



FOI 16154 Communications between Enough and the PCC

Request:

This is a request for information according to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It relates to communications between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner and the community interest company "Enough." Enough is also known as This is enough Limited and enough®

Please note there are three parts to my request.

- (1) Please can you provide me with copies of all communications between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner, and the CIC Enough, between 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025.
This can include but is not limited to, all email communications between the unit and the following email addresses: Katie White: katie@myenough.com Tom Allchurch: tom@myenough.com and any other email addresses ending in myenough.com
As well as SMS messages, written letters.
- (2) Please can you also provide me with copies of any meeting minutes between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner and representatives from Enough including Katie White and Tom Allchurch, between 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025. This can include minutes from face to face meetings, or phone calls, or video calls.
- (3) Please can you also provide me with any documents such as powerpoint presentations, funding agreements, evaluation reports, due diligence reports, funding/financial contracts or other documentation created relating to Enough, that are held by the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner, in the time period 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025.

Schedule of Response Information:

This is a request for information according to the Freedom of Information Act 2000. It relates to communications between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner and the community interest company "Enough." Enough is also known as This is enough Limited and enough®

Please note there are three parts to my request.

- 1. Please can you provide me with copies of all communications between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner, and the CIC Enough, between 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025.**

This can include but is not limited to, all email communications between the unit and the following email addresses: Katie White: katie@myenough.com Tom Allchurch: tom@myenough.com and any other email addresses ending in myenough.com
As well as SMS messages, written letters.

We have undertaken a detailed search of our records and can confirm that we hold some information pertinent to this question. Please find copies of these communications attached. Please note that some information has been redacted or removed under the following Freedom of Information Act exemptions:

- Section 36(2)(b)(ii) Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs
- Section 40(2) Personal Information
- Section 43(2) Commercial Interests

Section 36(2)(b)(ii) Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs

Section 36(2)(b)(ii) of the FOIA 2000 states information is exempt if in the reasonable opinion of a qualified person, disclosure of the information under this Act would, or would be likely to, inhibit the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation.

Section 36 is a qualified, prejudiced-based exemption and requires the application of a Prejudice Test and a Public Interest Test before it can be claimed. The Public Interest Test is separate from the qualified person's opinion. The Prejudice Test and Public Interest Test have been applied as follows:

Prejudice Test

We consider that disclosure of some information pertinent to this request would be likely to inhibit the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation within the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (OPCC).

The OPCC must have an internal thinking space to be able to consider options for working with external partners, especially when considering how we deliver the police and crime plan.

Release of the requested information could lead to partners and external organisations not wanting to engage with our office in the future, which would have a detrimental impact on our ability to carry out our role.

The disclosure of such information would therefore likely inhibit such a free and frank exchange and would thereby prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure:

The Freedom of Information Act encourages transparency and honesty from all public authorities and the OPCC for Devon and Cornwall is no exception to this. By releasing information held by the OPCC we are encouraging public trust and belief in our work.

Factors favouring non-disclosure:

There is a public interest in the OPCC being able to consider views provided under candid discussion, consider frank assessments as well as explore options, and revisit decision making as a part of the process of deliberation. Exempting this information would prevent premature disclosure of matters that are still under consideration. Release of the requested information could lead to partners and external organisations not wanting to engage with our office in the future, which would have a detrimental impact on our ability to carry out our role.

Balancing test:

Having weighed up the competing interest of the test above, I have come to the decision in favour of non-disclosure of the redacted and removed information in the document attached. The detrimental impacts of releasing this information is far greater than the potential benefits, and therefore there is a greater public interest in withholding this information than in releasing it.

Section 40(2) Personal Information

Section 40 is a class-based absolute exemption (does not require the consideration of the public interest test) where it can be evidenced that disclosure of the information would breach the General Data Protection Regulation Act 2018 (GDPR).

We consider that disclosure of personal data of OPCC staff and other third parties would contravene the data protection principles, in particular Article 5(1) of the GDPR which requires that personal data shall be (a) processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to individuals ('lawfulness, fairness and transparency').

GDPR protects personal information from being disclosed to any person other than yourself. An unlawful disclosure of such information would leave a Public Authority vulnerable to civil litigation.

Section 43(2) Commercial Interests

Section 43(2) is a qualified, prejudice-based exemption and requires the application of a Prejudice Test and a Public Interest Test before it can be claimed. These tests have been applied as follows:



📞 01392 225555 📩 opcc@dc-pcc.gov.uk

📍 The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner
Andy Hocking House, Alderson Drive, Exeter EX2 7RP
🌐 devonandcornwall-pcc.gov.uk



Prejudice (Harm) Test

We consider that disclosure of some information pertinent to this request would be likely to prejudice the commercial interests of Enough. Some information which has been sent from Enough to the Police and Crime Commissioner is commercially sensitive and includes information which we consider to be akin to a business case.

