



Scottish Information
Commissioner
www.itspublicknowledge.info

Decision Notice 083/2023

Whether requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable

Authority: University of Edinburgh

Case Refs: 202200486, 202201001, 202300120 and 202300256

Summary

The Applicant asked the Authority for information on several matters, but her requests primarily focused on information relating to Roxburgh Street/Place, Edinburgh. The Authority declined to comply with the requests as it considered them vexatious or manifestly unreasonable. The Commissioner investigated and found that the requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable, and so the Authority was not obliged to respond.

Relevant statutory provisions

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 (FOISA) sections 1(1), (2) and (6) (General entitlement); 2(1)(b) (Effect of exemptions); 14(1) (Vexatious or repeated requests); 39(2) (Health, safety and the environment); 47(1) and (2) (Application for decision by Commissioner)

The Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (the EIRs) regulations 2(1) (definition of “the Act”, “applicant” and “the Commissioner” and paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of definition of “environmental information”) (Interpretation); 5(1) and (2)(b) (Duty to make environmental information available on request); 10(1), (2) and (4)(b) (Exceptions from duty to make environmental information available); 17(1), (2)(a), (b) and (f) (Enforcement and appeal provisions)

The full text of each of the statutory provisions cited above is reproduced in Appendix 1 to this decision. The Appendices form part of this decision.

Background

1. On 25 March 2022, 18 July 2022, 8 August 2022 and 15 January 2023, the Applicant made requests for information to the Authority. The information requested concerned several matters, but her requests primarily focused on information relating to Roxburgh Street/Place, Edinburgh. The full wording of the requests can be seen at Appendix 2.
2. The Authority responded on 12 April 2022, 2 August 2022, 2 September 2022 and 7 February 2023. The Authority stated that it considered the Applicant's requests vexatious or manifestly unreasonable and noted that it had already undertaken voluminous correspondence with the Applicant, where it had advised her repeatedly that it could not provide her with any further information and to contact the organisations responsible for providing the information requested.
3. On 12 April 2022, 2 August 2022, 4 September 2022 and 7 February 2023, the Applicant wrote to the Authority, requesting a review of its decisions as she did not agree that her requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable.
4. The Authority notified the Applicant of the outcome of its reviews on 27 April 2022, 22 September 2022, 12 September 2022 and 22 February 2023. The Authority upheld its original decisions, for the reasons previously stated.
5. On 28 April 2022, 28 January 2023, 8 September 2022 (confirmed on 27 July 2023) and 24 February 2023, the Applicant wrote to the Commissioner, applying for a decision in terms of section 47(1) of FOISA. By virtue of regulation 17 of the EIRs, Part 4 of FOISA applies to the enforcement of the EIRs as it applies to the enforcement of FOISA, subject to specified modifications. The Applicant stated she was dissatisfied with the outcome of the Authority's review because she did not agree that her requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable.

Investigation

6. The Commissioner determined that the applications complied with section 47(2) of FOISA and that he had the power to carry out an investigation.
7. On 14 June 2022, 12 October 2022, 2 February 2023 and 7 March 2023, in line with section 49(3)(a) of FOISA, the Authority was notified in writing that the Applicant had made valid applications. All cases were allocated to an investigating officer.
8. Section 49(3)(a) of FOISA requires the Commissioner to give public authorities an opportunity to provide comments on an application. The Authority was invited to comment on all four applications and to answer specific questions on each.
9. These questions related to why the Authority considered the requests vexatious or manifestly unreasonable, and sought (i) evidence of the nature and volume of the Applicant's previous requests and correspondence and (ii) evidence of any advice and assistance it had previously provided to her (both in terms of signposting to relevant bodies and in advising that her requests and correspondence were becoming vexatious or manifestly unreasonable).

