

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)
Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)**

Decision notice

Date: 7 July 2014

Public Authority: Transport for London
Address: 8th Floor, Windsor House
42-50 Victoria Street
London,
SW1H 0TL

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant has requested information relating to the number of Taxi and Private Hire drivers with a work related health condition that relates to the emissions of vehicles in London.
2. The Commissioner's decision is that Transport for London (TfL) has correctly applied Regulations 12(4)(b) to withhold the information.
3. The Commissioner does not require the public authority to take any steps as a result of this decision notice.

Background

4. In December 2010 the Mayor of London published his Air Quality Strategy (https://www.london.gov.uk/Air_Quality_Strategy) to reduce harmful emissions and improve air quality in London. This included a number of initiatives to reduce emissions from transport, homes, offices and new developments, as well as raising awareness of air quality issues. Some of the initiatives focused on taxis such as the 15 year age limit for taxis which came into effect on 1 January 2012.
5. The complainant is a self-employed taxi driver and must be licensed by TfL's Taxi and Private Hire team (TPH).

Request and response

6. On 26 March 2014 the complainant made a request under the FOIA

'After listening to Mr Leon Daniels on the radio Eddie Nester show. Could you kindly confirm how many Taxi and Private Hire drivers currently licensed by TFL have a work related health condition that relates to the emissions of vehicles in London.

Could you also list what grants are available to the above drivers from TFL in order to reduce emissions or replace Taxis or PH Vehicles.'

7. TfL responded on 1 April 2014 with the financial assistance offered to taxi and private hire vehicle owners to reduce harmful emissions but did not answer the question on work related health conditions.
8. On 3 April 2014 the complainant stated that one of his questions had not been answered. On the same day TfL responded by referring the complainant to a previous email of 28 February 2014, in which TfL explained the application of section 14 of FOIA and the circumstances where he could contact the Taxi and Private Hire department outside the FOI process for issues concerning his own licence.
9. On 4 April 2014 the complainant stated that his request for information related to illnesses as a result of emissions from vehicles and believed that the request was not FOIA but was caught by the Environmental Information Regulations.
10. On 25 April 2014 TfL agreed that the requested information would fall under the Environmental Information Regulations and cited Regulation 12(4)(b) as a reason to refuse the requested information. TfL stated that *'the background and pattern of any requests made under FOIA can also be taken into consideration under Regulation 12(4)(b).'*
11. TfL also considered whether the public interest in openness and transparency *'would outweigh the burden on the business area in diverting resources away from its core functions to respond to your repeated information requests.'*
12. In addition, TfL confirmed that the complainant's appeal against *'your decision to ban me from FOI Requests'* of 3 March 2014 was reviewed on 7 April 2014 and upheld the finding of 28 February 2014 that the requests were vexatious.

Scope of the case

13. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 13 April 2014 to complain about the way his request for information had been handled.
14. The Commissioner considers the scope of this case is to determine whether TfL is correct to rely on regulation 12(4)(b) to refuse to provide the requested information about illnesses related to emissions.
15. As TfL and the complainant have accepted that the information requested is covered by the Environmental Information Regulations and the Commissioner is not minded to dispute this, he does not consider it necessary to provide an explanation as to why the information is caught by the Environmental Information Regulations in this notice.

Reasons for decision

Regulation 12(4)(b) – Manifestly unreasonable

16. Regulation 12(4)(b) of EIR states that:

“For the purposes of paragraph (1)(a), a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that –

(b) the request for information is manifestly unreasonable;”

17. At paragraph 32 of his decision on FS50440146 (Luton Borough Council)¹, the Commissioner made it clear that the inclusion of “manifestly” in regulation 12(4)(b) indicates Parliament’s intention that, for information to be withheld under this exception, the information request must meet a more stringent test than simply being “unreasonable”. “Manifestly” means that there must be an obvious or tangible quality to the unreasonableness.
18. The Commissioner continued at paragraph 33 by saying that the regulation will typically apply in two sets of circumstances: firstly, where a request is vexatious; or secondly, where compliance meant a public authority would incur an unreasonable level of costs, or an unreasonable diversion of resources. In this case TfL has argued that meeting the terms of the request would place an unreasonable burden on resources and is vexatious.

