Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)

Decision notice

Date: **14 September 2020**

Public Authority: **Central Bedfordshire Council**
Address: **Priory House,**
Monks Walk
Chicksands
Shefford
Bedfordshire
SG17 5TQ

Decision (including any steps ordered)

1. The complainant has requested information relating to a payment made to a company and the information associated with that work. The council provided some information however it refused to provide other information on the basis that the exception in Regulation 12(4)(d) applies. On review it upheld its decision.

2. The Commissioner's decision is that council was not correct to apply Regulation 12(4)(d) to withhold a copy of a draft report, however, it was correct to apply it to withhold correspondence and information associated with the report. She has also decided that the council did not comply with the requirements of Regulations 14(2) and 14(4).

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

    - to disclose a copy of the final draft report to the complainants.

4. The public authority 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

5. On 4 April 2019 the complainant wrote to the council and requested information in the following terms:

"In accordance with the Act, we request the following:

1.. Please provide electronic copies of all written documentation (i.e. reports, appraisals, written advice, and email communication between officers and the consultant, G L Hearn Ltd.) that relate to consultancy services provided by G L Hearn to Central Bedfordshire Council, to include all draft versions of written documentation submitted to the Council as well as the final version of any written reports.

2. Please provide a copy of the Purchase Order (which we assume is reference 142715) for the consultancy works stating the amount of money this work was originally intended to cost. Was the amount finally paid (i.e. £24,800) the same as the amount for which the work was originally tendered, as detailed in the Purchase Order?

3. Please provide a copy of the two G L Hearn Ltd. invoices which relate to the payments made at line 3138 and line 3165 of the February published data (i.e. CBC financial transactions).

4. Please advise whether the consultancy services provided by G L Hearn Ltd. are complete or partially complete at this time (3'd April 2019)? Were the invoices paid in February in full and final settlement of the work detailed within the Purchase Order?

5. Please confirm that the G L Hearn Ltd. consultancy services does relate to the Forward Plan item (Housing Enabling Strategy).

6. Please advise whether further work is being or has been commissioned that relates to the consultancy services undertaken by G L Hearn Ltd. or to the Housing Enabling Strategy. If additional work has been commissioned, whether with G L Hearn Ltd. or an alternative supplier, please provide a copy of the Purchase Order for that work and state the name of the company that has been procured.

7. Please state whether other consultancy services were provided, or are being provided, by other companies that is related to the Housing Enabling Strategy."

6. The council responded on 2 September 2019 and refused the request on the basis that Regulation 12(4)(d) applied (material still in course of completion, unfinished documents, or incomplete data).

7. The complainant's requested that the council carry out a review of its decision on 18 November 2019. The request included a number of further questions.

8. Following an internal review, the council wrote to the complainants on 8 January 2020. It addressed the various points made by the complainants in their request for review, however, it also refused to respond to some parts of the request on the basis that the requests were framed as questions rather than specific requests for information.

9. On the 8th January 2020 the complainants wrote again to the council again stating that they had asked for an internal review to be conducted and that it had not carried this out.

10. An internal review was carried out and a response was provided on 28 February 2020 providing information and answering the questions falling within parts 2 to 7 of the request. The council however upheld its decision that the draft report and some associated correspondence falls under the exception in Regulation 12(4)(d) to withhold the information from disclosure.

Scope of the case

11. The complainants contacted the Commissioner on 15 January 2020 to complain about the way their request for information had been handled.

12. They consider that the information does not fall to be considered under the Regulations. They consider that the information should fall to be considered under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. They also consider that the council is not correct to state that some of their requests were questions and not requests for recorded information, and therefore argue that the requests should have been considered. They also dispute the council's position that the information is subject to Regulation 12(4)(d).

13. The Commissioner wrote to the council on 29 April 2020. She informed it that where recorded information is held which can respond to a question, then the council would need to consider that information for

disclosure under the Regulations or the Act. She therefore asked the council to reconsider its response to the request and to inform her of the outcome of its reconsideration.

