

5 June 2025

Dear

### **Complaint in respect of ATISN 24654**

I have considered your complaint in accordance with the procedure outlined in the [Welsh Government's Practical Guide for Making Requests for Information](#) which is available by post on request or via the internet.

You submitted your request for information (our reference ATISN 24654) in which you asked for the following information in relation to a planning appeal for Limegrove House, Limegrove Avenue, Carmarthen, SA31 1SW (AS-03183-C8X1R0; PL/05392):

- Release of the e-mail addresses that have been redacted.
- I still wish to know the name of the redacted email addressee and their position/title if they are a public official.

Following our response, you submitted a request for an internal review as outlined at Annex 1 to this letter.

### **Review outcome**

Your request for information was considered under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 - Personal information. I have considered the decision to not release the requested information.

I can confirm that the redacted information contained the email addresses of the recipients of the email only. PEDW does not hold the position/title of the email recipients.

The response of 16 May outlined Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), together with the conditions in section 40(3)(a)(i) or 40(3)(b), provides an absolute exemption if disclosure of the personal data would breach any of the data protection principles. Furthermore it explained ...

I have considered whether there is lawful basis for disclosure, by being necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the requester and whether such interests are overridden by the interest or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection of personal data.

Welsh Government acknowledges the legitimate interest in openness and transparency that release of the information would engender. However, and in the absence of any stated interest of your own, we are unable to identify any other specific legitimate interest in the release of the information.

Therefore, I am satisfied that the correct decision was reached in the previous response to you dated 16 May and I uphold that decision for the reasons explained.

**Next steps**

If you remain dissatisfied with this response you have the right to complain to the Information Commissioner. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office  
Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
Cheshire  
SK9 5AF

Website: [www.ico.org.uk](http://www.ico.org.uk)

Yours sincerely

Chief Planning Inspector, PEDW

## Annex 1

### **Freedom of Information Request – Refn : ATISN 24654**

I am writing to request an internal review of the above freedom of information decision. On the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2025 I made a FOI to PEDW requesting the names and details of the redacted addressees in a series of emails, the most relevant dated 11<sup>th</sup> March 2025, that formed part of a file named 'Outcome of Appeal Case PI 50392' (please see attached file ) – an appeal case in which I was named as an appellant. Whilst the identity of a number of addressees were disclosed in the emails, it appeared that a number of addressees, in particular those pertaining to the email dated 11<sup>th</sup> March 2025, had been redacted.

In the response letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 2025 (please see attached file), the request was refused on the grounds that -:

***“ I have concluded that the information requested is exempt from disclosure under Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 - Personal information. Further details and reasoning for this exemption are provided at Annex 1 “***

I am dissatisfied with the outcome and should be grateful if you would conduct an internal review of the decision. I believe that the applicable legislation has been misapplied and interpreted in a far broader sense than that originally intended by the legislation, in particular as these are likely to be public officials and is inconsistently applied due to the fact that the names of other public officials are named. Additionally, it also gives insufficient weight to the legitimate interest as to who exactly are the other recipients of an email referring to the outcome of an investigation of a planning appeal decision that was itself subject to a **public hearing**.

I should be grateful if you would confirm receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully,