

Level 10  
1 Stratford Place  
Montfichet Road  
London  
E20 1EJ



26 September 2019

**INFORMATION REQUEST REFERENCE 19-039**

Dear 

Thank you for your information request, received on 6 August 2019. You asked the London Legacy Development Corporation (Legacy Corporation) to provide the following information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA):

1. *You have bought the Company who run the stadium, so how much did you pay for it, using public money?*
2. *How much public money did you spend on lawyers and legal fees when you were buying the company?*
3. *Why did you buy the company?*
4. *What was The Mayors involvement in buying the company?*
5. *How much public money have you spent on Lawyers and Legal fees in your dispute with West Ham from 2015 until now?*
6. *How many Stewards work inside the stadium on a typical West Ham match?*
7. *How many Stewards work outside the stadium at a West Ham match?*
8. *How many Stewards work from the stadium to the station at Westfield?*
9. *How much Public Money do you spend on Stewards on a typical West Ham Match?*
10. *How much public money have you spent on Stewards at West Ham matches during the following times:*

*2015/16 Football  
2016/17 Football  
2017/18 Football  
2018/19 Football*

11. *How much public money will you be spending on West Ham Stewards during August 2019.*
12. *There are a lot of barriers around and about the stadium and the walk to and from, how many are there, how much do they cost and who pays for them?*
13. *How many Stewards will be working at West Ham matches during August 2019, please make sure this is accurate.*
14. *How many Stewards worked at each West Ham match during 2018/19 season?*
15. *Why do they keep stopping us when we are trying to get to the tube? If I am lucky enough to get to a game, my travel schedule is very tight.*
16. *How many reports did you have done into the company who run the stadium in the 12 months before you bought it?*
17. *How much did you spend on each of the reports?*  
  
*Please send me a copy of each report. A PDF copy by email.*
18. *How much public money did you spend on Stewards for the American Baseball games, the concerts and the athletics meeting during 2019? Please make sure each one is detailed, not just a running total.*
19. *How many Stewards did you have for the American Baseball Games, the concerts and the athletics meeting:*  
  
*Inside The Stadium?*  
*Outside the Stadium?*  
*On the way to the Station at Westfield?*
20. *Did you make a profit on the American Baseball, Concerts and Athletics Meeting in 2019, or did you make a loss on any of them. Please provide the actual profit or loss made on each one.*
21. *Do you make a profit or a loss on West Ham matches? As an example, please show how much you spent putting on each West Ham match since you bought the company who run the stadium, such as how much each match on Stewards, how much on the catering, how much on the cleaning, how much on other costs. Also please show how much you get from West Ham as rent for each home match.*
22. *How many cleaners work before, during and after a West Ham match?*
23. *Who provides the cleaners, and how much does the cleaning operation cost for a West Ham match? Who pays for the cleaners?*
24. *How many bar and catering staff work at a West Ham match?*

I can confirm that the Legacy Corporation and E20 Stadium LLP, the Legacy Corporation's wholly owned subsidiary, hold information which falls within the scope of your request. The information relevant to your request is below and our response follows your order:

1. *You have bought the Company who run the stadium, so how much did you pay for it, using public money?*

£1 million was paid on acquisition. Please refer to FOI 19-008 already published on our website: <https://www.queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/our-story/the-legacy-corporation/good-governance/publication-scheme/disclosure-log/2019-foi>

2. *How much public money did you spend on lawyers and legal fees when you were buying the company?*

The amount spent on legal fees to purchase the Stadium operating company was £98,968.80.

3. *Why did you buy the company?*

We do not hold information which directly responds to your request. However, please refer to the press release issued on 22 January 2019:

<https://www.queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/media/press-releases/london-stadium-owners-bring-venue-operations-in-house>

4. *What was The Mayors involvement in buying the company?*

We do not hold information which directly responds to your request, please refer your request to the following email address: [mayor@london.gov.uk](mailto:mayor@london.gov.uk). The consent of the Mayor to acquire the company was received under "MD2402 E20 Stadium LLP to acquire LS185": <https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/md2402-e20-stadium-llp-acquire-ls185>

5. *How much public money have you spent on Lawyers and Legal fees in your dispute with West Ham from 2015 until now?*

The amount spent on legal fees on disputes with West Ham since 2015 is £4.9m.

6. *How many Stewards work inside the stadium on a typical West Ham match?*

The average number of stewards working inside the Stadium at a West Ham match during the 2018/19 season was 1,260. This includes c191 stewards who are redeployed during their shifts to work outside the Stadium during egress.

