



Neutral citation number: [\[2025\] UKFTT 00251 \(GRC\)](#)

Case Reference: FT/EA/2024/0143

**First-tier Tribunal
(General Regulatory Chamber)
Information Rights**

**Decided without a hearing
Decision given on: 25 February 2025**

Before

**JUDGE KIAI
TRIBUNAL MEMBER CHAFER
TRIBUNAL MEMBER SAUNDERS**

Between

PETER MARSHALL

Appellant

and

THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Respondent

Decision: The appeal is Allowed

Substituted Decision Notice: No Steps are ordered.

REASONS

Background to the Appeal

1. This appeal is against a decision of the Information Commissioner (the "Commissioner") dated 14th March 2024 (IC-264455-V7C5, the "Decision Notice"). The appeal relates to the application of the Freedom of Information

Act 2000 ("FOIA"). It concerns information requested from Westminster City Council ("the Council"), regarding the decision to merge with other councils and decision to end that agreement.

2. The parties opted for paper determination of the appeal. The Tribunal is satisfied that it can properly determine the issues without a hearing within rule 32(1)(b) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (General Regulatory Chamber) Rules 2009 (as amended).

The Request

3. On 11th August 2023, Mr Marshall wrote to the Council and requested information in the following terms:

"1. When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation to the Council's Gazetteer Custodian;

2. Were there similar arrangements in respect of any other Council departments;

3. When did those arrangements cease; and

4. Please provide all relevant documentation".

The Response

4. On 11th September 2023, the Council responded to the request. It provided some information within the scope of the request (it enclosed a Cabinet Report dated 27th March 2017, titled 'Tri-Borough Shared Services Arrangements') and responded:

'1. When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation to the Council's Gazetteer Custodian;

The Gazetteer post sits within the Architecture and Data team within Digital and Innovation. It was initially a Bi-Borough post with RBKC however as part of the recent IT disaggregation it became a sovereign role.

2. Were there similar arrangements in respect of any other Council departments;

Yes

3. *When did those arrangements cease;*

The IT disaggregation from RBKC happened in a phase approach from Sept 22 – Dec 22’.

5. It further advised that the remaining information was in the public domain and therefore exempt under section 21, it referred Mr Marshall to their website using the following link – <https://committees.westminster.gov.uk/documents/s21912/3%20-%20Tri-Borough%20Review%20of%20Section%20113%20Agreements.pdf>.
6. Mr Marshall replied the same day stating that he had looked at the link provided and noted:

*‘However the document dated 27 March 2017 appears only to relate to the tri-borough arrangement between WCC, LBHF and RBKC regarding **Adult Social Care, Children Services and Public Health Services**’. You will note from my revised request I also asked:*

(a) Were there similar arrangements in respect of any other Council departments;

(b) When did those arrangements cease; and

(c) Please provide all relevant documentation

Your Internal Review has dealt with the Gazetteer Custodian (LLPG) and the points mentioned in the third paragraph above. It has not answered questions at (a) to (c) above which were clearly contained in the revised FoI dated 11 August 2023 which for ease of reference is attached’.

7. The Council upheld its position on internal review (dated 11th October 2023). It maintained that the information requested by way of questions (a) and (b) in the email of 11th September 2023 was available on the Council’s website (providing 2 further links) and was therefore exempt by virtue of section 21. It further asserted that this partly addressed the question referred to as (c) for documentation. However, the request for “**all relevant documentation**” would encompass a large amount of information across the council. As a result, and in line with section 12, locating, retrieving and extracting such documents would exceed the appropriate limit of 18 hours.
8. Mr Marshall replied on the same day, explaining that he had studied the information provided in the two links provided ‘*However, neither give any*

information as regards your legal department. Therefore your Internal Review is vague and incomplete. It does not answered [sic] my revised request specifically referred to in your IR'.

9. On 22nd November 2023 Mr Marshall wrote to the Council in the following terms:

'Dear Sirs

Thank you for your response.

Can you explain why you have not acted on my revised FoI insofar as it relates to your legal department?

That is entirely a matter for your team in the first instance".

