



Consultation on Lambeth's Events Strategy

Consultation Report

January 2020



Lambeth

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1.0 Introduction | 3 |
| 1.1 Background..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Our proposals | 3 |
| 2.0 The consultation..... | 4 |
| 2.1 Consultation objectives..... | 4 |
| 2.2 Who we consulted..... | 4 |
| 2.3 When we consulted..... | 4 |
| 2.4 How we consulted..... | 4 |
| 3.0 Responses from members of the public | 5 |
| 3.1 Summary of results..... | 5 |
| 4.0 Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders..... | 10 |
| 4.1 Question 1 | 10 |
| 4.2 Question 2 | 13 |
| 4.3 Question 3 | 15 |
| 4.4 Question 4 | 18 |
| 4.5 Additional comments..... | 22 |
| 5.0 What happens next..... | 35 |
| Appendix – Question responses | 36 |

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

In 2016, the council created a new events strategy for 2016-2020. Lambeth has a rich history of hosting a range of events that are enjoyed by a diverse range of people.

The key values of this strategy were to:

- **Generate income** – with increased funding pressures due to a huge cut in funding from central government, Lambeth Council needed to think creatively about ways to generate income in the borough, which included attracting commercial events to our public spaces.
- **Protect parks** – with reduced funding, we wanted to ensure that part of events income was ring-fenced to pay for improvements in parks, so we introduced the Parks Investment Levy (PIL).
- **Keep the much-loved Lambeth Country Show free** – this historic event is much loved by residents and we remained committed to keeping it free to attend.
- **Support a diverse range of events including community events and major events** – we wanted to ensure that Lambeth's vibrancy and diversity were reflected in its events programming. The independent Parks for London [Good Parks for London 2018 Report](#) scored Lambeth highly on the quality and diversity of our events programming

- **Give certainty about the number of major commercial events** – we capped this at a maximum of 8 major commercial events in certain spaces.

Since then, there has been much public interest in certain events held in Lambeth parks. The decision was taken to carry out a review of the Events Strategy during 2019 in order to inform a refreshed Strategy to be implemented in April 2020.

A number of changes are already being implemented, including adopting a new [Lambeth Events Policy](#) produced by Parks for London and representing best practice for London.

1.2 Our proposals

The overarching values from 2016 remain but in the refreshed strategy there is a particular focus on events being environmentally sustainable and financially transparent, as well as locally led and accountable:

- **Environmentally sustainable** – We have already purchased specialist equipment for Lambeth Landscapes to use for event reparations to allow repair works of a

professional standard to be undertaken year round by our staff. We have commissioned Ecological Impact Assessments for parks hosting Major events and these will be refreshed in 2020. We propose a new emphasis on events which have minimal potential to damage grass, for example through greater use of hard-surfaced sites.

- **Financially transparent** – We are proposing to publish annual figures on events income and what the Parks Investment Levy is spent on.
- **Locally led and accountable** – We have already integrated the events and parks teams into the same council service (Neighbourhoods), to ensure a more balanced perspective for large events held in parks and ensure closer working between officers in the different teams. We are proposing that community engagement happens earlier in the event application process. We also suggest that we remove the current complex formula for the Parks Investment Levy (PIL) and replace it with a set percentage of total income from every event to ensure consistency and more income for our parks.

2.0 The consultation

2.1 Consultation objectives

The objective of the consultation was to gain the views of residents of the borough, parks users and key stakeholders on our proposals to update the events strategy.

2.2 Who we consulted

We consulted residents of the borough, parks users and key stakeholders.

2.3 When we consulted

The consultation started on 4 March and closed on 5 May 2019.

2.4 How we consulted

2.4.1 Press activity

There was no specific press activity

2.4.2 Digital activity

Participants were directed to the online consultation platform on Lambeth Council's website and invited to complete a survey. This was supported by Twitter and Facebook posts as well as stakeholder emails.

2.4.2.1 Print activity

There was no specific print activity

2.4.2.2 Event activity

This consultation was promoted through discussion at meetings such as the Parks Forum



3.0 Responses from members of the public


3.1 Summary of results

In total 604 people took part in the consultation, although not everyone answered every question. In addition, a small number of extra responses were emailed directly from key stakeholders.

3.1.1 Question 1


'We are proposing to increase transparency about how much income is generated from events and how it is spent, by publishing the total annual income as well as an annual report showing the allocation of the Parks Investment Levy (PIL) on the Council's website. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'


Responses received:



Responses to this question were as follows:


178
 people left a further comment in this section.


44%
 of those who commented expressed their support for the proposal.


47%
 of those who commented had further suggestions as to how to make the data more transparent.

Suggestions included:

'We would like an event-by-event financial breakdown, not just a grand total. This is so we can assess the value vs the wear and tear on the park.'

'The size of the levy should be increased to allow increased funding allocations to those spaces most deleteriously affected by events.'

'Details of profit of each event vs days and space closed to public should also be published. Rather than a "total annual income", is it possible to breakdown PIL income per events venue?'


'More money spent on the clean up during and after the event'

'It is essential that there is more transparency given the prolonged periods of part closure of areas of the parks and commons for post event repairs'

3.1.2 Question 2


'Currently, event organisers are required to pay a Parks Investment Levy (PIL) that is ring-fenced for enhancements in parks. We propose to set the PIL at a set percentage of total income from every event, simplifying the current formula, and at a level which increases the amount of events income spent on enhancing our parks. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'


Responses received:




Responses to this question were as follows:


199
 people left a further comment in this section.


43%
 of those who commented expressed their unequivocal support for the proposal.


37%
 made further suggestions about how to balance the level of charge against the amount of damage sustained to the park and the time that the park is inaccessible to the wider public.


17%
 of those who commented wanted to ensure that any revenue raised went directly back to the park hosting the event.


Comments included:

- 'Would you consider a progressive tax so that lower income events are still encouraged?'
- 'The PIL should not be payable by charitable organisations - especially those that are Friends of parks in Lambeth. The proposal seems sensible for commercial organisers.'
- 'The charge should reflect the inconvenience to park users and damage to the park.'
- 'As long as it is a percentage of total income and not total profit'
- 'It should not be so high as to discourage organisers from holding events in the borough.'

3.1.3 Question 3


'In order to try and diversify events income and reduce the pressure on grassed areas, we are proposing to devote more time and effort to marketing non-grass areas such as in and around buildings, town squares and on parts of unused all-weather sports pitches. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

Responses received:



Responses to this question were as follows:


161
 people left a further comment in this section.


71%
 of those who commented expressed their support for the proposal.


20%

suggested that a balance needed to be struck, bearing in mind that many hard standing areas will not be suitable for large scale events.

Concerns were also raised about possible displacement of other activities currently taking place on non-grassed surfaces, particularly sports.

Comments included:

'Would be good to use artificial alternatives where possible ie artificial grass as it's hard wearing and relatively maintenance free but still gives the grass aesthetic'

'Town square spaces must not be fenced off. Enclosed events need to take place on vacant sites or specific hard surfaces in parks'

'This is a good idea but execution is limited as the spaces proposed will not host large events.'

'Mixes it up a bit and leads to greater variety.'

'Festivals and music events need grassed areas. No-one will sit on concrete'

5.5.1 Question 4

'Currently, an event application process goes to Health and Safety Assessment before Community Engagement. We are proposing that Community Engagement happens earlier in the process'

Current process:

- Stage one – Application and Technical Assessment
- Stage two – Health and Safety Assessment
- Stage three – Community Engagement (including ward councillor engagement and applying for a licence)
- Stage four – Final Decision and Event Permit

Proposed process:

- Stage one – Application and Technical Assessment; ward councillor consultation and community engagement (as agreed by ward councillors)
- Stage two – Health and Safety Assessment
- Stage three – Final Decision and Event permit

To what extent to you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

Responses to this question were as follows:



158

people left a further comment in this section.



39%

of those who commented expressed their support for the proposal.



37%


stressed the need for meaningful community engagement.



28%

gave more detailed feedback about the proposed process.

Responses received:



Comments included:

'The community are the users of all of these spaces so they need to be engaged as early as possible.'

'More consultation will improve community engagement and should reduce dissatisfaction and complaints'

'Strong agreement based on actual community engagement and discussion at the local councillors' stage. Friends of and other groups must be actively involved with the councillors.'

'Some assessment of the likely environmental impact should also be undertaken before presenting the application to the community for their consideration.'

'I support this. It will allow inappropriate events to be stopped at an earlier stage saving everyone hassle.'

3.1.4 Additional comments

'Please let us know any other comments you have on Lambeth's approach to managing events. In particular, feedback relating to specific parks will help us tailor our policies accordingly'

Responses to this question were as follows:



298

people left a further comment in this section.



24%

of these comments related to concern about the damage to parks that is caused by events.



21%

suggested that the number and scale of events in parks were inappropriate to the location.



17%

of comments were specifically related to the Country Show.

Comments include:

'We need to avoid damage to Streatham Common through having too many events and not allowing sufficient time for the grass to grow back.'

'You can't have something for nothing. If you use our parks to make money but don't give anything back then it's a problem.'

'Noise levels over summer weekends need to be carefully monitored. Music should not be audible more than half a mile away.'

'Greatly reduce impact from events by massively reducing put-up and take-down times for the commercial events currently being allowed in parks. Damage to parks from events needs to be repaired a lot quicker.'

'Could it be an essential part of any work that turfing is laid or grass seed planted to rectify damage caused by events?'



In addition, there were a number of responses specific to individual parks, in particular Clapham Common, Streatham Common, Kennington Park and Brockwell Park.

4.0 Responses from statutory bodies and other stakeholders

Responses were received from a number of stakeholders as part of the questionnaire responses and are set out below:

4.1 Question 1

'We are proposing to increase transparency about how much income is generated from events and how it is spent, by publishing the total annual income as well as an annual report showing the allocation of the Parks Investment Levy (PIL) on the Council's website. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'



On the face of it, The Green Party is inclined to strongly agree with this proposal. There is the danger, however, that the data published will increase the quantity of 'noise' that could be used to obfuscate and obscure the real costs and benefits of opening up our green spaces for commercial events.

It seems reasonable to imagine that at least part of the reason that this proposal is being made is to justify opening up Lambeth's parks to outside commercial events, by increasing the public's awareness of the costs of their maintenance. We would therefore require that all costs and revenues be published in as clear a manner as possible. This must include, for example: The revenue earned and costs incurred by each park from commercial events, as well as the overall amount earned from all events across Lambeth.

The cost to individual parks over and above the discrete period of the events themselves e.g. Ongoing maintenance of any plants or trees that must be replaced, drainage damage etc.

The time spent and resulting costs incurred of all Lambeth council staff on the application including but not limited to the events team, marketing, health and safety, community outreach activity

and licensing An estimate of the opportunity cost of holding the events at the given time in the particular park i.e. Reduced footfall from regular park users, events/activities/services that will be limited or not able to take place at all while these larger commercial events are taking place.

Ultimately the public needs to be comprehensively informed as to how profitable these commercial events that are being held in their parks are, in the form of all the costs and benefits (direct and indirect). This is the only way that they can reach a decision as to whether they should support or oppose them.

We would also require that Lambeth actively reaches out to local residents to provide them with this information, rather than merely publishing on a website and expecting residents to seek it out themselves, as far as is reasonable to do so.'

(Lambeth Green Party)



From the Friends of Kennington Park.

A total annual breakdown on the Council's spending per park should be published, so there is clarity on the base budget - management

4.1 Question 1 responses

and staffing costs; equipment for Lambeth Landscapes; cleaning; services (drains, gate opening); horticulture/trees/grass; repairs and preventative maintenance; sport - and the outside income from events, filming, cafes, ice cream vans, sports, licenses for personal trainers, professional dog walkers, charges for sports pitch marking.

Clarity is required as to what the PIL is allocated to - whether it is for park "enhancements" or contributing to maintenance. Information should be available to Friends Groups on what is covered by the Council's insurance - is damage covered or is this covered from the repair's budget.

Information should be available as to whether some services are provided via overtime payments rather than within contracts. Re assurance is sought that the charges to commercial event organisers are now at an appropriate level, the level has an impact on the amount of the 20% PIL.

Information should also be available as to how much money is received, by event, for damage to the park, this should also include community events. In relation to events, clarity is required on deposits paid by event organisers, what monies are subsequently held to rectify damage and what the process is for the assessment of costs and payment for large scale remedial work after events. A recent query in Kennington was

whether re-seeded grass areas be taped off or fenced off while the grass recovers.'

(Friends of Kennington Park)



Lambeth Parks Forum believes that transparency with respect to Lambeth's Events budget is very much to be welcomed. Public support for commercial events is largely predicated on the belief that this earns money that contributes towards the upkeep of our parks. Until recently we believe that the Events programme has not earned a significant income for parks, beyond the Parks Investment Levy, because of the drain on the budget imposed by the cost of the Lambeth Country Show (LCS).

While we recognise that the LCS is a popular Lambeth event, we believe that including it in the Events budget has led to a situation where the costs of staging the show were driving the Events policy, leading to an Events programme that was perhaps over-ambitious and detrimental to some of the host open spaces: Clapham Common, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Streatham Common. We understand that the LCS budget is to be held separately in future from that of Events and hope that this will lead to a more sustainable model for financing the Show.'

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



FOBP welcomes all moves to greater transparency, in particular the regular, detailed reports on events regularly received for some time now from Parks officers to the Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum. It hopes these regular, detailed reports to the Forum, specifying income for individual parks, will continue, while welcoming the proposed annual reports on the Council's website.'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



We strongly agree with increased transparency but think that the total annual income should be broken down for the major parks including Clapham Common and that this should show the total revenue from events, but also from sports and cafes for each major park. The Parks Investment Levy should also be broken down for each of the major parks.'

(Clapham Town Labour)



Given the controversial nature of the events policy transparency is key to informing residents of the revenue benefits of events. Revenue per event should be included in this disclosure. There

4.1 Question 1 responses

should also be a calculation of the amount of revenue that was generated per day the event team was on site, the amount per square metre of space that was taken up and the amount per visitor. This will help inform all stakeholders regarding the revenue generated compared with the impact on the common. This should be included in the planning application so residents can judge for themselves the trade off between the revenue potential and the inconvenience of the event'

(Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee)



Transparency with respect to Lambeth's Events budget is very much to be welcomed. Public support for commercial events is largely predicated on the belief that this earns money that contributes towards the upkeep of our parks. Until recently we believe that the Events programme has not earned a significant income for parks, beyond the Parks Investment Levy, because of the drain on the budget imposed by the cost of the Lambeth Country Show (LCS). While we recognise that the LCS is a popular Lambeth event, we believe that including it in the Events budget has led to a situation where the costs of staging the show were driving the Events policy and determining the Events target income. Brockwell Park and Clapham Common, between them were the main sources of Events

income to reach this target, to the detriment of both. The proposal, set up to support maximising Events income, that our park could potentially host 8 major event days in one year (not counting the Lambeth Country Show) is regarded by Brockwell Park stakeholders as unsustainable and a serious risk to the Park.

(Brockwell Park Community Partners)

4.2 Question 2

'Currently, event organisers are required to pay a Parks Investment Levy (PIL) that is ring-fenced for enhancements in parks. We propose to set the PIL at a set percentage of total income from every event, simplifying the current formula, and at a level which increases the amount of events income spent on enhancing our parks. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'



From the Friends of Kennington Park

Last year Kennington Park "hosted" Bensons Funfair which was on site (fenced in and including fair equipment, lorries and caravans) on the south field of the Heritage Park for 15 days (open to the public for 10 day), maximum on site at any one time 400, categorised as a small event: the PIL for Kennington was £800.

FriendsFest was on site (fenced in) on the south field of Kennington's Heritage Park for over 2 weeks, open for 10 days, the Events paperwork said 250 people onsite at any one time (this year it reads 650), categorised as a small event - the PIL for Kennington was £7,000.

The Council earned over £30,000 from events in Kennington in 2018/19. At a daily rate, the PIL contribution to Kennington is derisory, months later the park is still recovering from the damage.

There needs to be full discussion with Friends Groups on the spending of PIL money and transparency as to whether this goes on "enhancements", is factored in to the budget for the park or allocated to specific repairs and maintenance.

