Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)

Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)

Decision notice

Date:	**20 July 2022**
Public Authority:	**East West Railway Company Ltd**
Address:	**One Grafton Mews** **Midsummer Boulevard** **Milton Keynes** **MK9 1FB**

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant has submitted three requests for information either directly or through third parties. East West Railway Company Ltd ("EWRC") refused the requests as either vexatious for the purposes of FOIA or manifestly unreasonable for the purposes of the EIR.

2. The Commissioner's decision is that the requests should all have been dealt with under the EIR. EWRC has only demonstrated that the second and third requests engage Regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR although the balance of the public interest favours maintaining this exception. EWRC has not demonstrated that the first request was manifestly unreasonable and is therefore not entitled to rely on this exception.

3. The Commissioner requires EWRC to take the following steps to ensure compliance with the legislation.

    - Issue a fresh response, to the first request, that does not rely on Regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR.

4. EWRC must take these steps within 35 calendar days of the date of this decision notice. Failure to comply may result in the Commissioner making written certification of this fact to the High Court pursuant to section 54 of the Act and may be dealt with as a contempt of court.

Request and response

The First Request

5. On 10 May 2021, the complainant – a campaign group – acting through a solicitor ("the Solicitor") requested information of the following description:

> "[1] EWR is asked to provide the information constituting the 'high-level environmental appraisal' of the nine Route Alignment Options and the proposed northern approach.
>
> [2] Insofar as it is not covered by request 1, EWR is asked to provide the information upon which it relies in concluding that it is 'confident' that the detailed design for the southern approach can mitigate any impacts on the Wimpole and Eversden Woods SAC. Such information is to include the impacts identified and the mitigations considered.
>
> [3] EWR is asked to provide the information constituting the 'operational analysis' on which it relies in concluding that the northern approach proposed in appendix F of the Second Consultation Document would require the provision of a four-track railway in section NA2.
>
> [4] EWR is asked to provide the information upon which it relies in concluding that the Shepreth Branch Royston Line could remain as a twin track railway from the new Hauxton Junction to the Shepreth Branch Junction.
>
> [5] EWR is asked to provide the information on which it relies in concluding that no 'significant alterations' will be needed to the bridge where the Shepreth Branch Royston Line crosses under the A1301. Such information is to extend (insofar as it has been considered) to both a two and four-track approach to the Shepreth Branch Line and to the grade-separated junction that EWR considers may be needed at Shepreth Branch Junction.
>
> [6] EWR is asked to say whether it has assessed the number of properties that would need to be demolished if the portion of the Shepreth Branch Royston Line from the Hauxton Junction to the Shepreth Branch Junction were to require works to increase the number of tracks. If it did undertake such an assessment, it is asked to disclose the information constituting that assessment.

[7] EWR is asked to provide any non-public information it holds (provided by Network Rail or others), or any assessment it has itself undertaken, which leads to the conclusion that there may be demand by 2043/2044 for around 24 freight trains per day on the line between Bedford and Cambridge. Such information is to include any quantification of the current freight use of the Shepreth Branch Royston Line and the West Anglia Main Line.

[8] EWR is asked to provide any report or other analyses which it holds which caused it to conclude that embankments and viaducts will be required in some form between Cambourne and Hauxton Junction on the southern approach. In doing so, EWR is not asked to provide information concerning the specifics of where and how embankments and viaducts will be used on each route alignment.

[9] EWR is asked to provide any engineering long section drawings which it has produced to assess the northern approach. If no such drawings exist, EWR is asked to provide (a) the length of viaduct; (b) length in cutting; and, (c) length on embankment of its comparator northern approach.

[10] Insofar as EWR has already undertaken this assessment, EWR is asked to provide a list of the roads which will be permanently severed or otherwise obstructed by each of the Route Alignment Options comprised in the southern approach (Cambourne through to Cambridge station).

[11] EWR is asked to provide the information constituting the updated 'cost estimates' provided by Network Rail and Atkins referred to in the Second Consultation Technical Report at 5.4.12, and, if different, the most recent cost estimates produced. Such estimates are not to be limited to the figures, and should (insofar as they exist) include the explanation of the estimates provided by Network Rail and Atkins.