10. Mr Marshall referred the matter to the Information Commissioner. In particular on 16th October 2023, he highlighted that *'WCC's legal department is still shared. This has not been disclosed either in the response to my FOI or by the Internal Review'.*

11. During the course of the Commissioner's investigation, the Council added that it was also seeking to rely on section 14 for question 4 of the request as it imposed a grossly oppressive burden on the Council (in its letter dated 7th February 2024). *If one part of a request triggers section 14 then it will cover the entirety of the request.*

12. The Council advised the Commissioner that the request imposed a disproportionate burden on staff and would divert resources across several teams within a number of departments. To comply with the request would lead to the Council being distracted from the provision of its services. It further asserted:

- Mr Marshall has made 23 requests for information within 15 months, along with numerous follow up emails;
- Most of the requests made by the complainant relate to the decision to renumber/name Cottesloe House/Jerome Crescent;
- 2 of the requests relate to Gazetteer custodian role, which participated in the naming/numbering process. This request falls into the latter category;
- To provide the complainant with "all relevant documentation" that relates to merging or collaborative arrangements between Royal

Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in respect of the Gazetteer Custodian, similar arrangements with other council departments, and the ceasing of those arrangements, would impose a significant burden on the Council and its staff;

- For the Council to locate information regarding “similar arrangements” it would be required to look through a period of 13 years’ worth of activities;
- The Council entered into a Tri-Borough Shared Service arrangement with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Hammersmith in 2010. This arrangement ceased in 2017/8 following a withdrawal from the London Borough of Hammersmith. The remaining 2 Councils continued a Bi-Borough shared service agreement, until 2022 when the IT shared service agreement ended and the IT function disaggregated and reverted to sovereign boroughs;
- As the request asked for “all relevant documentation”, this could amount to a vast range of information. It provided the following examples of information which would likely be retrieved and require reviewing: legal documents, Governance documents (such as briefing papers for decision makers), restructure information for several departments, structure charts/operating models (current and proposed), job descriptions and evaluations, consultation documents (reports and responses) and process mapping, including off-boarding and on-boarding for affected services;
- Whilst specific information may be held by the Council’s Legal and HR departments, officers from each department could potentially hold documentation relating to restructures and/or service delivery. This would require a large number of officers from each service area to undertake searches for any information within the scope of the request.
- It would be required to locate all the relevant Council structures dating back to 2010 in order to identify how many teams were affected by the former structures back in 2010;
- Documentation would not be held in 1 database, rather it would comprise of documents, meeting notes, emails and other items, which would be held across the council’s network;

- Due to the age of some of the requested information, relevant officers who would know the best search terms to use are no longer employed by the Council and are unavailable to consult with;
- Even if it did undertake the proposed work, any information located would need to be reviewed and some would be exempt from disclosure:
 - o Any legal documents would be exempt under sections 41 and 42;
 - o Some of the requested information may include commercial interests and therefore be exempt under section 43;
 - o Some information may contain personal information which would be exempt under section 40;
- 1 officer in 1 of the affected departments conducted a sampling exercise and it took 3 hours to locate information relating to the 2022 IT disaggregation only. This search located 30 emails and 122 files relating to IT restructure;
- There were 7 teams who would need to undertake searches for the requested information and further information may be stored elsewhere by the Council.

13. On 25th January 2024, the ICO requested further clarification:

'You advised that only one member of staff within the IT conducted a search for the requested information, which took up to 3 hours. Can you provide more information regarding why it took 3 hours.'

How long did the search take using "ITCED" take, were the 30 emails and 122 documents to share point reviewed for any exemptions? Is this why the search took 3 hours or did it take 3 hours to just locate all this information?

"Search of emails under known term (transition), filtered by manager at that time located 6 emails in relation to the arrangements of that team to cover the workload during disaggregation of a shred service."

- *How long did this search by the IT officer/manager take, or were these emails reviewed?*

Can you confirm whether these 6 emails are also a part of the 3 hours mentioned previously?

You explained that there are 7 teams who would need to undertake searches, can you advise how many members of staff are in each team and perhaps ask an additional member of staff to also conduct a sampling exercise so we can form an average per staff member?''.

14. It does not seem an answer was received to these queries.

15. On 19th February 2024 (following correspondence not set out here), the ICO wrote to Mr Marshall and advised him that they were likely to support the Council's application of section 14 and therefore were writing to him to see if he would be willing to refine his request. They explained that Mr Marshall's email dated 22nd September 2023 (asking the Council why it had not acted on his revised FoI insofar as it relates to the legal department) would not be considered a valid request under FOIA as it was asking for an explanation rather than recorded information. The ICO advised Mr Marshall to make a new request for information if he was interested in specific information regarding the legal department only. The ICO reiterated that the request dated 11th August 2023 was very broad. The ICO asked if Mr Marshall would be happy to refine his request further as this may support a more targeted response.