Parks are not event sites, PIL refers to Investment, the question is whether the holding of events in parks is "investing" in parks.'

(Friends of Kennington Park)



Lambeth Parks Forum was pleased when the PIL income was increased by Cllr Hopkins while he was Cabinet member and would of course welcome further increases in the money available to invest in our parks and open spaces.

However, the PIL policy begs the question of where, legally, the levy income from park events should be spent. As we understand it, recent legal rulings in the case of Finsbury Park suggest that the only legitimate use of this income is to be spent fully in the host park.

Lambeth Parks Forum would regard this as an undesirable outcome, if applied rigidly, because we would support PIL income to be invested in smaller parks as well.

We hope that an appropriate mechanism can be found to enable PIL income as to be used for the benefit of all our parks and open spaces.'

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



What is the set percentage level?

(Friends of Ruskin Park)

4.2 Question 2 responses



At the moment, this is an illegal proposal, FOBP believes, in that, following the Finsbury Park judgement, all event revenue raised in a particular park must go to that park alone. We urge the Borough Solicitor urgently to advise Lambeth Council on the legality of its PIL proposal, in the context of the Finsbury Park judgement.'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



We strongly agree with the proposal that event organisers be required to pay Parks Investment Levy (PIL) as a set % of total income from every event rather than the current method of basing it on the number of people attending as

- It makes it easier to collect with no room for negotiation
- It makes it more predictable

We would suggest introducing the set % of income but also having a per head charge if attendance exceeds the expected number.'

(Clapham Town Labour)



The proposed simplifications would increase transparency but not provide any adjustments for important considerations such as charitable events vs commercial events (some charitable events can still be profit-making for commercial enterprises), where the event is held (e.g. on grass vs a hard surface) and, most importantly, the damage caused to ground, especially grass. Furthermore, given PIL is dependent on the total income generated from an event, this is a matter of secondary importance to CCMAC being consulted on how the total income is generated via the setting of the pricing tariff for events'

(Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee)



We agree that the calculation of PIL income should be simplified and would welcome a further increase in the money available to invest in our park.

However, the PIL policy begs the question of where, legally, the income from park events should be spent.

As we understand it, recent legal rulings in the case of Finsbury Park, suggest that the only legitimate use of this income is to be spent fully in the host park. Brockwell Park Community Partners has long had a policy that parks income

should be able to be used to support smaller parks as well as the 'flagship' ones.

We would regard it as an undesirable outcome, if PIL income spending was rigidly confined to host parks. This income allows parks to benefit from investment that might not otherwise have taken place.

We hope that an appropriate mechanism can be found to enable PIL income to be used for the benefit of all our parks and open spaces. We would welcome a legal ruling on this point.'

(Brockwell Park Community Partners)

4.3 Question 3

'In order to try and diversify events income and reduce the pressure on grassed areas, we are proposing to devote more time and effort to marketing non-grass areas such as in and around buildings, town squares and on parts of unused all-weather sports pitches. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'



Lambeth Green Party strongly supports this proposal. Non-grass areas are much more durable than grass and recover more quickly. This is particularly important in the summer when those grassed parts of the parks are in greater demand and it is important to minimise the time that they are unavailable to the public.'

(Lambeth Green Party)



From the Friends of Kennington Park

Events should be appropriate to a park, Kennington is a heritage park with two smallish grass fields. A funfair is not an appropriate event for such a park. It is fenced in and throughout a two week period, heavy equipment, lorries and caravans are parked on the field (in some places above a World War Two mass grave from the trench shelter tragedy). This leaves the grass bare, patchy, with oily marks, tyre tracks and uneven from the weight of the equipment. A funfair should not be held on a grass field, the impact is considerable particularly if the weather is wet.

The question should be asked why an event such as FriendsFest is held, fenced in, in the middle of a field in a park. The setting has no relevance to the event. It is noted that The Parks

for London documentation referred to said that events staged in public parks should be justified by other benefits rather than merely income such as wider policy objectives e.g. health and well-being. The Friends believe there has got to be a proper balance between commercial events and people's right to enjoy their local park.'

(Friends of Kennington Park)



Lambeth Parks Forum agrees that would be better to transfer as many public events as possible into spaces other than parks and that this would be a useful exercise.

Parks are critical for recreation in a way that other open spaces are not. Many Lambeth residents, from all sectors of our community, live in crowded conditions and for them, access to open space is an important amenity and a significant benefit to health and well-being. Large events taking place in the summer especially, reduce access to parks and deprive people of these opportunities when they are most needed.

The effect of large scale events on grassland, with large numbers of people concentrated in one place, is inevitably damaging and more so in bad weather. Parks are organic spaces that take time to recover. Even with conscientious attention to reinstate parks, damage, such as compaction, accumulate over time, resulting in deterioration

4.3 Question 3 responses

of the condition of the soil and the ecology of the green space. The poor condition of the grassed and overused event site on Clapham Common bears witness to this.

A move to hosting large events in more urban space, or even hardstanding areas in open spaces, would be a popular development.'

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



We acknowledge the many benefits of holding a limited number of appropriate events that are clearly in the public interest at the proper locations on public land.

Our objection is to the overuse of grass areas which are unsuitable for large events at a time when hard surface purpose-built events sites are idle. Where they exist, the default site for all substantial events should be on hard surface sites, not grassed areas. Hard surface events sites should be used to their maximum throughout the year for maximum commercial gain.

CCMAC believes that no events such as Winterville or Summerville proposed for Clapham Common should be held on grassed areas.'

(Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee)



In some cases, this might make sense. However, Ruskin Park is starting a master-planning reviews. Non grassed areas have been under-used. There may be better alternative uses in the longer term for them than as permanent sites for events. Choices of Events' sites in the short term should not prevent strategic changes of use to improve the park infrastructure.

(Friends of Ruskin Park)



It is a worthy aim to diversity events income and reduce the pressure on grassed areas. In Brockwell Park, however, there are hardly any ungrassed areas – the redgra pitch, for instance, is so small, it is likely not to generate revenue sufficient to justify the effort needed to put an event on it.

Elsewhere in the borough, we could see there being a need for wide community consultation to change a beloved pitch into an events area'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



We strongly agree that the Council should make more effort to market the non-grass areas to

reduce the pressure on grassed areas. But we consider that the Council should make the non-grass areas more attractive and better maintained with good disabled access.

However, we recognised that increased use of the non-grass areas on Clapham Common would mean that Wandsworth Council would have control of planning and licensing of the events rather than Lambeth.'

(Clapham Town Labour)



It would be better to transfer as many public events as possible into spaces other than parks and we agree that this would be a useful exercise.

Parks are critical for recreation in a way that other open spaces are not. Many of our local residents live in crowded conditions and the park is bordered by some areas of deprivation in Tulse Hill, Coldharbour and Thurlow Park wards.

For many local people, access to open space is an important amenity and a significant benefit to health and well-being. Large events taking place in the summer especially, reduce access to parks and deprive people of these opportunities when they need them most.

We are particularly concerned about reduced access to the park during set-up and build-

4.3 Question 3 responses

down of events and believe that these should be kept as short as possible. Even if the park remains accessible during these times, it will not necessarily be a safe environment for children.

The effect of large scale events on grassland, with large numbers of people concentrated in one place, is inevitably damaging and more so in bad weather. Parks are organic spaces that take time to recover. Even with conscientious attention to reinstatement, damage, such as compaction, accumulate over time, resulting in deterioration of the condition of the soil and the ecology of the green space. Large areas of grassland in Brockwell Park have gradually become invaded by species that thrive on compacted soils and some of the biodiversity of the grassy areas has been lost through reseeded or re-turfing with standard amenity grass.

A move to hosting events in more urban space, or even hard standing areas in open spaces, would be a popular development.'

(Brockwell Park Community Partners)

4.4 Question 4

'Currently, an event application process goes to Health and Safety Assessment before Community Engagement. We are proposing that Community Engagement happens earlier in the process. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'



While the new process clearly represents an improvement on the old one, Lambeth Green Party feels it does not go far enough.

In particular it does not include the community at an early enough point. In our revised version of the process - see below - we propose involving the community and beginning outreach as soon as an event organiser makes contact and declares an interest, and ahead of any formal application.

We would then favour including an additional period of community engagement at a later stage, once the technical and health and safety assessments have taken place.

We would also request that more detail be entered into as to the form the community engagement will take, and what in particular the community will be consulted about. For example, will it be required that there is agreement on noise levels, curfew times, and areas of the parks that will be in/out of use at which times?

Communication in a way people understand, at an early stage, when it comes to technical details about noise, would help residents know what to expect.

We would also require that event plans are made available publicly in an accessible venue, such as Brockwell Hall and/or Herne Hill Station Hall

for a reasonable period of time as far in advance as possible.

We'd also request that it be possible to respond to plans via an online survey (similar to this one) with a requirement that individuals include their postcode, so it can be recorded whether respondents live in the borough & live near the event.

Green Party Proposed Process

- Stage One - Preliminary proposal and negotiations including (initial) ward councillor consultation
- Stage Two - Identify and inform stakeholders e.g. 'Friends of', TRAs, Trader associations - consult on the basics
- Stage Three – Application & Technical Assessment;
- Stage Four – Health & Safety Assessment
- Stage Five - Revisited stage ward councillor consultation and community engagement'

(Lambeth Green Party)



The Friends currently attend many pre event and post event site meetings in Kennington Park the Events, Parks and the Organisers.

4.4 Question 4 responses

Any consultation/engagement has to be meaningful. It appears that once a particular event has been held in the park, the precedent is set.

Friendsfest was held in Kennington in autumn 2018 and there were various issues and the grass has yet to recover. The Events weekly document states that for this year's Friendsfest it is currently at Stage 2 and the organiser's website indicates that this year's event is already "sold out" for the 10 days. It refers to the "outdoor grassed site experience" and that the event would only be cancelled if the weather conditions were considered dangerous.

How meaningful will the consultation will be?

It is unclear why the "community engagement" is to be agreed by the ward councillors.

Lambeth Planning holds a list of community consultees, other than FOKP does Events consult other local groups?

There is considerable frustration that public consultation is currently limited to Licensing applications with signs posted around the park.

As Kennington Park is part bordered by the borough of Southwark and there will be an impact from events in the park and the allied heavy traffic during set up and take down and possible noise, consultation should include the relevant local Southwark ward councillors.

It is regrettable that this consultation was not about the principle of events in parks but on the events strategy.'

(Friends of Kennington Park)



Lambeth Parks Forum believes that there is an important role for local elected members in ensuring that the views of the local community and local park users are taken into account in event planning.

We agree that the community and local Friends and MACs should be consulted at the earliest possible stage of planning; once the SAC consultations begin, initial proposals are likely to become established policy.

There is an inbuilt perception in the planning process that once a proposed event goes out to public consultation it will go ahead but is only subject to amendments to appease the local community. It is of little use if MAC or Friends groups or the wider community get sight of the event pro forma only a short time before the event and when it is too late to make significant changes.

This proposal does carry a risk to Councillors, if they are perceived to be too close to the Events team or know little about their parks and open spaces.

We regret the closure of the "Lead Councillor" system, which gave Councillors the opportunity to become knowledgeable about local issues like events and to develop the sort of community engagement that made constructive dialogue possible.

We hope that councillors will recognise how important it is to achieve good working relationships with parks users.'

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



Community engagement earlier is essential. However, this is worthless unless the community is listened to.

In the case of Winterville in 2018 its approval was despite objections running 6:1 vs supporters and every local ward councillor except one was against the event. Serious and – we now know – well founded concerns about the state of the grass were downplayed, with devastating consequences for both this winter and last winter. The events strategy should state that no event will be approved unless it has the support of both the CCMAC and a majority of local ward councillors. CCMAC should be involved as early as possible in the process.'

(Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee)

4.4 Question 4 responses



We are not sure about this change. There are pros and cons. We agree that Friends Groups should have adequate time to consider and respond to proposals, and no-one wants to make the process longer than necessary, or to waste effort. We trust Events Lambeth will undertake the basic checks in the current stages 1 and 2, and we do not want to waste effort on considering applications that were anyway going to fail on technical, or other grounds. This could happen if community engagement is moved to stage 1.

In general, FoRP would be accepting of applications concerning Ruskin Park where the event:

- Appealed to a significant section of local people and did not offend other sections
- Had an affordable/proportionate entrance charge
- Had health and well-being outcomes
- Had a scale of size, duration and areas of exclusion which were reasonable
- Had been assessed by Lambeth as safe and technically sound, and complying with its policy

We would find it helpful if Events Lambeth sent us formally a summary of the proposed event to comment on, and a date for reply. Then

the trustees would apply our checklist above, possibly share it with members and invite any comments, and reply to Events Lambeth within the timescale. Our role is to enable 2-way communication about planned events, and to comment by exception if we feel reasonable concerns about the well-being of the park and its users are not being adequately addressed by Lambeth.'

(Friends of Ruskin Park)



The existing process, while paying lip service to community engagement, has in practice been a dead letter, lacking all genuine engagement. Moving the community/ward councillor engagement to an earlier stage in the process is welcome to the FOBP, but unless it consists of clearly defined ways of engaging the local community, including a transparent scoring system for all major elements of the event, it too will be a dead letter.

For events in Brockwell Park, the views of major stakeholders such as the FOBP and the Brockwell Park Community Partners (BPCP) must be sought in good time and their views accorded serious weight in the process; a no from FOBP and BPCP should be definitive in refusing an event in Brockwell Park.'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



We strongly support community engagement happening earlier in the event application process.

We are not clear where applying for a license happens in the proposed process and think it should happen between Stages 2 and 3.

We are sceptical whether community engagement has had a significant effect on the events that have happened in the past and suggest that the annual report proposed in Question 1 should include details of events that have been refused as a result of community engagement.'

(Clapham Town Labour)



We agree that public consultation on major events should take place as early as possible and also that there is an important role for local elected members in ensuring that the views of the local community and local park users are taken into account in event planning.

The Friends of Brockwell Park and the BPCP (Brockwell Park MAC) should be consulted at the earliest possible stage of planning, after the first technical assessments have been carried out.

4.4 Question 4 responses

Once the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) consultations begin, initial proposals are likely to become established policy. There is a public perception that once a proposed event goes out to public consultation, there is nothing to stop it going ahead and it can only be subject to minor alterations to appease the local community.

This is very damaging for Lambeth. It is also of little use if the BPCP, the Friends or the wider community get sight of the event pro-forma only a short time before the event and when it is too late to make significant changes.

This proposal does carry a risk to Councillors, if they are perceived to be too close to the Events team or know little about their parks and open spaces. We regret the closure of the "Lead Councillor" system, which gave Councillors the opportunity to become knowledgeable about local issues like events and to develop the sort of community engagement that made constructive dialogue possible. We hope that councillors will be able to achieve good working relationships with parks users and the local community.'

(Brockwell Park Community Partners)

4.5 Additional comments

'Please let us know any other comments you have on Lambeth's approach to managing events. In particular, feedback relating to specific parks will help us tailor our policies accordingly'



I am submitting this proposal on behalf of the Lambeth Liberal Democrats.

The Lambeth Liberal Democrats are extremely disappointed by the scope and content of this consultation.

Lambeth Labour's refusal to commit to proper guardianship of our parks is a failure of duty and leadership. We reject the premise of this consultation as it appears designed simply to illicit superficial support for a pre-determined policy.

These proposals do not address the fundamental issue of the primary purpose of Lambeth's parks and, most importantly, who they are for and the positive impact they could have if invested in to realise their full potential. The proposals will not make parks policy more locally-led. Parks must be for people and not profit.

The Liberal Democrats believe that access to high quality green space close to people's homes is a human right and not just a privilege. High quality green space includes proper maintenance, access to high levels of light and a respect for horticultural excellence and sustainability.

Events in parks should be agreed to via full and proper public consultation, of benefit to, inclusive of and shaped by the local community through

co-creation. No event should do damage to the park's natural or landscaped environment, the communal facilities, or prevent residents' normal daily use of the park.

Greater consideration needs to be given to the appropriateness of events for the space, the impact of licensing, and the impact of event set-up and security on park users. It must be acknowledged that noise levels have considerable impact on residents and we request that the decibel for events in Lambeth be restricted below the legal maximum level allowed.