Disclosure of some this information is likely to prejudice Enough's commercial interests as the information could be used by competitors to gain a competitive advantage. This would disadvantage the company in the marketplace both now and in the future.

Other information was provided to Enough in confidence by third parties. Breach of confidence through an FOI disclosure could harm Enough's reputation and prejudice the organisation's ability to conduct itself in a commercial environment.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure:

The Freedom of Information Act encourages transparency and honesty from all public authorities and the OPCC for Devon and Cornwall is no exception to this. By releasing information held by the OPCC we are encouraging public trust and belief in our work.

Factors favouring non-disclosure:

There is a strong public interest in allowing private sector, third sector and public sector organisations of all sizes to develop business cases and commercial products and to share information with other organisations without fear of this information being made public.

If commercially or business sensitive information were to be released by the OPCC as part of a FOI disclosure, it would then discourage other companies from working with or supplying services to the OPCC.

Damage would therefore not only be commercially harmful to Enough but also the OPCC.

Balancing test:

Having weighed up the competing interest of the test above, I have come to the decision in favour of non-disclosure of the redacted and removed information in the document attached. The risk of releasing this information is greater than the potential benefits, and therefore there is a greater public interest in withholding this information than in releasing it.



- 2. Please can you also provide me with copies of any meeting minutes between the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner and representatives from Enough including Katie White and Tom Allchurch, between 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025. This can include minutes from face to face meetings, or phone calls, or video calls.**

Following a detailed search of our records, we have not been able to identify any meeting minutes pertinent to this question and therefore consider that on the balance of probabilities that we do not hold this information.

- 3. Please can you also provide me with any documents such as powerpoint presentations, funding agreements, evaluation reports, due diligence reports, funding/financial contracts or other documentation created relating to Enough, that are held by the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner, in the time period 1 January 2025 and 26 November 2025.**

We have undertaken a detailed search of our records and can confirm that we hold some information pertinent to this question. Please find copies of these communications attached. Please note that some information has been removed under the following Freedom of Information Act exemption: Section 36(2)(b)(ii) Prejudice to the effective conduct of public affairs.

Section 36(2)(b)(ii) of the FOIA 2000 states information is exempt if in the reasonable opinion of a qualified person disclosure of the information under this Act would, or would be likely to, inhibit the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation.

Section 36 is a qualified, prejudiced-based exemption and requires the application of a Prejudice Test and a Public Interest Test before it can be claimed. The Public Interest Test is separate from the qualified person's opinion. The Prejudice Test and Public Interest Test have been applied as follows:

Prejudice Test

We consider that disclosure of some information pertinent to this request would be likely to inhibit the free and frank exchange of views for the purposes of deliberation within the OPCC.

The OPCC must have an internal thinking space to be able to consider options for working with external partners, especially when considering how we deliver the police and crime plan.

Release of the requested information could lead to partners and external organisations not wanting to engage with our office in the future, which would have a detrimental impact on our ability to carry out our role.



The disclosure of such information would therefore likely inhibit such a free and frank exchange and would thereby prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs.

Public Interest Test

Factors favouring disclosure:

The Freedom of Information Act encourages transparency and honesty from all public authorities and the OPCC for Devon and Cornwall is no exception to this. By releasing information held by the OPCC we are encouraging public trust and belief in our work.

Factors favouring non-disclosure:

There is a public interest in the OPCC being able to consider views provided under candid discussion, consider frank assessments as well as explore options, and revisit decision making as a part of the process of deliberation. Exempting this information would prevent premature disclosure of matters that are still under consideration. Release of the requested information could lead to partners and external organisations not wanting to engage with our office in the future, which would have a detrimental impact on our ability to carry out our role.

Balancing test:

Having weighed up the competing interest of the test above, I have come to the decision in favour of non-disclosure of the redacted and removed information in the document attached. The detrimental impacts of releasing this information is far greater than the potential benefits, and therefore there is a greater public interest in withholding this information than in releasing it.

Additional context

Although not directly pertinent to your request, the OPCC would like to provide some additional context and information in addition to the attached disclosure documents.

Neither the OPCC or the Police & Crime Commissioner are affiliated with Enough or have endorsed the work of Enough.

The video released under this FOI request was created as a result of the Police and Crime Commissioner being invited to a stakeholder event hosted by Enough that she was unable to attend at short notice. This video was not created to be used for any promotional purposes by Enough or to demonstrate endorsement of Enough, and was created to be used at this specific event only.