14. The council responded to the Commissioner providing a copy of the information it holds and clarifying that it had responded to the questions asked of it in its review dated 28 February 2020 (which had not been provided to the Commissioner previously).

15. It confirmed its view that it considers the withheld information is exempt under Regulation 12(4)(d). The Commissioner therefore considers that the complaint is whether the council was correct to apply Regulation 12(4)(d) to withhold the information. She will also consider the time which the council took to issue its response to the request.

Reasons for decision

Is the information environmental information?

16. The complainant's dispute the council's decision that the information is environmental information for the purposes of the EIR.

17. Regulation 2(1) provides that:

"environmental information" has the same meaning as in Article 2(1) of the Directive, namely any information in written, visual, aural, electronic or any other material form 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) and (b) 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 elements of the environment referred to in (b) and (c);"

18. The withheld information includes a report, correspondence and other information surrounding an analysis of housing need in Central Bedfordshire and advice on the best strategy for delivering this need. The withheld information also includes a number of drafts of the draft report, together with associated correspondence surrounding the drafts.

19. The council argues that the information is information which *'broadly relates to the development of a local area, which can be understood to affect the state of various elements'*. The council therefore considers that the request should be dealt with under the EIR.

20. In effect, the information provides background information on the analysis of housing needs in the county and examines and suggests ways forward to deliver this.

21. The development of new housing will affect the factors of the environment set out in Regulation 2(1)(a) of the EIR. The Commissioner therefore considers that the information falls within the scope of Regulation 2(1)(c) in that it is information on a plan or a measure which is likely to affect the factors listed in Regulation 2(1)(a).

22. The Commissioner therefore considers that the council was correct to consider that the information is environmental information and to consider the request under the provisions of the EIR.

Regulation 12(4)(d)

23. The council continued to withhold the draft report and the correspondence relating to this under Regulation 12(4)(d). The withheld report is essentially an analysis of future housing need within the area, together with an analysis of the various options for funding and delivering this. The withheld correspondence relates to the drafting of this report.

24. Regulation 12(4)(d) of EIR provides that a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that the request relates to material that is still in the course of completion, unfinished documents or incomplete data.

- Material which is still in the course of completion. This can include information created as part of the process of formulating and developing policy where the process is not complete.
- Draft documents are unfinished even if the final version has been produced.
- Data that is being used or relied on at the time of the request is not incomplete, even if it may be modified later.

25. The aims of the exception are:

- to protect work a public authority may have in progress by delaying disclosure until a final or completed version can be made available.
- This allows it to finish ongoing work without interruption and interference from outside; and
- to provide some protection from having to spend time and resources explaining or justifying ideas that are not and may never be, final.

The complainants' arguments

26. The complainants argue that the report, although not signed off, is being used by the council for its purposes, and therefore the information is not 'unfinished' or incomplete. They therefore argue that the report should not fall within the scope of the exception. They included examples of council statements which seemingly rely upon sections of the report from within council minutes and other documents which demonstrate their point.

The council's arguments

27. The council argues that the report and the surrounding correspondence remain unfinished material. They argue that the report was considered by the relevant committee and at that time it chose to take a different way forward, discontinuing work on the report at that point.

28. In its review response of 28 February 2020, the council responded by explaining the process which had occurred with the report, and what it had done afterwards. It said that:

"The invoice was paid in February 2019 as it was considered that the consultancy had completed its work to the brief that had been set. However, officers were considering whether the report fulfilled its purpose and whether further work might be required to ensure it did.

Because of urgent work deadlines on the local plan, the entire team were then taken off this work from April 2019 until present.

Since this time, officers have taken stock of what is required to fulfil the role of the HES and reflected on the fact that producing a rigid strategy, at one particular point in time, is not necessarily the best way of doing this, bearing in mind the changing nature of the data being analysed. Therefore, work on this report will not continue."

29. It argues therefore that as the report was never signed off, it was never finished. Further, it argues as the wider project of establishing and meeting new housing need was under reconsideration at the time that the request was received, the information falls within the scope of unfinished material as the wider project remained ongoing. Therefore, it argues that Regulation 12(4)(d) applies as the wider project regarding housing need continues.