16. Mr Marshall replied the same day stating:

*'...I asked quite clearly on 11 August 2023: **Were there similar arrangements in respect of any other Council departments.***

*On 11 September 2023 the Council responded saying there was collaboration in the areas of **Adult Social Care, Children Services and Public Health Services** thereby implying no other departments/services were involved in bi or tri-borough collaboration.*

That was clearly wrong and misleading.

In those circumstances the Council has not complied with my request.

If I were to take your advice and serve a fresh request it would probably be refused on the same grounds'.

17. Following correspondence with the ICO, the Council emailed Mr Marshall on 29th February 2024 with further links from the Council's website, which they state addressed Mr Marshall's request for the Council to confirm which Council departments have a similar arrangement with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (this referred to Adult Social Care and Public Health, Children's Services, Legal Services, Insurance and Risk, Joining Libraries).

18. Mr Marshall replied the same day asking why the Council had chosen not to disclose legal services when replying to his original FoI request and why they had sought to avoid lawful disclosure by deliberately and falsely asserting exemption on the grounds of vexation.

19. The ICO asked Mr Marshall if he was now satisfied for the ICO to close the case as the relevant links to the information in the public domain had now been provided.

20. On 1st March 2024, Mr Marshall asked the ICO to share with him the correspondence with WCC that achieved 'the very much belated disclosure'. The ICO stated that the request had been referred to the information access team. However, they needed to know by 8th March if Mr Marshall wanted the matter closed or wanted a decision notice, they could not wait until a response had been received

21. As a result (on 1st March 2024) Mr Marshall requested a Decision Notice. He requested that any decision notice needed to set out the council's failings, referring to the fact that the Council had taken more than 7 months to provide the 'required information' and disclosure had only taken place after the ICO's intervention.

22. On 3rd March 2024, Mr Marshall emailed the ICO stating:

'I have checked the link provided by WCC and note this was updated on 27 February 2024...please ascertain the nature to that update'

23. In a further email the next day, Mr Marshall added:

'The Council have never referred me to that page previously. Why?

Because of the way the Council has acted so far it makes me suspicious about the update which took [sic] only a matter of days ago (27 February 2024).

As such I feel those details should be disclosed'.

24. Further to Mr Marshall's concerns, the ICO contacted the Council to make enquires about Mr Marshall's concerns. The Council replied on 6th March (addressed below).

The Decision Notice (Dated 14th March 2024)

25. The Commissioner considered that the scope of his investigation is to determine whether the Council was entitled to rely on section 14 to refuse the

request. He sets out that in his view, the key question for public authorities to consider when determining if a request is vexatious is whether the value and purpose of the request justifies the distress, disruption or irritation that would be incurred by complying with it. He concludes:

'29. The Commissioner acknowledges that a search requiring the Council to review over 13 years' worth of information would impose a significant burden on the Council to review over 13 years' worth of information would impose a significant burden on the Council. The Council demonstrated that it took just one member of staff over three hours to locate information within scope of a very small element of the request and in order to comply with the request, in total, it would need staff from multiple departments to be consulted and to determine whether they hold any information within the scope of the request.

30. When considering a burdensome request, the Commissioner is required to consider both the burden involved and the public value of the information being requested. The Commissioner considers that in the circumstances of this case and the request in question, there is a genuine motive from the complainant in trying to access this information and a genuine public interest in disclosure of the requested information. This is because it relates to the decision to merge Council responsibilities and the decision to end of such agreements. The Commissioner recognises that these decisions would have had an impact on the residents within the areas in question.

31. However, having reviewed the Council's submissions the Commissioner does not consider that the public value in the requested information would be significant enough to override the large amount of work the Council would be required to undertake. The request is extremely broad in scope and the Council would be required to spend significant time searching for and collating information. The necessity of having to carry out redactions for elements of the information which are exempt under various sections of FOIA would also represent an extremely large burden in terms of time. The Council has therefore demonstrated to the Commissioner that compliance would cause a grossly oppressive burden and the request is exempt under section 14(1) of FOIA. As the request is exempt under section 14, the Commissioner has not gone on to consider section 21".

Changes to the Council's website

26. On 6th March 2024, the Council wrote to the ICO, in order to respond to the query, about what changes had been made to the website on 27th February. The Council clarified that *'the only change made on the 27th was to Parveen's title,*

so from "Parveen Akhtar, Executive Director of Democracy, Law and People" to "... Director of Corporate Services".

27. Mr Marshall emailed the ICO on the same day asking if the ICO was able to advise on the nature of the 27th February 2024 update of the Council's web page. It does not seem from the documents before the Tribunal that he ever received a reply to his query, other than being told that it would be covered in the Decision Notice.

Legal Services

28. Further correspondence was exchanged. On 6th March 2024, Mr Marshall emailed the ICO stating *"you will appreciate that the Council has still not provided any of the information requested in the FoI as regards the collaborative arrangements relating to Legal Service ie when and by what power was the collaborative arrangement entered into"*. In a separate email, Mr Marshall reiterated:

'I accept WCC eventually sent the link you mention on 29 February 2024, but until then it had not even disclosed Legal Services was ever part of a joint collaborative arrangement with RBKC.

Additionally it still has not answered the question:

"When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation [to Legal Services]"

Which was implicit in the request 2 that followed in the revised FoI of 11 August 2023".

29. Various emails were exchanged and on 13th March 2024, the ICO replied in the following terms:

'...unfortunately you did not specifically request this information and I therefore cannot consider this in my investigation.

We must take the reasonable persons reading of the request, all 4 questions are set out separately and you have not asked for information regarding:

When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in

relation to the Council's Gazetteer Custodian; and other similar arrangements such as legal services.

You would be required to make a new request for information for this information'

Notice of Appeal

30. Mr Marshall appealed on the basis that:

- The decision is wrong because it is contrary to the facts;
- The Third party took 7 months to disclose there was a collaborative arrangement with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation to its Legal Department;
- That disclosure only came about because of intervention by the ICO following Mr Marshall's complaint;
- To subsequently produce the decision on 14th March 2024 was inappropriate in the circumstances and should be set aside;
- Mr Marshall requested the ICO to produce their correspondence with the third party but they refused. Mr Marshall believes that correspondence is essential for the purpose of the appeal.

31. The Commissioner submitted a response and Mr Marshall submitted a reply to that response.

Issues and Evidence

32. The issue in this case is whether the Council were entitled to rely on section 14(1) FOIA to refuse to respond to the remainder of the Request.

33. By way of evidence and submissions we had the following, all of which we have taken into account in making our decision:

- a. An Open Hearing Bundle;
- b. The Respondent's Response;
- c. The Appellant's reply to the Response by the First Respondent to the Notice of Appeal.

Legal Framework

34. The relevant provisions of FOIA are as follows:

1. General right of access to information held by public authorities.

- (1) Any person making a request for information to a public authority is entitled—
 - (a) to be informed in writing by the public authority whether it holds information of the description specified in the request, and
 - (b) if that is the case, to have that information communicated to him.

14 Vexatious or repeated requests.

- (1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.
- (2) Where a public authority has previously complied with a request for information which was made by any person, it is not obliged to comply with a subsequent identical or substantially similar request from that person unless a reasonable interval has elapsed between compliance with the previous request and the making of the current request.

17 Refusal of request.

- (5) A public authority which, in relation to any request for information, is relying on a claim that section 12 or 14 applies must, within the time for complying with section 1(1), give the applicant a notice stating that fact.
- (6) Subsection (5) does not apply where—
 - (a) the public authority is relying on a claim that section 14 applies,

- (b) the authority has given the applicant a notice, in relation to a previous request for information, stating that it is relying on such a claim, and
- (c) it would in all the circumstances be unreasonable to expect the authority to serve a further notice under subsection (5) in relation to the current request.

35. There is no further guidance on the meaning of “vexatious” in the legislation. The leading guidance is contained in the Upper Tribunal (“UT”) decision in **Information Commissioner v Dransfield [2012] UKUT 440 (AAC)**, as upheld and clarified in the Court of Appeal (“CA”) in **Dransfield v Information Commissioner and another & Craven v Information Commissioner and another [2015] EWCA Civ 454 (CA)**.