Commissioner's analysis and findings

10. The Commissioner has considered all of the submissions made to him by the Applicant and the Authority.

Handling in terms of the EIRs

11. The Authority considered some elements of the Applicant's requests under the EIRs, having concluded that the information requested was environmental information, as defined in regulation 2(1) of the EIRs.
12. Where information falls within the scope of this definition, a person has a right to access it (and the public authority has a corresponding obligation to respond) under the EIRs, subject to the various restrictions and exceptions contained in the EIRs.
13. The Applicant has not challenged the Authority's application of the EIRs.
14. The Commissioner accepts that, as the relevant elements of the requests concern information relating to an element of the environment (land) and the factor of noise, those elements fall within the definition of environmental information set out in regulation 2(1), in particular paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that definition, and the Authority was correct to consider those elements under the EIRs.

Section 39(2) of FOISA – Environmental information

15. The exemption in section 39(2) of FOISA provides, in effect, that environmental information (as defined by regulation 2(1) of the EIRs) is exempt from disclosure under FOISA, thereby allowing any such information to be considered solely in terms of the EIRs. In this case, the Commissioner accepts that the Authority was entitled to apply this exemption to the information it identified as environmental information.
16. As there is a statutory right of access to environmental information available to the Applicant in this case, the Commissioner accepts, in all the circumstances, that the public interest in maintaining this exemption (and responding to the request under the EIRs) outweighs any public interest in disclosing the information under FOISA.
17. The Commissioner therefore concludes that the Authority was correct to apply section 39(2) of FOISA, and consider the Applicant's information requests (to the extent that they related to environmental information) under the EIRs.

Regulation 5(1) of the EIRs – Duty to make environmental information available

18. Regulation 5(1) of the EIRs requires a Scottish public authority which holds environmental information to make it available when requested to do so by any applicant. This obligation relates to information that is held by the authority when it receives a request.
19. On receipt of a request for environmental information, therefore, the authority must ascertain what information it holds falling within the scope of the request. Having done so, regulation 5(1) requires the authority to provide that information to the requester, unless a qualification in regulations 6 to 12 applies (regulation 5(2)(b)).
20. Under the EIRs, a public authority may refuse to make environmental information available if one or more of the exceptions in regulation 10 applies.

Regulation 10(4)(b) of the EIRs and section 14(1) of FOISA – manifestly unreasonable requests and vexatious requests

21. Under regulation 10(4)(b) of the EIRs, a Scottish public authority may refuse to make environmental information available, to the extent that the request for information is manifestly unreasonable.
22. In considering whether the exception in regulation 10(4)(b) of the EIRs applies, the authority must interpret it in a restrictive way and apply a presumption in favour of disclosure. Even if it finds that the request is manifestly unreasonable, it is still required to make the information available unless, in all the circumstances, the public interest in doing so is outweighed by that in maintaining the exception.
23. Similarly, in terms of section 14(1) of FOISA, a Scottish public authority is not obliged to comply with a request for information made under section 1(1) if the request is vexatious (although this provision is not subject to the public interest test).
24. Neither FOISA nor the EIRs define “vexatious” or “manifestly unreasonable”. However, the Commissioner’s general approach is that the following factors are relevant when considering whether a request is vexatious or manifestly unreasonable:
 - (i) it would impose a significant burden on the public body;
 - (ii) it does not have a serious purpose or value;
 - (iii) it is designed to cause disruption or annoyance to the public authority;
 - (iv) it has the effect of harassing the public authority; or
 - (v) it would otherwise, in the opinion of a reasonable person, be considered manifestly unreasonable or disproportionate.
25. This is not an exhaustive list. Depending on the circumstances, other factors may be relevant, provided the impact on the authority can be supported by evidence. The Commissioner recognises that each case must be considered on its merits, taking all the circumstances into account.
26. While the Commissioner's view is that the terms "vexatious" and “manifestly unreasonable” must be applied to the request and not the requester, he acknowledges that an applicant's identity, and the history of their dealings with a public authority, may be relevant in considering the nature and effect of a request and its surrounding circumstances. It may be reasonable, for example, for the authority to conclude that a request represents a continuation of a pattern of behaviour it has deemed vexatious in another context.

