



By email: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information – Notice of Decision

I refer to your application under section 30 of the *Freedom of Information Act 2016* (the FOI Act), received by the City and Environment Directorate (CED) on 29 January 2026. It is my understanding you are seeking access to the following information:

“Final report/deliverable from the Contract Number EPN200476 Ainslie Avenue Corridor Feasibility Study”

I thank you for providing the following statement on the public interest in your application. Your views have been considered in reaching my decision on your application:

“The requested feasibility report is sought in the public interest to improve transparency and understanding of decision-making that may have broader community, planning, and financial implications.”

Timeframes

In accordance with section 40 of the FOI Act, CED is required to provide a decision on your access application within 30 working days. As this matter required third party consultation, the decision due date was extended by 15 working days, in accordance with section 40(2) of the FOI Act. Therefore, a decision is due to you on or by 8 April 2026.

Authority

I am an Information Officer appointed by the Director-General of the City and Environment Directorate under section 18 of the FOI Act to deal with access applications made under part 5 of the FOI Act.

Decision on access

A search for records held by CED has been completed and five records within the scope of your application have been identified. The records are listed in the schedule at **Attachment A**.

I have decided to:

- grant **full** access to three records.
- grant **partial** access to two records.

The reasons for my decision are detailed in the *Statement of reasons* section below. The records being released to you are provided at **Attachment B**, with redactions applied to any information that I have decided is contrary to the public interest to release.

Statement of reasons

The FOI Act has a pro-disclosure bias, which requires information to be disclosed unless doing so would be contrary to the public interest. As an Information Officer, I am responsible for determining whether disclosure of the information within the scope of your application would be contrary to the public interest.

My assessment begins with schedule 1 of the FOI Act, which outlines categories of information that are taken to be contrary to the public interest to disclose. If the information does not fall within any of these categories, I must then apply the public interest test under section 17 of the FOI Act. This test involves weighing the factors favouring disclosure against those favouring nondisclosure, as set out in schedule 2.

In reaching my access decisions, I have taken the following into account:

- the FOI Act
- the information that falls within the scope of your application
- your views regarding the public interest
- the views of third parties consulted
- the *Human Rights Act 2004*
- the ACT Ombudsman FOI Guidelines

I confirm that I have not considered any of the factors listed in section 17(2) of the FOI Act, which outlines a list of considerations that must not be taken into account when applying the public interest test.

Schedule 1 – Information taken to be contrary to the public interest

- *No relevant sections identified.*

Schedule 2 – Public interest test

Factors favouring disclosure (Schedule 2.1)

- *Section 2.1(a)(i) - promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the government's accountability.*
- *Section 2.1(a)(ii) - contribute to positive and informed debate on important issues or matters of public interest.*

In reviewing the information within the scope of your application, I consider that disclosure promotes open discussion of public affairs and enhances the government's accountability generally. I consider that disclosure would also contribute to positive and informed debate about the potential future development of a parcel of land that is a matter of public interest. I have placed significant weight on this factor.

Factors favouring nondisclosure (Schedule 2.2)

- *Section 2.2(a)(ii) - prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy or any other right under the Human Rights Act 2004.*

- *Section 2.2(a)(xi) - prejudice trade secrets, business affairs or research of an agency or person.*
- *Section 2.2(a)(xiii) - prejudice the competitive commercial activities of an agency.*

Records 4 and 5 contains personal information relating to staff members of third-party businesses. I consider that this information is not readily available to the public and has come into the possession of CED with the expectation that it be handled in accordance with the Territory Privacy Principles and the *Information Privacy Act 2014*. I consider that the disclosure of this information could reasonably be expected to prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy under the *Human Rights Act 2004*.

Record 5 also contains commercially sensitive business information. The Preliminary Valuation Advice was developed based on the professional experience, knowledge, analysis and opinion of Capital Valuers. This information reflects proprietary valuation methodologies and professional judgement developed and applied in the course of Capital Valuers' commercial operations. As the information was provided as a paid professional service, I consider that public disclosure could reasonably be expected to adversely affect Capital Valuers' competitive commercial activities by diminishing the commercial value of the information. Further, the public availability of Capital Valuers' valuation approach would likely prejudice their trade secrets, business affairs and research.

I have placed substantial weight against these factors.

Balancing the factors

In balancing the factors favouring disclosure against those favouring nondisclosure, I have carefully considered the public interest in promoting transparency, accountability and informed public debate. I acknowledge that disclosure of certain information would advance these interests, particularly where it relates to the government's operations and the context surrounding government decision-making.

However, I must also consider the strong public interest in protecting personal privacy and safeguarding the legitimate business affairs of third parties. In several instances, the likelihood and degree of prejudice that could result from disclosure would be significant. I consider that the disclosure of commercially sensitive information that is generally unknown to the public is likely to prejudice the trade secrets and business affairs of Capital Valuers, including giving valuable insight and advantage to their competitors.

On balance, I find that the factors against disclosure carry greater weight than the factors favouring disclosure for the relevant information.

Having applied the public interest test outlined in section 17 of the FOI Act, I have concluded that some information contained in the records is not in the public interest to disclose. Accordingly, I have redacted this specific information under section 50(2) of the FOI Act.

Consistent with the pro-disclosure intent of the FOI Act, I am satisfied that redacting only the information that is contrary to the public interest ensures compliance with the FOI Act while still providing access to the majority of the information held by CED within the scope of your application.

Charges

Processing charges are applicable for this application because the total number of pages to be released to you exceeds the charging threshold of 50 pages. However, I have decided not to impose a fee in response to your application.

Online publishing – Disclosure Log

Under section 28 of the FOI Act, CED maintains a disclosure log, which is a public record of access applications and decisions. Your original access application and my decision will be published on the CED disclosure log. Your personal contact details will not be published.

ACT Ombudsman Review

My decision on your access application is a reviewable decision as identified in schedule 3 of the FOI Act. You have the right to seek ACT Ombudsman review of this outcome under section 73 of the FOI Act within 20 working days from the day that my decision is provided to you, or a longer period allowed by the ACT Ombudsman. If you wish to request a review of my decision, you may write to the ACT Ombudsman at:

The ACT Ombudsman
GPO Box 442
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Via email: actfoi@ombudsman.gov.au

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal (ACAT) Review

Under section 84 of the FOI Act, if a decision is made under section 82(1) on an Ombudsman review, you may apply to the ACAT for review of the Ombudsman decision. Further information may be obtained from the ACAT at:

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal
GPO Box 370
Canberra City ACT 2601
Telephone: (02) 6207 1740
<https://www.acat.act.gov.au/>

Please contact the CED Information Access team if you have any queries in relation to your application via 6207 2987 or CEDFOI@act.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

Signed electronically

Adam Roach
Information Officer
City and Environment Directorate
7 April 2026