¹ http://www.ico.org.uk/~media/documents/decisionnotices/2013/fs_50440146.ashx

19. Unlike FOIA and specifically section 12, the EIR does not contain a provision that exclusively covers the time and cost implications of compliance. The considerations associated with the application of regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR are, instead, broader than with section 12 of FOIA. In particular, the Commissioner recognises that there may be other important factors that should be taken into account before a judgement can be made that environmental information can be withheld under the exception:

- Under the EIR, there is no statutory equivalent to the “appropriate limit” – the cost limit beyond which a public authority is not obliged to comply with a request – described at section 12 of FOIA;
- The proportionality of the burden on the public authority’s workload, taking into consideration the size of the public authority;
- The requirement, under regulation 12(1) of the EIR, to consider the public interest test;
- The EIR’s express presumption in favour of disclosure; and
- The individual circumstances of the case.

20. In this case the Commissioner has considered the cost of complying with the request and the burden this would impose on the TfL, whether the request can be considered vexatious and whether there are any other circumstances which mean that the request should be seen as manifestly unreasonable.

21. In the decision of the Upper Tribunal in *Information Commissioner v Devon CC and Dransfield*², Judge Wikeley discussed factors that may be considered when deciding if a request can be characterised as vexatious:

“It may be helpful to consider the question of whether a request is truly vexatious by considering four broad issues or themes –(1) the burden (on the public authority and its staff); (2) the motive (of the requester); (3) the value or serious purpose (of the request) and (4) any harassment or distress (of and to staff).”

² Court reference GIA/3037/2011

22. The Commissioner has considered these headings below and has set out the TfL's arguments together with his own comments. However, before discussing this specific request the Commissioner considers it is important to briefly set out the background to the issue raised by the complainant and his history of dealing with the TfL.
23. It is apparent from TfL's responses to the complainant's requests that the context and history of the request is important. TfL made it clear that in determining this request was manifestly unreasonable it had taken into account the many previous requests by the complainant and the recent application of section 14 of the FOIA.
24. TfL has explained that its relationship with the complainant started in 2009 and related to the passenger complaint against the complainant which was investigated and found to be unjustified. Since then there has been extensive correspondence (including FOI requests) raising numerous issues (often about private hire vehicles) and complaints about how TfL's Taxi and Private Hire team (TPH) fulfils its functions and the conduct of its staff.
25. TfL has stated that *'TPH considers that this represents an attempt by (the complainant) to punish TfL for the original complaint handling and to pressurise TPH to act according to his wishes in general and to invite his union to participate in particular.'*
26. TfL has a Taxi Engagement policy which provides a forum for unions that can demonstrate representation of a sufficient proportion of London taxi drivers. The complainant's union (the RMT) is not part of the forum and he considers this to be unfair.
27. TfL stated that TPH organised a centralised contact to deal with the voluminous non-FOI correspondence but the complainant *'continued to send very large amounts of correspondence and to escalate his complaints to increasingly senior levels whenever the outcome is not to his liking.'*
28. In addition, TfL stated that the complainant has made *'prolific use'* of FOIA and these requests were answered as TfL recognised that *'he has a legitimate and unavoidable need to engage with TfL...However, the situation has become increasingly untenable.'*
29. TfL believes that the numerous requests form part of an organised campaign to put pressure on TfL to act according to his wishes or in retaliation where TfL has failed to do so. TfL consider that the abuse of the statutory rights of access to information puts an unsustainable burden on TfL and that the complainant is aware of this burden.

30. Taking this into account the Commissioner has gone on to consider whether the request is for information about a genuine underlying issue or part of a campaign to disrupt the public authority. He has focused on whether the aggregated impact of dealing with the requests would cause a disproportionate and unjustified level of disruption, irritation or distress.

Is the request vexatious?