Event organisers and Council officers must ensure there is thorough pre- and post- event site meetings at all events.

The Lambeth Liberal Democrats call for a full, comprehensive review of the Lambeth Country Show to determine its future. It is unacceptable that LCS is running at a loss of £800,000 whilst being over-commercialised. If it is to continue it requires a radical reimagining and a clearer purpose as a true community event. We call more widely for greater transparency of finances.

We demand better for Lambeth's parks. Our view remains that the current Events Policy should be scrapped.

Lambeth Liberal Democrats will bring forward policies to shape Lambeth's public spaces for the future ahead of 2022 and seek to influence Liberal Democrat policy at a national level to

4.5 Additional comments

address the threat faced by urban parks across the country, including those in Lambeth.

In the meantime we believe there are three courses of action that Lambeth Council should take to better achieve its responsibilities to protect our parks for the future:

Undertake a Natural Capital Account of the borough's environmental assets. This has been done by a number of London boroughs and would establish a value for the recreational, health, wellbeing, and economic benefits derived from those assets. It has been demonstrated that the costs of maintaining green infrastructure can be less than 10% of the value gained from them. We contest that this makes a strong case for funding our parks free from the need for commercial exploitation.

Protect all Lambeth's parks, green spaces and playing fields in perpetuity by applying for a Deed of Dedication through the Fields in Trust charity. This would eliminate the immediate threat to these spaces and ensure that they will be available for future generations of Lambeth residents to enjoy.

To prioritise S106 and CIL funds from future developments to green space over other discretionary initiatives and to apply greater rigour and public transparency in the assessment of applications.'

(Lambeth Liberal Democrats)



The Friends of Kennington Park know that Lambeth Council is dealing with severe budget cuts and understand that parks have a role in generating income, but FOKP have concerns about the disruption and damage to the park that the events often leave behind.

Events must be well planned and managed with a clear plan for restoring any damage - this should apply to both the large commercial events and small community ones.

FOKP has been active in attending pre and post event site meetings in the park, liaising with Events, Parks and event organisers to discuss the issues. FOKP want Kennington to remain a well kept, green, welcoming, open park for the community and to actively ensure that it does not deteriorate. FOKP would be very happy to discuss further the issues about events in Kennington Park.

As an events site: Logistically Kennington is not suited to being an event site - access is primarily through the park depot; the paths are lined by large overhanging trees and on occasions branches have had to be lopped to allow lorries to pass; the drainage is poor; paths are narrow and winding with grass verges - this is particularly challenging for articulated lorries and last year an artic drove over the grass

area between two paths prior to any tracking being laid.

The heritage park has two grass fields, divided by the Midnight Path (a Lambeth Highway). Any event will cause disruption to the daily park users, particularly when events, such as Bensons Funfair and Friendsfest fence off virtually all of one of the fields for about 2 weeks at a time. Despite tracking, the grass suffers and the remedial work is often delayed. The south field is still awaiting grass repairs six months later.

Appropriate events; The Friends believe that any event should be appropriate in content and scale to the size of the heritage park and take into consideration the everyday users and local community.

FOKP protested vigorously several years ago at the plan to turn the north field into a temporary car park for several hundred cars during a film shoot.

Kennington, like many other parks, has an issue with street drinkers and would be anxious to avoid events where alcohol is sold.

Equally, the Council has just granted a lease for the park cafe and, not only will cafe patrons look out onto the fencing of an event and have the event music, but the event catering is in competition with the cafe.

To reiterate the comment of Parks for London: "events staged in public parks should be justified

4.5 Additional comments

by other benefits rather than merely income such as wider policy objectives e.g. health and well-being”

Remedial work: The Friends are aware that it is proposed to take this work in house, however, the repair work should be done quickly, appropriately and properly managed - such as re turfing rather than re seeding, where necessary, with the follow up watering, etc and fenced off (rather than taped off).

Concern is that the same footprint is used on the south field for events, so the entrance area for both Bensons and Friendsfest never has the opportunity to recover and, in bad weather, turns to mud. Months after the events the grass has bare patches.

Frequency; a previous Council policy had a stated recovery period, up to 20 days. Efforts should be made to ensure that a park can recover and events are not held over consecutive weekends, especially during the summer holiday.

Duration - Bensons Funfair is on site in Kennington at the start of the summer holidays for 15 days, Friendsfest in September for 17 days. This is too long to have the south field unavailable for everyday users. The feedback from an FOKP member survey a few years ago resulted in 54% of respondents saying events should be onsite for no longer than 3 days, 34% for 7 days and 6% for 10 days. The feedback

also favoured a recovery time for the park between 3 and 8 weeks.

Scale of events - the category of event sizes is calculated on the number of people on site at any one time, in 2019 for Friendsfest it is 650 and for Bensons 400. Friendsfest is open 11 days, with entrance of a specified number of ticket holders every 10 minutes for between 9 and 10 hours for 10 days. Events classify both as a “small event”. The cumulative figures should be calculated.

Finances - the key words are clarity and transparency. The Lambeth Country Show is not included within this consultation, it should not be subsidised by events in other parks. Events should break even otherwise Lambeth parks are being “given away” without any profit to the Council or benefit to the park users. PIL should genuinely be additional monies to develop the natural capital of the park and not an add-on to the park budget.

Benefit to the host park and surrounding local businesses - £7k PIL from 2018/19 is welcome money for Kennington Park, but at the cost of one of the fields being fenced off for a month and damaged grass area. The benefit to local businesses is unclear.

Reviewing the impact of events in parks - events needs to be analysed over several years - a minimum of the past three need to be considered to get any real insight. There is much

seasonality and variance in what goes on. Every year FOKP complains about the damage done to the park by Bensons, each year there is some patching up and a year later, Bensons return and the damage is done again. Long term, with a reduced park budget, the fabric of the park will continue to deteriorate.

Consultation - it has to be local, wider, genuine and open, without the current fallback that the Health and Safety Assessors see no issues. There should be some involvement for Southwark Councillors for Kennington Park events. Those participating should feel that their comments are taken on board. An event returning to the same park the following year should be properly re-scrutinised, lessons acted upon and refused, if necessary.

Protection for parks - Kennington Park has already been recommended by Lambeth Council to Fields in Trust charity and RBL as a Centenary Field in recognition of its role during World War One. FOKP have already celebrated Kennington as a Centenary Field with the local community and the parishioners of St Mark's Church.

Consideration should be given to extending Lambeth's protection of its parks and green spaces in perpetuity through a Deed of Dedication through Fields in Trust.

A number of London Borough Councils have undertaken a Natural Capital Account of their borough's environmental assets. This would

4.5 Additional comments

establish a value for the recreational, health, wellbeing, and economic benefits derived from those assets. The results have shown that the cost of maintaining green infrastructure can be less than 10% of the value gained from them.

Finally, of some relevance to the current consultation is Lambeth's previous discussion on events. Below are some of the recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Cabinet following the August 2016 Events Policy Call in, the meeting was chair by the now leader of Lambeth Council, Cllr Hopkins:

1. That consideration be given to using cumulative attendance figures when deciding how an event is classified.
2. That all local ward councillors (including those in neighbouring boroughs, where relevant) as well as area leads be involved in consultations, pre-event planning meetings, LESAG [Lambeth Events Strategy Action group – police, fire, events] meetings and post- event evaluation in relation to events in their area.
3. That local councillors and residents and groups be given a clear understanding prior to an event of plans regarding post-event cleaning.
4. That more detail and greater guarantees regarding closer consultation and early engagement with councillors, Friends groups

and the local community be included in the Events Strategy, and form a standard part of event contracts.

5. That examples of proposed draft contracts for event organisers be inserted into the Events Strategy.
6. That finalised events contracts be shared as openly as possible.
7. That actual noise levels recorded at the agreed monitoring points for music events should be routinely published in order to provide transparency as to whether pre-agreed thresholds were adhered to. These should also be included in the annual review of the strategy. Where levels have been breached, details of the penalty charges should also be published. These should be severe in order to deter non-compliance.
8. That licensing sub-committee reports related to music events should include an acoustics report as standard.
9. That licensing applications for events be routinely advertised to local community groups in order that they are informed of the plans and their right to make representations.
10. That clearer comparative analysis from other boroughs be included in the Strategy.
11. That a clear, concise guide be produced for community groups interested in holding

events, outlining the process and the help and support available (for example, with regards to public liability insurance).

12. That further analysis of the costs and income generation of the Lambeth Country Show be carried out in order to assess whether it can be delivered more efficiently.
13. That an analysis be carried out of the benefits to local businesses of holding events.
14. That clear performance measures and targets, including on income generation, be established in order to assess at the one year review point whether the Events Strategy has been successful.
15. That as detailed an analysis as possible in relation to total events income and costs including externalities (that is, impacts on the Council and others and their costs), be made openly available, including a clear outline for the disbursement of PIL.

(Friends of Kennington Park)



Lambeth Parks Forum would like to submit the following comments:

The Culture 2020 consultation resulted in a policy for 8 major event days to be held in any one

4.5 Additional comments

season in any event site. We believe that this is unsustainable in any park or open space and we hope that this policy will now be redundant. We believe that every effort must be made in advance of the development of plans to ensure that the impact of a proposed event on an open space is fully understood and can be mitigated.

If there is a possibility that it will cause serious damage, we do not think that an event should be permitted. This should also be a matter for discussion with local Councillors in advance.

All events, especially large events, should be appropriate and proportionate to the open space and the local area, and event planning should take into account access to transport links, the impact on local communities and the local environment.

There should not be a routine borough template for planning events; each open space must be considered individually, as the topography and nature of our open spaces varies.

The decision to increase permitted noise levels at music events is very unpopular and should be urgently reconsidered by the Council.

We believe that all events should be supervised on the day to an appropriate degree. Clearly the level of supervision of large events is not needed for all but small events can often be badly organised, disruptive and cause damage to the park. In one Instance during a charity

event in Brockwell Park the organisers changed their layout without consultation with the Parks staff, interrupted a planned football match and disturbed nesting birds.'

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



Issues to be considered in relation to events held in Lambeth parks:

1. **Consultation** There need to be agreed mechanisms by which Friends groups or MACs are given advance notice of events and the opportunity to comment on the formal plans.
2. **Scale** Events must be tailored to a reasonable fit for the park and to the size of access routes. In Brockwell, for instance, a major entrance for people coming from Brixton tube is via Brixton Water Lane, which is narrow and a busy bus route.
3. **Balance** There needs to be a balance between large, ticketed events, which are mostly for people from out of the borough and smaller events (e.g. funfairs) which are mostly attended by local people.
4. **Occupation** There should be rigorous control of set-up and build-down times, minimising the disruption of park access for the community, especially at holiday periods.
5. **Supervision** All events should be supervised. Many small events (e.g. .charity runs) take place at weekends, when there are no regular park staff on duty. Small events can be very problematic because they are often run by inexperienced and badly organised groups and can result in problems of safety and disruption of ordinary park activities.
6. **Protecting parks** There has to be a balance between securing income and the wellbeing of the park itself. These are organic spaces and cannot be assumed to recover quickly from heavy use.
7. **Community events** The system for organising community events by park groups via EventLambeth is over-rigorous and does not take into account the often meagre resources available to small community groups. There needs to be a review of how community groups apply for their own small events.
8. **Remedial works** Every effort must be made to restore parkland to health quickly after all events. The Parks team are under-resourced and often this can result in delays. Some thought has to be given to planning how this can most easily be achieved. The load on staff time generated by events is considerable. Were EventLambeth to hold 8 major events in 5 parks this would

4.5 Additional comments

amount to 40 events in the summer period (when parks are busy and need, for instance, additional litter picking. This would total up to 80 handover inspections a season. Even if each handover only took two hours, this is a minimum of 160 hours of staff time to assess damage and arrange for and effect repair. The current levels of staffing are not adequate, in our opinion.

9. **Major events** The plan to hold up to 8 major events each summer in each of our larger parks must be reconsidered. This is not sustainable. There needs to be a more acceptable definition as to what constitutes a major event; the LCS, for instance is not classified as a major event.
10. **Noise** The recent decision to allow an increase in noise levels is very unpopular with communities and should be reviewed. Monitoring of noise levels must allow for local variation in how sound is perceived. It is very important to allow noise nuisance to be effectively communicated and to be properly considered.

(Lambeth Parks and Open Spaces Forum)



CCMAC welcomes Lambeth's decision to consult on the matter of Lambeth Council's events strategy and policy.

However, we are disappointed that the questions in the consultation do not provide an opportunity to hear from the community on many of the most important and controversial aspects of events on public land such as Clapham Common.

Although not part of the consultation, we believe it is essential that Lambeth engages with residents and stakeholders, in particular CCMAC, on these issues. In each case we expect CCMAC to be fully consulted in the decision making process.

1. The definition of the 'scale' of events needs to be revisited. The current definitions are not credible.
2. Whatever the outcome of the review CCMAC believes there must be far less disruption from events. A material reduction in disruption should be measurable in terms of the number of participants, the number of days the event is on site (including rigging and de-rigging), where on public land the event takes place and the physical impact on said public land, in particular grass.
3. Planning applications should clearly state the number of days event crews and equipment expected to be on site and the number of days the space applied for will be fenced off for set up, take down and recovery of the land, not just the number of days of the actual event. No application should be considered where the estimated time for

recovery is less than the actual time for recovery for a previously held event of the same time.

4. There must be a minimum amount of time between events to ensure users of the public land are not subjected to week after week of large crowds or disruption.
5. There must be a minimum amount of time between events on the grass to ensure it has proper time to recover.
6. A much greater percentage of revenue raised by events at specific locations should be clearly and transparently ring-fenced for spending on that location.
7. The current default position for events seems to be that they are walled/fenced off. Whilst this may be necessary in some instances, the default position should be that events are not walled/fenced off unless absolutely necessary for public safety purposes.

The majority of CCMAC – and from their representations to us most local residents as well – see many events as being not for the benefit of local residents and not justified by the revenue they generate. Only a small number are recognised as having any benefit to the local community and the most disruptive events are primarily for generating revenue.

The events strategy should not be designed as a revenue generating tool and more attention

4.5 Additional comments

should be given to other ways to generate revenue such as commercialisation, crowd funding, grant applications etc. This should include proper public consultation so residents can appreciate the challenges Lambeth Council faces and stakeholder buy in can be enhanced. The views of CCMAC and local residents must be given more weight. No event in Lambeth should be used to subsidise the Lambeth County Show.'

(Clapham Common Management Advisory Committee)



What about the possibility of having a 'fallow year' on the Common with the aim of halting those events that put heavy goods vehicles on the Common and cause us considerable damage. I appreciate that these events raise money for the Common but this money does not compensate for the damage caused'

(Friends of Streatham Common)



We believe Lambeth is responding already to feedback and is changing its approach for the better. We think that it is sensible to follow the new Parks for London Events Policy template, and to take account of Lambeth Parks and

Open Spaces Forum's issues to be considered in relation to events held in Lambeth parks

We understand the historical and popular reasons for keeping the Lambeth Show free. However, it does not make sense to exclude it from the other key values of the strategy. It should have a viable business plan that pays for itself so it does not result in a cost to another budget within the directorate or elsewhere in Lambeth.

We support the additional values of the refreshed strategy.'

(Friends of Ruskin Park)



It is a matter of regret that this events consultation, promised for September 2018, is only taking place in April-May 2019, too late to affect the Mighty Hoopla events in June, to which FOBP strenuously objects.

This consultation does not explicitly abandon the Council's '2020 policy' target of 8 event days per annum in major parks; this policy needs to be revoked.

The question of noise levels is not being revisited, although the massive increase from 65db to 75db is one of the elements of the events policy that is most objected to by local people. FOBP

strongly objects to the 75db level and urges a return to 65db.

There should be a refusal to proceed with any event without a specific environmental report on its likely impact on the park available before consultation opens.

Financial note

At the moment, we are assured that Lambeth Council has a budget for parks and open spaces that is not dependent in any way on income from events. That is as it should be, as a parks budget cannot be dependent on the haphazard nature of events being booked or not.

FOBP believes it is illegal for Lambeth Council to use revenue from events in a park outside that particular park and awaits confirmation from the Borough Solicitor that that is the legal position.