7. *How many Stewards work outside the stadium at a West Ham match?*

The Stadium event plan sets the number of stewards, and this will vary depending on the specific arrangements. Stewards are also redeployed at different time of their shifts to work inside and outside the stadium. Typically c191 stewards (that have been redeployed) work outside the Stadium per match, plus an average of 22 traffic management personnel work outside the Stadium per match. This includes stewards working between the Stadium and Westfield.

8. *How many Stewards work from the stadium to the station at Westfield?*

See answer 7 above.

9. *How much Public Money do you spend on Stewards on a typical West Ham Match?*

Please be advised that the financial cost of stewarding for a West Ham match is being withheld under FOIA section 43(2) – commercial interests.

*S.43(2) - Commercial interests.*

*(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).*

The section 43(2) is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we have to consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice our commercial interests or the commercial interests of a third party.

Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor and the purposes for which they could use the information.

The Legacy Corporation and E20 have assessed the impact of releasing the financial cost of stewarding. There is, of course, a public interest in promoting transparency of the decisions and accountability, however, the Stadium needs to be able to successfully operate in a small, strong and very competitive market. The financial costs of the stewarding, if disclosed, would be likely to put the Stadium at a competitive disadvantage within this market by allowing competitors of the Stadium, who are not subject to the same legislation, to gain access to commercially valuable information which would give them a better understanding of the Stadium costs and which they could then use to undercut the Stadium and undermine the Stadium negotiation position as a competitive venue for sports events with a similar field of play set up, such as rugby or international football.

It is the view of the Legacy Corporation, E20 and the Stadium operator, that the disclosure of this financial information would prejudice the commercial interests of the Stadium because it will reveal detail of financial information which would be likely impact on future negotiations for use of the Stadium or procurement of stewarding

contracts, which in turn would harm E20 and the Legacy Corporation's ability to achieve best value for the public purse, therefore at this time, the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

10. *How much public money have you spent on Stewards at West Ham matches during the following times:*

2015/16 Football  
2016/17 Football  
2017/18 Football  
2018/19 Football

Please see answer to question 9 above.

11. *How much public money will you be spending on West Ham Stewards during August 2019.*

Please see answer to question 9 and 10 above.

12. *There are a lot of barriers around and about the stadium and the walk to and from, how many are there, how much do they cost and who pays for them?*

The event management plan includes the deployment of barriers. The number of barriers will vary depending on the specific plan for each match.

Barriers are both owned by the Stadium and hired in. The Stadium regularly reviews whether it is more efficient to purchase or hire barriers. Other land owners (including Westfield, Stratford Station, IQL) also deploy barriers.

Please be advised that the costs of barriers are being withheld under FOIA section 43(2) – commercial interests.

*S.43(2) - Commercial interests.*

*(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).*

The section 43(2) is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we have to consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice our commercial interests or the commercial interests of a third party.

Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor and the purposes for which they could use the information.

The Legacy Corporation and E20 have assessed the impact of releasing the financial cost of putting up barriers. There is, of course, a public interest in promoting transparency of the decisions and accountability, however, the Stadium needs to be able to successfully operate in a small, strong and very competitive market. These costs, if disclosed, would be likely to put the Stadium at a competitive disadvantage within this market by allowing competitors of the Stadium, who are not subject to the same legislation, to gain access to commercially valuable information which would give them a better understanding of the Stadium costs and which they could then use to undercut the Stadium and undermine the Stadium negotiation position as a competitive venue for sports and other events.

It is the view of the Legacy Corporation, E20 and the Stadium operator, that the disclosure of this financial information would prejudice the commercial interests of the Stadium because it will reveal detail of financial information which would be likely impact on future negotiations for use of the Stadium or procurement of barriers, which in turn would harm E20 and the Legacy Corporation's ability to achieve best value for the public purse, therefore at this time, the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

*13. How many Stewards will be working at West Ham matches during August 2019, please make sure this is accurate.*

At the time of the request, one pre-season match had been played on 3 August 2019. There were 992 stewards at this match. The number of stewards at the two other West Ham matches during August 2019 was 1242 and 1237.

*14. How many Stewards worked at each West Ham match during 2018/19 season?*

The number of stewards at each West Ham match during the 2018/19 season is the in the table below:

18 August 2018	WHU football match	1215
1 September 2018	WHU football match	1210
23 September 2018	WHU football match	1216
26 September 2018	WHU football match	1008
29 September 2018	WHU football match	1210
20 October 2018	WHU football match	1310
31 October 2018	WHU football match	1450
3 November 2018	WHU football match	1303
24 November 2018	WHU football match	1245
4 December 2018	WHU football match	1314
8 December 2018	WHU football match	1312
22 December 2018	WHU football match	1297

2 January 2019	WHU football match	1290
5 January 2019	WHU football match	1417
12 January 2019	WHU football match	1304
4 February 2019	WHU football match	1299
22 February 2019	WHU football match	1233
2 March 2019	WHU football match	1215
16 March 2019	WHU football match	1185
30 March 2019	WHU football match	1235
20 April 2019	WHU football match	1232
4 May 2019	WHU football match	1215

In addition, there were c22 traffic management personnel per match.

