



6th February 2025

Request:

Please could you provide me with data on the number of individuals arrested on suspicion of dangerous driving in the full calendar years 2023 and 2024, broken down by the following:

- (i) Nationality
- (ii) Ethnicity (both ethnic description and ethnicity appearance)
- (iii) For each arrest, specify in which neighbourhood the alleged offence took place and the date when it took place

As well as this breakdown, I would be grateful if you could provide an overall arrest figure for each year broken down by (i) nationality and (ii) ethnicity.

Response:

Please note, ethnicity is self-defined and Northamptonshire Police do not record ethnicity appearance.

	2023	2024
Albania	3	2
Bangladesh	1	
Belgium		1
Cameroon		1
Canada	1	
England	20	13
India	1	
Iran, Islamic republic of		1
Iraq	1	1
Ireland	2	4
Jamaica		1
Kosovo		2
Lithuania	4	
Malaysia		1
Moldova, Republic of;Romania	1	1
Netherlands	1	
Nigeria		3
Pakistan	2	
Poland	4	2
Romania	3	9
Somalia	1	
Spain		1



Sudan		1
Syrian Arab Republic	1	
Turkey		2
UK	145	140
UK;Bangladesh		1
UK;England		1
UK;Russian Federation		2
UK;Saudi Arabia		2
UK;Zimbabwe		1
United States of America	1	
Zimbabwe	1	1
Not recorded	1	2

	2023	2024
A1. Asian - Indian	1	5
A2. Asian - Pakistani	3	1
A3. Asian - Bangladeshi	2	6
A9. Any other Asian background	5	4
B1. Black Caribbean	4	4
B2. Black African	6	9
B9. Any other Black background	10	9
M1. White & Black Caribbean	5	1
M2. White & Black African	4	
M3. White & Asian		1
M9. Any other mixed background	3	4
NS. Not stated	6	9
O2. Arab		1
O9. Any other ethnic group	1	2
W1. White British	123	112
W2. White Irish	3	6
W3. Gypsy or Irish Traveller	3	1
W9. Any other white background	15	21

	2023	2024
ABBNEY NORTH	2	
ABBNEY SOUTH		4
ABINGTON	3	
ALL SAINTS	2	1
AVONDALE GRANGE	2	
BADBY	1	
BARBY AND KILSBY	1	1
BARNWELL		1
BEANFIELD		1
BILLING	2	4
BLAKESLEY AND COTE	1	



BLISWORTH AND ROADE		1
BOUGHTON AND PITSFORD	7	
BOUGHTON GREEN		2
BRAMBLESIDE	1	
BRAMPTON		1
BRAUNSTON		1
BRICKHILL	2	2
BRIXWORTH		2
BURTON LATIMER		2
CASTLE	5	6
CORBY CENTRAL	3	3
CORBY EAST	1	2
CORBY RURAL WEST		1
CRICK		3
CROYLAND	1	2
DELAPRE	2	3
DESBOROUGH LOATLAND	2	2
DESBOROUGH ST. GILES		1
DRAYTON		1
EARLS BARTON		1
EAST HUNSBURY	2	2
EASTFIELD	6	1
ENDERBY AND NARBOROUGH		1
EXETER	2	2
FINEDON	2	1
FLORE		1
GRANGE PARK	1	2
GREAT DODDINGTON AND WILBY	1	
HARPOLE AND GRANGE	4	2
HEADLANDS	2	
HEMMINGWELL	2	4
HEYFORDS AND BUGBROOKE	1	1
HIGHAM FERRERS LANCASTER		2
HILL	2	
IRCHESTER	2	
IRTHLINGBOROUGH WATERLOO	1	
KINGS SUTTON		1
KINGSLEY	3	1
KINGSWOOD	1	2
LONG BUCKBY	1	
LOWER NENE	1	
LUMBERTUBS	2	4
LUTTERWORTH	1	2
MOULTON	3	1
NENE VALLEY	7	5