36. As noted by Arden LJ in her judgment in the CA in Dransfield, the hurdle of showing a request is vexatious is a high one: *“...the starting point is that vexatiousness primarily involves making a request which has no reasonable foundation, that is, no reasonable foundation for thinking that the information sought would be of value to the requester, or to the public or any section of the public. Parliament has chosen a strong word which therefore means that the hurdle of satisfying it is a high one, and that is consistent with the constitutional nature of the right. The decision maker should consider all the relevant circumstances in order to reach a balanced conclusion as to whether a request is vexatious.”* (para 68).

37. Judge Wikeley’s decision in the UT Dransfield sets out more detailed guidance that was not challenged in the CA. The ultimate question is, “is the request vexatious in the sense of being a manifestly unjustified, inappropriate or improper use of FOIA?” (para 43). It is important to adopt a “holistic and broad” approach, emphasising “manifest unreasonableness, irresponsibility and, especially where there is a previous course of dealings, the lack of proportionality that typically characterise vexatious requests.” (para 45). Arden LJ in the CA also emphasised that a “rounded approach” is required (para 69), and all evidence which may shed light on whether a request is vexatious should be considered.

38. The UT set out four non-exhaustive broad issues which can be helpful in assessing whether a request is vexatious:

- a. **The burden imposed on the public authority by the request.** This may be inextricably linked with the previous course of dealings between the

parties. "...the context and history of the previous request, in terms of the previous course of dealings between the individual requester and the public authority in question, must be considered in assessing whether it is properly to be characterised as vexatious. In particular, the number, breadth, pattern and duration of previous requests may be a telling factor." (para 29).

b. The motive of the requester. Although FOIA is motive-blind, "what may seem like an entirely reasonable and benign request may be found to be vexatious in the wider context of the course of dealings between the individual and the relevant public authority." (para 34).

c. The value or serious purpose. Lack of objective value cannot provide a basis for refusal on its own, but is part of the balancing exercise – "does the request have a value or serious purpose in terms of the objective public interest in the information sought?" (para 38).

d. Any harassment of, or distress caused to, the public authority's staff. This is not necessary in order for a request to be vexatious, but "vexatiousness may be evidenced by obsessive conduct that harasses or distresses staff, uses intemperate language, makes wide-ranging and unsubstantiated allegations of criminal behaviour or is in any other respects extremely offensive." (para 39). 23. Overall, the purpose of section 14 is to "protect the resources (in the broadest sense of that word) of the public authority from being squandered on disproportionate use of FOIA" (UT para 10), subject always to the high standard of vexatiousness being met.

The role of the tribunal

39. The tribunal's remit is governed by section 58 FOIA. This requires the tribunal to consider whether the decision made by the Commissioner is in accordance with the law or, where the Commissioner's decision involved exercising discretion, whether he should have exercised it differently. The tribunal may receive evidence that was not before the Commissioner and may make different findings of fact from the Commissioner.

Discussion and Conclusions

40. In accordance with section 58 of FOIA, our role is to consider whether the Commissioner's Decision Notice was in accordance with the law. As set out in section 58(2), we may review any finding of fact on which the notice in question was based. This means that we can review all of the evidence provided to us and make our own decision.
41. The Tribunal has considered the suggested list of factors set out in the ***Dransfield*** case and the overall circumstances of the case.
42. **The burden imposed on the public authority by the request.** This is a key factor relied upon by the Council. We note at this juncture that it would have been helpful if the Council had replied to the ICO's email dated 25th January 2024 (requesting further clarification in relation to the sample provided). Whilst the Tribunal accepts that there were various requests and repeated emails to the Council - particularly an ongoing pattern of requests about matters arising, we accept the Appellant's evidence that had the information not been provided in such a piecemeal manner the Appellant would not have been required to submit various re-worded requests over a period of time. The Council failed in their duty under section 16 to provide advice and assistance to someone making an information request - including helping an applicant refine a request so that it can be answered within the appropriate costs limit. Had the links which were sent on 29th February 2024 been sent to the Appellant at the outset (in August 2023), we find he would not have sent the various and repeated requests and emails and would indeed have refined his request appropriately. Indeed, once he received these links, the Appellant was satisfied that his concerns had been addressed (other than relating to the legal department - which is addressed further below). He explicitly stated in his email dated 1st March that it had taken the Council more than 7 months to provide '*the required information*'. Indeed, it is clear from the correspondence that the only reason he asked for a Decision Notice was because he wanted the council's failings to be set out and addressed, in the context where he had been told his claim was vexatious.
43. **The motive of the requestor.** There is nothing to suggest the Appellant has an inappropriate motive. We have read the history as set out in his reply to the Response by the First Respondent to the Notice of Appeal dated 28/05/2024. We considered the request in the wider context of dealings between Mr Marshall and the public authority set out therein, but conclude the request was not vexatious.
44. **Value or serious purpose.** The Tribunal conclude that there was a value or serious purpose in terms of the objective public interest in the information sought. Indeed the Commissioner accepted in the decision notice at paragraph