[12] EWR is asked to provide the information upon which it relies in concluding that the impacts of the southern approach on the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory are 'predicted to be capable of mitigation, subject to detailed design'. Such information is to include the impacts identified and the mitigations considered."

The Second Request

6. On 20 May, the complaint itself wrote to EWRC and, as part of a longer letter explaining its concerns about the proposed route, also purported to seek information in the following terms:

> "[1] EWR Co must extend the consultation period so that it closes on 9 September 2021 at the earliest.
>
> [2] EWR Co must provide details of how it proposes to analyse consultation responses to overcome the innate bias in question 1 and ensure that it gives sufficient weight to the comments of those who remain concerned by its failure to consult properly and openly on a northern approach and/or who disagree with its assessment that a southern approach is to be preferred.
>
> [3] EWR Co must provide information regarding: (i) the proposed freight capacity of the central section; (ii) how increased freight traffic has the potential to impact the current conclusion that there is no need to provide additional tracks between Hauxton and Shepreth Branch Junction (paragraph 11.1.2 of the Technical Report); (iii) possible mitigation measures in relation to both the noise and air pollution impacts of freight and their cost.
>
> [4] EWR Co must provide comparative journey times from Bletchley to Cambridge and for Bedford to Cambridge
>
> [5] EWR must provide a break down of forecast trips for journey pairs between relevant current and future stations.
>
> [6] EWR Co must provide updated car and coach comparisons for the Oxford to Cambridge comparator on page 42 of the Consultation Document (which is the same as that used in last year's Preferred Route Option Report).
>
> [7] EWR Co must: (i) explain why its proposed southern approach makes sense in relation to passengers who wish to travel east of Cambridge to destinations beyond Ely and, in particular, towards Norwich;15 (ii) explain why it is an appropriate strategic assumption that east of Cambridge journeys will use the line to Newmarket, rather than the connections from Ely, given the significant investment that it appears will be required in the Newmarket line to allow such journeys; (iii) confirm that the line from Cambridge station to Cambridge North and beyond will need four-tracking if and when its services are extended further east or explain why the existing two track configuration will be sufficient in those circumstances.

[8] EWR Co must: (i) provide details of existing freight usage of the Cambridge to Newmarket line; (ii) explain why it is a reasonable strategic assumption that the Cambridge to Newmarket line will be used for freight to go east, rather than the connections from Ely; (iii) provide cost estimates comparing the cost of the necessary upgrade of this line and the cost of the much shorter chord around Ely proposed by CA Ltd (which would enable freight to bypass Cambridge altogether).

[9] EWR Co must provide, for the purpose of the current consultation, artists' impressions of the main structures, and their proposed dimensions, so that residents can understand what is being proposed and its impact on the rural landscape and villages for the purposes of answering question 1 and identifying any mitigating measures they may wish to mention in answer to questions 39 to 41.

[10] EWR Co must: (i) provide a revised comparison of the structures proposed in northern and southern approaches into Cambridge; (ii) explain why they have not used CBRR's proposed trench solution in the current consultation comparisons.

[11] EWR Co must, in particular: (i) confirm that the five properties that it has identified as likely to require demolition with a southern approach are all residential properties;22 (ii) explain how many of the 39 to 84 properties which it is said may be affected by a northern approach are "homes"; (iii) disclose the number of farms on the southern approach which are impacted, some of which will be rendered uneconomic and all of which will be more expensive to run, in order to provide a fair comparison with the commercial premises impacted on a northern approach; (iv) disclose how many people on the southern approach will lose part or most of their gardens.

[12] EWR Co must disclose whether the Milton junction has been assumed to be grade-separated in each direction.

[13] EWR Co must explain how they have assessed the impact of Thameslink services on the SBR line in respect of the Sponsor's Requirements in: (i) paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of Appendix A of the Technical Report (to isolate the wider network from poor performance on EWR and to isolate EWR from disruption on the wider network); and (ii) paragraph 5.1 Appendix A of the Technical Report to allow for anticipated future growth."