30. It considers that the information was never finalised in the sense that it was never signed off (i.e., accepted or agreed). It also argues that the associated information also falls within the scope of the request, including earlier drafts of the report, together with associated correspondence and some notes from team meetings/briefings.

31. The council said that the final draft of the report would normally have been signed off by the council's executive committee via the formal governance structures. However, the only official decision of the council in relation to the report, via the housing delivery board, was to discontinue it with immediate effect. It therefore argues that as the document has not formally been agreed through the normal procedures, the document remains in draft, and the council has no current intention to complete it. The wider project however remained ongoing.

The Commissioner's analysis

32. A document may be unfinished because the authority is still working on it at the time of the request or because work on it ceased before it was finalised and there is no intention to finalise it. Furthermore, draft documents will engage the exception because a draft of a document is by its nature an unfinished form of that document. A draft version of a document is still an unfinished document, even if the final version of the document has been published.

33. The report was provided to the Commissioner to consider, she notes that it states that it is a 'final draft copy'. The Commissioner is satisfied that the document retained its 'draft' status in that it was never 'signed off' by the council. It was not taken forward from the point that the relevant council committee considered it. This being said, the Commissioner recognises that the document was in its final form. The council considered and accepted that the GL Hearn had met its brief in producing the report, and it confirmed to the complainants that it had paid GL Hearn for the report. The document was a planned way forward, but the council's executive committee decided not to take this approach forward, albeit that the complainant's argue that some elements of the report may subsequently have been relied upon during their reconsideration of the way forward.

34. It is possible that some details of the report would be referred to by the council without changing the fact that the overall report, and the analysis and suggestions it makes are not intended to be taken forward by the council. This does not prevent the report being a 'draft' or unfinished report for the purposes of the exception. In essence, repurposing some of the information which was provided in the report does not automatically mean that the entire report has been, or will be accepted, agreed or relied upon by the council in its future planning. It does not therefore preclude the exception being applicable to the entire report.

35. There is, however, also an argument that the report, though an important part of an evidence base for an evolving process, is a finished snapshot of the situation at the time, albeit one that was not given final sign-off by the council's cabinet.

36. Issues similar to this case were considered by Upper-tier Tribunal (Information Rights)[1] in the case of *Highways England Company Ltd v the Information Commissioner and Manisty (GIA/1589/20180)*, where the Tribunal found that the exception could apply where the requested information relates to material which is itself 'in the course of completion'. In recognising this, the Tribunal emphasised that any relevant incomplete project or larger piece of work must in itself be 'material'.

---

1 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5c7fad1640f0b6332c6c6851/GIA_1589_2018-01.pdf

37. The Tribunal concluded that, while the exception may still apply where the requested information *relates to* material in the course of completion, the EIR require a judgement to be made. This judgement involves consideration of whether the requested information can be considered to be separate from any continuing work. The judge summarised that *'It is not engaged when a piece of work may fairly be said to be complete in itself.".*

38. In this case, the Report was completed by GL Hearn and submitted for approval by the councils executive committee. It was discontinued at that point. In the Commissioner's view this can be considered discretely and separately from any further work that may occur in the future from the report analysis. The council itself said that the work on the report was complete in that it was not going to be worked on further, although it continues to take forward its wider aim in establishing the need for, and delivering future housing requirements.

39. In reaching this view, the Commissioner is also mindful of her guidance on the exception where she finds that *"the fact that a public authority has not completed a particular project or other piece of work does not necessarily mean that all the information the authority holds relating to it is automatically covered by the exception."*

40. She is therefore satisfied in this case that the Report should not be considered more widely as *'material in the course of completion'* and that it does not fall within the scope of the first limb of this exception.

41. With regard to the third limb (incomplete data), there has been no suggestion by the council that the work was incomplete in itself. The Commissioner has not therefore considered this limb of the exception further in this decision notice.

