

**Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA)**  
**Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)**  
**Decision notice**

**Date:** 5 May 2022

**Public Authority:** Wrexham County Borough Council

**Address:** [foi@wrexham.gov.uk](mailto:foi@wrexham.gov.uk)

**Decision (including any steps ordered)**

---

1. The complainant requested various information regarding the Kings Mill heritage centre between 1 January 2018 and 29 January 2021. Wrexham County Borough Council (the Council) withheld the information requested under sections 36(2)(b)(i), 36(2)(b)(ii) and 36(2)(c) (effective conduct of public affairs). The Commissioner's decision is that the Council has correctly applied 36(2)(b)(i) and 36(2)(b)(ii) to the withheld information. The Commissioner does not require any steps to be taken.

**Request and response**

---

2. On 29 January 2021, the complainant wrote to the Council and requested information in the following terms:

"Under the provision of the FOI Act, I would like copies of :

1. all correspondence and documentation (paper and electronic) regarding the Kings Mill heritage centre between WCBC Executive Board members and council officers between Jan 1 2018 and Jan 29 2021.
2. all correspondence and documentation (paper and electronic) regarding the Kings Mill heritage centre between WCBC and the National Trust between Jan 1 2018 and Jan 29 2021.

3. all correspondence and documentation (paper and electronic) regarding the Kings Mill heritage centre between WCBC officers between Jan 1 2018 and Jan 29 2021.
  4. all correspondence and documentation (paper and electronic) regarding the Kings Mill heritage centre between WCBC Executive Board members and the Melin y Brenin community group between Jan 1 2018 and Jan 29 2021.
  5. A list of all meetings involving WCBC officers and/or councillors to discuss the Kings Mill heritage centre between Jan 1 2018 and Jan 29 2021. Please supply a list of WCBC officer and councillor attendees".
3. The Council responded on 10 March 2021 and stated that the information requested was exempt under section 36 of the FOIA.
  4. On 10 March 2021 the complainant requested an internal review of the Council's refusal to provide the information.
  5. The Council provided the outcome of its internal review on 20 May 2021 and upheld its decision that the information in question was exempt by virtue of section 36 of the FOIA.

### **Scope of the case**

---

6. The complainant contacted the Commissioner on 20 May 2021 to complain about the way their request for information had been handled.
7. The scope of the Commissioner's investigation is to consider whether the Council should disclose the information held relevant to the request or whether it was correct in relying on section 36 of the FOIA.

### **Reasons for decision**

---

### **Background**

8. The request in this case relates to the Council's plans for Kingsmill former Visitor Centre in Wrexham. The property was gifted to the Council by former Erddig estate owner Philip Yorke and is subject to a covenant which states that it can only be used as a public amenity for culture and heritage purposes. The Commissioner understands that the Council decided to sell the property under auction in early 2021. Prior to the decision made to sell the property Melin y Brenin Community Group had attempted to acquire the building to create a "hub of culture, heritage and wellbeing".

## **Section 36 – prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs**

9. Section 36 of the FOIA states that information is exempt where, in the reasonable opinion of a qualified person, disclosure would or would be likely to prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs. Section 36 operates in a slightly different way to the other prejudice based exemptions in the FOIA. Section 36 is engaged, only if, in the reasonable opinion of a qualified person, disclosure of the information in question would, or would be likely to, prejudice any of the activities set out in sub-sections of 36(2).
10. In this case the Commissioner is considering the application of the exemptions at sections 36(2)(b)(i), 36(2)(b)(ii) and 36(2)(c).
11. Sections 36(2)(b)(i) and (ii) provide that information is exempt if its disclosure would, or would be likely to, inhibit the free and frank provision of advice, or the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation. Section 36(2)(c) provides that information is exempt if its disclosure would otherwise prejudice, or would be likely otherwise to prejudice, the effective conduct of public affairs.

### **Are the exemptions engaged?**

12. In order to establish whether the exemptions have been applied correctly the Commissioner has:
  - Ascertained who is the qualified person or persons for the public authority in question;
  - Established that an opinion was given;
  - Ascertained when the opinion was given; and
  - Considered whether the opinion given was reasonable.
13. The Council confirmed that its qualified person is the Chief Officer, Governance & Customer (Monitoring Officer). The Council explained that the qualified person considered the requested information and is of the opinion that the exemptions at all three limbs of section 36(2) are engaged for all of the withheld information.
14. The Commissioner is satisfied that the Council's Monitoring Officer is authorised as the qualified person under section 36(5) of the FOIA. The Council provided the Commissioner with a copy of the submission put to the qualified person and confirmation that they agreed the engagement of section 36 on 8 March 2021. The qualified person was not provided with actual copies of the withheld information with the submission, but the information was described to them. The Commissioner notes that the qualified person signed their agreement to the submission which

indicated that the level of prejudice claimed was the lower threshold of "would be likely".

15. The Commissioner has gone on to consider whether the qualified person's opinion is reasonable. It is important to highlight that it is not necessary for the Commissioner to agree with the opinion of the qualified person in a particular case. The opinion also does not have to be the only reasonable opinion that could be held or the most reasonable opinion. The Commissioner only needs to satisfy himself that the opinion is reasonable or, in other words, it is an opinion that a reasonable person could hold.
16. In the opinion of the qualified person the exemptions at 36(2)(b) and 36(2)(c) are applicable to the withheld information because disclosure of the information could inhibit the future free and frank provision of advice, views and formulas when reaching decisions. Disclosure could also result in "an adverse effect on the local authority's ability to offer an effective public service or to meet its wider objectives or purpose".
17. In terms of sections 36(2)(b)(i) and (ii) the Council contends that it needs a safe space to develop ideas, debate live issues and reach decisions away from external interference and distraction. This aids internal deliberation and decision making processes. The Council pointed out that the withheld information includes communications between officers, elected members, Legal Service, Committee Services, National Trust and Melin y Brenin Community Group regarding the site. It also includes information and advice regarding the building such as the process for disposal, advice on value estimates and auctioneer competitive fee quote, value estimates and reserves. Some of the emails also contain legal advice on covenants.
18. At the time of the request the Council pointed out that the subject matter - the sale and disposal of the site - was very much live as it was due to be sold by auction. In addition, it was a sensitive subject as it was a Heritage Centre and, as a consequence, it was politically sensitive. Disclosure would inhibit the provision of advice and exchange of views on an issue that was live at the time of the request and thus affect the quality of decision making by the Council.
19. The Commissioner accepts that it is reasonable for the qualified person to consider that there was a need for a safe space to deliberate upon matters concerning the disposal of the site as they developed. The process which the qualified person is referring to as needing to be protected under section 36 is the process of being able to discuss and debate issues, such as the sale and disposal of properties, away from the public eye.

20. In reaching a decision in this case, the Commissioner has taken into account that the sale and disposal of the site in question was live at the time of the request and the property had not been sold. Having reviewed the withheld information the Commissioner is satisfied that the reasons outlined by the qualified person fit substantially with the application of section 36(2)(b)(i) and (ii). He is also satisfied that the qualified person's opinion - that inhibition relevant to those subsections would be likely to occur through disclosure of the withheld information - is reasonable. The Commissioner's conclusion is, therefore, that the exemptions provided by section 36(2)(b)(i) and (ii) are engaged.
21. In terms of section 36(2)(c) although the Council has stated that disclosure would have an adverse effect on its ability to offer an effective public service or to meet its wider objectives or purpose it has not explained exactly how disclosure of the withheld information would be likely to have this effect. The Council has failed to provide sufficient detail and explanation as to why it considers disclosure in this case would otherwise prejudice the conduct of public affairs. It follows that the Commissioner is not satisfied that the qualified person's opinion about the likelihood of prejudice under section 36(2)(c) is reasonable. Therefore he does not find section 36(2)(c) engaged.