Burden

31. TfL has stated that since 2009 there has been numerous FOIA and EIR requests with multiple questions. Annex A details the 19 requests for the financial year 2013/14 and there were 49 requests in the previous 3 financial years. Most of the queries are '*highly specific to the TPH function*' and therefore no other TfL business area has the expertise to provide a response.
32. TfL has demonstrated to the Commissioner that several requests were beyond the cost limits of FOIA but information was provided up to the cost limit.
33. In 2012, there were 11 similar requests between 23 May and 4 July (35 working days) and after TfL provided information for some of the requests at a cost of £950, the remainder were refused on cost grounds. TfL explained to the complainant that any further FOI requests received within 60 working days would also be subject to consideration under section 12 and that future requests may be considered under section 14, if the request is vexatious.
34. TfL is therefore satisfied that the complainant is aware of the burden that his requests place on TfL.
35. In January and February 2014 TfL cited section 12 (costs) to refuse the recent requests and invited the complainant to prioritise one request to be answered within the cost limit. In the Internal review dated 10 February 2014, TfL provided considerable advice on how the cost limits apply and made a number of suggestions on how the complainant could revise his requests within the cost limits.
36. On 18 February, the complainant chose one request to be prioritised (FOI-1603-1314) and made 5 further requests under the reference FOI – 2264 – 1314. (See Annex A)
37. On 28 February 2014, TfL stated that all remaining unanswered requests from before 18 February were refused citing section 12 and the new requests (FOI – 2264 – 1314) were refused under section 14 of FOIA.

TfL also stated that *'This does not affect your right to contact TPH in connection with your own licence in the normal way.'*

38. The complainant made a further FOIA request on 21 February 2014 and the request that is the subject of this decision notice on 26 March 2014.
39. The Commissioner recognises that the complainant may have legitimate rights to contact the TPH but the Commissioner needs to balance this with the frequency and volume of FOIA and EIR requests. He is therefore satisfied that this is placing a considerable burden on TfL.

Motive

40. TfL considers that the complainant is partly attempting to find out information he believes he is entitled to but also that the requests are now partly intended to pursue a campaign of harassment.
41. TfL has demonstrated that the complainant mixes FOI, non FOI and complaints in much of his correspondence. He corresponds with different people around TfL up to and including the Commissioner, particularly regarding complaints about how TPH fulfils its functions and copies in members of the London Assembly. TfL view this as an attempt to circumvent the centralised arrangements put in place to minimise the disruption to TfL.
42. The correspondence often refers to the enforcement of rules regarding the conduct of private hire vehicles and attempts to reopen issues where the outcome is not to the complainant's liking.
43. In the opinion of TfL, the complainant has no intention of engaging cooperatively with TfL and the FOI team where he states *'For example, if I was to give a letter, which contained an FOI Request to a cleaner/door person in the employment of TfL, then TfL would have 20 working days to comply with my request'*.
44. On 19 February 2014 TfL responded *'we are aware that requests can be submitted to any representative of TfL...suggested that it would be of assistance in providing timely responses if you were to submit requests through the most appropriate channels and this was intended to be helpful.'* TfL viewed the complainant's response of 25 February 2014 as demonstrating a hostile approach. He repeated his underlying concern that visits by Compliance Officers had had little effect on the illegal plying for hire and parking by Private Hire Vehicle drivers and asked for the reasons for refusing the details of the Complaints Policy.
45. The Commissioner accepts that the purpose of the requests may have gone beyond the point of simply obtaining information.

Value or serious purpose

46. TfL accepts that this request for information on work related health conditions that relate to the emissions of vehicles in London has a serious purpose. However, within the context of the history of the complainant's many requests, his wider dealings with TfL (and TPH in particular) and the timing of the request shortly after TfL had issued a notice in accordance with section 17(6)(a) of the FOIA following a claim that section 14 applies, TfL is satisfied that it was reasonable and appropriate to find this request manifestly unreasonable.
47. In addition, TfL state that it is highly possible that it does not hold the information or that the cost involved in establishing what is held would be excessive. It has explained the difficulties in extracting from individual files any illnesses that could be related to vehicle emissions and that could be separated from any other work or activity undertaken by the drivers.
48. The Commissioner accepts that the complainant's request covers a serious matter. He is also aware of the complainant's history of correspondence. However, despite this he has not seen any evidence that the complainant had made this specific request before so it is difficult to say there would be nothing to gain from disclosure of this information.

Harassment or distress

49. TfL argues that it is reasonable to view the request as part of a long campaign of harassment against it and its officers. In support of this TfL refer to the many FOI requests and other voluminous correspondence and complaints. These clearly cause significant disruption to TPH's operations, distract employees from other duties and require a disproportionate resource.
50. TfL believes that *'there is no response that TfL would be able to offer that would satisfy (the complainant), that any response would simply lead to further requests and that (the complainant) would aim to use any information disclosed to further undermine the operation of TfL's TPH function and put pressure on them to accede to his wishes.*
51. Having taken all the circumstances into account the Commissioner is minded to accept the request is vexatious when seen in the context of all of the previous correspondence with the public authority.