The Commissioner's conclusions

42. The Commissioner considers that the report falls within the scope of the exception as an 'unfinished document' on the basis that work on it ceased before it was finalised and there is no intention to finalise it. It is a draft report which has never been given final formal approval by the council, nor has it been accepted as forming part of the council's ongoing policy. For this reason, having considered the council's submissions together with the withheld information, the Commissioner is satisfied that Regulation 12(4)(d) is engaged.

43. As regards the associated discussions and correspondence, the Commissioner considers that the council is correct in identifying that as it relates to the draft report it also falls within the scope of the exception in Regulation 12(4)(d). She also notes, however, that the

correspondence broadly surrounds the creation of the report and contains earlier drafts of the report, as well as discussions surrounding this. She therefore considers that this information falls within the scope of the exception in its own right.

Public Interest Test

44. As with the other exceptions in the EIR, when regulation 12(4)(d) is engaged, the public authority must still carry out the public interest test in order to decide whether the information should be withheld.

45. Under Regulation 12(1)(b), the public authority can only withhold the information if, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exception outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

46. Furthermore, under Regulation 12(2), it must apply a presumption in favour of disclosure.

Public interest in disclosing the information

47. The complainants argue that there is a strong public interest in the information being disclosed. They argue that the council has used parts of the report in submission for the local plan, but that it may not have identified where this information was used to support its plan. They argue therefore that the information cannot be considered to still be draft.

48. They also argue that there is a wider public interest in the council being transparent about the report given the importance of the council's wider development plans in the county. In their request for review they argued that:

> "*Our client believes there are a number of other relevant factors in support of disclosure, being:*
>
> *- the focus on transparency;*
> *- accountability for spending public money; and*
> *- the suspicion of wrongdoing."*

49. The Commissioner recognises that the development plans, if they went ahead, would obviously create a major affect on the environment, the infrastructure in the area, development opportunities and the general circumstances in which people live. It can affect people's enjoyment of their properties and the nature of their communities to a large degree.

50. The need for social and affordable housing is also a major point of interest within communities. As the council has changed its plans since the draft report was submitted there is a clear public interest in allowing the public to understand what information the council had in front of it when deciding to take a different approach, and what affect that different approach will have on the county as a whole compared to that which the report recommended. For instance, if the draft report had initially suggested either more, or less, social housing would be required, there is a strong public interest in understanding that to be the case, and in asking the council to explain why it has moved away from the recommendations.

51. The report contains an analysis of the best way forward to deliver the housing needs in the area. There is a public interest in the public being able to understand the potential methods of financing, managing, and delivering the options which were under consideration at that time. There is also a clear public interest in knowing the estimated costs to the council of the plan as it stood, as compared to the costs and methods used to finance this of the plans which the council ultimately delivers.

52. There is also an argument that evidence informing the local plan submission requires significant transparency in order to ensure that the local plan is based upon an informed position, and is backed by a solid, fact based, evidence base.

53. There is also a public interest in disclosing the report in that public funds were used to hire GL Hearn to produce it, but it was then discontinued with, apparently no direct further action taken as a result of it. A disclosure would allow the public to better understand why public money was spent on a report which, ultimately, was not considered an appropriate way forward by the council.

Public interest in maintaining the exception

54. The Commissioner acknowledges that the sensitivity of information falling within the scope of this exception will generally be relative to the timing of the request and the stage that a relevant decision-making process has reached. In this case the report was complete and ready for the council to sign off. It is dated February 2019. The council's argument is that the project was not taken forward as it decided it should not use information from a static period of time when it came to analysing the requirements of various areas. It says the document will remain in draft form as it is taking forward a new, different approach.

55. The council argues that:

> *"Release of this work at this point may mislead the public and oblige the Council to explain or justify where or why elements of this report vary from our own methodologies and how the data is no longer current. This will divert considerable resources as the issues the report discusses have engendered much speculation. The public interest in maintaining the Councils focus on the delivery of the service, the effective conduct of public affairs and protecting the thinking space of the Council in particular where a document is draft, is not final, and has not been formalised through our governance structure, tips the weighting in favour of maintaining the exception and outweighs that of the disclosure"*.