### **Public interest test**

22. Section 36 is a qualified exemption and therefore the Commissioner must consider the public interest test and whether, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

### **Public interest arguments in favour of disclosing the information**

23. The Council submitted the following arguments in favour of disclosure:

- The general public interest in promoting transparency, accountability, public understanding and involvement in the democratic process.
- The legitimate public interest in the subject matter associated with the request, that is in knowing the options being considered for the Kings Mill Heritage Centre.
- The public interest in good decision-making by public bodies, in upholding standards of integrity and securing the best use of public resources by demonstrating proper scrutiny, exchange of views and professional advice.

24. The complainant did not submit any representations as to why they consider the public interest in this case favours disclosure.
25. The Commissioner understands that there has been significant local interest about the disposal of the Kings Mill Heritage centre, including a number of media articles about the matter. The Commissioner accepts that disclosure of the withheld information would provide the public with an insight into the decision making process around the sale/disposal of the property and the reasons for the decision. This would allow the public to participate in the decision making that is ongoing. In addition, the Commissioner accepts that there is always a public interest where information relates to public money.

### **Public interest in favour of maintaining the exemption**

26. The Council pointed out that that the overall purpose of the communications that have been withheld was to share free and frank views and for the purposes of obtaining and providing advice. The communications were intended for internal use only and not for dissemination into the public domain. The Council considers that disclosure would impact on the future free and frank provision of advice, views and formulas when reaching decisions as officers would be wary of not having a 'safe space' to debate if it was thought that such communications would end up in the public domain.
27. The Council considers that the loss of frankness and candour in the course of such deliberations would be highly likely to damage the quality of advice to decision makers and thus inhibit the Council's ability to make informed decisions relating to the sale of the site, or indeed future decisions.
28. The Council pointed out that, at the time of the request, the information was very much live as the property had not been sold. The argument for protecting internal deliberation and decision making processes was applied to preserve a 'safe space' to debate issues away from external scrutiny, and preventing a 'chilling effect' on free and frank views in future. In light of the timing of the request the Council attributed weight to the need to protect this private thinking space and ongoing deliberations relating to the subject matter.

### **Balance of the public interest**

29. In the Commissioner's view, having accepted the reasonableness of the qualified person's opinion that disclosure of the information would be likely to prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs, he must give weight to that opinion as valid evidence in his assessment of the balance

of the public interest. However, he must also consider the severity, extent and frequency of the prejudice claimed.

30. The Commissioner acknowledges the public interest arguments in favour of disclosure. He notes that there has been local interest about the sale of the site including a number of media articles. The Commissioner accepts that disclosure of the withheld information would allow the public to understand and scrutinise what options were being explored for the property and the basis on which decisions concerning the Kings Mill Heritage site were made. The Commissioner appreciates that disclosure of the withheld information may assist public debate and enable the public to scrutinise decisions made by the Council and hold them to account where necessary.
31. The Commissioner recognises that, inherent in the section 36(2)(b) exemptions is the argument that a public authority should be afforded private space for staff in which issues can be considered and debated, advice from colleagues and subject experts can be sought and freely given and ideas tested and explored to protect the integrity of the deliberation process.
32. In this case, the Commissioner notes that the subject matter associated with the withheld information was live at the time of the request and the property had not been sold. The Commissioner accepts that a safe space is required when issues under discussion are still live and in the development/proposal stage. At the time of the request, the Commissioner considers that there was a real likelihood that disclosure would hinder the Council's ability to consider its options fully and discourage those staff involved in the process from participating in a free and frank way. These effects would be likely to be fairly extensive and severe and impact negatively on the Council's ability to arrive at the most appropriate way forward
33. The Commissioner has considered the withheld information and the wider context that informs the public interest, including the principles of transparency and accountability. For the reasons set out above, the Commissioner considers that in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemptions at section 36(2)(b) outweighs the public interest in disclosure. The Council was not, therefore, obliged to disclose the requested information.

## Right of appeal

---

34. 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](mailto:grc@justice.gov.uk)

Website: [www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber](http://www.justice.gov.uk/tribunals/general-regulatory-chamber)

35. 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.
36. 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 .....**

**Joanne Edwards**  
**Senior Case Officer**  
**Information Commissioner's Office**  
**Wycliffe House**  
**Water Lane**  
**Wilmslow**  
**Cheshire**  
**SK9 5AF**