15. *Why do they keep stopping us when we are trying to get to the tube? If I am lucky enough to get to a game, my travel schedule is very tight.*

The event management plan includes a series of measures to ensure spectators are safely moved from the Stadium to Stratford Station. A series of “stop and holds” are put in place to assist safe spectator flows. This is normal procedure for managing large crowds from major events.

16. *How many reports did you have done into the company who run the stadium in the 12 months before you bought it?*

E20 Stadium LLP, the Legacy Corporation’s wholly owned subsidiary, commissioned due diligence reports prior to the acquisition of the stadium operator into finance, tax, legal and health and safety. In addition, it commissioned a report by MOPAC into a whistleblowing allegation made to the Mayor in respect of stewarding arrangements at the Stadium.

17. *How much did you spend on each of the reports?*

The amount spent on these reports was as follows: finance and tax £95,472.34; legal £98,968.80 (please refer to question 2); health and safety £95,775.00; and £20,800 on the MOPAC report.

*Please send me a copy of each report. A PDF copy by email.*

I can confirm E20 holds this information, however, this information is being withheld under the following FOIA exemptions:

- S. 31 – law enforcement (relates to the MOPAC and health and safety reports)
- S. 40 – personal data (all reports)
- S. 41 – information provided in confidence (MOPAC)
- S.43(2) – commercial interests (all reports); and
- S.42 – legal professional privilege (relates to the legal reports)

Section 31 - Law enforcement.

*(1) Information which is not exempt information by virtue of section 30 is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice—*  
*(a) the prevention or detection of crime*

The section 31 exemption is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we have to consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice the prevention of crime. Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor, and the purposes for which they could use the information.

The Legacy Corporation has assessed the impact of releasing this information and consider that it would not be in the public interest to release the information. The withheld information relates to an investigation into whistleblowing allegations in relation to stewarding and the contingency procedures in relation to dispersal plans of the public. Disclosing this information would be likely to prejudice any follow on legal action from the whistleblowing investigation and would be likely to prejudice the security of the Stadium and the safety and security of Stadium events would be jeopardised. It is the view of the Legacy Corporation that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing at this time.

#### Section 40 – personal information

*(2) Any information to which a request for information relates is also exempt information if—*

*(a) it constitutes personal data which do not fall within subsection (1), and*

*(b) either the first or the second condition below is satisfied.*

*(3A) The first condition is that the disclosure of the information to a member of the public otherwise than under this Act –*

*(a) would contravene any of the data protection principles*

The Legacy Corporation relies on this exemption to the withhold names and email addresses of staff below Head of Service level who are not in decision-making positions, and who would have a reasonable expectation that their information would not be released. In addition, all telephone numbers are withheld.

In determining whether the exemption applied the organisation first considered whether the information was *personal data* within the meaning of Article 4(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation (“GDPR”). Based on the definition, the organisation maintains that the information is personal data. The organisation has then considered whether the condition at section 40(3A)(a) FOI is engaged, i.e. whether disclosure of the personal data would breach any of principles related to the processing of personal data (Article 5(1)(A) GDPR).

In terms of processing Article 4(2) of the GDPR, the release/processing of personal data in response to a request under FOIA would fall within this definition.

The organisation has considered the provisions of Article 4(2) in the light of Article 5(1)(a), in particular, whether disclosure would be fair.



The organisation maintains that, at the time the data were collected, the individuals would have had no reasonable expectation that the information would be further processed and disclosed in response to a Freedom of Information request. In addition, withholding the personal information of members of staff below Head of Service level does not have an impact on how the disclosed information can be understood.

As the organisation considers disclosure of the information would be unfair, section 40 act as an absolute exemption in this case and there is no need to carry out a public interest test.

Section 41 - Information provided in confidence.

*(1) Information is exempt information if—*

*(a) it was obtained by the public authority from any other person (including another public authority), and*

*(b) the disclosure of the information to the public (otherwise than under this Act) by the public authority holding it would constitute a breach of confidence actionable by that or any other person.*

Section 41 exemption is an absolute exemption and is not subject to the public interest test. Information related to whistleblowing allegations would have been provided in confidence or in the expectation of confidence and disclosure could damage the effective conduct of future whistleblowing investigations.