NORTHFIELD	1	
OAKLEY VALE	1	1
OLD DUSTON		1
OOFB	6	11
OUNDLE		1
PARKLANDS	4	3
PIPERS HILL		3
QUEEN ELEANOR AND BUCCLEUCH		1
QUEENSWAY		1
RAUNDS SAXON		1
RAUNDS WINDMILL	2	1
RAVENSTHORPE	1	
REDWELL EAST	2	
ROTHWELL	2	5
RUSHDEN BATES		2
RUSHDEN PEMBERTON	1	
RUSHDEN SARTORIS	1	2
RUSHDEN SPENCER		2
SALCEY	1	
SHIRE LODGE	5	1
SILVERSTONE		1
SLADE		2
SPALDING RURAL SOUTH	2	
SPENCER	2	3
SPRATTON		1
ST. CRISPIN	2	11
ST JAMES	12	3
ST. MICHAEL'S AND WICKSTEED	7	4
ST. PETER'S	4	
STANION AND CORBY VILLAGE	2	1
SWANSPool	6	5
THORPLANDS	2	1
THRAPSTON LAKES	1	
THRAPSTON MARKET	1	1
TOVE		1
TOWCESTER BROOK	1	
TOWCESTER MILL	3	2
W'BORO NORTH		1
W'BORO SOUTH	2	1
WEEDON	3	
WELDON AND GRETTON	3	2
WELLAND	3	1
WEST HUNSBURY	8	9
WESTON	3	4
WILLIAM KNIBB	1	1

WOLLASTON		1
WOODFORD	2	2
YELVERTOFT	3	
Unknown	9	19

Neighbourhood will not be broken down by date as this increases the risk of an individual being identified.

Section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 requires that, when refusing to provide such information (because the information is exempt) is to provide you the applicant with a notice which:

- (a) States that fact
- (b) Specifies the exemption(s) in question and
- (c) States (if that would not otherwise be apparent) why the exemption(s) applies.

The information is exempt from disclosure by virtue of the following exemption:

Section 40(2) – Personal Information

Section 40 pertains to third party personal data. This would not be released under the Freedom Of Information Act unless there is a strong public interest. This is because any release would breach the Principles contained within Article 5(1) of the GDPR and Part 2 of the Data Protection Act 2018.

One of the main differences between the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act is that any information released under Freedom Of Information is released into the public domain, not just to the individual requesting the information. As such, any release that identifies an individual through releasing their personal data, even third party personal data, is exempted unless there is a strong public interest in its release. The public interest is not what interests the public but what benefits the community as a whole.

Personal data is defined under the Data Protection Act as data that is biographical in nature, has the applicant as its focus and/or affects the data subject's privacy in his or her personal, professional or business life.

Principle a of Article 5(1) states that information must be processed fairly, lawfully and in a transparent manner. In this case the individuals would have a reasonable expectation that information would not be processed if it resulted in their identification, or equally led an individual to be wrongfully identified as a consequence. Disclosures which appear harmless, pieced together with other disclosures can be used in a 'mosaic effect' to third parties who may have access to additional information that would enable them to link the requested information to an individual.



Freedom Of Information Act disclosures are to the world at large and will remain in the public domain indefinitely. Therefore, provision of this information would exceed the original Policing requirement for the processing of the information and would not be lawful or fair to the individuals in question.

It is for these reasons outlined above; that I feel the principle a would be breached by this disclosure and the Section 40 exemption remains in place. I am not obliged to consider any further principle in my arguments. This is an absolute, class-based exemption and, as such, there is no requirement to consider the public interest test.

The numerical data presented in this response is an un-audited snapshot of un-published data sourced from "live" systems and is subject to the interpretation of the original request by the individual extracting the data.

Every effort is made to ensure that the figures presented are accurate and complete. However, it is important to note that the data has been extracted from a number of data sources used by forces for police purposes. The detail collected to respond specifically to your request is subject to the inaccuracies inherent in any large scale recording system. As a consequence, care should be taken to ensure data collection processes and their inevitable limitations are taken into account when interpreting the data.

The figures provided therefore are our best interpretation of relevance of data to your request, but you should be aware that the collation of figures for ad hoc requests may have limitations and this should be taken into account when the data is used.

If you decide to write an article / use the enclosed data we would ask you to take into consideration the factors highlighted in this document so as to not mislead members of the public or official bodies or misrepresent the relevance of the whole or any part of this disclosed material.