



14 September 2016

**INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE 16093**

Dear 

Thank you for your information request, received on 16 August 2016. You asked the London Legacy Development Corporation (Legacy Corporation) to provide the following information under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR):

*“Please provide the number of planning requests that have been rejected by LLDC and any details for each of them.*

*With clarification - provide the number of planning requests that have been rejected by LLDC and any details for each of them from 2012 to present, in the area of Hackney Wick, Fish Island and Olympic Park.*

*The term planning application means planning applications made to the LLDC as a local planning authority. And pre application correspondence to the LLDC which resulted in a planning application not being submitted/brought forward.”*

The Legacy Corporation can confirm that it holds information in relation to your requests.

Q1. Please provide the number of planning requests that have been rejected by LLDC and any details for each of them.

The Legacy Corporation became a Local Planning Authority (LPA) on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012. The Legacy Corporation have refused 29 applications between 1st October 2012 and 16 August 2016. The table in **Annex A** provides details of these planning applications, including which went to appeal and the outcome. The geographic areas of Hackney Wick, Fish Island and Olympic Park are not defined within the planning system therefore this table represents all rejected planning applications within the LPA area of responsibility.

Q2. Please provide the number of pre-application correspondence to the LPA which resulted in a planning application not being submitted / brought forward.

Of the 210 Pre-Applications we have received during the period 1st October 2012 to 16 August 2016, 85 have resulted in no application being submitted thus far.

The Legacy Corporation can confirm that they hold some of the information you have requested. The volume of information requested is such that we are refusing to respond to the request under the EIR exception reg. 12(4)(b) on the grounds that providing all of the information requested is manifestly unreasonable. While there is a presumption in favour of disclosure under EIR, the request as it stands would place unreasonable demands on our resources.

The request asks for all pre-application correspondence in relation to the 85 pre-applications that have, to date not resulted in a planning application. The resources required to identify, locate and extract all of the information associated with this request would be too burdensome on the Legacy Corporation's limited resources. The Legacy Corporation currently employs approximately 150 staff, only 18 of which are part of the Planning Policy & Decisions Team representing the Local Planning Authority function, and making available the additional personnel resources that would be required in order to identify, retrieve and extract the information requested in order to answer this request would place a disproportionate burden on the Corporation and would greatly distract for the Corporation's ability to deliver its other responsibilities.

While there are no appropriate costs limit under the EIR, the exception at regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR can apply if the cost or burden of dealing with a request is too great.

Information Commissioner's Office guidance suggests that, as with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), public authorities use a rate of £25 per hour for any staff time involved as this is an indication of what Parliament considers to be a reasonable charge for staff time. In assessing whether the cost or burden of dealing with a request, public authorities need to consider the proportionality of the costs involved and decide whether they are clearly or obviously unreasonable.

This does not take into consideration the detrimental impact on the other responsibilities of the personnel involved and the additional work required to locate all of the applicants in order to notify them of the request and that their information would become public and then redact anything then considered personal or commercially sensitive.

The Legacy Corporation have considered the public interest in respect to this decision and appreciate that they also have to balance public interest with the effective, efficient and economic use of the resources that they have responsibility for as a public authority and in this instance cannot justify the costs that would result from fully responding to this request as it currently stands.

We have therefore considered your request, and believe it to be manifestly unreasonable under regulation 12(4)(b) of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

If you are unhappy with our response to your request and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, you should write to:

Deputy Chief Executive  
London Legacy Development Corporation  
Level 10  
1 Stratford Place  
Montfichet Road  
London  
E20 1EJ

Please note: complaints and requests for internal review received more than two months after the initial response will not be handled.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may appeal directly to the Information Commissioner at the address given below. You should do this within two months of our final decision. There is no charge for making an appeal.

Further information on the Freedom of Information Act 2000 is available from the Information Commissioner's Office:

Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
SK9 5AF

Telephone 08456 30 60 60 or 01625 54 57 45

Website [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely



FOI / EIR Co-ordinator  
London Legacy Development Corporation