The Third Request

7. On 21 May 2021, a local MP ("the MP") wrote to EWRC, on behalf of the complainant and made five further requests:

> "[1] EWR asserts that four-tracking is necessary if the line approaches Cambridge from the north. Can you provide detailed reasoning in why you think that this is necessary, in view of the following considerations?
>
> [2] If the EWR were to approach Cambridge from the south and to serve Cambridge North station as suggested in The Technical Document Appendix F § 1.1.10, would that also require four-tracking north of Cambridge station? If not, why not?
>
> [3] Does EWR agree that the trench railway system proposed by CBRR could be built for the Fen Crossing section of the northern approach? If so, are the statements in the consultation about embankments and viaducts being the only option for this section correct?
>
> [4] Why does the analysis of the northern approach make no reference to the CBRR fen crossing proposal and conclude that the only possible solution is to go over roads and to build the railway high in the landscape when crossing the fens?
>
> [5] Why did EWR not describe trench railways in the consultation?
>
> [6] Will EWR commit look again at the trench railway solution as part of a full and fair consultation on a northern approach to Cambridge?"

8. On 8 June 2021, EWRC responded. It refused to provide any information. To the extent that the requests sought environmental information, it relied on Regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR as they were manifestly unreasonable. To the extent that the requests sought non-environmental information, EWRC relied on section 14 of FOIA on the grounds that the requests were vexatious.

9. The Solicitor requested an internal review on behalf of the complainant on 17 July 2021. EWRC sent the outcome of its internal review on 24 August 2021. It upheld its original position.

Scope of the case

10. The Solicitor contacted the Commissioner on 7 October 2021 to complain about the way the complainant's requests for information had been handled.

11. The Commissioner commenced his investigation with a letter to EWRC on 8 June 2022. He noted that, in his view, the information would all be environmental and that Regulation 12(4)(b) was the appropriate exception to consider. He also made clear that EWRC would only get one chance to justify its use of the exception and that, if it failed to provide adequate justification and evidence, he reserved his right to issue a decision notice ordering fresh responses to be provided.

12. The Commissioner considers that the scope of his investigation is to determine whether any of the requests were manifestly unreasonable.

Reasons for decision

Is the requested information environmental?

13. Regulation 2(1) of the EIR defines environmental information as being information on:

    (a) the state of the elements of the environment, such as air and atmosphere, water, soil, land, landscape and natural sites including wetlands, coastal and marine areas, biological diversity and its components, including genetically modified organisms, and the interaction among these elements;

    (b) factors, such as substances, energy, noise, radiation or waste, including radioactive waste, emissions, discharges and other releases into the environment, affecting or likely to affect the elements of the environment referred to in (a);

    (c) measures (including administrative measures), such as policies, legislation, plans, programmes, environmental agreements, and activities affecting or likely to affect the elements and factors referred to in (a)…as well as measures or activities designed to protect those elements;

    (d) reports on the implementation of environmental legislation;

    (e) cost-benefit and other economic analyses and assumptions used within the framework of the measures and activities referred to in (c); and

(f) the state of human health and safety, including the contamination of the food chain, where relevant, conditions of human life, cultural sites and built structures inasmuch as they are or may be affected by the state of the elements of the environment referred to in (a) or, through those elements, by any of the matters referred to in (b) and (c);

14. The Commissioner notes that the information in question all relates to the construction of a railway line between Oxford and Cambridge. That is a major infrastructure project (ie. a "measure") likely to affect the elements of the environment (particularly, soil and landscape). All the information is information on either the measure itself, or forms part of the economic analyses and assumptions used to assess the measure. For procedural reasons, the Commissioner has therefore assessed this case under the EIR.

Regulation 12(4)(b) – manifestly unreasonable

15. Regulation 5(1) of the EIR states that:

> "a public authority that holds environmental information shall make it available on request."

16. Regulation 12 of the EIR states that:

> (1) Subject to paragraphs (2), (3) and (9), a public authority may refuse to disclose environmental information requested if—
>
> (a) an exception to disclosure applies under paragraphs (4) or (5); and
>
> (b) in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
>
> (2) A public authority shall apply a presumption in favour of disclosure.
>
> (4) 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. The Commissioner considers that a request can be manifestly unreasonable for two reasons: firstly, if it is vexatious and secondly where it would incur unreasonable costs for a public authority or an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Would the request impose a manifestly unreasonable burden?