The public interest test

52. Regulation 12(4)(b) is a qualified exemption and is therefore subject to the public interest test at regulation 12(1)(b) which states that information can only be withheld if in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

Public interest arguments in favour of disclosure

53. The complainant has stated his reasons for obtaining the information:

'I believe that I have a vested interest in my future as a Taxi Driver. TFL has stated that London Taxis are responsible for the deaths of approximately some 4,000 people in London due to the emissions that Taxi produce and introduced a 15 year age limit on Taxis and now they are talking about reducing this down to a 10 year age limit Taxis.

TFL decide on the type of vehicle that I am allowed to drive and as a Taxi Driver I should be made aware of any potential health risks to myself.

I also believe that TFL has a Duty of Care placed on them as a Public Body for transparency and openness.

Under the Health and Safety at Work Act there are laws imposed on employer, employee and self-employed people to reduce the risk from any hazards.'

54. TfL has stated that it recognises that the complainant has a legitimate interest in matters relating to the licencing of taxi and private hire drivers and that there is an inherent public interest in openness and transparency in evaluating how effectively TPH discharges its functions.
55. While TfL recognise that there is a legitimate interest in releasing health and emission related information, they suggest that *'the usefulness of this specific information, and therefore the public interest in carrying out the large amount of work involved, would be limited as it is only for the number of drivers with "work related health conditions".'* (see also paragraph 47 above where TfL explain that they may not hold any accurate information)

Public interest in maintaining the exemption

56. Balanced against the arguments favouring disclosure, TfL state that they have already taken into account public interest factors by engaging with the complainant for the past 6 years. TfL has devoted large amounts of staff time and resources to answering both the statutory requests as well as his general correspondence and have released considerable amounts of information into the public domain.

57. TfL states that this level of correspondence is diverting TfL (and in particular TPH) away from its normal duties, which is having a detrimental impact and it is in the public's interest that TPH is able to conduct its other daily functions.

58. The First-Tier Tribunal's decision in *Anthony Lavelle v Information Commissioner* (EA/2010/0169) makes a comment on the integrity of EIRs at paragraph 37 of the decision which states:

"there is a need to maintain the integrity of information rights legislation, and this includes ensuring it is not misused at the cost of others by responding to requests that are manifestly unreasonable".

59. In view of the complainant's increasing requests for information, the burden, disruption and the ignoring of the advice about the costs of requests, TfL state that it has reached the point where it could no longer sustain the engagement with the complainant and applied section 14 then Regulation 12(4)(b) by virtue of the requests being vexatious or manifestly unreasonable.

60. TfL have stated that TPH will continue to engage with the complainant on matters directly related to his own registration but TfL is satisfied that his use of the statutory information access regimes can no longer be regarded as proportionate. *'No other taxi driver has come close to placing this level of demand on TfL.'*

Balance of the public interest arguments

61. With regard to the public interest in disclosure the Commissioner has taken into account the general public interest in transparency and accountability. He recognises the complainant's reasons for making the request as being legitimate and is mindful of the presumption in favour of disclosure.

62. However, balanced against this is the burden that would be imposed on TfL. There is also the wider public interest in protecting the integrity of the EIRs and ensuring that they are used responsibly.

63. The Commissioner has considered the burden placed on TfL dealing with the amount of correspondence from the complainant. He is of the opinion that the level of correspondence over the past 6 years placed a disproportionate burden on TfL. The Commissioner is also of the opinion that it is not the intention of the act to be designed to overburden a public authority so that it has a detrimental effect on its other public functions.

64. Therefore, in all the circumstances, the Commissioner has concluded that the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosure of the information.
65. As such he accepts that the request is 'manifestly unreasonable' under the provisions of regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR and TfL is correct to refuse to respond to the request.

Right of appeal

66. Either party has the right to appeal against this decision notice to the First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights). Information about the appeals process may be obtained from:

First-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)
GRC & GRP Tribunals,
PO Box 9300,
LEICESTER,
LE1 8DJ

Tel: 0300 1234504

Fax: 0116 249 4253

Email: GRC@hmcts.gsi.gov.uk

Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

67. If you wish to appeal against a decision notice, you can obtain information on how to appeal along with the relevant forms from the Information Tribunal website.

68. Any Notice of Appeal should be served on the Tribunal within 28 (calendar) days of the date on which this decision notice is sent.

