Gloucestershire Constabulary
Police Headquarters
No.1 Waterwells, Waterwells Drive
Quedgeley, Gloucester. GL2 2AN
www.gloucestershire.police.uk

Your reference:	26_1048
Our reference:	FOI_
E-mail:	FOI @gloucestershire.police.uk
Direct dial:	01452 754304
Postal Address:	As above
Date:	19/11/2026

Dear

Gloucestershire Constabulary Freedom of Information request 26_1048

On 01/11/2026 you sent an email constituting a request under the Freedom of Information Act asking the following:

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, please provide the following information about safety camera sites operated by or on behalf of Gloucestershire Constabulary and the Gloucestershire Road Safety Partnership in Gloucestershire:

1. Every current fixed speed camera site, average-speed (section control) site and red-light camera site.

2. Every mobile enforcement site that is already published (for example on your website or partnership map).

For each site, please include, where held: a site reference; latitude and longitude (or OS grid reference); road name/number and a short location description; camera type (for example Gatso, Truvelo, Redspeed, SPECS, VECTOR, mobile); posted speed limit; direction(s) of enforcement; whether the site is fixed, average-speed, red-light or mobile; status (for example operational, decommissioned); and the date the site was installed or decommissioned, if recorded.

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 s1, I can confirm that Gloucestershire Constabulary holds some relevant information.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires Gloucestershire Constabulary, when refusing to provide information (because the information is exempt) to provide you the applicant with a notice which: (a) states the fact, (b) specifies the exemption in question and (c) states (if not otherwise apparent) why the exemption applies.

The following exemption applies:

We are committed to being an anti-discriminatory organisation. This means not only acting in a non-discriminatory way, but addressing systemic inequalities, disadvantage and discrimination.

Section 31(1)(a) – Law Enforcement

The exemption above is qualified and prejudice based therefore both a Public Interest Test and Harm Test are required.

Harm

FOI requests are considered on an applicant and motive-blind basis. However, disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is also disclosure to the public at large and not an individual transaction. Once information is disclosed, the public authority has no control over how that information is used, shared, analysed, or combined with information available from other sources.

In considering disclosure, the authority must assess whether placing information into the public domain would or would likely cause harm. In this case, the request seeks detailed information relating to all fixed, mobile, average speed enforcement, and red-light enforcement locations and data across the force area. Whilst individual elements of this information may be observable by motorists or available from official sources such as force websites or safety camera partnerships, the requested disclosure would create a single, authoritative, and comprehensive dataset that does not currently exist in the public domain, and it is that fact which is harmful.

The act of collating and publishing this information would significantly increase its value and utility to those seeking to undermine, avoid or interfere with road policing and speed enforcement activity. The harm arises not from the disclosure of individual camera information specifically, but from the provision of a complete and readily accessible intelligence picture of enforcement capability and coverage across the force area.

Although it is acknowledged that many speed cameras are overtly positioned on public roads and some high-level information is already publicly available, disclosure of a comprehensive and verified list of all fixed, mobile, average speed and red-light camera detail would provide substantially greater insight than can be obtained through casual observation or fragmented public sources. Information that is currently dispersed and difficult to compile would be transformed into a single, authoritative resource.

Additionally, and in respect only of the operational status of fixed and average speed cameras, and red-light cameras, disclosure risks current enforcement strategies (use of a combination of live and dummy fixed speed cameras to maximise deterrence across a wider area) being undermined. If the operational status of each individual camera were disclosed as part of this request, drivers would quickly become aware of which sites are live and which are not, reducing the deterrent effect created by the wider network of cameras and increasing risk to road users.

Disclosure of the information requested, therefore, would increase the likelihood of individuals readily identifying enforcement gaps, adapting driving behaviour only in known camera locations, targeting enforcement infrastructure for damage or interference, and otherwise taking steps to circumvent lawful road safety measures.

It would increase opportunities to undermine the effectiveness of speed enforcement and the broader road safety objectives it supports by allowing criminals and those with criminal intent the ability to build up a mosaic picture of force capabilities and resources and use this information to undermine law enforcement. This places the community at increased

risk of harm and impacts on police resources where additional resources and tactics need to be put in place to counter any harm caused by an adverse FOIA disclosure.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure – s31

The use of speed and red-light enforcement cameras is not a secret. Fixed, mobile and average cameras are all placed overtly on the road network and are clearly signed, and red-light cameras are overtly placed. There is also information in the public domain which provides some high-level data about individual sites. That, in itself, could favour disclosure of the requested information.

Factors favouring non-disclosure – s31

The Police Service has a duty to deliver effective law enforcement, ensuring that the prevention and detection of crime, apprehension or prosecution of offenders is carried out appropriately, and the public are kept safe.

Disclosing information that would allow the identification of granular detail about each individual fixed, mobile and average speed camera site in the force area risks the tactic being undermined, whether through vandalism or manipulation of the information by those with malicious intent to circumvent cameras. The release of this information could therefore provide a tactical advantage to offenders which would negatively impact on public safety and undermine the policing purpose.

Factors favouring disclosure – s38

Disclosure could promote accountability by allowing the public to understand where enforcement resources are located and how they are used. It may also contribute to public debate regarding the effectiveness of speed enforcement measures, road safety strategies and the allocation of public funds.

Factors favouring non-disclosure – s38

There is a public interest in protecting public safety and preventing harm. The disclosure of detailed information could assist drivers seeking to avoid detection, thereby reducing the deterrent effect of enforcement technology. This could encourage speeding, red-light contraventions and other dangerous driving behaviours in areas perceived to present a lower risk of enforcement. Such behaviour would increase the likelihood of road traffic collisions, serious injury and fatalities affecting road users, pedestrians, emergency service personnel, and other members of the public.

The prevention of death and serious injury on the roads is a significant public interest consideration. There is a compelling public interest in ensuring that enforcement measures continue to operate effectively as part of wider road safety strategies designed to protect the public

Balance Test

The public interest in transparency about the road safety strategy is evident, however information in the public domain sufficiently meets this interest. It is not in the public interest for further, low-level information to be made public where to do so would result in

law enforcement tactics and operational capability being compromised, and those who wish to commit criminal acts being facilitated to do so.

Any disclosure that would advantage those with criminal intent by providing them with a comprehensive and authoritative dataset of enforcement locations that could be used to give a clearer understanding of enforcement coverage and potential gaps, or target enforcement infrastructure, is not in the public interest.

Furthermore, any reduction in the effectiveness of speed enforcement has the potential to increase risks to road users and the wider community. There is a substantial public interest in preserving the operational effectiveness of measures designed to improve compliance with road traffic laws and reduce collisions and casualties.

Having carefully considered the competing factors, it is concluded that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure. The balance therefore lies in favour of non-disclosure.
If you are not satisfied with this response or any actions taken in dealing with your request, you have the right to ask that we review your case under our internal procedure. Please note that a request for an internal review must be made within 20 working days of the response to your original request.

If you decide to request that such a review is undertaken and following this process you are still unsatisfied, you then have the right to direct your complaint to the Information Commissioner for consideration.

The Information Commissioner can be contacted via the following means:

Website - https://ico.org.uk/

Call their helpline - 0303 123 1113

Email - casework@ico.org.uk

Post –

Information Commission's Office
4th Floor, No.3 Circle Square
5 Hawkshaw Street
Manchester
M1 7BL

Yours sincerely,

Disclosure Officer
Gloucestershire Constabulary