



Owen Boswarva <owen.boswarva@gmail.com>

## Request for internal review: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION - FOI-7860

1 message

Owen Boswarva <owen.boswarva@gmail.com>  
To: FOI Officer <FOI.Officer@northtyneside.gov.uk>

1 April 2026 at 15:53

Dear Information Governance and Compliance Officer,

Thank you for your email below, which I have understood to be a response to the "meta-request" that I submitted to the Council on 24 March 2026 (your reference FOI-7860). That request was mainly for information related to the handling of my previous information requests submitted on 2 February 2026 (your reference FOI-7516).

I have understood that the Council is refusing to comply with my new request for information on the basis that the request is vexatious within the meaning of section 14 of the FOI Act.

This is a request for an internal review of the Council's handling of my new request reference FOI-7860. Please consider in particular the following points.

The Council has conflated my new request with correspondence from my previous requests (reference FOI-7860), which it has listed and which it characterises as burdensome:

"When considered together, these contacts form a continuing attempt to revisit matters that have already been addressed through the FOI process.

"The cumulative impact of this pattern has created a significant and ongoing burden on the Authority's resources. The correspondence demonstrates a level of persistence focused on challenging the handling and outcome of your previous FOI request, rather than seeking new information that the Authority holds."

In my view the volume of correspondence listed by the Council is not at all unusual, given that my requests of 2 February 2026 covered both access to information (handled under the FOI Act) and re-use of information (handled under the RPSI regulations), that the requested information was of a technical nature and subject to third-party intellectual property rights, and that an internal review was carried out by the Council.

It is clear from reading the correspondence that all communications were iterative rather than repetitive, and necessary to resolve issues with the Council's handling of my requests. For example the Council's internal review led to disclosure of information that was withheld in the Council's original response, and the exchange of emails on 23 March 2026 culminated in clarification of the Council's permission for re-use of that information.

Contrary to the Council's claim, I have not attempted to "revisit matters that have already been addressed through the FOI process." Following the outcome of the Council's internal review I clearly recognised that my next option was to make a complaint to the ICO, and that in the meantime the Council was under no obligation to correspond further with regard to my requests of 2 February 2026 (reference FOI-7516).

My new request of 24 March 2026 (reference FOI-7860) does not duplicate in any way my earlier access request – it is not "subsequent identical or substantially similar" within the meaning of section 14. The information in scope of my new request is mostly recent and should be readily available within the Council, if held. Handling of my new request is unlikely to be administratively burdensome.

As my new request is mainly for information related to the handling of my previous requests, there may of course be some overlap in subject matter. It is possible some of the information, if disclosed, could assist me in making a complaint to the ICO related to my previous requests. However, the submission of a new information request for that purpose is an entirely normal and proper use of the FOI Act.

I draw the Council's attention to the ICO's guidance on requests about previous information requests (meta requests): <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/foi/freedom-of-information-and-environmental-information-regulations/requests-about-previous-information-requests-meta-requests/>. The ICO advises in that guidance that "you should only consider refusing a meta request as vexatious if you can point to specific evidence that the request will cause a disproportionate or unjustified level of disruption, irritation or distress on its own merits."

Thank you for your attention to this request for an internal review.

Kind regards,

Owen Boswarva

Contact details

e-mail: [owen.boswarva@gmail.com](mailto:owen.boswarva@gmail.com)

telephone: [REDACTED]

address: [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **FOI Officer** <[FOI.Officer@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:FOI.Officer@northtyneside.gov.uk)>

Date: Wed, 1 Apr 2026 at 14:20

Subject: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION - FOI-7860

To: Owen Boswarva <[owen.boswarva@gmail.com](mailto:owen.boswarva@gmail.com)>

## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

In all further correspondence please quote our reference FOI-7860.

Your request for information under the above legislation has now been considered. Please see response below:

### **Response:**

After reviewing your request, the Authority has decided to refuse it under **Section 14(1) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000**, on the grounds that the request is vexatious.

The pattern and volume of your recent emails, place a disproportionate and unreasonable burden on the Council's resources. The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) recognises that Section 14(1) may be applied where a requester submits overlapping or repetitive requests that have the effect of harassing the authority or causing unjustified disruption.