The Authority’s submissions

27. The Authority stated that, since February 2018, the Applicant had sought repeatedly to engage it using information legislation and through contact with its complaints team. Specifically, the Authority noted the Applicant had made:
 - 41 FOI and EIRs information requests
 - five subject access requests
 - 17 requests for internal reviews

- seven applications to the Commissioner (that it was aware of), with one resulting in a decision by the Commissioner ([Decision 075/2022¹](#)), which did not require it to take any action
 - numerous emails to its Records Management Section and Data Protection Officer
 - 16 contacts to its complaints team in 2018-19; eight in 2019-20; 143 in 2020-21; 141 in 2021-22; and 16 so far (13 July) in 2022-23.
28. The Authority explained that the majority of the Applicant's information requests and other correspondence related to issues which were not its responsibility and which it would not be reasonable to expect would be its responsibility: typically, they relate to the area where the Applicant resides and to issues including drainage, graffiti, general noise and the congregation of smokers.
29. The Authority noted that, despite repeated advice to contact the relevant responsible bodies, the Applicant continued to complain and make requests to it and had, at times, subsequently complained about the conduct of staff members who had tried to help her.
30. The Authority stated that the Applicant had also been abusive to staff members involved in routine correspondence:
- accusing staff members of harassment and intimidation (in response to standard requests for payment)
 - accusing it of maliciously taking revenge on her for her complaints (by seeking payment of sums due)
 - making unfounded allegations of intimidation and threatening behaviour on its part
 - accusing the Authority of misusing her personal data
 - otherwise being generally abusive.
31. The Authority explained it had not refused any of the Applicant's information requests, which began in 2018, as vexatious or manifestly unreasonable until 2022.
32. The Authority stated it became necessary at that time to inform the Applicant that her requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable, because they were imposing a significant burden, did not have a serious purpose or value, were designed to cause disruption or annoyance, had the effect of harassing it and would otherwise, in the opinion of a reasonable person, be considered to be manifestly unreasonable or disproportionate.
33. In terms of the significant burden imposed, the Authority explained this was caused by the sheer volume of the Applicant's requests and her other correspondence. It provided evidence in support of this claim. The Authority further noted that the nature of those requests and correspondence – often rambling, unfocused and difficult to understand – and the Applicant's apparent lack of understanding about the legislation under which she was submitting requests, added to the burden.
34. The Authority explained that, since 2022, it had come to view the Applicant's requests as part of a campaign against it which began over an issue she had in relation to charges in 2018. To support this view, the Authority noted the following, with reference to specific examples:

¹ [Decision 075/2022 | Scottish Information Commissioner \(itspublicknowledge.info\)](#)

- the Applicant had made two recent requests for information apparently unrelated to those refused as vexatious or manifestly unreasonable, which she subsequently revised to relate back to the subject matter of those previous requests
 - in nine cases, the Applicant had made requests about her own requests and the Authority's responses to those requests
 - in other cases, it appeared that the Applicant was actively searching for topics she could make requests about, or using something said in the Authority's correspondence as the basis for a request.
35. The Authority also cited the Commissioner's guidance on "[Vexatious or repeated requests](#)"², which states that a requester's identity, and history of dealings with a public authority, can be relevant to a section 14(1) decision. Specifically, the Authority stated it considered relevant the Commissioner's guidance that it may be reasonable for the public authority to conclude that a request represents the continuation of a pattern of behaviour which has been deemed vexatious in another context.
36. The Authority noted that it had, on 29 July 2020, written to the Applicant advising her that it considered her level of complaints excessive and that it would not respond further on the matters she had complained about. However, the Applicant subsequently contacted, or attempted to contact, it on around 300 further occasions.
37. The Authority stated it had previously written to the Applicant on 30 January 2020 and 11 March 2021 advising her, respectively, that her requests were beginning to show signs they were becoming vexatious and that freedom of information laws are a mechanism for the public to obtain recorded information, not for raising concerns or furthering a complaint with a public authority.
38. The Authority also provided a breakdown of the information requests it had received from the Applicant since 2018 on similar topics to those in this case:
- 11 referring to smokers and/or Roxburgh Place/Street. (It also noted the aforementioned decision issued by the Commissioner ([Decision 075/2022](#)) related to an appeal for one of those requests.); and
 - four referring to the Assembly Venue on Roxburgh Place.