Balance of the public interest

56. In determining where the balance of the public interest lies, the Commissioner has given due weighting to the general presumption in favour of disclosure and the specific public interest in transparency and accountability in relation to decisions having a significant community impact.

57. With regard to the council's argument that a safe space is needed to develop its approach to the Local Plan, the Commissioner acknowledges that the wider process of establishing and delivering future housing need is ongoing, and that a disclosure of the information could provide a distraction which would invade the thinking space and inhibit the council's ability to carry out this work. This is the very activity which the exception is formulated to protect.

58. The council's local plan was initially submitted for approval in 2018, however following its examination further evidence was required from it, and this was not submitted until 15 May 2020[2], after the request for information had been received.

59. Paragraph 8 of the Commissioner's guidance on the application of Regulation 12(4)(d) refers the original proposal for the Directive on public access to environmental information, which the EIR implement. The proposal explained the rationale for both this exception and the exception for internal communications:

[2] https://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/info/45/planning_policy/468/local_plan_-_overview/15

"It should also be acknowledged that public authorities should have the necessary space to think in private. To this end, public authorities will be entitled to refuse access if the request concerns material in the course of completion or internal communications. In each such case, the public interest served by the disclosure of such information should be taken into account." (Explanatory memorandum to COM/2000/0402 final)[3]

60. As noted, in the case of *Manisty*[4] the Upper Tribunal considered similar arguments to this case, (although within the context of whether the exception was engaged or not). It considered that part of the relevant test involved in determining whether a document could continue to fall within the scope of the exception involves "*exercising a judgement on whether the information could now properly be considered as independent from the continuing work on the Expressway"*

61. At para 31 of the decision, the Tribunal also stated that: *One factor that may help in applying this approach in some cases is whether there has been a natural break in the private thinking that the public authority is undertaking. Is it moving from one stage of a project to another? Another factor may be whether the authority is ready to go public about progress so far'.*

62. Although the Commissioner accepts the fact that the report is still in draft form, and therefore that the exception is engaged, the circumstances in which the report was in at the time that the request was received was that it was not going to further worked upon as the brief set by the council had been met, and also that it was not going be taken forward by the council.

63. The Commissioner considers that the decision not to take forward the report forms a natural break in the private thinking that the public authority was undertaking. She recognises however that the overall plan of identifying and delivering future housing to the area remained one of its priorities.

[3] https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52000PC0402&from=EN

[4] [2018] UKUT 423 ACC

64. This 'break' weakens the public interest arguments that its contents should be withheld on the basis that the council needs thinking space in order to take its plans forward. Essentially, this report is no longer under consideration by the council, and therefore it did not need to protect the safe space surrounding it. Its argument is that it needs to protect its safe space in order to continue with its newer consideration of the project.

65. The council also argues that as it is not taking this report forward and has reconsidered its approach, disclosing this information at this time would be likely to be misleading and potentially cause a significant diversion of public resources as it continues with the wider issue of future housing need. It argued that the only decision which the council had taken over the report was to discontinue it with immediate effect in February 2019. It argues that the information may now be out of date, but also acknowledges that there has been significant speculation over the findings of the report, or its wider policies as regards the development of its plan. The Commissioner notes however that the request was received on 4 April 2019, and therefore its contents would not have been significantly out of date at that time (the initial report being dated February 2019). The central aspect which had changed at that point was the council's decision to take another way forward.

66. The Commissioner also considers that it was open to the council to provide an explanation along with the disclosure, explaining why it has chosen not to accept this plan, and to provide an explanation as to how it is taking the project ahead in the future. She notes however that at the time of the initial request, the council may still have been considering that policy in itself. It would however have been able to explain to interested parties why the report is no longer in line with its thinking and explain that the information may not therefore provide details of its current intentions.

67. This does, however, fit within the council's argument that disclosing the document would increase the burden on its resources to some extent. Disclosing the information might put the council into a position where lobby groups, the media and interested parties seek information on why the plans were not taken forward, or pressuring the council to explain what aspects it is still considering taking forward from the draft, leading it to expend resources either explaining, or defending its current plans against those outlined in the report. This could take up valuable resources discussing a plan which it has never agreed and which it doesn't intend to follow going forward.

68. The Commissioner notes in her guidance that in the case of FER0349127[5] her decision was that Regulation 12(4)(d) did not apply where a document had been completed and submitted to a county council for wider consideration on a matter. This is similar to the situation in this case where the guidance document had been completed and submitted to the council to take forward, albeit that it chose not to do so.

69. The Commissioner considers that the drive by central government to place more decisions regarding planning decisions being taken locally was not limited to decisions being made in isolation by local authorities. The intention was to include more input from local communities into planning decisions. The effectiveness of public participation in decision making is increased where interested parties are informed about analysis which has taken place and informed about the potential benefits and repercussions of the decisions which need to be taken. This is, in part, achieved through public consultation following the publication of the local plan. The Commissioner understands that a consultation period was previously run, and that the council has recently run another consultation exercise over the additional material which it submitted, although this falls outside of the time period which the Commissioner can take into account in reaching her decision. This consultation period ran for eight weeks, from 18 June 2020 to 12 August 2020[6].

70. Having considered all of the above factors the Commissioner has not been persuaded by the Council's argument that the public interest in maintaining the exception in Regulation 12(4)(d) outweighs the public interest in the report being disclosed.

71. She considers that, whilst the request in July 2019 fell at a time when the council was reconsidering the way it had approached the issue via the report and needed thinking space to further develop its policy, a disclosure of the draft report it had discontinued in February would not greatly affect its safe space given that it was reconsidering its approach. Whilst she recognises the likelihood that questions would be asked of the council as regards the contents of the draft report and the reasons for discontinuing it, these explanations could be provided alongside the information when it was disclosed.

---

[5] https://ico.org.uk/media/action-weve-taken/decision-notices/2011/644548/fs_50349127.pdf

[6] https://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk/info/45/planning_policy/468/local_plan_-_overview/17

72. As regards the associated documents, she notes that as drafts of the final draft document, the public interest in these documents being disclosed would be weakened by the publication of the final draft report.

73. She has therefore decided that the public interest in the exception being maintained for these documents does outweigh the public interest in the information being disclosed.

74. The Commissioner's decision is therefore that the public interest in the final draft report being disclosed outweighs that of the exception being maintained. She therefore considers that the council was not correct to apply Regulation 12(4)(d) to withhold the final draft report.

75. She considers however that the public interest in disclosing the associated correspondence is outweighed by the public interest in the exception being maintained for this information. The council was therefore correct to apply Regulation 12(4)(d) to this information.

Regulation 14(2)

76. The complainant's made their initial request for information on 4 April 2019. The council provided its response to the request on 2 September 2019.

77. Regulation 14(1) provides that *"If a request for environmental information is refused by a public authority under regulations 12(1) or 13(1), the refusal shall be made in writing and comply with the following provisions of this regulation."*

78. Regulation 14(2) provides that *"The refusal shall be made as soon as possible and no later than 20 working days after the date of receipt of the request."*

79. The council's initial response therefore fell outside of the 20 working days required by Regulation 14(2).

80. The council did not therefore comply with the requirements of Regulation 14(2).

Regulation 14(4)

81. Regulation 14 (4) provides that in cases of refusals under Regulation 12(4)(d), the public authority should specify *"…the estimated time in which the information will be finished or completed"*.

82. The council did not provide any specific date, presumably on the basis that the work itself had been completed but the wider project was ongoing. It should nevertheless have provided an estimate of the date when the overall work would be completed.

83. The Council therefore did not comply with Regulation 14(4).

Right of appeal

84. 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

85. 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.

86. 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 ……

Andrew White
Head of FoI Casework and Appeals
Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF