

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL TO THE FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL (INFORMATION RIGHTS) UNDER SECTION 57 OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

Appeal No: EA/2012/0025

BETWEEN: LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYDON **Appellant** and THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER Respondent and **JOHN LAING PLC Second Respondent BEFORE: ANISA DHANJI JUDGE** and ANNE CHAFER AND NIGEL WATSON **PANEL MEMBERS CONSENT ORDER APPROVAL PURSUANT** to Rule 37(1) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier) (General Regulatory Chamber)

which has been agreed by all parties and dated 24th July 2012.

Signed:

Anisa Dhanji

Tribunal Judge Dated: 24 July 2012

Rules 2009, the Tribunal approves the Consent Order in this matter in the form attached hereto,

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL TO THE FIRST TIER TRIBUNAL UNDER SECTION 57 OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

Appeal No: EA/2011/0025 BETWEEN:		
	LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYD and THE INFORMATION COMMISSION and JOHN LAING PLC	Appellant
CONSENT ORDER		
Pursuant to Rule 37(1) of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (General Regulatory Chamber) Rules 2009 IT IS ORDERED BY CONSENT THAT:		
1.	The Commissioner's Decision Notice number December 2011 is substituted as follows: The disputed information (as defined in Annex A), 12(5)(e) of the Environmental Information Regulat public interest in maintaining that exception outword disclosure.	is exempt under regulation ions 2004 ("EIR"), and the
2.	There shall be no order as to costs.	
Signed:		Date: 24 July 2012

Anisa Dhanji

Tribunal Judge

ANNEX A

Statement of reasons for consent order

- This appeal is brought against a Decision Notice dated 20 December 2011 (reference FS50379408). That Decision Notice was concerned with the following information:
 - (i) The value of various A and B loans and transfer values for a number of different sites marked for development (page 37 to 41 of the Conditional Sale and Development Agreement);
 - (ii) Details of John Laing plc's professional liability insurance;
 - (iii) The price change matrix attached to Annexure 4 of the Conditional Sale and Development Agreement;
 - (iv) The development property fee and new council property fee (page 59 of the Property and Development Management Agreement).
- 2. By way of his Decision Notice, the Commissioner decided that item (i) was exempt under regulation 12(5)(e) of the EIR. However, the Commissioner found that regulation 12(5)(e) was not engaged in respect of items (ii) to (iv) and ordered this information to be disclosed.
- 3. The Appellant appealed only against the Commissioner's findings in relation to items (iii) and (iv) (hereafter "the disputed information").
- 4. In the light of the witness evidence filed on behalf of the Appellant in the course of these proceedings, the Commissioner is now satisfied that the disputed information is exempt under regulation 12(5)(e) and that the public interest in maintaining that exception outweighs the public interest in disclosure.