompanying file titled 'FOI 23449 Speeding Offences Data.xlsx'.**

The following exemption has 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 be 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, we 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, we are required to evidence the harm in disclosure and apply the public interest test.

Harm

Disclosure under FOIA is disclosure to the world at large, not a private transaction. Whilst not questioning the motives of the applicant, releasing the requested information would reveal locations where enforcement activity has historically generated the greatest number of prosecutions. This would provide those with intent to disrupt or disable the safety camera network with valuable information about which sites would result in the greatest impact if targeted.

Publishing the locations of the highest-performing enforcement sites would draw particular attention to those locations and increase the risk of deliberate interference, vandalism, or damage to camera infrastructure by providing those with intent to disrupt or disable the safety camera network, sites would result in the greatest impact if targeted. It is recognised that speed enforcement cameras have historically been the subject of criminal damage and attempts to disable their operation. Any increase in the likelihood of vandalism or interference could result in cameras being temporarily unavailable for operational use, reducing the force's ability to enforce speed limits and promote road safety. This in turn could increase risks to road users at locations where cameras have been installed specifically because of identified road safety concerns.

Furthermore, activity information released over time concerning cameras – where they are identified by their specific location - would accumulate to build a more detailed picture of enforcement tactics, camera usage, and operational priorities. Whilst any single disclosure may appear innocuous, cumulatively, such disclosures can undermine the effectiveness of law enforcement measures.

It is publicly known that not all cameras on the safety camera network are operational at the same time, however, by disclosing information which confirms a specific camera site is active (such as revealing it as one of the highest yielding sites) it would become apparent, across a number of related requests, which cameras have been, and by extension, have less likely been functional. Even where data is historical, the resultant “mosaic effect” of multiple disclosures over time risks revealing patterns of activation relevant to the current status of individual cameras. This would be likely to influence driver to exceed the speed limit where they believe cameras are likely not operational or monitoring speed, undermining police tactics in the use of speed cameras as a deterrent and risking public safety on the roads.

Public Interest Test

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

Disclosure would promote transparency and accountability regarding the use of automated speed enforcement technology. It would also encourage public debate about whether enforcement activity is being targeted proportionately and effectively.

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

There is a strong public interest in ensuring that law enforcement tactics and capabilities remain effective. Disclosing cameras with high numbers of NIPS, FPNs and driving awareness courses issued making them vulnerable to being targeted for criminal damage and vandalism. Disclosure would contribute to a cumulative mosaic effect, whereby information released over time could be combined with other data to reveal operational activity patterns, deployment strategies, and enforcement priorities. The resultant effect would be that the deterrent effect of speed enforcement would be prejudiced.

There is a significant public interest in maintaining SP's ability to prevent and detect offences and secure

compliance with road traffic legislation. Any information which would undermine that strategy would not be in the public interest to disclose.

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

Disclosure would identify that SP take their responsibility for public safety on the roads seriously and deploy resources effectively.

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

Disclosure may increase the likelihood of targeted vandalism, criminal damage, or interference with camera infrastructure. Any damage to enforcement equipment could reduce road safety enforcement capability at locations identified as requiring intervention. Any reduction in enforcement capability presents an increased risk to road users as offenders will be more inclined to break the speed limit in the knowledge there will be no reprisals. Increased speed on the roads contributes directly to collisions, injuries and fatalities and it is not in the public interest SP to release information which would contribute to any such result.

Balance test

Whilst SP recognises the public interest in transparency and accountability, greater weight is attached to the strong public interest in preserving the effectiveness of law enforcement activity, mitigating any targeting, vandalism or disruption of enforcement infrastructure and maintaining the safety of the public. SP considers that disclosure would be likely to prejudice the prevention and detection of offences and undermine the effectiveness of road safety enforcement. Accordingly, the public interest favours maintaining the exemption.

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 SP, 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

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.

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