We do not believe that parks are ideal venues for commercial events; in the amount of land they remove from public use and for prolonged periods, in their threat to the park's ecology and the environmental damage caused, particularly in poor weather, they conflict too much with the legitimate needs of local park users for health, physical and mental, and for general recreation.

FOBP does not believe there should never be major events in Brockwell Park, just that they should be extremely rare: the park already hosts an annual major event, the Lambeth Country Show. In particular, we welcome some positive

4.5 Additional comments

moves made this year to mitigate the impact of Mighty Hoopla and will closely examine if they make a difference to an event we profoundly object to, due to its number of attendees, the length of time it takes over the park, and the extent.

The elephant in the room is the staggering annual losses incurred by the Lambeth Country Show (LCS) over many years. The 2018 event cost £1.3 million, compounded by the unnecessary, FOBP believes, walling of the LCS. It made an income of £373,000, producing a horrifying loss of £804,000. In 2018, events in Brockwell Park and Clapham Common raised £1.024 million, which the Council could view as covering the LCS losses.

To force major events on parks and open spaces solely to help plug that LCS gap in the council's finances is neither right nor sustainable, the FOBP believes. In light of recent court judgements, it is also illegal.

If the Council addressed the losses of the LCS, it would remove the pressure to hold events in public parks: they would then only be held if local people genuinely wanted an event, on their own terms, rather than using parks as a money tree for commercial event organisers and the council.'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



Main points

- FOBP believes major events should be an absolute rarity in Brockwell Park
- If a major, gated event is to be held in Brockwell Park, we expect that it should first have to secure the requisite points in a transparent scoring system (Appendix A) and then be approved by local people after a process of genuine consultation
- The pressure to hold major events will be significantly reduced once Lambeth Council addresses, as it must in short order, the significant losses of the Lambeth Country Show
- We give a suggested approach to preserving the security of the Lambeth Country Show without an offensive wall (Appendix B)
- We make a positive suggestion about inviting visitors to contribute to the costs of the LCS without charging them for entry.

Friends of Brockwell Park (FOBP) welcomes the decision of Lambeth Council to review its Culture 2020 events policy, adopted in 2015, which laid down that each of the 5 chief parks/open spaces of the borough, including Brockwell Park, should hold eight major (20,000+ visitors) event days per annum—including, in our case, the Lambeth Country Show.

FOBP opposed this policy at the time, as being a one-size-fits-all approach that took no account of the special features of Brockwell Park. Subsequent events, such as the two Sunfall ones in 2016 and 2017 and the Field Day/Mighty Hoopla one in June 2018, have borne out the unsuitability of such events in this particular park: damage to paths and to the ecology of the park remains in December, six months after Field Day/Mighty Hoopla. We repeat our opposition to the eight event days policy.

FOBP fully recognises the financial pressures imposed on local councils by central government. We acknowledge that parks can play some small part in mitigating those pressures, and we are willing to discuss particular proposals to that end. But FOBP warns against treating Lambeth's parks and open spaces as a cash cow, or a money tree. Our overall view is that the use of parks for large, private, gated events misunderstands the role of parks in the physical and mental health and wellbeing of local people. Accordingly, we believe private, gated events should be an extremely rare occurrence in Lambeth parks and only permitted provided clear conditions are fully met, in a transparent process, following genuine consultation.

Positive proposals

FOBP seeks to engage in this present consultation in a positive manner. In Appendix A, for instance, we suggest the creation of a clear,

4.5 Additional comments

transparent points system for deciding on the impact of an event before it can be considered.

We also suggest a modern way of funding the Lambeth Country Show—a solution to whose large losses is key to any new events strategy. In return, we call on Lambeth Council to be more transparent around the events it facilitates, sharing information fully and long before—months rather than the days we sometimes get—before any decision.

The problem of the Lambeth Country Show

For more than 40 years, the Lambeth Country Show (LCS) has been a joyous annual event, loved by locals and by people all over London and beyond. There is one big problem with the LCS and it is summarised here:

- Cost of Lambeth Country Show: £1 million
- Profit of Lambeth Country Show: £300,000
- Loss of Lambeth Country Show: £700,000

This year's walling and security staffing of the LCS will make this financial position worse, but the core problem is that a local council is running an event—now largely patronised by people from outside the borough, it must be said—at a huge loss. What plugs that enormous financial gap? It is events in parks, which last year made, yes, £700,000.

Lambeth councillors have repeatedly stated they want to keep the Lambeth Country Show

free, and this is something the FOBP supports. But not at any price and in particular, not at the price of the imposition of very large, noisy, gated events in Brockwell Park that disrupt the main aims of the park—the promotion of the physical and mental health and wellbeing of local people—at the height of summer.

In these hard financial times, FOBP believes the LCS needs to cut its coat according to its cloth and that Lambeth Council must, over a short period, say three years maximum, redesign the Lambeth Country Show to bring it into financial stability, so it at least makes enough money to cover its own costs without a large subsidy from events imposed on parks. We believe this should be a plank of any successful events policy.

To help with addressing this funding gap, starting with the Lambeth Country Show next year, FOBP believes the council could adopt a modern method of seeking help from LCS visitors: suggesting that they text a donation towards the costs of the show. We believe it is worth a try.

Legality of holding events in parks

There are serious questions over the legality of holding events in parks. The decision in the case of Finsbury Park, that money can be raised in a park, but must only be used in the park that raised it, is the law of the land at the moment and of course prevents Lambeth Council from using money generated in Brockwell Park to plug the deficit in the accounts of the Lambeth Country

Show. FOBP is disturbed by suggestions that Lambeth Council is considering taking part in a legal challenge to this ruling; we do not believe most local people would consider it a good use of council tax.

Established legislation limits park closures in London to a max of 12 days in any one year and 4 consecutive days (1890 Act) and limits enclosures to 10% or 1 acre, whichever is the greater (1967 Order). It is of grave concern to FOBP that these laws may not be being observed. We would welcome a statement from the Borough Solicitor on the legal aspects of events in parks.

Walling the Lambeth Country Show

As indicated by our 700-strong petition signed at the LCS and presented to the Council in November, many, many local people regretted the decision to surround the 2018 LCS with a high wall. FOBP would hope that on reflection this policy could be modified to some extent. In Appendix B, we give suggestions for a less obtrusive approach and suggest the council consult local people on a way forward in this contentious area.

Advance consultation

At the moment, there is no clear method of consulting local people on major events such as Sunfall or Field Day. FOBP believes that leaving the decision to local councillors alone, as has

4.5 Additional comments

been mooted, does not meet the demand for genuine consultation. For a major event, we believe a public meeting, along the lines of the one convened by the Herne Hill Forum in January 2018, goes a long way to meet that need—and an online survey should be considered as well. After the event, a properly run review meeting, with adequate notice, a clear agenda and attendance by key Lambeth officers and event organisers, should be held.

Appendix A. Scoring system for Events applications

FOBP believes a transparent scoring system that calculates the pluses and negatives of any event—beyond the financial gain to the council—would play an important role in a decision whether to hold any particular event.

These are the principal elements of the scoring system, each based on FOBP's concerns about impact on the environment of the park and local people:

- Percentage of park taken, per day
 - Up to 10% of park taken
 - More than 10% of park taken
 - Walls used
 - Metal fence used

- Attendance over whole event
 - Up to 5000 people (FOBP's preferred maximum attendance)
 - Up to 10,000 people
 - Up to 20,000 people
 - More than 20,000 people
- Noise levels, per day
 - Up to 55 decibels—zero rating?
 - Over 55 decibels—per decibel above
- Number of days of actual event
- Number of days' setup and breakdown
- Whether entry is free or paid
- Closing times
- Ecological/social improvements brought about by the event will get positive points; damage caused by a previous event will get negative points

We will be providing a suggested points scoring system shortly, but wanted to set out the principles that should guide it right away.

Appendix B. Security and the Lambeth Country Show

The Council maintains that contemporary security issues now demand that effective control and search points are established at all entry

points to the Lambeth Country Show to ensure that armed troublemakers do not gain access to the site.

FOBP points out that this effective control could be established at the existing gate entries to the park, supplemented by intensive closed circuit TV monitoring, and replacement of the majority of Security Staff used with the employment of large numbers of uniformed police.

Saving on the costs of construction, dismantling, and removal of the walling structures, plus that of rectifying the damage caused by them, added to fewer security staff required, would help cover the costs of CCTV monitoring, and of the more expensive police officers.

During this year's walled Country Show, many of us did not consciously see one single uniformed police officer. In addition, when a fight between two gangs did materialise, witnessed by an FOBP Committee member, the Security Staff summoned were really quite at a loss as to what to do – reluctant (entirely understandably) as they were to intervene.

The noticeable presence of groups of (friendly) uniformed police officers, would, FOBP believes, do more to deter such incidents than any number of Security Staff employed. In addition, with powers of arrest etc ... the police would be in a far more certain position on intervention. With extra police presence at obvious points of weakness on the park's perimeter, with the

4.5 Additional comments

closed circuit monitoring coordinating closely with the police, with a couple of police vans cruising round the outside of the park, FOBP feel a very good level of security could be achieved.

We stress this scenario is only applicable in respect of a community event with the standing of the LCS. In no other context could ordinary Park users be persuaded to willingly accept being checked, over a couple of days, when they wished to enter the park.

More than 700 people signed the FOBP petition against walling the LCS. The LCS is such a precious and widely loved local event, FOBP believes LBL should consult the local community to secure a more user-friendly, safe LCS.'

(Friends of Brockwell Park)



Section 1 – Current Concerns:

a. Large areas of public open space are being taken out of use for commercial events for extended periods. This is critical because much of the borough is already under-provided with public open space and green-space, but the borough's population is increasing rapidly as a result of new developments at higher densities.

b. Although supposedly to raise money, finances are not transparent about how much comes

back to the park concerned, or to parks and open spaces generally.

c. Damage to grass and paving from heavy vehicles, concentrated footfall and temporary structures. The time and cost for reinstatement adds to the adverse impact of the actual events.

d. Noise disturbance to people living around the park, particularly from entertainment events. Residents have told us they deplore the relaxation of noise limits for major events in the 2016 strategy.

e. Community events are discouraged by demand from commercial events and cumbersome booking arrangements. Booking arrangements, timescales and deposits need to be proportional to the scale of the event. It should be easier to arrange smaller-scale community events in public spaces.

Section 2 – Comment on Proposed Changes

a. Events Policy Template:

Although we welcome adoption of the template, its effectiveness will depend on the details. The obligations and level of detail requested from the event organisers should be proportionate to the scale of the event.

b. Sustainability:

The scale and frequency of events should be set at a level which is sustainable for each open space. Larger parks have some scope to rotate

events around different fields or sites within the boundary. Events involving heavy footfall or vehicle traffic should preferably be site on paved areas, but even the hardstandings may need more frequent repair as a result.

c. Financial Transparency:

Any move in this direction must be welcomed. The lack of financial transparency has been a concern for many years, and has greatly damaged confidence in the Council's probity and competence. The finances of the Lambeth Country Show are of particular interest, given the over-design of security measures at the 2018 show. We can see no justification for a solid steel fence, backed up by massive concrete blocks, when a fence of mesh panels would have achieved the objective more economically.

d. Accountability:

Placing the Events and Parks teams under the same directorate will be of limited value if they each remain in their own bubble, or lack any common purpose. We welcome proposals for earlier community engagement, particularly for larger events. It is perverse that this has so far been lacking for the Council's own Lambeth Country Show. A fixed percentage being returned to parks from each event is a sound principle, but the critical issue will be how much. Some open spaces are less suited to income-generating events due to their location or limited

4.5 Additional comments

size, so we would prefer income to go into a single Parks pot.

e. Diversity:

It is not clear how the Council intends to promote this, if at all. We suggest that encouraging more smaller-scale community-based events would attract more support from residents generally. Potentially it would raise the profile of individual parks and bring in more local users. Friends groups for individual parks already make a considerable contribution to enhancement of our open spaces. Again we must stress the need for a more user-friendly application process and affordable deposits which are not a deterrent to smaller groups.'

(The Brixton Society)



There has been a lot of concern about the impact of major events in Clapham Common. Lambeth is proposing to tender out the grassed events area through a 4 year contract for the last three weeks of August and the first week of September when a host of different events will be held.

We have real concerns about the Council granting a 4 year contract for 4 weeks over the summer holidays as:

It would mean enclosing a large area of the Common during the school holidays when families who cannot afford to go away for holidays enjoy the Common for picnics and all kinds of other sporting and social activities

It would reduce local control of what takes place and pass it to a commercial entity

We thought a better idea would be to award a contract to a company to do all the installation and derigging of the stages and enclosures required for events of the 4 week period with Lambeth Council keeping control of what events were organised.

We think it would be even better to have 2 events (SW4 and London Calling) over 4 days under the current system rather than 4 weeks of events as proposed.

We strongly support Winterville being moved to the non-grass area so that the large grass area that is damaged each year is not enclosed as restoration works are carried out from January to May each year.

Other comments

We think the Events Strategy should include a section on how the Council will encourage the local community to organise their own activities and events on the Common rather than just focusing on commercial events.'

(Clapham Town Labour)



Brockwell Park is a Grade II listed historic landscape and a conservation area. Brockwell Park is host to a Grade II* listed building, Brockwell Hall, a clock tower, a walled garden. It has been the recipient of substantial investment by the Heritage Lottery Fund for its landscape and it is planned to seek further investment from the HLF for the restoration of Brockwell Hall. It makes no sense to overuse this space for up to 8 major event days a year, as proposed by Lambeth's Culture 2020 policy.

BPCP policy on events is that there should be no more than two major events a year. It is unfortunate that the Lambeth Country Show, which is held in Brockwell Park and attracts up to 200,000 visitors over a weekend, is not classed as a major event. Now that it is planned to separate the LCS and Events budgets, we urge that the LCS is re-classified as a major event and that PIL is levied on the Council for the support of the park.

We do not think that Brockwell Park is a suitable environment for very large events. It has a complex landscape which presents many challenges for such events. In the past, many of these have not been properly addressed and although the most recent major music event (Field Day) was well-organised, in earlier years there was a conspicuous failure by Event companies and our own agencies to meet these challenges.

4.5 Additional comments

Even with a well-organised event such as Field Day in 2018, there were problems. The Clocktower was slightly damaged by erection of fencing; the same section of fencing used steel pins that were inserted into the path nearby. The path was part of the HLF landscape restoration. The Community Gardens which were also restored as part of the landscape works and since then has a programme of events itself, was fenced so closely that access was restricted and planned events were compromised. The Walled Garden – also restored at great expense by the HLF and which is open to the public every day, was walled off in the same way and difficult to access.

We believe that every effort must be made in advance of the development of plans to ensure that the impact of a proposed event on Brockwell Park is fully understood and can be mitigated. If there is a possibility that it will cause serious damage, we do not think that an event should be permitted. This should also be a matter for discussion with local Councillors in advance. There is also the need to consider the fabric of historic sites such as Brockwell Park. A path near the hall had its surface completely buckled by the weight of the installations the lorries hauled up the hill in 2018; we are concerned what damage will be done to the Hall and its surrounds if major events are permitted after the proposed restoration. Each event held in Brockwell Park over the size of 10k visitors, has caused some unexpected damage, whatever the intention of the provider has been;

in such a sensitive and important landscape, this must be borne in mind by event planners.

In summary, we believe that event planning for Brockwell Park must be considered in the light of its historic importance and its conservation status. We think that there should not be a single, borough-wide template for all parks but that each should be considered separately, taking its special features into account and be appropriate and proportionate to the park environment and the surrounding neighbourhoods. We would welcome an agreed protocol for assessing potential and actual damage to Brockwell Park to be developed between Lambeth and the BPCP.

We believe that all events should be supervised on the day to an appropriate degree. Clearly the level of supervision of large events is not needed for all but small events can often be badly organised, disruptive and cause damage to the park. In one Instance during a charity event in Brockwell Park the organisers changed their layout without consultation with the Parks staff, interrupted a planned football match and disturbed nesting birds.