Signed

Pamela Clements
Group Manager
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Annex A

List of [REDACTED] FOI/EIR requests for 2013-14

| Date | Request |
|------------|---|
| 25/04/13 | <p>FOI-0153-1314</p> <p>Can you please provide the figures for bill and badge checks Taxi Drivers since April 2012 to the current date. If possible could you break these down on a monthly basics.</p> <p>Can you also provide the same figures for Private Hire Drivers. If possible could you confirm if the checks were carried out at night time of day time.</p> |
| 08/07/13 | <p>FOI-0634-1314</p> <p>Please confirm the dates of meetings held between TPH and LTDA, LCDC and Unite since the Olympics to the current date. Could you also please provide minutes to each meeting going from the present day working your way backward towards the Olympics.</p> |
| 06/08/13 | <p>FOI-0830-1314</p> <p>Regarding TPH - Can you please confirm the number of complaints received, dates, list the nature of complaint and provide copies of the complaints received over the last two years.</p> <p>Please confirm the number of warning issued to driver/s and provide a copy of a warning letter that is issued or given to driver/s committing such offence.</p> |
| 27/08/1314 | <p>FOI-0945-1314</p> <p>Follow on from FOI-0830- Could you please confirm which teams you would be contacting as I believe that all complaints about Taxi drivers are dealt with by one Department namely " Taxi & Private Hire"</p> <p>I want to know how many complaints was received by TPH about over ranking and parking in the Paddington Station area.</p> <p>Also I would like to know how many complaints was received by TPH about private hire vehicles parked at the junction of Regent Street and Swallow Street.</p> <p>I would like, if possible, for both searches to start from the 6 August 2013 going back in time i.e. 5, 4, 3, August 2013 until the £450 cost limit is met or the two years whichever is sooner.</p> |
| 10/09/13 | <p>FOI-1023-1314</p> <p>I am lead to believe that TPH has regular compliance meetings could you please provide dates of meetings and provide minutes of each meeting. starting with the most recent meeting working your way backward in time i.e. September, August, July 2013. For one year if</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>possible or until the cost limit is met.</p> <p>Could you also confirm if TPH/TFL has regular meetings with the Cab Enforcement Unit of the Met Police.</p> |
| 23/09/13 | <p>FOI-1097-1314</p> <p>Can you please confirm the number of Enforcement Operations that have been carried out over the last five years at the road junction of Swallow Street / Regent Street and list them on a yearly basis and provide dates.</p> <p>Also over the five year could you confirm how many PH drivers at this junction received a cautioned or convicted for touting and how many have their licence revoked.</p> |
| 03/10/13 | <p>FOI-1175-1314</p> <p>Can you please confirm the total number of complaints received by TPH in connection to Taxi Drivers in the area of Finsbury Park Station?</p> <p>Could you please also provide copies of all complaints received by TPH with the complainants name and address or email address redacted.</p> <p>If this request exceeds the cost limit could you please start the FOI from today date working your way backwards in time until the cost limit is met and advise me accordingly</p> |
| 21/10/13 | <p>FOI-1302-1314</p> <p>F/on from FOI-1097 - What action, if any, is taken by the Compliance Officers when they find Private Hire cars forming a line, Private Hire cars, waiting to be booked.</p> <p>Could you please provide any policy or rules in connection to the above.</p> <p>I am lead to believe that their have been 320 deployments by Compliance Officers since July 2012. Could you please confirm the dates and times of these visits.</p> |
| 04/11/13 | <p>FOI-1402-1314</p> <p>Could you please supply a copy of the complaint mention below that was lodged with the LGO and a copy of their reply to the complaint. Also copies of all correspondence between TFL/TPH and the LGO in connection to this complaint.</p> |
| 20/11/13 | <p>FOI-1539-1314</p> <p>F/on from FOI-1302 - previous cost limit by TPH - refined request - In order to fetch my request within the cost limit would it be better if I applied for the visits to the "night shift only" or out of the "approximately 320 visits" already identify. I understand that it takes 5</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| | <p>minutes to read a record therefore 12 records an hour could be inspected and in ten hours 120 records could be inspected. Could you start at the date requested working your way back in time until the cost limit is met, if possible.</p> <p>Could you also confirm if there is an agreement with TFL and Westminster City Council over the enforcement of the Bus Lane and who is responsible for the issuing of PCNs for the Bus Lane. Could you also confirm if the Buses that have forward facing CCTV fitted have any PCNs been issued as a result of cars / Private Hire Cars being parked in the Bus Lane during its hours of operation.</p> |