Section 43(2) – Commercial interests

*(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).*

Section 43(2) is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we must consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice our commercial interests or the commercial interests of a third party. Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor and the purposes for which they could use it.

The Legacy Corporation has assessed the impact of releasing the information redacted under this exemption. There is, of course, a public interest in promoting transparency of the decisions and accountability with regards to the agreements that are entered into by public sector bodies. However, the disclosure of the information currently identified as commercially sensitive would be highly likely to prejudice the commercial interests of Vinci (the previous owners of the stadium operating company) and E20.

It is the view of the Legacy Corporation that, at this time, the public interest in withholding this information, outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

Section 42 - Legal Professional Privilege

(1) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege or, in Scotland, to confidentiality of communications could be maintained in legal proceedings is exempt information.

This is a qualified exemption and the public interest was taken into consideration. The Legacy Corporation recognises the public interest in promoting the transparency of their decisions and accountability, however there is also a strong requirement to safeguard openness in communications between client and lawyer which is essential to effective governance.

The general public interest inherent in section 42 will always be strong due to the importance of the principle behind legal professional privilege: safeguarding openness in all communications between client and lawyer to ensure access to full and frank legal advice, which in turn is fundamental to the administration of justice. Strong countervailing considerations are needed to justify disclosure of legal advice.

The Legacy Corporation has considered the public interest factors in favour of disclosure of the requested information, including the general public interest in transparency and accountability of public bodies and informing the public debate. The Legacy Corporation has considered whether this information should be released under FOIA and has concluded that the stronger public interest lies in withholding the information because of the strong need to ensure that the Legacy Corporation as a public body can obtain full and frank legal advice to inform its decision-making processes.

*18. How much public money did you spend on Stewards for the American Baseball games, the concerts and the athletics meeting during 2019? Please make sure each one is detailed, not just a running total.*

None. Payments by the relevant event promoters for these events met all operational expenditure including the costs of stewards.

*19. How many Stewards did you have for the American Baseball Games, the concerts and the athletics meeting:*

*Inside The Stadium?*

*Outside the Stadium?*

*On the way to the Station at Westfield?*

The number of stewards (excluding traffic management personnel) is shown below

MUSE 1 June 2019	1,110
Major League Baseball 29 June 2019	1,345
Major League Baseball 30 June 2019	1,234
Müller Anniversary Games 2019 20 July 2019	771
Müller Anniversary Games 2019 21 July 2019	766

20. *Did you make a profit on the American Baseball, Concerts and Athletics Meeting in 2019, or did you make a loss on any of them. Please provide the actual profit or loss made on each one.*

In relation to the Major League Baseball games in 2019:

Please note that we have responded to this question under FOI 19-030. The response is copied below:

“In addition to the wider economic benefit of bringing MLB to London, I can confirm a profit was generated by the baseball games. The details of any loss/profit made by E20 are being withheld under s.43(2) commercial interests.

Section 43(2) - Commercial interests.

(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).

Section 43(2) is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we have to consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice our commercial interests or the commercial interests of a third party.

Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor and the purposes for which they could use the information.

The Legacy Corporation has assessed the impact of releasing this information under the section 43 exemption in order to decide whether disclosure would, or would be likely to, prejudice their commercial interests or those of any third party(ies). They have concluded that prejudice to commercial interests would be caused by disclosure so that the exemption is engaged.

The London Stadium operates in a commercial environment, in competition with other stadia nationally and in some cases internationally for events such as concerts and MLB. As such to disclose the profitability of events in the Stadium would provide the London Stadiums competitors with an unfair advantage and prejudice the commercial interests of the stadium operator, E20 and the Legacy Corporation.

There is, of course, the Legacy Corporation’s commitment to openness and transparency, as well as the inherent presumption in favour of disclosure of information requested, however, the disclosure of the information currently withheld under section 43(2) and identified as commercially sensitive would be likely to prejudice commercial interests of the Legacy Corporation because it will

reveal details which would be likely to impact on current and future highly sensitive negotiations and this would in turn be likely to impact on the Legacy Corporation's ability to get best value for the public purse.

It is the view of the Legacy Corporation that, at this time, the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it."

In relation to concerts in 2019:

There was one concert in the Stadium on 1 June 2019 – Muse. I can confirm the concert made a profit. The details of any profit made by E20 are being withheld under s.43(2) commercial interests.

In relation to the athletics meeting in 2019:

There was one athletics event in the Stadium in 2019 – the Müller Anniversary Games on 20 July - 21 July 2019. In line with the athletics agreement (released under FOI 16-031), UK Athletics met all operational expenditure. E20 Stadium LLP made a small direct profit on catering.