The BPCP works very hard to provide better habitat for species in Brockwell Park. We have put in hedges, installed wild flower meadows, planted trees, provided green screens, protected and added to the meadow area, cultivated small 'wild spaces' for weeds that are necessary for certain species etc. Our current project is to re-wild the

big pond to add to the resources that Lambeth can draw on to educate its school children and the wider population. All of these things can be degraded by large masses of trampling footprints and are not easily or quickly restored. We have an ambition to upgrade Brockwell Park from a Lambeth Site of Interest for Nature Conservation (SINC) to a London SINC. This would fit well with the borough's ambitions for environmental protection and the development of "green corridors" and the national interest in preserving wildlife habitat. These issues must be part of the planning and discussion of events.

We remain concerned that if our plans for Brockwell Hall are successful and we can greatly increase park income through improved catering facilities and a wedding and events venue, that there will be a conflict if major events continue to be permitted, such that large areas of the park (including the Hall in 2018) are fenced off. This issue needs to be properly considered, as a priority, for the park's future. Lambeth Council has contributed to the first HLF bid for the landscape and will also contribute to the Hall restoration if it goes ahead. It makes no sense to see the value of its assets lost by conflict between one income stream and another.'

(Brockwell Park Community Partners)

5.0 What happens next

As a result of the responses received to the consultation, we are planning to make several changes to the way outdoor events are managed in our parks. These changes will all come into effect from April 2020 when the existing Outdoor Events Strategy expires (unless otherwise stated).

The main changes that we will be making are:

- Update the existing Events Strategy and remove the limit for event days at individual parks.
- Create a new Lambeth Events Policy, modelled on the best practice template produced by Parks for London. This will replace the old Events Guide and will be implemented in April 2020 and includes a more collaborative approach to engaging with the community over large events.
- Simplify the process by which the Parks Investment Levy (PIL) is calculated. This is the money from events income which goes directly to parks, and it will increase to 22% of the total income generated from every event.
- Produce an annual events service report which will detail the benefits from events, income raised through events and what the Parks Investment Levy (PIL) element has been spent on, and at which parks.
- Increase officer time spent marketing hard-surfaced sites for events in a bid to reduce the pressure on grassed areas. To support

this, sections of the little used Redgra sports pitches on Clapham Common and in Ruskin Park will be designated for events use.

- Implement recommendations from the Events Scrutiny Panel, which seek to increase social and environmental benefits arising from events held in the borough.
- Completely rejuvenate the section of Clapham Common used primarily for events. This will create a hard-wearing sward and improve drainage, making the area much more resilient to event use and able to recover better.

During 2019 we have already made additional changes to the way outdoor events are managed, with the aim of achieving a better balance between putting on events and protecting the parks used; as well as responding to concerns raised by residents and stakeholder groups. The main changes have been:

- Integrating the Events team with Parks, under the same Assistant Director.
- Improving the way parks are repaired following events, by creating capacity within the Parks team to undertake some of the repair work

and purchasing specialist equipment; and by securing a term contractor to take on the work which our Parks team is not able to do – ensuring a more consistent service.

- Creating a separate cost centre for the Lambeth Country Show, disaggregating its financial impact from the rest of the Events service.
- Doubling the funding from events income for the free bandstand concerts put on by stakeholder groups at Clapham Common, Ruskin Park and Myatt's Fields Park.
- Commissioning ecological surveys of the parks used for major events to ensure that environmental impacts are minimised.
- Creating and publishing a Green Events Guide, with a wide range of actions to make events more sustainable, which we will work with producers to implement.

Appendix – Question responses

Question 1

'We are proposing to increase transparency about how much income is generated from events and how it is spent, by publishing the total annual income as well as an annual report showing the allocation of the Parks Investment Levy, on the Council's website. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

Agree / good idea

You should show income and spend by park with subsidy and overheads shown separately. The income and spend on events should also be shown separately to show clearly which events have contributed to the cost of maintaining the parks and which have not. The cost of policing and security should be included. There should be no commercial confidentiality when public money is being spent

Yes we need to see that money obtained through overuse of the parks is spent putting trying to rectify the mess that is left

Yes as the self-titled co-operative council transparency regarding income/ expenditure should be promoted the greatest possible extent by the borough and its partners

Would like to see past income before we see any other big events happening

With cuts in central government funding and increase in gentrification. We see certain groups within the community being ousted out and gentries supporting their own initiatives. It would be good for more transparency in terms of where funding is allocated.

We would like an event-by-event financial breakdown, not just a grand total. This is so we can assess the value vs the wear and tear on the park.

Agree / good idea

We strongly agree with increased transparency but think that the total annual income should be broken down for the major parks including Clapham Common and that this should show the total revenue from events, but also from sports and cafes for each major park. The Parks Investment Levy should also be broken down for each of the major parks.

Transparency is required both on how much income is generated and how that income is spent in supporting the park.

Transparency is important

There seems to a supposition here that events are going to happen regardless of ratepayers opinion. I strongly agree on transparency but find it odd this is the first question in the survey

The Council should publish the income from each individual event and show the money generated is spent. The Council has refused to do this in the past, relying on supposed "commercial sensitivity". There is an overriding public interest consideration, requiring full public disclosure, which overcomes such concerns.

Thanks for bringing such proposal into Lambeth borough. I will suggest more attention and priorities into housing crisis in Lambeth. Me and my family we will be 5 people in may with birth of my 3rd child have been living in a one bedroom flat with lots of difficulties this flat has and bidding for a new 3 bedroom since 2 years and sent lots of complains to different housing officers in Lambeth even I met our MP but honestly so disappointed. Now so concerned about my 3rd baby will born in beginning of may have no space to put her bed.

Appendix: responses

Agree / good idea

Surely no-one could disagree with transparency, but it is important the maximum degree of transparency is available to local residents. Ideally, the income from every event (anonymized if necessary for reasons of commercial confidentiality) should be published, along with all the costs associated with that event, including clear-up costs. While events are clearly necessary to enable the Council to maintain and invest in parks, residents need to be assured that the net income is sufficient to justify the inevitable disruption events incur especially in the small to medium sized parks.

Sounds good

Sounds fine, but I don't have enough information to comment sensibly

Some info may be commercially sensitive but sounds like good idea.

Should not just be total annual income but show income per event v. cost to the taxpayer of the event.

Seems sensible. Would be particularly good to know how much is reinvested in the park where the events are staged - Might ensure more people support them.

Report also needs to include the direct and indirect cost of events e.g. increased litter, damage to the park, and should include the cost of running the Country Show.

Rather than a "total annual income", is it possible to breakdown PIL income per events venue?

Agree / good idea

Please publish all supporting detail too, so that those who wish to audit this information can do so and not just take it on trust. Headline numbers alone are useless.

Please do what you say you are going to do. Charge a set percentage of total income from every event to ensure consistency and more income for our parks. Publish the finances and what they are spent on. We have a right to transparency.

Please break down income by event and location in detail and how much income is returned to the parks. Include expenditure on damage repair.

Only agree if you are transparent about the damage and repair as a result of these events. Also it should be clear the loss of access for residents.

Once the figures are published it would be good to see them made simple for everyone to understand. i.e. percentage of money raised by events allocated to the spaces they were held on. Plus what percentage of park budget is spent on each space. Streatham Common appears to be the poor cousin of Lambeth Parks, with little spent on it compared to surrounding Lambeth spaces, yet it is hugely popular throughout the year with all age groups and by a diverse community.

Appendix: responses

Agree / good idea

On the face of it, The Green Party is inclined to strongly agree with this proposal. There is the danger, however, that the data published will increase the quantity of noise that could be used to obfuscate and obscure the real costs and benefits of opening up our green spaces for commercial events. It seems reasonable to imagine that at least part of the reason that this proposal is being made is to justify opening up Lambeth's parks to outside commercial events, by increasing the public's awareness of the costs of their maintenance. We would therefore require that all costs and revenues be published in as clear a manner as possible. This must include, for example: The revenue earned and costs incurred by each park from commercial events, as well as the overall amount earned from all events across Lambeth. The cost to individual parks over and above the discrete period of the events themselves E.g. Ongoing maintenance of any plants or trees that must be replaced, drainage damage etc The time spent and resulting costs incurred of all Lambeth council staff on the application including but not limited to the events team, marketing, health and safety, community outreach activity and licensing An estimate of the opportunity cost of holding the events at the given time in the particular park i.e. Reduced footfall from regular park users, events/activities/services that will be limited or not able to take place at all while these larger commercial events are taking place Ultimately the public needs to be comprehensively informed as to how profitable these commercial events that are being held in their parks are, in the form of all the costs and benefits (direct and indirect). This is the only way that they can reach a decision as to whether they should support or oppose them. We would also require that Lambeth actively reaches out to local residents to provide them with this information, rather than merely publishing on a website and expecting residents to seek it out themselves, as far as is reasonable to do so.

No - it's an excellent proposal!

Must be park specific details of income, Costs and damages

More transparency needed from Lambeth on all matters.

Agree / good idea

More transparency is always a good thing!

More transparency definitely needed!

Long overdue!

Lambeth Parks Forum believes that transparency with respect to Lambeth's Events budget is very much to be welcomed. Public support for commercial events is largely predicated on the belief that this earns money that contributes towards the upkeep of our parks. Until recently we believe that the Events programme has not earned a significant income for parks, beyond the Parks Investment Levy, because of the drain on the budget imposed by the cost of the Lambeth Country Show (LCS). While we recognise that the LCS is a popular Lambeth event, we believe that including it in the Events budget has led to a situation where the costs of staging the show were driving the Events policy, leading to an Events programme that was perhaps over-ambitious and detrimental to some of the host open spaces: Clapham Common, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Streatham Common We understand that the LCS budget is to be held separately in future from that of Events and hope that this will lead to a more sustainable model for financing the Show.

It's always good to be transparent. You will have to make sure it's easy for residents to access and understand though

It's about time you did this. Why the delay?

It's a public space - and public money - income generation and spend should always be totally transparent.

It would be great if we could have a choice of the different events that are available or new events that the council view /a short list

It would be useful to have a break down of cost and P&L figures

Appendix: responses

Agree / good idea

It would be more useful if the annual Income be broken down by park. For example if smaller parks income is increasing it would be useful to know what events have been commercially successful even if they caused some short term disruption

It would be great to see these figures to see what is successful in the area.

It would be good to have a breakdown of how the income is used

It will be important to make accounts available for further scrutiny and even have headline breakdowns available on the website about income from different types of events. if promoters / events companies are paying directly for any repair of parks post events that should be clear too.

It should also state clearly what the council expenditure was as a result of the events. More importantly all the expenditure and income on each of the major events should be specified, not just the total amounts.

It needs to be the income by event by park, indicating the amount going into the parks budget and the amount going to the "host" park. There needs to be clarity on the parks budget with a breakdown by park and information on the income that is to be raised from events. It is noticeable that increased transparency is offered rather than total transparency. The likelihood is that the Council will hide behind "commercially sensitive information". The concern is that more events are given permission so as to raise the necessary finance for the overall budget. Why is the Lambeth Country Show not included in this consultation?

Agree / good idea

It is vital for local residents to see how much is raised, broken down by venue, and how much is spent on the particular venues restitution and maintenance. A total annual income will not be enough since it will not allow residents information to judge whether their local park is getting a fair share of income by way of compensation for the harm done. What we need to see is how ALL the income generated is spent - events team costs, that spent on Lambeth's parks and open spaces and that diverted into the general budget. Large vague amounts will just be seen as a token nod to transparency.

It is something you should have always been doing, why does it need a survey

It is really important local residents area able to understand: - total income generated by event - proportion reinvested into the park - contribution to up keep and repairs of park post event - contribution to council

It is great to be transparent but it would be better that it were fully transparent so that the total income is described and all (not just the PIL) of the spending is also described, so that everyone can see where it all goes.

It is essential that there is more transparency given the prolonged periods of part closure of areas of the parks and commons for post event repairs

It is always better to publish provocatively any information of public interest that does not fall under one of the Fol exemptions.

Increased transparency is good but there should be even more transparency will it be gross or net of costs - actual or forecast costs?

I think this question is a moot point, and all council activities should be transparent.

I think this is really important, especially for some areas, for example, Streatham common, where several events are held and little (if any) of the income appears to be ploughed back into maintaining the common.

Appendix: responses

Agree / good idea

I think its brilliant to have transparency on all things where funds are raised using public property.

I think it is about time to get more transparency as to the income and spending at Lambeth!

I think being transparent about how income is generated should be put in the context of the cuts that the council has endured from central government.

I strongly agree with this because no matter how many times I disagree with some event being held in the Parks (Brockwell) they still go ahead which impact the environment in a big way. I am never able to visit the park when an event is running.

I sincerely hope that this survey is not just paying lip service but will have a bearing on the decision making.

I know that the use of our parks for profit has a negative affect for many regular users. Any genuine information regarding the benefit of these events to the council seems important.

I feel this would be helpful in giving people a balanced understanding of the positive impact an event can have on an area. What may aid this also would be to include a report on the positive social impacts, outcomes and legacies an event can have on the local area - the kinds of social groups involved, local businesses/social enterprises and Charities taking part, the areas they work in and awareness, improvements they were able to achieve as a result.

I am in favour of Lambeth generating income from events, but many of my neighbours are not. So transparency is essential!

Agree / good idea

I agree that there should be transparency in all Council financial dealings but would advise caution in raising charges or adding too many costs in the way of levy's as this will eventually deter event operators such as myself from bringing events to Lambeth, simply because the charges don't make the event viable.

I agree that increased transparency is good - but the proposed method of doing this is not sufficient, it is not the whole picture.

I agree in principle provided the report itself is simple and concise, albeit accurate and nuanced as required, and is not costly

Greater transparency on income and allocation is hugely needed.

Great idea because more transparency is needed in all levels of government

Great idea as long as there is total transparency on how much is generated and how it is spent. Great for showing the ambition and culture that the council is trying to promote.

Given the controversial nature of the events policy transparency is key to informing residents of the revenue benefits of events. Revenue per event should be included in this disclosure. There should also be a calculation of the amount of revenue that was generated per day the event team was on site, the amount per square metre of space that was taken up and the amount per visitor. This will help inform all stakeholders regarding the revenue generated compared with the impact on the common. This should be included in the planning application so residents can judge for themselves the trade off between the revenue potential and the inconvenience of the event.

Appendix: responses

Agree / good idea

From the Friends of Kennington Park A total annual breakdown on the Council's spending per park should be published, so there is clarity on the base budget - management and staffing costs; equipment for Lambeth Landscapes; cleaning; services (drains, gate opening); horticulture/trees/grass; repairs and preventative maintenance; sport - and the outside income from events, filming, cafes, ice cream vans, sports, licenses for personal trainers, professional dog walkers, charges for sports pitch marking. Clarity is required as to what the PIL is allocated to - whether it is for park "enhancements" or contributing to maintenance. Information should be available to Friends Groups on what is covered by the Council's insurance - is damage covered or is this covered from the repair's budget. Information should be available as to whether some services are provided via overtime payments rather than within contracts Re assurance is sought that the charges to commercial event organisers are now at an appropriate level, the level has an impact on the amount of the 20% PIL. Information should also be available as to how much money is received, by event, for damage to the park, this should also include community events. In relation to events, clarity is required on deposits paid by event organisers, what monies are subsequently held to rectify damage and what the process is for the assessment of costs and payment for large scale remedial work after events. A recent query in Kennington was whether re-seeded grass areas be taped off or fenced off while the grass recovers.

Figures must also include how much income, if any, is spent directly or indirectly by Lambeth setting up and cleaning up after such events, along with the cost to the public of lost amenity whilst events have caused areas to be unavailable to the public.

Events can have a number of negative effects and affect the quiet enjoyment of parks and public spaces so transparency about the income and how it can be used positively is important

Agree / good idea

Ensure maximum percentage possible is included in the Parks Levy.

Details of profit of each event vs days and space closed to public should also be published

Committing to be more transparent is always good but I'm not sure this pledge of publishing an annual total and a report idea goes far enough. In certain instances, it would be more appropriate to give transparency on a per event basis to help people make a more informed judgement call on whether they think an event would be worth the potential disruption, loss of use for the community or potential damages to a park.

At the moment

As long as there is consultation on the events

As all Parks and green spaces need supporting and maintaining the allocation of raised funds needs to be published. The disproportionate funding of parks where HLF money has been spent needs to be rationalised, despite the potential legal difficulty of doing so.