18. The EIR do not provide a definition of what constitutes an unreasonable cost. This is in contrast to section 12 of the FOI Act under which a public authority can refuse to comply with a request if it estimates that the cost of compliance would exceed the "appropriate limit". This appropriate limit is defined by the Freedom of Information and Data Protection (Appropriate Limit and Fees) Regulations 2004 ("the Regulations") as £450 for a public authority such as EWRC – the equivalent of 18 hours of staff time.

19. Although the Regulations are not directly applicable to the EIR, in the Commissioner's view they can provide a useful point of reference when public authorities argue that complying with a request would incur an unreasonable cost.

20. The Regulations allow a public authority to charge the following activities at a flat rate of £25 per hour of staff time:

    - Determining whether the information is held;
    - Locating the information, or a document which may contain the information;
    - Retrieving the information, or a document which may contain the information; and
    - Extracting the information from a document containing it.

21. EWRC indicated that it wished to claim that responding to the requests would impose a manifestly unreasonable burden. Accordingly, the Commissioner asked EWRC to provide a detailed explanation and estimate of the burden that would be incurred.

22. EWRC noted the amount of time that it had spent on dealing with requests submitted by the complainant and associates. It also drew the Commissioner's attention to the content of its original refusal notice.

23. In its original refusal notice, EWRC referred to "more than 18 hours of staff time" that would be required in order to comply with the request. It noted the need to liaise across the organisation and to consider other exceptions – although it offered no evidence in its refusal notice to support its estimation of the burden.

The Commissioner's view

24. Whilst the Commissioner notes all three requests contain multiple different elements, in his view, EWRC has not demonstrated that complying with any of the three requests would require a manifestly unreasonable burden.

25. The Commissioner is aware that Regulation 12(4)(b) absolves a public authority of its obligation to provide information, consider other exceptions or even to confirm whether the requested information is held. It follows that the public authority must meet a high bar to demonstrate burden.

26. EWRC stated in its refusal notice that, between January 2020 and May 2021 it had dealt with over 158 interactions with persons associated with the complainant and that it had spent an estimated 375 hours of staff time on such interactions. However, it provided no evidence in support of this assertion. In any case, in order to establish burden, a public authority must demonstrate that the request itself would create a burden – not that previous requests had been burdensome.

27. The Commissioner also notes that there is no provision within the EIR which allows for requests to be aggregated and that the burden must be made out for each individual request.

28. EWRC appears to have made no attempt, despite having been specifically asked to do so by the Commissioner, to estimate the burden of responding to any of the requests beyond asserting that it will be burdensome. EWRC does not appear to have made any attempt to quantify the volume of material that might fall within the scope of any of the requests and has not explained in detail the tasks that would need to be undertaken in order to comply.

29. The Commissioner therefore cannot consider that EWRC has made the case that any of the requests would impose a manifestly unreasonable burden.

Were any of the requests vexatious?

30. Following the lead of the Upper Tribunal in Craven v Information Commissioner & DECC [2012] UKUT 442 (AAC), the Commissioner considers that there is, in practice, no difference between a request that is vexatious under the FOIA and one which is manifestly unreasonable under the EIR – save that the public authority must also consider the balance of public interest when refusing a request under the EIR. The analysis that follows looks at vexatiousness as, if the request is found to be vexatious, then it will also be manifestly unreasonable and hence Regulation 12(4)(b) will be engaged.

31. The term "vexatious" is not defined within the FOIA. The Upper Tribunal considered the issue of vexatious requests in Information Commissioner v Devon CC & Dransfield [2012] UKUT 440 (AAC). It commented that "vexatious" could be defined as the "manifestly unjustified, inappropriate or improper use of a formal procedure". The Upper

Tribunal's approach in this case was subsequently upheld in the Court of Appeal.

32. The Dransfield definition establishes that the concepts of proportionality and justification are relevant to any consideration of whether a request is vexatious.

33. Dransfield also considered four broad issues: (1) the burden imposed by the request (on the public authority and its staff), (2) the motive of the requester, (3) the value or serious purpose of the request and (4) harassment or distress of and to staff. It explained that these considerations were not meant to be exhaustive and also explained the importance of:

> "…adopting a holistic and broad approach to the determination of whether a request is vexatious or not, emphasising the attributes of manifest unreasonableness, irresponsibility and, especially where there is a previous course of dealings, the lack of proportionality that typically characterise vexatious requests." (paragraph 45).

