

16 September 2026

FOI Ref 23293

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

I would like to know the number of incidents of exceeding the speed limit recorded on the A513 in Stafford between the junction with the A34 at Weeping Cross and the junction with Brocton Road at Milford Common, recorded by both fixed and mobile speed recording equipment.

I would like the data from 1.1.2021 to 14.8.2026.

Please outline the date/time of incident and the speed recorded for each occurrence.

SP received your request on 24/08/2026 and have processed this under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

SP's response to your enquiry is as follows:

Staffordshire Police holds/does not hold the requested information.

- I would like to know the number of incidents of exceeding the speed limit recorded on the A513 in Stafford between the junction with the A34 at Weeping Cross and the junction with Brocton Road at Milford Common, recorded by both fixed and mobile speed recording equipment.
I would like the data from 1.1.2021 to 14.8.2026.
Please outline the date/time of incident and the speed recorded for each occurrence. – **Partially disclosed, please see the accompanying file titled 'FOI 23293 Speeding Offences Data.xlsx'.**

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 section 31(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, 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

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, such as the speeds captured by the 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 and the speeding thresholds that are set 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 our ability to protect the public, then non-disclosure takes precedence.

SP can neither confirm nor deny whether further information relevant to this request is held, as the duty in Section 1(1)(a) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 does not apply by virtue of the following exemptions:

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

- Section 31(3) – Law Enforcement.
- Section 38(2) – Health & Safety

Harm

SP neither confirms nor denies whether information relating to the operational status or activity of individual fixed cameras is held. 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 information is held in respect of this request in relation to fixed cameras would diminish the effectiveness of safety cameras in the Staffordshire Police area and undermine police enforcement. To confirm or deny that information is held 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.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring confirming or denying information is held – Section 31(3)

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. Confirmation or denial that information is held 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 not confirming or denying information is held – Section 31(3)

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. Confirmation or denial that information is held 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. This may also encourage motorists to fail to adhere to the speed limit and would put lives at risk. Confirmation or denial that information is held 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 confirming or denying information is held – Section 38(2)



In addition to the basic premise of being open and transparent, confirmation or denial that information is held would promote transparency regarding the operation, placement and enforcement practices of speed cameras. This may enhance public confidence in road safety measures and demonstrate that enforcement is proportionate and evidence based.

Factors favouring not confirming or denying information is held – Section 38(2)

Confirmation or denial that information is held in respect of this request would enable individuals to evade enforcement. This may encourage non-compliance with speed limits and increase the risk of collisions. If drivers adapt their behaviours solely to avoid detection at specific points, this could undermine the deterrent effect of the cameras and increase speeds in surrounding areas, posing a risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users.

Balance Test

Disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is a release of information to the world in general and not an individual applicant. Having considered the public interest factors SP are required to determine whether on balance the factors favouring disclosure outweigh those which are against disclosure. It is our view that the factors favouring disclosure do not outweigh those which favour non-disclosure.

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

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.



STAFFORDSHIRE
POLICE

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, considering 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