All council finances should be transparent it is our money. Damage to the parks should be paid for by the people renting it.

Essential

Appendix: responses

Question 2

'Currently, event organisers are required to pay a Parks Investment Levy (PIL) that is ring-fenced for enhancements in parks. We propose to set the PIL at a set percentage of total income from every event, simplifying the current formula, and at a level which increases the amount of events income spent on enhancing our parks. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

How to make data more useful/transparent

You should show income and spend by park with subsidy and overheads shown separately. The income and spend on events should also be shown separately to show clearly which events have contributed to the cost of maintaining the parks and which have not. The cost of policing and security should be included. There should be no commercial confidentiality when public money is being spent

You can't "increase transparency". Either you disclose it or you don't. I would support full disclosure

Would like to see past income before we see any other big events happening

With cuts in central government funding and increase in gentrification. We see certain groups within the community being ousted out and gentries supporting their own initiatives. It would be good for more transparency in terms of where funding is allocated.

We would like an event-by-event financial breakdown, not just a grand total. This is so we can assess the value vs the wear and tear on the park.

We strongly agree with increased transparency but think that the total annual income should be broken down for the major parks including Clapham Common and that this should show the total revenue from events, but also from sports and cafes for each major park. The Parks Investment Levy should also be broken down for each of the major parks.

How to make data more useful/transparent

We need to know where the main earnings come from -and details of the losses from the Lambeth Country Show. When parks are being deprived of funds, money wasted on the Country Show cannot be justified

Transparency v imp

Transparency is vital so that there can be public understanding of how the massive shortfall in the Lambeth Country Show is financed - ie where the money is found.

Transparency is required both on how much income is generated and how that income is spent in supporting the park.

Transparency is important

Transparency about income generated is welcome but needs to be accompanied by an honest statement of all the costs involved in generating the income.

To be really transparent the disclosure should also include total income and expenditure per event, not just a total figure.

This is a minimum transparency requirement so it should be done already. It must also be done in sufficient detail so that cost both financial and other expenditure - such as lost access to park spaces for local community - is also set out.

There seems to a supposition here that events are going to happen regardless of ratepayers opinion. I strongly agree on transparency but find it odd this is the first question in the survey

Needs to be max income gained from a set limit on the number of events at each park, and that is a nett income, i.e. the full costs that arise to Lambeth from the obvious ones such as clearing up/repairing damage etc but also officers time in administration on events. There needs to be a clear profit from the events i.e. benefiting local people by way of income to their council, people attending the events need to pay for this in the ticket price.

Appendix: responses

How to make data more useful/transparent

There needs to be a detailed breakdown of costs and benefits and income from an event and exactly how it is allocated and to what.

The transparency should also extend to indicating how much revenue each park generates in a year and the size of each parks budget. If your accounting practices do not allow you to disaggregate spend in individual parks, this should change for FY 20/21.

The size of the levy should be increased to allow increased funding allocations to those spaces most deleteriously affected by events.

The report should highlight what parks generate what amount of income and how much is spent on each park.

The problem is that many Lambeth residents have lost trust in the council, especially the many who voted you in. You saw that in loss of Labour seats last May. Why, how does the Country Show lose so much money? will your new transparency make this clear?

The Council should publish the income from each individual event and show the money generated is spent. The Council has refused to do this in the past, relying on supposed "commercial sensitivity". There is an overriding public interest consideration, requiring full public disclosure, which overcomes such concerns.

Surely no-one could disagree with transparency, but it is important the maximum degree of transparency is available to local residents. Ideally, the income from every event (anonymized if necessary for reasons of commercial confidentiality) should be published, along with all the costs associated with that event, including clear-up costs. While events are clearly necessary to enable the Council to maintain and invest in parks, residents need to be assured that the net income is sufficient to justify the inevitable disruption events incur especially in the small to medium sized parks.

Should not just be total annual income but show income per event v. cost to the taxpayer of the event.

How to make data more useful/transparent

Seems sensible. Would be particularly good to know how much is reinvested in the park where the events are staged - Might ensure more people support them.

Report also needs to include the direct and indirect cost of events e.g. increased litter, damage to the park, and should include the cost of running the Country Show.

Rather than a "total annual income", is it possible to breakdown PIL income per events venue?

Please publish all supporting detail too, so that those who wish to audit this information can do so and not just take it on trust. Headline numbers alone are useless.

Please do what you say you are going to do. Charge a set percentage of total income from every event to ensure consistency and more income for our parks. Publish the finances and what they are spent on. We have a right to transparency.

Please break down income by event and location in detail and how much income is returned to the parks. Include expenditure on damage repair.

Only agree if you are transparent about the damage and repair as a result of these events. Also it should be clear the loss of access for residents.

Once the figures are published it would be good to see them made simple for everyone to understand. i.e. percentage of money raised by events allocated to the spaces they were held on. Plus what percentage of park budget is spent on each space. Streatham Common appears to be the poor cousin of Lambeth Parks, with little spent on it compared to surrounding Lambeth spaces, yet it is hugely popular throughout the year with all age groups and by a diverse community.

Appendix: responses

How to make data more useful/transparent

On the face of it, The Green Party is inclined to strongly agree with this proposal. There is the danger, however, that the data published will increase the quantity of noise that could be used to obfuscate and obscure the real costs and benefits of opening up our green spaces for commercial events. It seems reasonable to imagine that at least part of the reason that this proposal is being made is to justify opening up Lambeth's parks to outside commercial events, by increasing the public's awareness of the costs of their maintenance. We would therefore require that all costs and revenues be published in as clear a manner as possible. This must include, for example: The revenue earned and costs incurred by each park from commercial events, as well as the overall amount earned from all events across Lambeth. The cost to individual parks over and above the discrete period of the events themselves E.g. Ongoing maintenance of any plants or trees that must be replaced, drainage damage etc The time spent and resulting costs incurred of all Lambeth council staff on the application including but not limited to the events team, marketing, health and safety, community outreach activity and licensing An estimate of the opportunity cost of holding the events at the given time in the particular park i.e. Reduced footfall from regular park users, events/activities/services that will be limited or not able to take place at all while these larger commercial events are taking place Ultimately the public needs to be comprehensively informed as to how profitable these commercial events that are being held in their parks are, in the form of all the costs and benefits (direct and indirect). This is the only way that they can reach a decision as to whether they should support or oppose them. We would also require that Lambeth actively reaches out to local residents to provide them with this information, rather than merely publishing on a website and expecting residents to seek it out themselves, as far as is reasonable to do so.

Not enough. It should at least be broken down into income per park.

Must be park specific details of income, Costs and damages

More transparency needed from Lambeth on all matters.

More transparency is always a good thing!

How to make data more useful/transparent

More transparency definitely needed!

Lambeth Parks Forum believes that transparency with respect to Lambeth's Events budget is very much to be welcomed. Public support for commercial events is largely predicated on the belief that this earns money that contributes towards the upkeep of our parks. Until recently we believe that the Events programme has not earned a significant income for parks, beyond the Parks Investment Levy, because of the drain on the budget imposed by the cost of the Lambeth Country Show (LCS). While we recognise that the LCS is a popular Lambeth event, we believe that including it in the Events budget has led to a situation where the costs of staging the show were driving the Events policy, leading to an Events programme that was perhaps over-ambitious and detrimental to some of the host open spaces: Clapham Common, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Streatham Common We understand that the LCS budget is to be held separately in future from that of Events and hope that this will lead to a more sustainable model for financing the Show.

It's always good to be transparent. You will have to make sure it's easy for residents to access and understand though

It's a public space - and public money - income generation and spend should always be totally transparent.

It would be useful to have a break down of cost and P&L figures

It would be more useful if the annual Income be broken down by park. For example if smaller parks income is increasing it would be useful to know what events have been commercially successful even if they caused some short term disruption

It would be good to have a breakdown of how the income is used

Appendix: responses

How to make data more useful/transparent

It will be important to make accounts available for further scrutiny and even have headline breakdowns available on the website about income from different types of events. If promoters / events companies are paying directly for any repair of parks post events that should be clear too.

It should also state clearly what the council expenditure was as a result of the events. More importantly all the expenditure and income on each of the major events should be specified, not just the total amounts.

It needs to be the income by event by park, indicating the amount going into the parks budget and the amount going to the "host" park. There needs to be clarity on the parks budget with a breakdown by park and information on the income that is to be raised from events. It is noticeable that increased transparency is offered rather than total transparency. The likelihood is that the Council will hide behind "commercially sensitive information". The concern is that more events are given permission so as to raise the necessary finance for the overall budget. Why is the Lambeth Country Show not included in this consultation?

It is vital for local residents to see how much is raised, broken down by venue, and how much is spent on the particular venues' restitution and maintenance. A total annual income will not be enough since it will not allow residents information to judge whether their local park is getting a fair share of income by way of compensation for the harm done. What we need to see is how ALL the income generated is spent - events team costs, that spent on Lambeth's parks and open spaces and that diverted into the general budget. Large vague amounts will just be seen as a token nod to transparency.

It is really important local residents are able to understand: - total income generated by event - proportion reinvested into the park - contribution to up keep and repairs of park post event - contribution to council

It is great to be transparent but it would be better that it were fully transparent so that the total income is described and all (not just the PIL) of the spending is also described, so that everyone can see where it all goes.

How to make data more useful/transparent

It is essential that there is more transparency given the prolonged periods of part closure of areas of the parks and commons for post event repairs

It is always better to publish provocatively any information of public interest that does not fall under one of the FoI exemptions.

Is it possible to see further details about these proposals beyond the question of transparency of the income generated for the Council?

Increased transparency is good but there should be even more transparency will it be gross or net of costs - actual or forecast costs?

Income should be shown for each park and open space. Similarly PIL allocation. Also, the cost to LBL of hosting events should be shown for each park/ open space. So that residents can look at income net of cost. In addition the overhead cost of the events team should be shown alongside this, even if it cannot be allocated to each park/ open space. The cost and income from the Lambeth Country Show should be shown.

If you do not publish also publish the staffing costs of the Lambeth Events team, the whole exercise is a charade and a waste of time.

I would like far more transparency showing how much money goes back into the parks. I would like to know why money cannot be spent to fix basic things within the parks, such as fixing toilets or maintaining water fountains.

I think this question is a moot point, and all council activities should be transparent.

I think it's brilliant to have transparency on all things where funds are raised using public property.

I think it is about time to get more transparency as to the income and spending at Lambeth!

Appendix: responses

How to make data more useful/transparent

I think being transparent about how income is generated should be put in the context of the cuts that the council has endured from central government.

I know that the use of our parks for profit has a negative affect for many regular users. Any genuine information regarding the benefit of these events to the council seems important.

I feel this would be helpful in giving people a balanced understanding of the positive impact an event can have on an area. What may aid this also would be to include a report on the positive social impacts, outcomes and legacies an event can have on the local area - the kinds of social groups involved, local businesses/social enterprises and Charities taking part, the areas they work in and awareness, improvements they were able to achieve as a result.

I am in favour of Lambeth generating income from events, but many of my neighbours are not. So transparency is essential!

I agree that there should be transparency in all Council financial dealings but would advise caution in raising charges or adding too many costs in the way of levy's as this will eventually deter event operators such as myself from bringing events to Lambeth, simply because the charges don't make the event viable.

Greater transparency on income and allocation is hugely needed.

Great idea because more transparency is needed in all levels of government

Great idea as long as there is total transparency on how much is generated and how it is spent. Great for showing the ambition and culture that the council is trying to promote.

How to make data more useful/transparent

Given the controversial nature of the events policy transparency is key to informing residents of the revenue benefits of events. Revenue per event should be included in this disclosure. There should also be a calculation of the amount of revenue that was generated per day the event team was on site, the amount per square metre of space that was taken up and the amount per visitor. This will help inform all stakeholders regarding the revenue generated compared with the impact on the common. This should be included in the planning application so residents can judge for themselves the trade off between the revenue potential and the inconvenience of the event.

From the Friends of Kennington Park A total annual breakdown on the Council's spending per park should be published, so there is clarity on the base budget - management and staffing costs; equipment for Lambeth Landscapes; cleaning; services (drains, gate opening); horticulture/trees/grass; repairs and preventative maintenance; sport - and the outside income from events, filming, cafes, ice cream vans, sports, licenses for personal trainers, professional dog walkers, charges for sports pitch marking. Clarity is required as to what the PIL is allocated to - whether it is for park "enhancements" or contributing to maintenance. Information should be available to Friends Groups on what is covered by the Council's insurance - is damage covered or is this covered from the repair's budget. Information should be available as to whether some services are provided via overtime payments rather than within contracts Re assurance is sought that the charges to commercial event organisers are now at an appropriate level, the level has an impact on the amount of the 20% PIL. Information should also be available as to how much money is received, by event, for damage to the park, this should also include community events. In relation to events, clarity is required on deposits paid by event organisers, what monies are subsequently held to rectify damage and what the process is for the assessment of costs and payment for large scale remedial work after events. A recent query in Kennington was whether re-seeded grass areas be taped off or fenced off while the grass recovers.

Appendix: responses

How to make data more useful/transparent

Figures must also include how much income, if any, is spent directly or indirectly by Lambeth setting up and cleaning up after such events, along with the cost to the public of lost amenity whilst events have caused areas to be unavailable to the public.

Events can have a number of negative effects and affect the quiet enjoyment of parks and public spaces so transparency about the income and how it can be used positively is important

Details of profit of each event vs days and space closed to public should also be published

Could we have this information sectioned by park?

Committing to be more transparent is always good but I'm not sure this pledge of publishing an annual total and a report idea goes far enough. In certain instances, it would be more appropriate to give transparency on a per event basis to help people make a more informed judgement call on whether they think an event would be worth the potential disruption, loss of use for the community or potential damages to a park.

Break down of costs - such as walls and security, and illuminate how they are tendered for

As all Parks and green spaces need supporting and maintaining the allocation of raised funds needs to be published. The disproportionate funding of parks where HLF money has been spent needs to be rationalised, despite the potential legal difficulty of doing so.

Are you also able to show how much volunteers and volunteer groups contribute to the ongoing vitality of the parks?

Any event lasting more than 1 week should have income individually listed. All top 10 income events should be listed with income.

How to make data more useful/transparent

According to the Finsbury Park case, all money generated within the park, is legally required to be used within the park. Therefore 1) all monies generated need to be transparently reported and 2) all monies expenditure needs to be transparently reported.

Access and to more, detailed, other, information, can, improve, up date, professional, services, for all and the future

A breakdown by event should be shown.

A bit more detail than simple totals will be necessary to make the information meaningful.

Question 3

'In order to try and diversify events income and reduce the pressure on grassed areas, we are proposing to devote more time and effort to marketing non-grass areas such as in and around buildings, town squares and on parts of unused all-weather sports pitches. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

All money should go back to the park

The income from events in the park should go back to the park. If the events don't pay enough money for using the space e.g. Winterville they should be stopped. Events that don't fit in the local community should be stopped or at least been reduced in days. I am talking mainly about SW4 festival. it's too long, too loud and too many days and the electro music doesn't fit into a family area of young families. The playgrounds at Clapham common are in a disastrous state and some of the climbing frames can cause severe danger e.g. Windmill playground. Wooden castle hasn't been replaced. This playground needs a complete makeover. Also there is nothing for older children to play.

Appendix: responses

All money should go back to the park

I would like far more transparency showing how much money goes back into the parks. I would like to know why money cannot be spent to fix basic things within the parks, such as fixing toilets or maintaining water fountains.

I understand the need for councils to find creative ways to raise money in these times, but do think that if local residents have to sacrifice their open spaces for large chunks of the year (Winterville take about 6 months from set up to remediation) then some of proceeds should go towards maintaining good facilities in the parks. In particular Clapham Common kids area needs a complete renovation. As does the paddling pool.

I think this is really important, especially for some areas, for example, Streatham common, where several events are held and little (if any) of the income appears to be ploughed back into maintaining the common.

Extract from Haringey website: "ALL income generated from events taking place in Haringey parks and open spaces, is spent in the parks and open spaces. ALL income generated through events specifically held in Finsbury Park, will be spent in Finsbury Park as required under the Open Spaces Act 1906."

