

**(CCC) Cambridge Half Marathon**

1. I would like copies of any documents that relate to Cambridge City Council's decision (whether taken alone or jointly with Cambridgeshire County Council or any other statutory body) to allow the 2021 TTP Cambridge Half Marathon to be run through Cambridge, given the extensive diversions and road closures it entailed, including but not limited to the decisions related to those road closures and diversions.

2. I would like copies of any documents that relate to Cambridge City Council's role in helping to plan and regulate the operation and route of the 2021 TTP Cambridge Half Marathon.

3. I would like an answer to the question: Did Cambridge City Council, either alone or in conjunction with other statutory bodies, carry out any assessment – such as an Equality Impact Assessment – of the impact of allowing the TTP 2021 Cambridge Half Marathon to be run on groups protected under the Equality Act? If so, can I see a copy of that assessment?

**Response**

Some information you have requested is held however some information you have requested is refused under the exemption of disclosure. This will be set out later in the reply.

The City Council gave consent for the use of Midsummer Common to facilitate the event. The planning and regulation of the route was carried out by the Organiser. The City Council has no regulatory role in respect of the permitted use of the Highway, as this is a County Council function.

The City Council did complete an EQIA for its Events Policy decision 18th January 2018 (a copy is attached) which was made at Community Services Scrutiny Committee. A record of decision can be found using this link <https://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=176&MId=3289&Ver=4>

The Safety Advisory Group did consider event at which City Council Officers where present. More information on the Safety Advisory Group can be found on our website. <https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/hire-a-park-or-open-space-for-your-event>

The information held by the Safety Advisory Group in the minutes is of two types:  
1. Information providing the background to the event, such as staffing levels, facilities, etc.

2. A question and answer session on specific points raised by attendees.

We are withholding the background information under section 43(2) FOIA as we believe that release would harm the commercial interests of the organisations.

We are withholding the question and answers under sections 41, information provided in confidence and section 38, health and safety.

Section 43(2):

Where organisers have provided details of how they have arranged and organised their events, the material explain staffing levels, features of the events and how they manage these. The organisers' commercial interests would be likely to be harmed by placing this information in the public domain as it would enable their competitors to understand how these events were being run and to emulate the planning that organisers have obviously put a lot of time into.

It is in the public interest for people to understand how public authorities engage with event organisers, especially when these are taking place in public spaces and often incur public expense in terms of policing and other services.

It is not in the public interest to harm the commercial interests of organisers of events as these form an important part of public life and contribute to the economy. A lot of the companies that run such events are small and medium enterprises, which would be particularly vulnerable to their ideas being copied.

As it is not clear that there is a significant public interest in the public knowing about the internal workings of the types of organisations that engage with us, the balance of the public interest is in withholding this information.

Section 41:

The information has been obtained from a third party in that it was provided by the event organisers.

The meetings are held such that the representatives of the organisers meet the advisory group in a private space. The free and frank discussion gives rise to the material being confidential in nature – particularly when organisers are frank about their understanding of health and safety law, their statements about their arrangements and advice that is given that confirms the suitability or vulnerabilities in these arrangements.

The organisers would be damaged if their frank views and explanations were made public because judgements would be made about their adherence to health and safety legislation, whereas the purpose of these sessions is to enable the organisers to improve their understanding. Therefore, disclosure would cause detriment.

Where a company experiences this sort of detriment, where members of the public may question their ability to run an event safely based on a snapshot of

FOI Ref

**9867**

Response sent

**24 Nov 2021**

their understanding of health and safety procedures, such damage could leave the Council open to legal action.

As this is a snapshot of health and safety arrangements that the organisers are making, and not the final outcome of their arrangements, we are unable to find a public interest defence in disclosure.

Section 38:

The purpose of the meetings is to increase the health and safety at events. It is likely that publication of the minutes, which are full of frank discussions would inhibit organisers in the future from engaging with SAG. This, in turn, would mean that event organisers would not be given expert advice from the expert group, which would be likely to lessen the safety of events and increase the chances of harm to members of the public that attend.

There is a public interest in citizens being able to understand what advice is being given and to ensure that a four hour monthly meeting with the attendance of a large number of public servants is functioning well.

However, there is a very strong public interest in promoting health and safety and ensuring that event organisers can ask questions in a safe space and get frank advice that leads to greater safety for members of the public.

We conclude that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in releasing this information.

Further queries on this matter should be directed to <a href="mailto:foi@cambridge.gov.uk">foi@cambridge.gov.uk</a>
---