34. When considering the question of vexatiousness, a public authority can consider the context of the request and the history of its relationship with the requestor, as the Commissioner's guidance explains:

> "The context and history in which a request is made will often be a major factor in determining whether the request is vexatious, and the public authority will need to consider the wider circumstances surrounding the request." [1]

EWRC's position

35. In addition to the arguments about past and present burden, EWRC also drew the Commissioner's attention to a statement made by an individual who it said was closely connected to the complaint. That individual had, at a meeting with representatives from local parish councils been recorded as having:

> "compiled a comprehensive list of various actions that all of us can do to make sure our voice is still heard at EWR. She likened her list of objectives to an annoying mosquito round the head of EWR"

[1] https://ico.org.uk/media/for-organisations/documents/1198/dealing-with-vexatiousrequests.pdf

36. The making of information requests was listed as being one of those "annoying" actions.

37. EWRC also referred, in its original refusal notice, to the complainant's tone in previous correspondence as having had an "aggressive intimidatory tone." It cited a single example but stated that other correspondence from individuals connected with the complainant had adopted "a similar aggressive and discourteous tone."

38. Responding to the requests would, in EWRC's view require a considerable, unreasonable and disproportionate diversion of resources which, it argued, would divert from core operations. It further argued that previous engagement had indicated that no response it could provide would satisfy the complainant and would be likely to generate further follow-up enquiries.

39. Some of the information was, EWRC argued, already in the public domain and could be accessed by the complainant – or indeed anyone else. The process of assessing what was and wasn't in the public domain though, would require time.

40. Finally, EWRC drew attention to the overlapping nature of the requests and pointed out that the first request had been submitted halfway through a consultation period. The deadline for compliance with that request would have only allowed a single day for the requested information to have been assessed before the consultation closed. EWRC thus argued that the value to be attributed to such a request was much lower than it might otherwise have been.

The complainant's position

41. The complainant, acting through the solicitor, presented a submission as to why the requests were neither vexatious nor manifestly unreasonable.

42. The complainant drew attention to the consultation that was ongoing at the time of the requests and argued that the information was important to understand the matters being consulted on. The complainant also stressed the importance of the project and the potential disruption it would cause.

43. The complainant accepted that the second request had not been sent with the primary purpose of gathering information and had in fact been sent with the purpose of outlining ongoing opposition to the project.

44. The complainant argued that the individual quotation from the particular individual identified in paragraph 35 should not be taken as representing the complainant's settled position. The complainant denied that there

had been any "intentional strategy to disrupt annoy or harass." In any case, the complainant argued that this did not undermine the value of the information.

The Commissioner's view

45. In the Commissioner's view, EWRC has once again done a poor job of demonstrating why the request was manifestly unreasonable. In particular, it failed to put forward a body of evidence to support its arguments about the manifest unreasonableness the complainant has supposedly shown.

46. Taken at face value, the Commissioner accepts that 158 interactions over an 18 month period might be considered large. But without any context, it is difficult to say whether this is manifestly unreasonable.

47. EWRC has not provided the Commissioner with, for example, any evidence to show what the content of those interactions were or why they were deemed to have been instigated by persons associated with the complainant. If a person had, for example, signed a petition organised by the complainant, but had submitted their own letter of concern based on the way the project might affect them personally, would that be counted as a single interaction or two separate ones? Given the large geographical area covered by the project, it is likely to affect a large number of people and those opposed are likely to have, or have had, at least some form of engagement with the complaint – given the complainant's role as a coordinating body for those opposed to the project.

48. Further undermining EWRC's burden arguments is the fact that the evidence it did put forward to support the assertion – previous requests that had been made on the complainant's behalf – were ones which EWRC had been able to refuse as either too burdensome or not sufficiently clear. It is difficult for the Commissioner to understand why responding to such requests imposed an intolerable burden upon EWRC.

49. The Commissioner is not wholly persuaded by the complainant's defence of the statement set out at paragraph 36. Making information requests with a deliberate intent to cause annoyance is an abuse of information rights legislation. The Commissioner takes a dim view of such behaviour and notes that the minutes of the meeting at which the statement was made contain no indication that the individual making it was in anyway challenged. If such behaviour had been exhibited, whilst it may not have undermined the value of the information, it would have undermined the value of responding to the request.