Councils are only wardens of public spaces. I can't remember the bylaw but it says that councils aren't allowed to use money generated from parks to fill holes in their budget from government. If money is made it should all go towards community out reach projects and the park itself. The country fair should be free and unfenced. I don't care that vendors (commercial bars) complain about decreased profits. It's a community event and not a festival!!!

Being a frequent user of Kennington Park I dread the summer season when we lose a lot of our park to events. I understand the need to generate income but as park users have not seen the benefit at all. The children's playground is in desperate need for new equipment, the toilets in the playground are REVOLTING and we have been without a cafe for over a year because of tendering to the highest bidder. Whilst the number of events have increased the quality of park provision has decreased.

All money should go back to the park

And those figures should include cost of repairing damage to the park, policing costs, the cost to local business and also the benefit to local people. I am strongly opposed to paying for cuts by making more amenities and privileges available to the richer part of society.

All money raised by a particular event should go to the park where it was held - this would be some kind of compensation to regular users of the park and local residents for the disruption

All income raised from park events should be reinvested to maintain/fund/improve the public parks. It is not sufficient that cuts have led to the decline of public spaces and local groups are picking up the work/ protecting the areas at their own cost when the council is able to raise funds using the same space. It should be really clear how funds are used directly to improve the facilities available to both that area and other park facilities for residents.

According to the Finsbury Park case, all money generated within the park, is legally required to be used within the park. Therefore 1) all monies generated need to be transparently reported and 2) all monies expenditure needs to be transparently reported.

Appendix: responses

Question 4

'Currently, an event application process goes to Health and Safety Assessment before Community Engagement. We are proposing that Community Engagement happens earlier in the process. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?'

Damage to park

You damages the parks. It takes months to return to normal .the local shops do not get the benefit Local shops & council tax payers cannot park outside their homes etc. etc. .Our Parks are the PEOPLES OPEN SPACES not a rubbish dump Apart from all the noise pollution.

Yes we need to see that money obtained through overuse of the parks is spent putting trying to rectify the mess that is left

Yes I believe all these big events money should be spent on the doing playgrounds more specifically Clapham Common playground! It's a total disgrace yet you have many large events on the common every year. Still we are not able to use the area after the Christmas events because the grass as been ruined! Nothing has changed from last year it's still unusable!

We live close to Streatham Common & the concern is that a small income is being generated from the common's events, but there is a big 'hidden' cost to repair the common after each event. This also needs to be considered when looking at the overall viability of each event

The issue is not transparency about income but the associated massive disruption to public spaces for large portions of the warm part of the year for the sake of private for-profit events.

Damage to park

The damage to the common that these events do, is long lasting and it never seems to repair. Also we local residents feel that the revenue created by such events is not invested locally. A look around the area close to common there are many areas that need attention. For example a general tidy up cleaning the fly tipping problem that is evident at the top of Barrow rd. local residents have also found very unpleasant debris in and around their gardens, which has to be cleaned and disposed of themselves, this is unsafe and unacceptable. It is nice to see the common used for the benefit of the community but not to make money for music entrepreneurs who then pocket the cash and walk away. Please listen to your long suffering rate payers.

The council's events policy has had an absolutely appalling effect on my local park, Clapham Common. Thanks to the massive loss the council incurs on the Lambeth Country Show the council over exploits the revenue potential of other parks especially Clapham Common. You then spend a pittance putting right the enormous damage these events cause to the Common. Shameful.

Please break down income by event and location in detail and how much income is returned to the parks. Include expenditure on damage repair.

Only agree if you are transparent about the damage and repair as a result of these events. Also it should be clear the loss of access for residents.

More money spent on the clean up during and after the event

It is essential that there is more transparency given the prolonged periods of part closure of areas of the parks and commons for post event repairs

Appendix: responses

Damage to park

Brockwell Park is my local, much cherished park and one of the few decent-sized green spaces to escape the pollution around the main roads. It is a community resource that is vital to so many in and around Brixton. In the summer it is massively disrupted for endless weeks by work associated to two-day events, which almost solely benefit the businesses organizing them. This is unacceptable! The Country Show is welcome, if it can be set up and taken down quickly and isn't fenced off to cut vast stretches of the park off. The large commercial festivals should not happen. At all! This is not a commodity to be pumped out to events companies that cause wide-spread environmental damage, which they fail to repair. It also puts a strain on local residents due to crime and noise levels. If they are allowed, they should be given an absolute maximum of two days before and after to set up and take down, and made to pay for the full and immediate restoration of any damaged grass areas, as well, as pay towards policing etc.

And those figures should include cost of repairing damage to the park, policing costs, the cost to local business and also the benefit to local people. I am strongly opposed to paying for cuts by making more amenities and privileges available to the richer part of society.

Additional comments

'Please let us know any other comments you have on Lambeth's approach to managing events. In particular, feedback relating to specific parks will help us tailor our policies accordingly'

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

You should show income and spend by park with subsidy and overheads shown separately. The income and spend on events should also be shown separately to show clearly which events have contributed to the cost of maintaining the parks and which have not. The cost of policing and security should be included. There should be no commercial confidentiality when public money is being spent

You should be fully transparent about ALL income and outgoings!

You failed to keep promises about profits being split between council, parks hosting events and other parks that don't host events. The idea detailed here does not help anyone.

You can't "increase transparency". Either you disclose it or you don't. I would support full disclosure

Would like to see past income before we see any other big events happening

We would like an event-by-event financial breakdown, not just a grand total. This is so we can assess the value vs the wear and tear on the park.

We strongly agree with increased transparency but think that the total annual income should be broken down for the major parks including Clapham Common and that this should show the total revenue from events, but also from sports and cafes for each major park. The Parks Investment Levy should also be broken down for each of the major parks.

Appendix: responses

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

We need to know where the main earnings come from -and details of the losses from the Lambeth Country Show. When parks are being deprived of funds, money wasted on the Country Show cannot be justified

We live close to Streatham Common & the concern is that a small income is being generated from the common's events, but there is a big 'hidden' cost to repair the common after each event. This also needs to be considered when looking at the overall viability of each event

Transparency is required both on how much income is generated and how that income is spent in supporting the park.

Transparency about income generated is welcome but needs to be accompanied by an honest statement of all the costs involved in generating the income.

To what 'extend'? I am the spelling police!! Do you mean extent? I would have a better idea on whether to support this proposal if it was clear it was cost neutral

To be really transparent the disclosure should also include total income and expenditure per event, not just a total figure.

There needs to be max income gained from a set limit on the number of events at each park, and that is a nett income, i.e. the full costs that arise to Lambeth from the obvious ones such as clearing up/repairing damage etc but also officers time in administration on events. There needs to be a clear profit from the events i.e. benefiting local people by way of income to their council, people attending the events need to pay for this in the ticket price.

There needs to be a detailed breakdown of costs and benefits and income from an event and exactly how it is allocated and to what.

The transparency should also extend to indicating how much revenue each park generates in a year and the size of each parks budget. If your accounting practices do not allow you to disaggregate spend in individual parks, this should change for FY 20/21.

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

The size of the levy should be increased to allow increased funding allocations to those spaces most deleteriously affected by events.

The question is worded so that no one can disagree with it.

The problem is that many Lambeth residents have lost trust in the council, especially the many who voted you in. You saw that in loss of Labour seats last May. Why, how does the Country Show lose so much money? will your new transparency make this clear?

The Council should publish the income from each individual event and show the money generated is spent. The Council has refused to do this in the past, relying on supposed "commercial sensitivity". There is an overriding public interest consideration, requiring full public disclosure, which overcomes such concerns.

Surely no-one could disagree with transparency, but it is important the maximum degree of transparency is available to local residents. Ideally, the income from every event (anonymized if necessary for reasons of commercial confidentiality) should be published, along with all the costs associated with that event, including clear-up costs. While events are clearly necessary to enable the Council to maintain and invest in parks, residents need to be assured that the net income is sufficient to justify the inevitable disruption events incur especially in the small to medium sized parks.

Strange that wasn't the case from the onset and that you have to ask the electorate about transparency.

Should not just be total annual income but show income per event v. cost to the taxpayer of the event.

Seems sensible. Would be particularly good to know how much is reinvested in the park where the events are staged - Might ensure more people support them.

Appendix: responses

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

Report also needs to include the direct and indirect cost of events e.g. increased litter, damage to the park, and should include the cost of running the Country Show.

Please publish all supporting detail too, so that those who wish to audit this information can do so and not just take it on trust. Headline numbers alone are useless.

Please do what you say you are going to do. Charge a set percentage of total income from every event to ensure consistency and more income for our parks. Publish the finances and what they are spent on. We have a right to transparency.

Please break down income by event and location in detail and how much income is returned to the parks. Include expenditure on damage repair.

Only agree if you are transparent about the damage and repair as a result of these events. Also it should be clear the loss of access for residents.

Once the figures are published it would be good to see them made simple for everyone to understand. i.e. percentage of money raised by events allocated to the spaces they were held on. Plus what percentage of park budget is spent on each space. Streatham Common appears to be the poor cousin of Lambeth Parks, with little spent on it compared to surrounding Lambeth spaces, yet it is hugely popular throughout the year with all age groups and by a diverse community.

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

On the face of it, The Green Party is inclined to strongly agree with this proposal. There is the danger, however, that the data published will increase the quantity of noise that could be used to obfuscate and obscure the real costs and benefits of opening up our green spaces for commercial events. It seems reasonable to imagine that at least part of the reason that this proposal is being made is to justify opening up Lambeth's parks to outside commercial events, by increasing the public's awareness of the costs of their maintenance. We would therefore require that all costs and revenues be published in as clear a manner as possible. This must include, for example: The revenue earned and costs incurred by each park from commercial events, as well as the overall amount earned from all events across Lambeth. The cost to individual parks over and above the discrete period of the events themselves E.g. Ongoing maintenance of any plants or trees that must be replaced, drainage damage etc The time spent and resulting costs incurred of all Lambeth council staff on the application including but not limited to the events team, marketing, health and safety, community outreach activity and licensing An estimate of the opportunity cost of holding the events at the given time in the particular park i.e. Reduced footfall from regular park users, events/ activities/services that will be limited or not able to take place at all while these larger commercial events are taking place Ultimately the public needs to be comprehensively informed as to how profitable these commercial events that are being held in their parks are, in the form of all the costs and benefits (direct and indirect). This is the only way that they can reach a decision as to whether they should support or oppose them. We would also require that Lambeth actively reaches out to local residents to provide them with this information, rather than merely publishing on a website and expecting residents to seek it out themselves, as far as is reasonable to do so.

Appendix: responses

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

Lambeth Parks Forum believes that transparency with respect to Lambeth's Events budget is very much to be welcomed. Public support for commercial events is largely predicated on the belief that this earns money that contributes towards the upkeep of our parks. Until recently we believe that the Events programme has not earned a significant income for parks, beyond the Parks Investment Levy, because of the drain on the budget imposed by the cost of the Lambeth Country Show (LCS). While we recognise that the LCS is a popular Lambeth event, we believe that including it in the Events budget has led to a situation where the costs of staging the show were driving the Events policy, leading to an Events programme that was perhaps over-ambitious and detrimental to some of the host open spaces: Clapham Common, Brockwell Park, Kennington Park, Streatham Common We understand that the LCS budget is to be held separately in future from that of Events and hope that this will lead to a more sustainable model for financing the Show.

It's about time you did this. Why the delay?

It would great if we could have a choice of the different events that are available or new events that the council view /a short list

It would be more useful if the annual Income be broken down by park. For example if smaller parks income is increasing it would be useful to know what events have been commercially successful even if they caused some short term disruption

It should also state clearly what the council expenditure was as a result of the events. More importantly all the expenditure and income on each of the major events should be specified, not just the total amounts.

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

It needs to be the income by event by park, indicating the amount going into the parks budget and the amount going to the "host" park. There needs to be clarity on the parks budget with a breakdown by park and information on the income that is to be raised from events. It is noticeable that increased transparency is offered rather than total transparency. The likelihood is that the Council will hide behind "commercially sensitive information". The concern is that more events are given permission so as to raise the necessary finance for the overall budget. Why is the Lambeth Country Show not included in this consultation?

It is vital for local residents to see how much is raised, broken down by venue, and how much is spent on the particular venues restitution and maintenance. A total annual income will not be enough since it will not allow residents information to judge whether their local park is getting a fair share of income by way of compensation for the harm done. What we need to see is how ALL the income generated is spent - events team costs, that spent on Lambeth's parks and open spaces and that diverted into the general budget. Large vague amounts will just be seen as a token nod to transparency.

It is something you should have always been doing, why does it need a survey

It is really important local residents area able to understand: - total income generated by event - proportion reinvested into the park - contribution to up keep and repairs of park post event - contribution to council

It is great to be transparent but it would be better that it were fully transparent so that the total income is described and all (not just the PIL) of the spending is also described, so that everyone can see where it all goes.

If you do not publish also publish the staffing costs of the Lambeth Events team, the whole exercise is a charade and a waste of time.

Appendix: responses

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

If any amount is spent on repairing and restoring parks as a result of damage done during any event, or spending that mostly benefits event organisers, even if this were to be transparently reported I strongly disagree. Any event organiser should be budgeting and paying for this in full as part of their own up front and sunk costs to finance their event in the first place. If any amount of income generated from an event is spent without fully consulting residents beforehand, even if this were to be transparently reported I strongly disagree. I strongly disagree to event income being treated as able be spent without consulting residents. Residents effectively "pay" for events in hassle factor, and which is in addition to council tax paid. We therefore should be consulted on all proposed use of events income.

I would like far more transparency showing how much money goes back into the parks. I would like to know why money cannot be spent to fix basic things within the parks, such as fixing toilets or maintaining water fountains.

I think it's unfair to hold events in local parks without more consultation with local residents. We have the noise of the people coming and going, the music noise and then Milkwood Rd was used as a taxi area, so people shouting and vehicles coming and going all night. No transparency there. Plus we use the use of the park closest to our home.

I sincerely hope that this survey is not just paying lip service but will have a bearing on the decision making.

I have been trying for two years to find out how the money from the zipwire in Archbishop's Park has been spent and I have hit a brick wall. It's all very suspicious if it is not transparent.

I agree that increased transparency is good - but the proposed method of doing this is not sufficient, it is not the whole picture.

Lack of trust/doesn't go far enough

From the Friends of Kennington Park A total annual breakdown on the Council's spending per park should be published, so there is clarity on the base budget - management and staffing costs; equipment for Lambeth Landscapes; cleaning; services (drains, gate opening); horticulture/trees/grass; repairs and preventative maintenance; sport - and the outside income from events, filming, cafes, ice cream vans, sports, licenses for personal trainers, professional dog walkers, charges for sports pitch marking. Clarity is required as to what the PIL is allocated to - whether it is for park "enhancements" or contributing to maintenance. Information should be available to Friends Groups on what is covered by the Council's insurance - is damage covered or is this covered from the repair's budget. Information should be available as to whether some services are provided via overtime payments rather than within contracts Re assurance is sought that the charges to commercial event organisers are now at an appropriate level, the level has an impact on the amount of the 20% PIL. Information should also be available as to how much money is received, by event, for damage to the park, this should also include community events. In relation to events, clarity is required on deposits paid by event organisers, what monies are subsequently held to rectify damage and what the process is for the assessment of costs and payment for large scale remedial work after events. A recent query in Kennington was whether re-seeded grass areas be taped off or fenced off while the grass recovers.

For far too long you haven't been and frankly it's hard to see what the 'benefit' is if we don't know how much is raised and where its being spent.

A much higher percentage of revenues raised from events in public parks should be spent on improving those spaces for the benefit of everyone.

Appendix: responses

Disagree

Disagree with events in parks

You should not be using large scale events like this as income generators due to your own financial mismanagement. You've turned an amazing country show into a loss making corporate hell zone and made Brockwell Park, of which I am a regular user totally inaccessible due to the fencing needing for your desire to monetise this event, and turned a lovely park into a place for rent for you to raise funds. Just stop please.

You damages the parks. It takes months to return to normal .the local shops do not get the benefit Local shops & council tax payers cannot park outside their homes etc. etc. .Our Parks are the PEOPLES OPEN SPACES not a rubbish dump Apart from all the noise pollution.