The Applicant's submissions

39. For each application, the Applicant disputed that her requests were vexatious or manifestly unreasonable.
40. The Applicant stated that she was requesting information that she considered she had a right to receive and that she was simply seeking transparency from the Authority.

The Commissioner's view

41. The Commissioner has taken account of all the relevant submissions and supporting evidence from the Applicant and the Authority. Taken in isolation, the Applicant's requests might not appear to be vexatious or manifestly unreasonable (although they are frequently very difficult to follow and understand). However, the vexatious or manifestly unreasonable

² [BriefingSection14VexatiousorRepeatedRequests.pdf \(itspublicknowledge.info\)](#)

nature of a request may only emerge after considering it in the context created by previous ongoing correspondence.

42. The Commissioner is satisfied, having reviewed the details of the requests made to date and other correspondence from the Applicant to the Authority, that it was reasonable for the Authority to consider previous correspondence, including that relating to relevant requests from the Applicant, when deciding whether these requests should be treated as vexatious or manifestly unreasonable.
43. The Commissioner accepts the Authority's position that the Applicant's requests in this case represent a continuation of a pattern of behaviour which it has deemed vexatious in another context, for the following reasons:
 - the Authority previously warned the Applicant that her requests were in danger of becoming vexatious
 - the Authority previously advised the Applicant that freedom of information law is a mechanism for the public to obtain recorded information, not to raise concerns or further a complaint with it
 - the Authority previously refused to respond further to the Applicant through its complaints team, because of the nature and volume of her correspondence.
44. The Commissioner also recognises that the Authority did not refuse as vexatious or manifestly unreasonable any of the Applicant's information requests until 2022, that it provided her with significant reasonable advice and assistance and engaged with her at considerable length through other means (most notably, through its complaints team).
45. Taking all of this into consideration, the Commissioner considers it difficult to consider what more the Authority could have done to satisfy the Applicant, beyond providing her with information it did not have and which it would not be reasonable to expect it to have.
46. The Commissioner's guidance on "[Vexatious or repeated requests](#)" and on "[Manifestly unreasonable requests](#)"³ states that those provisions are designed to protect the credibility and effectiveness of freedom of information law but must, given that the right to request information is an important legal right, be used carefully.
47. The Commissioner's above guidance goes on to say that a request may be inconvenient, and may even stretch an authority's resources, but that will not automatically make it vexatious or manifestly unreasonable, particularly if there is a reasonable foundation for the request.
48. In the Commissioner's view, the Applicant's information requests are of the rare type he had in mind when drafting the above guidance and he is satisfied that the Applicant meets each of the following factors set out in that guidance:
 - her campaign is either not well founded or has no reasonable prospect of success
 - she has failed to take her concerns up with the relevant authorities (or, at least, continues wrongly to take them up with the Authority)
 - she appears unwilling to accept the Authority's view that it has provided her with as much information and advice and assistance as it can reasonably offer.

³ [BriefingRegulation104bManifestlyUnreasonableRequests.pdf \(itspublicknowledge.info\)](#)

49. Taking each of the requests individually, looking at their wording and the way in which they are set out, the Commissioner also has to ask himself whether any reasonable person would regard them as written with the genuine purpose of extracting information from the Authority.
50. In this case, having considered all relevant submissions, and noting fully the backdrop against which the Applicant made the information requests in this case, the Commissioner accepts that a reasonable person would consider her requests to be manifestly unreasonable and disproportionate and so is satisfied the Authority was entitled to refuse to comply with the requests by virtue of section 14(1) of FOISA and regulation 10(4)(b) of the EIRs.

EIRs: the public interest test

51. As noted above, the exception in regulation 10(4)(b) is subject to the public interest test in regulation 10(1)(b) of the EIRs. This means that, although the Commissioner is satisfied that those elements of the Applicant's requests are manifestly unreasonable, he must still require the Authority to respond to those elements of the requests if the public interest in making the information available outweighs that in maintaining the exception.