50. However, whilst the statement is concerning, EWRC has not put forward any evidence to demonstrate that the suggested course of action has in fact been followed by the complainant or connected persons. There is no indication, for example, of whether EWRC saw a spike in requests or enquiries following the meeting in question. The evidence available to the Commissioner indicates that only the three requests under consideration here were made.

51. The fact that the complainant engaged the Solicitor to make the first request, in the Commissioner's view, weighs against the likelihood that it formed part of an ongoing campaign. That is not to say that a request made through a solicitor can never be vexatious, only that a reputable law firm would be unlikely to make a request that formed part of a harassment campaign – and the Commissioner sees no evidence to suggest that the Solicitor was engaged for this purpose. If anything, the engagement of a solicitor would indicate a professionalisation of the campaign and the rejection of tactics of harassment.

52. Turning to the "aggressive interrogatory tone", the Commissioner notes that EWRC was only able to provide a single example of such correspondence. The Commissioner has reviewed the correspondence carefully and, whilst it is clearly written with an angle (ie. opposition to the project), it is not expressed in tones that are derogatory or offensive. Whilst the tone may have been counter-productive in attempting to maintain a professional relationship, it still falls well within the bounds of the criticism that a public authority should reasonably be expected to bear.

53. Turning to the value of the request, the Commissioner does agree that the value of the requests was reduced substantially by the manner in which they were submitted.

54. Had the requests been made at the outset of the consultation, with plenty of time to allow EWRC to provide the information and to allow any disclosed information to be considered, the Commissioner would have accepted that the information would indeed have been of significant value – as it would have allowed those affected to have better understood the environmental decision that affected them. However in this case, the First request was submitted 21 working days before the consultation was due to close. EWRC would not have been obliged to have responded to the Second and Third requests prior to the consultation closing. Even if EWRC had complied with the first request on the 20th working day, that would have only allowed for a single day for all the identified material to have been reviewed before consultation responses were required.

55. The Commissioner considers that the Solicitor is well aware of the EIR compliance timescales and should have advised the complainant to factor this in to the timing of the requests.

56. However, in respect of the First Request only, the Commissioner does not consider that EWRC has demonstrated that this request was vexatious. This is especially when balanced against the value of the information – which would still be of value after the consultation had ended (albeit less so than whilst the consultation was ongoing).

57. The Commissioner therefore takes the view that the First Request was not manifestly unreasonable.

58. Finally, the Commissioner has noted the overlapping nature of the requests. The First Request was lengthy and broad in the variety of topics covered. Despite this, just ten days later, the complainant sent a further letter to EWRC. Whether this letter was sent for the "primary purpose" of requesting information is not relevant. The fact is that it did seek information: information which, at least in part, appears to overlap with that which the Solicitor had already sought on the complainant's behalf. Furthermore, the MP submitted a third item of correspondence, again requesting information that appears to be covered by the First Request and this appears to have been done at the complainant's behest. This was unnecessary and an abuse of the information rights process.

59. The Commissioner takes the view that the Second and Third requests – to the extent that they sought recorded information – were both manifestly unreasonable, given that they were submitted before EWRC had had chance to respond to the First Request. Therefore EWRC was not obliged to respond to them.

60. The Commissioner has considered the balance of the public interest and the presumption in favour of disclosure.

61. The Commissioner recognises that the Second and Third requests did seek information about a large infrastructure project and there will always be some public interest in disclosure of this kind. However, in the Commissioner's view that public interest is diminished considerably when set in the context of the broad request, for similar information, that had only just been submitted and had yet to be refused.

62. There is a strong public interest in protecting public authorities from having to spend taxpayers' money dealing with repetitive and overlapping requests. In the Commissioner's view this tips the balance strongly in favour of maintaining the exception and the presumption in favour of disclosure does not materially alter that balance.

63. The Commissioner therefore finds that the Second and Third requests engage Regulation 12(4)(b) of the EIR and that the public interest favours maintaining the exception in both cases.

Right of appeal

64. 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: 0203 936 8963
    Fax: 0870 739 5836
    Email: grc@justice.gov.uk
    Website: www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber

65. 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.

66. 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