Yes, the events on Streatham Common attract too much anti-social behaviour in the local area. As someone with a young family these events (specifically things like Garage Nation and Kisstory) make the common inaccessible for my family over a number of days. Which I think is unacceptable. Hold these events in purpose built buildings and clubs, not our beautiful common.

Yes I believe all these big events money should be spent on the doing playgrounds more specifically Clapham Common playground! It's a total disgrace yet you have many large events on the common every year. Still we are not able to use the area after the Christmas events because the grass as been ruined! Nothing has changed from last year it's still unusable!

This does not mean I agree with a multiple letting policy, which excludes and inconveniences local people.

Disagree with events in parks

The noise level that is currently permitted is completely ridiculous in the middle of a residential area. The amount of litter generated by these events in the surrounding streets is disgusting. The lack of security as thousands of people exit is ridiculous and the increase should be paid for by the event organisers. Finally, the fact residents are restricted from using the park for such elongated periods is simply ridiculous. If the organiser cannot do their build in a shorter period of time it is their fault and they should be responsible for any additional costs rather than stopping residents from using their park.

The income from events in the park should go back to the park. If the events don't pay enough money for using the space e.g. Winterville they should be stopped. Events that don't fit in the local community should be stopped or at least been reduced in days. I am talking mainly about SW4 festival. it's too long, too loud and too many days and the electro music doesn't fit into a family area of young families. The playgrounds at Clapham common are in an disastrous state and some of the climbing frames can cause severe danger e.g. Windmill playground. Wooden castle hasn't been replaced. This playground needs a complete makeover. Also there is nothing for older children to play.

The important issue is that parks should not be taken over by commercial events.

The extent of the damage to Clapham Common with its events is HUGE. I walk my dog there every day and meet people and enjoy it. It's one of the reasons why I live in Clapham. If you damage Clapham Common due to mismanagement and overuse then you are cutting your nose in spite of your face. It's very short sighted and I don't support it.

Appendix: responses

Disagree with events in parks

The events being held on Clapham Common have become excessive. The damage to the grass from Winterville along with the setting up and taking down of the metal barriers has rendered the main open space on Clapham Common that isn't used for Football and rugby pitches unusable for the local community for most of the year. The fencing only came down last week after 6 months and now they are putting up new fencing for the Moonwalk event. The grass and lawn still has yet to recover and local residents are still unable to use this part of the Common. The pollution caused by the Lorries bringing in their event equipment is not environmentally friendly and contributes to poor air quality. The events themselves cause an excessive amount of litter and rubbish on the common and the surrounding areas, the noise from these events, especially in the summer when residents have their windows open due to the heat makes it impossible to sleep because of the deafening thump of music. When the events end we have to endure anti social behaviour as people spill into the local streets often drunk. I would like to see the end of Winterville on this site as a start so that our local community can enjoy our Common again. It's part of why we live here. We pay our taxes and we vote in our elections. In addition to the amount of events happening on Clapham Common, the playground and paddling pool has declined in its maintenance and the 1 O clock club is no more. This sends a very strong message that Lambeth Council does not care about the children in this community and the families who actually live here.

The damage to the common that these events do, is long lasting and it never seems to repair. Also we local residents feel that the revenue created by such events is not invested locally. A look around the area close to common there are many areas that need attention. For example a general tidy up cleaning the fly tipping problem that is evident at the top of Barrow rd. local residents have also found very unpleasant debris in and around their gardens, which has to be cleaned and disposed of themselves, this is unsafe and unacceptable. It is nice to see the common used for the benefit of the community but not to make money for music entrepreneurs who then pocket the cash and walk away. Please listen to your long suffering rate payers.

Disagree with events in parks

The council's events policy has had an absolutely appalling effect on my local park, Clapham Common. Thanks to the massive loss the council incurs on the Lambeth Country Show the council over exploits the revenue potential of other parks especially Clapham Common. You then spend a pittance putting right the enormous damage these events cause to the Common. Shameful.

Stop ruining Streatham Common. Every time a big event occurs the grounds get wrecked by heavy vehicles completely ruining it for the year and sometimes longer.

Some of these events ruin places for example the grass area on Clapham Common and cause much distress to local residents because of the noise levels/ rubbish generated, etc

Proper reply wanted to the email sent yesterday to Cllr Sonia Winifred

Point 1 Generate income. this is a no brainer, times have changed and you need to find avenues to generate income / fundraising, but then you read point 3 - Keep the much loved Lambeth Country Show free UTTTERLY BONKERS in my opinion, this could be a financial lifeline and real income generator for Lambeth if you just charged people to attend it. even £2 a person or £5 or £10 per family on the gate, which includes an event map.... (which could have local business adverts on the back etc. as a further income generator. All other country shows in the country charge people to attend. Putting on a show of that size and scale costs money - LOTS OF IT. It is impossible for Lambeth to run it for FREE without it being a loss making exercise.... Stop raping all the other Lambeth areas of funding or stripping other events of their profits, so that you can prop up the Lambeth county show by "appearing to make it Free" - if everyone knew how much you were loosing on it each year, I'm sure their views would be different.

Please use this income generated to fight antisocial behaviour as it is at its peak in Lambeth

Appendix: responses

Disagree with events in parks

Parks should not be used to prop up other services - money should be re-invested in facilities, security, etc.

Parks are such important local asset as most of us don't have gardens to relax in

Parks are public spaces for public benefit, not entertainment venues for revenue raising.

Parks are for people, not commercial events

Last year Larkhall Park was blighted by event/police control tent, other structures & extensive barriers. On the day of the event, the park was almost unusable and 10,000 metres of local and main roads were closed. Many roads remained closed long after the event due to the stewards being 'jobsworths'. Many people could access the Wandsworth Road from various side streets. These people had no idea such event was taking place...the council were supposed to leaflet residents. They didn't get a notification & I certainly didn't. I realise there is an unwritten policy under UN sustainability, Agenda 21 & Agenda 30 to hinder & limit the use & access to public roads. As example of this is the fact that on any given weekend, Central London has closed/restricted access to many streets due to a plethora of stupid events, sporting events like Cycle London & the usual marches. This policy blights the lives of people who live and work in London. Not only that, tourists have their trips to London ruined. Does London do International travel warnings telling people not to bother visiting over the weekends? No, I thought not. This particular 'fun' lol run must have cause problems for guests at the growing number of hotels on the Wandsworth Road. Not having a bus service on a Sunday morning and part way into the afternoon is a joke. I personally witness very angry motorists, some who were attempting to avoid road blocks by mounting the pavement. The cost of this event could not be justified. Police in the events tent, police on the Wandsworth Road, how many more were occupied on this event at @£40ph each? I thought the Met were strapped for cash.

Disagree with events in parks

Kennington Park has often been removed from public use through advertising balloon activities. It's deplorable & unfair to local community, families, children & local workers. The income to LBL is small & the action shameful.

It annoys me that these public spaces are used for commercial gain

I was very disappointed that Kite Day at Streatham Common had to be rescheduled last year because of the damage caused by other events. There should be more consultation with residents and local groups about the plans for big events, and more transparency over the precautions taken to prevent damage as well as analysis of what damage could occur as a result of big events. Community events should not be sidelined by commercial events. I feel strongly that a fallow year would be valuable to Streatham Common. If isn't already, it should be written into contracts with commercial events organisers that if they or their customers cause environmental damage, they must bear the cost of remedying that damage.

I understand your reasoning to use the common to generate income (blackmailing residents that librarians will be closed without this income) But after The Winterville event the common area has been closed off for 5 months which is totally unacceptable. They should use the hard area for fairgrounds!!!!

I think it's unfair to hold events in local parks without more consultation with local residents. We have the noise of the people coming and going, the music noise and then Milkwood Rd was used as a taxi area, so people shouting and vehicles coming and going all night. No transparency there. Plus we use the use of the park closest to our home.

I strongly disagree with any ticketed events in Lambeth Parks especially Brockwell Park as the parks are vital for all Lambeth citizens to enjoy and relax. Major ticketed events reduce the availability of the park for all citizens.

Appendix: responses

Disagree with events in parks

I strongly agree with this because no matter how many times I disagree with some event being held in the Parks (Brockwell) they still go ahead which impact the environment in a big way. I am never able to visit the park when an event is running.

I know that the use of our parks for profit has a negative affect for many regular users. Any genuine information regarding the benefit of these events to the council seems important.

I do not support the use of Brockwell Park for such major and frequent events, inconveniencing we local residents with increased noise and people and taking away our use of the park in the usual way, not to mention the effect on the wildlife in the park.

Events take up too much space in Brockwell park . Fencing and the space allocated for a music fest was far too big . Lambeth Country Show does NOT need to be fenced and the public should be allowed to bring in alcohol and not pay excessive prices once inside !

Councils are only wardens of public spaces. I can't remember the bylaw but it says that councils aren't allowed to use money generated from parks to fill holes in their budget from government. If money is made it should all go towards community out reach projects and the park itself. The country fair should be free and unfenced. I don't care that vendors (commercial bars) complaints about decreased profits. It's a community event and not a festival!!!

Committing to be more transparent is always good but I'm not sure this pledge of publishing an annual total and a report idea goes far enough. In certain instances, it would be more appropriate to give transparency on a per event basis to help people make a more informed judgement call on whether they think an event would be worth the potential disruption, loss of use for the community or potential damages to a park.

Disagree with events in parks

But it simply does not go far enough. Specifically there is no provision for prior consultation with the local community as to whether they want the type of event basing proposed for their park as desirable for that location.

Brockwell Park is my local, much cherished park and one of the few decent-sized green spaces to escape the pollution around the main roads. It is a community resource that is vital to so many in and around Brixton. In the summer it is massively disrupted for endless weeks by work associated to two-day events, which almost solely benefit the businesses organizing them. This is unacceptable! The Country Show is welcome, if it can be set up and taken down quickly and isn't fenced off to cut vast stretches of the park off. The large commercial festivals should not happen. At all! This is not a commodity to pimped out to events companies that cause wide-spread environmental damage, which they fail to repair. It also puts a strain on local residents due to crime and noise levels. If they are allowed, they should be given an absolute maximum of two days before and after to set up and take down, and made to pay for the full and immediate restoration of any damaged grass areas, as well, as pay towards policing etc.

Being a frequent user of Kennington park I dread the summer season when we lose a lot of our park to events. I understand the need to generate income but us park users have no seen the benefit at all. The children's playground is in desperate need for new equipment, the toilets in the playground are REVOLTING and we have been without a cafe for over a year because of tendering to the highest bidder. Whilst the number of events have increased the quality of park provision has decreased.

Public parks are not spaces for big events, they are local lungs for people. Big events should not be held in parks.

Appendix: responses

Country Show

Country Show

You should not be using large scale events like this as income generators due to your own financial mismanagement. You've turned an amazing country show into a loss making corporate hell zone and made Brockwell Park, of which I am a regular user totally inaccessible due to the fencing needing for your desire to monetise this event, and turned a lovely park into a place for rent for you to raise funds. Just stop please.

We need to know where the main earnings come from -and details of the losses from the Lambeth Country Show. When parks are being deprived of funds, money wasted on the Country Show cannot be justified

Transparency is vital so that there can be public understanding of how the massive shortfall in the Lambeth Country Show is financed - ie where the money is found.

Lambeth country show is the most horrible event for us living near the park. People use are gardens as toilets. Why should we pay for this? It is not free for us. Make a £10 charge to enter

Events take up too much space in Brockwell park . Fencing and the space allocated for a music fest was far too big . Lambeth Country Show does NOT need to be fenced and the public should be allowed to bring in alcohol and not pay excessive prices once inside !

Councils are only wardens of public spaces. I can't remember the bylaw but it says that councils aren't allowed to use money generated from parks to fill holes in their budget from government. If money is made it should all go towards community out reach projects and the park itself. The country fair should be free and un fenced. I don't care that vendors (commercial bars) complaints about decreased profits. It's a community event and not a festival!!!

Country Show

But it simply does not go far enough. Specifically there is no provision for prior consultation with the local community as to whether they want the type of event basing proposed for their park as desirable for that location.

Brockwell Park is my local, much cherished park and one of the few decent-sized green spaces to escape the pollution around the main roads. It is a community resource that is vital to so many in and around Brixton. In the summer it is massively disrupted for endless weeks by work associated to two-day events, which almost solely benefit the businesses organizing them. This is unacceptable! The Country Show is welcome, if it can be set up and taken down quickly and isn't fenced off to cut vast stretches of the park off. The large commercial festivals should not happen. At all! This is not a commodity to pimped out to events companies that cause wide-spread environmental damage, which they fail to repair. It also puts a strain on local residents due to crime and noise levels. If they are allowed, they should be given an absolute maximum of two days before and after to set up and take down, and made to pay for the full and immediate restoration of any damaged grass areas, as well, as pay towards policing etc.

Appendix: responses

Other

| Other |
|---|
| With cuts in central government funding and increase in gentrification. We see certain groups within the community being ousted out and gentries supporting their own initiatives. It would be good for more transparency in terms of where funding is allocated. |
| Will Wandsworth Council use this transparency to undercut Lambeth or be equally transparent in the tariffs for its parks? It would be good if there was a London standard so it's easy to see income from the parks in SW London |
| Will there be a meeting for those that would like more explanation if it is necessary? |
| Where are you going to publish it? |
| We should canvas to have more residential input in how this is spent. Pavements outside Brockwell Park are terrible, and yet tens of thousands tread them annually with or without events. FIX THEM please! |
| Vanbrugh Court Freehold proposals. |
| The more money you generate the more you can spend on parks and gardens in Lambeth. That has to be a good thing |
| Thanks for bringing such proposal into Lambeth borough. I will suggest more attention and priorities into housing crisis in Lambeth. Me and my family we will be 5 people in may with birth of my 3rd child have been living in a one bedroom flat with lots of difficulties this flat has and bidding for a new 3 bedroom since 2 years and sent lots of complains to different housing officers in Lambeth even I met our MP but honestly so disappointed. Now so concerned about my 3rd baby will born in beginning of may have no space to put her bed. |

| Other |
|--|
| Stop wasting money on fences in Brockwell Park. Appalling anti-community behaviour. Tantamount to 'keep locals out, parks are for visitors from Chelsea only policy'. |
| Please can money be spent on Norwood Park rather than always being Brockwell, Brixton and Feast |
| Option for the public to agree to events |
| Once the figures are published it would be good to see them made simple for everyone to understand. i.e. percentage of money raised by events allocated to the spaces they were held on. Plus what percentage of park budget is spent on each space. Streatham Common appears to be the poor cousin of Lambeth Parks, with little spent on it compared to surrounding Lambeth spaces, yet it is hugely popular throughout the year with all age groups and by a diverse community. |
| Not yet |
| Not at the moment |
| N/A |
| More should be spent on the upkeep of the park and more community involvement |
| May it continue. Generate the area as a landmark. additional footfall, and monetary growth on sales. Can Businesses be communicated to directly in advance so they can capitalise on trade. |

Appendix: responses

Other

I understand the need for councils to find creative ways to raise money in these times, but do think that if local residents have to sacrifice their open spaces for large chunks of the year (Winterville take about 6 months from set up to remediation) then some of proceeds should go towards maintaining good facilities in the parks. In particular Clapham Common kids area needs a complete renovation. As does the paddling pool.

I think this question is a moot point, and all council activities should be transparent.

I think that the council should run this affair without a need for transparency to its residents.

I think it's important for residents to understand the Council's motivation for holding so many events on the Common during the year.

I think being transparent about how income is generated should be put in the context of the cuts that the council has endured from central government.

Other

I am in favour of Lambeth generating income from events, but many of my neighbours are not. So transparency is essential!

I agree that there should be transparency in all Council financial dealings but would advise caution in raising charges or adding too many costs in the way of levy's as this will eventually deter event operators such as myself from bringing events to Lambeth, simply because the charges don't make the event viable.

Ensure maximum percentage possible is included in the Parks Levy.

Could you please forward any information about housing standards as I am interested in this.

After having lived in Dumbarton Court for almost 36 years, I noticed that improvements are continuously being made and particularly, nowadays with the advancement of Technology everything is even getting better. Thank you.

A lot of space, can we get one of those outdoor gyms

For more information contact:

events@lambeth.gov.uk

EventLambeth
Lambeth Council
PO Box 734
Winchester SO23 5DG