The decision is based on your recent correspondence for which a timeline of the email correspondence has been noted below for reference:

The original request (FOI-7516) was received:

02/02/2026 Initial request received (FOI-7516).

10/02/2026 Response disclosed to advise exempt in answer to this request under section 21 as the information requested is publicly available through the VOA Lookup Service.

A request for an internal review (IR) received:

10/02/2026 Internal Review (IR) requested for FOI-7516.

17/02/2026 IR response disclosed for FOI-7516. The Authority provided the available information in electronic format as requested.

Further email communications on the internal review response for FOI-7516 received:

17/02/2026 Correspondence received in relation to the information disclosed in the Internal Review Response for FOI-7516. These were in relation to further queries about the UPRNs (Unique Property Reference Numbers) and the re-use request.

05/03/2026 Response disclosed to the queries/Issues raised on the Internal Review Response for FOI-7516. Section 43 (2) applied for information would prejudice the commercial interests of both GeoPlace and Ordnance Survey.

05/03/2026 Correspondence received in relation to the information disclosed in the Internal Review Response for FOI-7516. These were again in relation to the UPRNs (Unique Property Reference Numbers) and the re-use request.

23/03/2026 Follow up correspondence received to chase the re-use request information for FOI-7516.

23/03/2026 Response to the Open Government Licence v3.0 request disclosed and link to the North Tyneside council webpage included.

23/03/2026 Correspondence received with enquiries about the information disclosed for the Open Government Licence v3.0 for FOI-7516.

23/03/2026 Response to Open Government Licence v3.0 query raised disclosed.

23/03/2026 Correspondence received with further enquiries about the information disclosed for the Open Government Licence v3.0 for FOI-7516.

23/03/2026 Response to Open Government Licence v3.0 query raised disclosed.

23/03/2026 Response to queries raised in relation to the UPRN's disclosed. The Authority stands by its original response to the IR.

24/03/2026 Correspondence received on information disclosed in the IR for FOI-7516 in relation to the UPRNs (Unique Property Reference Numbers).

24/03/2026 Response to queries raised for the IR for FOI-7516 in relation to the UPRN's disclosed and referred to ICO.

A new FOI request (FOI 7860) received on the same subject:

24/03/2026 A new FOI request received seeking internal emails, metadata, and handling notes relating to the earlier request (FOI 7516).

When considered together, these contacts form a continuing attempt to revisit matters that have already been addressed through the FOI process.

The cumulative impact of this pattern has created a significant and ongoing burden on the Authority's resources. The correspondence demonstrates a level of persistence focused on challenging the handling and outcome of your previous FOI request, rather than seeking new information that the Authority holds.

If you are not happy with the process or the information disclosed once an internal review has been completed, the appropriate route for raising any further concerns is to contact the Information Commissioner's Office.

The authority has been transparent throughout this process, completed the necessary due diligence, and released all information that we are able to provide.

For these reasons and considering the overall context and history of correspondence, the Authority considers that Section 14(1) applies in this instance.

Please note that an anonymised copy of this response may be published in our Disclosure Log where appropriate.

This is a record of responses to completed requests for information that the Council has received and dealt with under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and Environmental Information Regulations 2004. The Disclosure Log is available online at the following address:

[Disclosure log | North Tyneside Council](#)

The information supplied to you is licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-governmentlicence/version/3/>

You are free to copy, publish, distribute and transmit the Information; adapt the Information; exploit the information commercially and non-commercially for example, by combining it with other Information, or by including it in your own product or application. When you use this information, you should include the following attribution statement: Contains public sector information provided by North Tyneside Council, [date of publication], licenced under the Open Government Licence.

I trust that this information answers your request, but if you have any further requests, please do not hesitate to contact me.

If you are unhappy with the way the Council has handled your request, you may ask for an internal review. Please contact the Information Governance Team no later than 40 working days after the date of this letter, after which time we will consider the matter closed.

Information Governance

North Tyneside Council

Quadrant

The Silverlink North

Cobalt Business Park

North Tyneside

NE27 0BY

e-mail [foi.officer@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:foi.officer@northtyneside.gov.uk)

Further information is also available from the Information Commissioner at:

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

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

Kind regards

**Information Governance and Compliance Officer**

Information Governance Team

Governance

North Tyneside Council

**Tel:** (0191) 643 2333

