

Subject: FW: ICO Casework reference ICO - 67304 - H3H7

Importance: High

From: John Fullbrook **Sent:** 07 March 2022 17:22

To: _____ **Cc:** Hazel Roxby

Subject: FW: ICO Casework reference ICO - 67304 - H3H7 **Importance:** High

Dear Russell

Freedom of Information Review Request – ICO ref. 67304 – H3H7

Thank you for your communications re this matter, and your understanding and conciliatory email of the 8th September 2021, making the Council aware of your position, - Your stance continues to be very much appreciated.

Despite your willingness to drop the matter on account of the fact that the reasons for the FOI request in the first instance had been dealt with some considerable time ago (Summer 2020 – when the responses from the then FOI panel were removed from the Steyning Parish Council web site) as well as you being satisfied that some elements of the initial refusal verdict were justified, the Council have continued to consider the request and indeed the FOI panel did meet on the 18th October 2021 to discuss the ongoing review, as the Information Commissioners Office had been communicating to the Clerk's office on your behalf to seek further resolution. The outcome of the meeting of the 18th October 2021 was for the Clerk to search for evidence of any governance wrongdoing in relation to the way in which your FOI request dated 20th April 2020 was first dealt with, and to present this to a subsequent FOI panel meeting so that a final conclusion to the matter could be drawn.

On the 16th February 2022 the FOI panel met once again and in conclusion agreed the following statement:

The response to your Freedom of information request dated 20th April 2020, compiled by the then SPC FOI panel consisting Cllrs Goldsmith, Campbell, Cree and Gary Sullivan (Cllr Lloyd was absent during these deliberations) seemed to allow for an opportunity for what was nothing short of a personal attack, and should have never have been sanctioned by the F&GP committee and then published on the official Steyning Parish Council web site (Due to it being a Council sanctioned FOI response).

The current FOI panel (consisting of - over the two meetings – Cllrs Norcross, Lloyd, S. Alexander, Young and Northam and the Clerk) accept that at the time of the initial decision and the subsequent review request decision, there were flaws within the application of the SPC FOI procedure, with notably the exclusion of the Clerk (Proper Officer) from the decision making process.

The Council would like to therefore unreservedly apologise to Mr Barnes for any annoyance and anguish caused by the actions of the Council in response to the initial April 2020 FOI request, and for the statement which led to that request, both of which have been removed from the SPC Web Site, and the Steyning Parish Council guarantees never to publish once again these statements nor any iteration of them.

We hope you find this statement and our recent actions satisfactory, but if there is any further undertaking required by SPC, then please let us know by return.

Yours sincerely

John

John Fullbrook
Clerk to the Council
01903 812042

From: Russell G K Barnes <[redacted]> > Sent: 08 September 2021 13:13
To: John Fullbrook <[redacted]> Subject: ICO Casework

Good Afternoon all

I have been contacted today by the ICO regarding an ongoing complaint.
Please note I am satisfied with the current status, i.e the FOI responses by Campbell and Cree are no longer online which is greatly appreciated.

The reason for the email is the officer advised that at some time in the future, when John returns I assume, there will be a review by the FOI panel (different members and ideally ones not complained about haha).

So just incase no one discusses with me, in advance of this meeting, I just wanted you to be aware of my position.

1. The FOI concerning ex-Cllr Cree, I am satisfied for it to be refused (I see no benefit in John trawling emails from over a year ago now), but a rewritten and concise reasoned response would be more appropriate whereby I am not accused of being vexatious and that the refusal does not contain personal attacks at me, it could simply cover all information has been provided and there is nothing further to add, case closed

2. The FOI concerning Cllr Campbell, I would suggest it is refused as an FOI as being inappropriate to be in the public domain and litter with GDPR breaches as well as being unevidence based he even called me a liar in the letter. It could be addressed as a SAR which would be more appropriate, but I do not wish for the council and John to waste any further time on these matters and so if there is a way of guaranteeing that both never appear on the council website again then that would be my preferred route of resolution. As I said, currently they are not online which is great, but if after review, by a new panel, it is decided to address them more appropriately, my comments are above. Have a lovely day.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us.

Kind Regards

Russell G.K Barnes

Architect

BA Hons Arch, Dip Arch, ARB, RIBA

On Behalf of R+R Architects Ltd.