The Authority's submissions

52. The Authority stated that the public interest in public authorities being able to carry out their functions without the unwarranted disruption of responding to information requests which a reasonable person would consider manifestly unreasonable or disproportionate outweighs the public interest in the transparent operation of public authorities and the Applicant's personal interest in receiving the information.

The Applicant's submissions

53. The Applicant did not provide specific public interest submissions for each application, but she submitted that there is public interest in public authorities being transparent and that the Authority's decision to decline to respond to her requests was not in the public interest.

The Commissioner's view

54. In reaching his conclusion on the public interest, the Commissioner has considered the submissions made by both the Applicant and the Authority.
55. In the Commissioner's view, there is an inherent public interest in the disclosure of information to ensure that an authority is transparent and accountable, and to allow its decisions and actions to be scrutinised.
56. Against this, the Commissioner has considered the strong public interest in ensuring that an authority can carry out its statutory functions without unreasonable or disproportionate disruption. There is also a public interest in ensuring that the EIRs are used responsibly.
57. While the Commissioner encourages public authorities to act in a transparent and accountable way, which benefits the wider public, he is satisfied that the Authority has already devoted a large amount of time in attempting to address the Applicant's concerns and repeatedly advised her to take those concerns up with the relevant bodies. There is a public interest in ensuring that the Authority's resources are not diverted from its other statutory functions - or from responding to other information requests - in responding to manifestly unreasonable requests.
58. After careful consideration, the Commissioner must find that the public interest in responding to the information requests made by the Applicant is outweighed by the public interest in

maintaining the exception in regulation 10(4)(b) of the EIRs. The Authority was, therefore, entitled to apply that exception to refuse to respond to the Applicant's requests.

Other matters

59. In the spirit of helping the Applicant avoid making vexatious requests in future, the Commissioner offers the following advice. Before making further requests, the Applicant should consider the following points:

- any future request should be focused clearly on the recorded information she wishes to receive and should not involve extended commentary or any attempt to dispute previous responses she has received
- she should carefully review the responses she has received to previous requests, to ensure she is not requesting information that has already been provided to her (or that she has already been advised relates to matters that are not the responsibility of the public authority in question)
- freedom of information law is not a means for her to challenge any issues she might currently be experiencing as a result of the actions of the public authority or anyone else
- future requests are more likely to be considered vexatious or manifestly unreasonable if they depart from the advice provided above. Equally, requests are unlikely to have a serious purpose if they seek information that the public authority has already provided (or advised that relates to matters that are not its responsibility).

Decision

The Commissioner finds that the Authority complied with Part 1 of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and with the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 in responding to the information requests made by the Applicant.

Appeal

Should either the Applicant or the Authority wish to appeal against this decision, they have the right to appeal to the Court of Session on a point of law only. Any such appeal must be made within 42 days after the date of intimation of this decision.

Margaret Keyse
Head of Enforcement

9 August 2023

Appendix 1: Relevant statutory provisions

Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002

1 General entitlement

- (1) A person who requests information from a Scottish public authority which holds it is entitled to be given it by the authority.
- (2) The person who makes such a request is in this Part and in Parts 2 and 7 referred to as the “applicant.”
- ...
- (6) This section is subject to sections 2, 9, 12 and 14.

2 Effect of exemptions

- (1) To information which is exempt information by virtue of any provision of Part 2, section 1 applies only to the extent that –
 - ...
 - (b) in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in disclosing the information is not outweighed by that in maintaining the exemption.
- ...

14 Vexatious or repeated requests

- (1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a Scottish public authority to comply with a request for information if the request is vexatious.
- ...

39 Health, safety and the environment

- ...
- (2) Information is exempt information if a Scottish public authority-
 - (a) is obliged by regulations under section 62 to make it available to the public in accordance with the regulations; or
 - (b) would be so obliged but for any exemption contained in the regulations.
- ...

47 Application for decision by Commissioner

- (1) A person who is dissatisfied with -
 - (a) a notice under section 21(5) or (9); or

- (b) the failure of a Scottish public authority to which a requirement for review was made to give such a notice.

may make application to the Commissioner for a decision whether, in any respect specified in that application, the request for information to which the requirement relates has been dealt with in accordance with Part 1 of this Act.

- (2) An application under subsection (1) must -
 - (a) be in writing or in another form which, by reason of its having some permanency, is capable of being used for subsequent reference (as, for example, a recording made on audio or video tape);
 - (b) state the name of the applicant and an address for correspondence; and
 - (c) specify –
 - (i) the request for information to which the requirement for review relates;
 - (ii) the matter which was specified under sub-paragraph (ii) of section 20(3)(c); and
 - (iii) the matter which gives rise to the dissatisfaction mentioned in subsection (1).

The Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004

2 Interpretation

- (1) In these Regulations –

“the Act” means the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002;

“applicant” means any person who requests that environmental information be made available;

“the Commissioner” means the Scottish Information Commissioner constituted by section 42 of the Act;

...

"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 paragraph (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 paragraphs (a) and (b) as well as measures or activities designed to protect those elements;

...

5 Duty to make available environmental information on request

- (1) Subject to paragraph (2), a Scottish public authority that holds environmental information shall make it available when requested to do so by any applicant.
- (2) The duty under paragraph (1)-
 - ...
 - (b) is subject to regulations 6 to 12.

...

10 Exceptions from duty to make environmental information available

- (1) A Scottish public authority may refuse a request to make environmental information available if-
 - (a) there is an exception to disclosure under paragraphs (4) or (5); and
 - (b) in all the circumstances, the public interest in making the information available is outweighed by that in maintaining the exception.
- (2) In considering the application of the exceptions referred to in paragraphs (4) and (5), a Scottish public authority shall-
 - (a) interpret those paragraphs in a restrictive way; and
 - (b) apply a presumption in favour of disclosure.

...

- (4) A Scottish public authority may refuse to make environmental information available to the extent that
 - ...
 - (b) the request for information is manifestly unreasonable;

...

17 Enforcement and appeal provisions

- (1) The provisions of Part 4 of the Act (Enforcement) including schedule 3 (powers of entry and inspection), shall apply for the purposes of these Regulations as they apply for the purposes of the Act but with the modifications specified in paragraph (2).
- (2) In the application of any provision of the Act by paragraph (1) any reference to -
 - (a) the Act is deemed to be a reference to these Regulations;
 - (b) the requirements of Part 1 of the Act is deemed to be a reference to the requirements of these Regulations;

...

- (f) a notice under section 21(5) or (9) (review by a Scottish public authority) of the Act is deemed to be a reference to a notice under regulation 16(4); and

...

Appendix 2: Information requests

Request made on 25 March 2022

ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS AND EQUALITY OF LIFE IMPACT

For some time [the Authority] have not been able to respond to concern raisers because of updating their policies (it appears)

Please advise

How long this message was on the concern raiser (s) site to respond

...

Please advise when the helpline was first discussed and total cost of implementation to date

While university life is full of exciting opportunities, it can also be an overwhelming time. Here you can find information on a range of services provided by [the Authority] and throughout Edinburgh to support your physical and mental wellbeing.

Covid-19 uUpdate: A new helpline has been launched for young people aged 16 to 25 who want to chat about the impact Covid-19 has had on their lives and who live in Edinburgh, Midlothian, East & West Lothian and the Scottish Borders:

Health in Mind

Please supply dates of reviewed footage of smokers congregating frequently at the side of [the Authority] Lister Medical Research Institute

If you do not have footage please advise who is responsible for the cleaning of the area of litter

...

Littering is a criminal offence, throwing down or dropping an item in any public open space is classed as littering. If a person is found guilty of the offence they can be issued with a fixed penalty notice of £80 or could potentially be prosecuted and risk a fine of up to £2,500.

Noise counts as a statutory nuisance (covered by Part III of the Environmental Protection Act 1990) if it either: unreasonably and substantially interferes with the user or enjoyment of a home or other premises; or injures health or is likely to injure health.

