

## REQUEST

Are you able to share with me any and all written correspondence between Hillingdon Council and MOPAC in regards to the purchase/sale of Uxbridge Police Station?

My understanding is that Hillingdon recently wrote to MOPAC requesting to purchase Uxbridge Police Station, and can you provide me with any response that has been given to Hillingdon from MOPAC on this issue?

---

## RESPONSE

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request of 27 June to the Mayor's Office for Policing And Crime (MOPAC). I confirm that your request has been handled under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and that MOPAC does hold some information relating to your request.

However some of this information is exempt from disclosure under Section 21 of the Freedom of Information Act, since it is information which is already published. Please find details below:

Letter from Hillingdon Council to Deputy Mayor for policing And Crime, Sophie Linden on 3 October 2017. This is published here:

<https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/29826?q=police+stations&go=Search>

In addition, Councillor Raymond Puddifoot of Hillingdon Council emailed Sophie Linden on 14 June and a reply was sent on 29 June. These are both attached.

Part of this email has been redacted since it is exempt under Section 43(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, relating to Commercial Interests – information whose disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (an individual, a company, the public authority itself or any other legal entity).

### **Public Interest Test**

In deciding whether to apply Section 43(2) of the Act, I have considered whether the public interest lies in favour of releasing information into the public domain or whether there is sufficient reason to support withholding the requested information.

### **Public Interest considerations favouring disclosure**

- There is a public interest in the transparency of information provided by MOPAC and the MPS which could increase confidence in both organisations.
- Disclosure could provide the public with an understanding that public funds are being used appropriately.

### **Public interest considerations favouring non-disclosure**

- Damage may occur to a tender process with a disclosure of this information.
- Disclosure of the information could impact on any future property sales by weakening the MPS' position in a competitive market.
- In these times of budget cuts, it is particularly important for the MPS to achieve value for money for the public purse. The MPS would not be in the best bargaining position to achieve this if through disclosures under the FOIA, the competitive nature of selling of MPS property is adversely affected.

**Balance Test**

In deciding whether to apply Section 43(2) of the FOIA, I have considered whether the public interest lies in favour of releasing information into the public domain or whether there is sufficient reason to support withholding the requested information. Having considered your request and having examined the associated risk in release, I have found there is a risk to the commercial interests of an organisation. I believe this risk, as outlined above, is both real and likely.

In view of this, the considerations favouring non-disclosure of the requested information outweigh the considerations favouring disclosure, therefore the redacted information is exempt from disclosure under Section 43(2) of the FOIA.

If you are unhappy with the response to your Freedom of Information request, please see the MOPAC website on what the next steps are at:

<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/mayors-office-policing-and-crime-mopac/governance-and-decision-making/freedom-information>