| 25/11/13 | <p>FOI-1603-1314</p> <p>How many Taxi licenses have been issued on a monthly bases. In the last year can you also confirm how many Taxi drivers were / are unable to work due to the length of time the CRB check is taking. In the next 20 days can you list the convictions that are recorded on CRB Taxi drivers records and CRB Private Hire Drivers and Operators records and separate them.</p> <p>In the last year could you confirm how many Private Hire Driver licenses have been issued on a monthly bases. In the last year can you also confirm how many Private Hire Drivers were / are unable to work due to the length of time the CRB check is taking.</p> |
| 09/12/13 | <p>FOI-1725-1314</p> <p>After a Tweet by Mr P.Rose, Unite Rep. http://tmi.me/1cl1zg it would appear that TFL has received a legal opinion which states that Private Hire vehicles can wait to be booked outside the PH Operating Centres / Office which also includes Satellite Offices. Could you find out if this is true or false and what is contained within this Legal Opinion. There are a number of Tweets by TPH with regards to Taxis over ranking at Waterloo and Paddington Station. If PH vehicles are allowed to do the very same thing then why is TFL turning a blind eye to PH doing the same thing.</p> |
| 31/12/13 | <p>FOI-1882-1314 – Withdrawn</p> <p>F/on from FOI-1539 - I requested the Times and Dates of the 320 records already identified up to the cost limit to further help you. I only need records for the night shift to be inspected if the times of the inspection are not available then could you confirm if there were any breaches of laws or their licensing conditions found on each visit.</p> |
| 27/12/13 | <p>FOI-1931-1314</p> <p>Follow-up to 1603-1314: how long it would take an employee of TFL to read one Taxi drivers record, point 1 below, and one Private Hire Drivers record, point 3 below, to gain the information that I have requested so far.</p> <p>Could you also confirm how many records could be inspected in one hour for all the points below to be answered.</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| 31/01/14 | <p>FOI-2149-1314</p> <p>Please confirm the number of staff normally employed at TPH for the purpose of relicensing Taxi and Private Hire Drivers.</p> <p>Could you please confirm how this process works once the CRB Check has been received and how long, minutes, each application takes to process. One without any convictions and one with convictions.</p> |
| 18/02/14 | <p>FOI-2264-1314</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • can you explain how the Handheld Devices that Compliance Officers use have names of Taxi and PH Drivers by scanning the barcode on the Identifiers and if his/her licence is valid. • you kindly clarify what information is held on the Handheld Devices and what are they used for. Where does this information come from if Taxi and Private Hire Drivers records are not computerised. • Could you kindly supply a copy of any policy, procedure or instruction/s issue to staff when dealing with CRB/DSB Records. • Can you please confirm what happens to the CRB /DSB once the relicensing has happened are they kept on record or destroyed. • Can you also confirm at what stage does the driver send his/her CRB / DSB to TPH as you are aware that CRB / DSB is no longer sent direct to TPH by the CRB / DSB Service |
| 18/02/14 | <p>FOI-2265-1314</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to my outstanding FOIs I would like you to answer FOI 1603-1313 up to the cost limit |
| 21/02/14 | <p>FOI-2352-1314</p> <p>Can you please provide a copy of any policy / instruction for measuring "Unmet Demand for Taxis"</p> <p>Also I understand that a number of Yellow Badge Areas have had their sectors closed due to a surplus of Taxis Drivers in certain sectors. Could you confirm which sectors are currently closed or suspended and supply a copy of any documentation which shows / proves that these sectors are over subscribed with Taxi Drivers.</p> <p>Could you also please list the yearly total of Taxi and Private Hire Drivers for the last five years. If possible could you please separate Yellow Badge and Green Badge figures for this.</p> |
| 26/03/14 | <p>FOI-2595-1314</p> <p>After listening to Mr Leon Daniels on the radio Eddie Nester show. Could you kindly confirm how many Taxi and Private Hire drivers currently licensed by TFL have a work related health condition that relates to the emissions of vehicles in London. Could you also list what grants are available to the above drivers from TFL in order to reduce emissions or replace Taxis or PH Vehicles.</p> |