21 Dec 2005 — to enable them to comply with the smoke-free provisions of The Smoking, Health and Social Care (Scotland) Act 2005, coming into force on etc etc etc

It is against the law to smoke in this doorway 'sign'. Some employers may want to consider making it a policy that smoking is not permitted within a certain distance from entrances, so that employees, visitors and the public do not have to walk through secondhand smoke to get into the building.

There are no legal requirements on how far a smoking shelter should be from any other structure. However, we'd always recommend it be at least 2 metres away

This is the area we are asking about:-

Watch "23/03/2022 pre ICO trusted xxxx copy" on YouTube

https://youtu.be/6a_2HlgDCpE

Transcript for ease of response

We are here today to talk about littering as a criminal offence, noise statutory nuisance and stench (I think there was two of them there today)

Request made on 18 July 2022

ENVIRONMENT IMPACT OF COVID-19 AND RESEARCH TRANSPARENCY

IT WAS STATED IN 2018

[The Authority] is a global university, rooted in Scotland. We are globally recognised for our research, development and innovation and we have provided world-class teaching to our students for more than 425 years. We are the largest university in Scotland and in 2016/17 our annual revenue was £929 million, of which £265 million was research income. We have over 39,000 students and over 9,700 full-time equivalent staff. We are a founding member of the UK's Russell Group of leading research universities and a member of the League of European Research Universities

2019

File ref: T3/26/285

Exemptions regarding assembly Venue

SO TO FOLLOW UP ENVIRONMENT IMPACT

To ask for copies of all correspondence related to any communication with

[the Authority] and
Assembly Venue Roxburgh Place

[the Authority] and
New College (top of Mound)

Including all communication related to the display of the banner at New College Building top of mound Edinburgh

Including all communication where it was requested that staff associated with [the Authority] and Assembly Venue

A. Ensured all music was contained in the venue

B. All staff on duty were quiet so as not to cause disturbances to residents who live in the area

The staff levels in 2017/18, 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22

Compared to:-

"We are the largest university in Scotland and in 2016/17 our annual revenue was £929 million, of which £265 million was research income. We have over 39,000 students and over 9,700 full-time equivalent staff. "

Currently number of students

And

To request the longest time it has taken [the Authority] to respond to:-

A freedom of information request (2016 - 2018, 2019-2022)

A freedom of information request review (2016 - 2018, 2019-2022)

Request made on 8 August 2022

United Kingdom Festival 75 [the Authority], local authority, assembly Venue

We asked our Government Officials, Creative Scotland and we now ask You

To ask [the Authority] who would hold overall responsibility for appointments, impact on community standards and Equality Legislation matters regarding 75 Festival Funds and Festival Funds oversight especially when

[the Authority] and Local Authority are working closely with trustees appointed (see below)

The dynamic new board includes cultural leader Leonie Bell at Renfrewshire Council, Director of Digital Products at BBC Chris Condron, Solicitor and charity legal specialist Marion Davis, Rector of [the Authority] Ann Henderson, Standard Life Aberdeen Chief Executive Keith Skeoch and award-winning ... (others)

The arts council provide funding but the applicant is responsible for every part of its business
We asked which events received most funding from creative Scotland in Festival 75 and which received least funding

But what we are asking [the Authority] is regarding the association with assembly Venue where a bar is in such close proximity to residents homes that it cannot possibly meet its condition of license -

Was the bar a local authority decision, venue decision, [Authority] decision and did [the Authority] have no input regarding the bar on the street outside assembly Venue

You must publish all requests because we value transparency

Request made on 15 January 2023

Building standards and Historic Figures Recognition - Plaques etc

To ask [the Authority] for information on a particular Street

In 2013 a plaque was dated to honour a person near to 5 Roxburgh Street

To ask for the correspondence whereby [the Authority] arranged this

IE the latest communication whereby it was put on the building exterior

To ask [the Authority] when 1, 3 and 5 Roxburgh Street buildings became changed to a different use and where the work within those buildings was relocated to and when

To ask for correspondence whereby [the Authority] arranged this

5 Roxburgh Street seemed to be [Authority] divinity procurement offices

To ask where they are now based