21. *Do you make a profit or a loss on West Ham matches? As an example, please show how much you spent putting on each West Ham match since you bought the company who run the stadium, such as how much each match on Stewards, how much on the catering, how much on the cleaning, how much on other costs. Also please show how much you get from West Ham as rent for each home match.*

E20 does not make a profit on West Ham matches. The cost of putting on a West Ham match has previously been reported to the London Assembly. The average cost for putting on a West Ham match since February 2019 is c£282,000.

The costs of stewarding are being withheld (please refer to our response to question 9 above). Please be advised that the costs of catering, cleaning and other costs are being withheld under FOIA section 43(2) – commercial interests.

S.43(2) - Commercial interests.

*(2) Information is exempt information if its disclosure under this Act would, or would be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of any person (including the public authority holding it).*

The section 43(2) is a qualified exemption and subject to the prejudice test and the public interest test. Under the prejudice test we have to consider if disclosure of this information would, or would be likely to, prejudice our commercial interests or the commercial interests of a third party.

Consideration is also given to the harm disclosing this information would be likely to cause, combined with other information already in the public domain (mosaic effect) or possibly released at a future date (precedent effect). The public interest test considers and balances the public interest in disclosing this information against the public interest in not disclosing this information and uses this assessment to decide

whether there is sufficient justification in withholding this information under this exemption.

Information disclosed under the FOIA is considered to be public information, and while there is a presumption towards disclosure, consideration needs to be given as to who will have access to this information beyond the requestor and the purposes for which they could use the information.

The Legacy Corporation and E20 have assessed the impact of releasing the financial cost of catering, cleaning and other costs. There is, of course, a public interest in promoting transparency of the decisions and accountability, however, the Stadium needs to be able to successfully operate in a small, strong and very competitive market. These financial costs, if disclosed, would be likely to put the Stadium at a competitive disadvantage within this market by allowing competitors of the Stadium, who are not subject to the same legislation, to gain access to commercially valuable information which would give them a better understanding of the Stadium costs and which they could then use to undercut the Stadium and undermine the Stadium negotiation position as a competitive venue for sports events with a similar field of play set up, such as rugby or international football..

It is the view of the Legacy Corporation, E20 and the Stadium operator, that the disclosure of this financial information would prejudice the commercial interests of the Stadium because it will reveal detail of financial information which would be likely impact on future negotiations for use of the Stadium or procurement of catering and cleaning contracts, which in turn would harm E20 and the Legacy Corporation's ability to achieve best value for the public purse, therefore at this time, the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

The rent paid by West Ham is £2.5m per season indexed (from after the first football season) for 25 matches, as set out in the Concession Agreement, which is published on our website: <https://www.queenelizabetholympicpark.co.uk/our-story/the-legacy-corporation/e20-stadium-llp> in the Stadium Agreements section.

*22. How many cleaners work before, during and after a West Ham match?*

The number of cleaning staff will vary per match. Around 139 cleaners work per match (source: London Living Wage calculation in September 2018).

*23. Who provides the cleaners, and how much does the cleaning operation cost for a West Ham match? Who pays for the cleaners?*

The cleaners are provided under a contract with the Stadium facilities management company, Vinci FM. Vinci FM sub contract certain services for events. The cleaning cost per match is being withheld under FOIA section 43(2) – commercial interests (please refer to our response to question 21). The Stadium operator, LS185 pays for the cleaners.

*24. How many bar and catering staff work at a West Ham match?*

The catering sub contractor, Delaware North supply bar and catering staff. The number of bar and catering staff will vary per match. Typically c819 bar and catering staff work per match (source: London Living Wage calculation in September 2018).

---

If you are unhappy with our response to your request and wish to make a complaint or request an internal review of our decision, you should write to:

Deputy Chief Executive  
London Legacy Development Corporation  
Level 10, 1 Stratford Place  
Montfichet Road  
London, E20 1EJ

Email: [FOI@londonlegacy.co.uk](mailto:FOI@londonlegacy.co.uk)

Please note: complaints and requests for internal review received more than two months after the initial response will not be handled.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may appeal directly to the Information Commissioner at the address given below. You should do this within two months of our final decision. There is no charge for making an appeal.

Further information on the Freedom of Information Act 2000 is available from the Information Commissioner's Office:

Wycliffe House  
Water Lane  
Wilmslow  
SK9 5AF

Telephone 08456 30 60 60 or 01625 54 57 45

Website [www.ico.gov.uk](http://www.ico.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely

FOI / EIR Co-ordinator  
London Legacy Development Corporation