30 that *"in the circumstances of this case and the request in question, there is a genuine motive from the complainant in trying to access this information and a genuine public interest in disclosure of the requested information. This is because it relates to the decision to merge Council responsibilities and the decision to end such agreements. The Commissioner recognises that these decisions would have had an impact on the residents within the areas in question"*.

45. Any harassment of, or distress caused to, the public authority's staff.

There is nothing to suggest (and there has been no allegation to the contrary) that the appellant has behaved inappropriately towards Council staff.

46. The overall circumstances of the case. As set out in the *Dransfield* test, the Tribunal is to take a rounded and holistic approach when considering whether the IC was correct in finding that the Council was entitled to rely on section 14 of FOIA.

47. The hurdle of showing that a request is vexatious is a high one. We do not find that the burden has been discharged. As set out above, this was not a request that had no reasonable foundation or was of no value. It was neither an unjustified, inappropriate nor an improper use of FOIA.

48. As the UT has explained, the purpose of section 14 is to "protect the resources (in the broadest sense of that word) of the public authority from being squandered on disproportionate use of FOIA", subject always to the high standard of vexatiousness being met. If the Council had sent the links that were sent in February 2025 to the Appellant from the outset and assisted him, as required under Section 16, we conclude that the public authority's resources would have been 'protected' and the Appellant would have been satisfied – subject to the issue of the Legal Department which we address now. Taking all of the above matters into account, we find that the Request is not vexatious within the meaning of section 14(1) FOIA. The request did not place an unreasonable burden.

49. By way of concluding remarks, the Tribunal notes that on 6th March 2024, Mr Marshall emailed the ICO stating *"you will appreciate that the Council has still not provided any of the information requested in the FoI as regards the collaborative arrangements relating to Legal Service ie when and by what power was the collaborative arrangement entered into"*. In a separate email, Mr Marshall reiterated:

'Additionally it [the Council] still has not answered the question:

“When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation [to Legal Services]”

Which was implicit in the request 2 that followed in the revised FoI of 11 August 2023”.

50. On 13th March 2024, the ICO replied in the following terms:

‘...unfortunately you did not specifically request this information and I therefore cannot consider this in my investigation.

We must take the reasonable persons reading of the request, all 4 questions are set out separately and you have not asked for information regarding:

When and by what power was there a merging or collaborative arrangement between the Council and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in relation to the Council's Gazetteer Custodian; and other similar arrangements such as legal services.

You would be required to make a new request for information for this information’

51. The Tribunal agree entirely with the Commissioners conclusions here. The information being requested at this stage, did not form part of the original request and therefore falls outside of the remit of this tribunal. We have no jurisdiction to consider them. The Appellant would be required to make a new request in order to obtain such information.

52. As one final note, the Tribunal note Mr Marshall's deep concerns about the changes to the Council's website on 27th February 2024. It does not seem that the specifics of what was changed were ever communicated to him (either before or in the Decision Notice). This is regrettable. Mr Marshall made it clear in his emails that he was concerned about this issue. Had it been explained to him that the only change had been to the title of one of the individuals, this may have helped to put his mind at ease somewhat.

53. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed. The Tribunal does not find that section 14 applied in the circumstances. However, no further steps are ordered. The Appellant did receive the information that he requested. The Tribunal appreciate that Mr Marshall wishes further disclosure to be made in relation to the Legal Services, however we find that this did not form part of the original application, and therefore a further application will need to be made if Mr Marshall wishes to pursue this.

Signed

Judge Kiai

Date:

21st February 2025