

Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Decision notice

Date: 31 October 2022

Public Authority: Royal Borough of Greenwich
The Woolwich Centre
35 Wellington Street
London
SE18 6HQ

Decision

1. The complainant asked a series of questions about Automatic Traffic Counters and a report concerning road closures to the Royal Borough of Greenwich ("the Council"). The Commissioner's decision is that, on a balance of probabilities, the Council does not hold the further information requested by the complainant.

Request and response

2. The complainant made the following information request to the Council on 11 October 2021:

"Automatic Traffic Counters:

Automatic traffic counters have been installed in a number of streets in Greenwich West.

1. Please specify in which streets these counters have been installed since September/October 2021 and the duration of their installation for each street?
2. I assume this is the second set of traffic counts commissioned later this year?

3. When will the results of the traffic surveys and any data analysis be made available in the public domain and where specifically?
4. Are there proposals to install more traffic counters here before 25 February 2022 and when/where will these be installed? What is the approximate cost of the counters and their installation?

West Greenwich Road Closures Report:

1. What is a vision zero (casualty reduction) scheme? How will these operate locally and how do they apply to cyclists and e-scooters?
2. Recommendations: 63.3% of responses within the scheme area expressed a positive preference for road closures. There was also another reported figure of 48% of respondents from within the scheme being positive about the trial measures. Which of these figures is accurate and do these figures include petition signatures? If not, what is the reason for petitions being omitted? Is this 63.3% figure a majority of the local population or just of those surveyed?
3. Apart from the online consultation tool on the WG road closures scheme what other inclusive methods were used? How were local residents who do not take part or have the means to complete online surveys consulted and how were these methods publicised?
4. **Equalities.** How were all the groups mentioned in the report under the Equalities Act 2010 consulted? These groups would include people with a relevant protected characteristic; **age, elderly, disabilities/long term health conditions**, pregnancy, maternity, care responsibilities, **race**, different genders.
5. In what ways did the survey include equality monitoring and consultation with groups or organisations representing people with a protected characteristic with the exception of taxi drivers and the emergency services?

What attempt was made to consult with people of a different **social status and a different social class** particularly council/social housing tenants and others on lower incomes who mainly live just outside the wealthier Hills and Vales enclave. How were the views of people who live in social housing included in the survey?

What specific evidence is there that 'the changes in the report are viewed clearly as beneficial under the public sector equality duty' in the responses to the report from all of the above mentioned groups?

6. What were the reasons for not including Greenwich South Street and Blackheath Hill in the data analysis at Appendix B: Traffic count data from West Greenwich Road Closures Area? Please post the relevant data information in the reply to this FOI?."
3. The Council answered each point in turn and included links to further information to help assist the requester with their enquiry.
4. The requester set out the grounds for internal review, asking a series of further questions which the Council answered again in turn. The final position of the Council is that it does not hold any further information relating to the original request and the further questions within the internal review.

Reasons for decision

5. This reasoning covers whether the Council is correct when it says that it does not hold the information the complainant requested.
6. The Commissioner understands that the complainant in this case is not satisfied that the Council adequately discharged its duties under the Equality Act 2010. Such matters fall outside of the Commissioner's jurisdiction. The Commissioner's role is to determine whether the Council has provided the information that it holds.
7. The Council has indicated to the complainant where information about its equalities consideration can be found. That is its only obligation under FOIA. No compelling evidence has been put forward to explain why further recorded information is held.
8. There is no requirement for the Council to create information in order to answer the requester's questions, its obligation is to supply information it held at the time of the request.
9. The Commissioner is therefore satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the Council supplied all the relevant information to the requester and does not hold any further information in scope of the request.

Right of appeal

10. 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: 0870 739 5836

Email: grc@justice.gov.uk

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

11. 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.
12. 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

Roger Cawthorne
Senior Case Officer
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF