

NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET MEMBER SIGNING

Friday, 28th July, 2023, 1.30 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road Wood Green N22 8JZ. You can watch the meeting online [Here](#)

Councillor Emily Arkell – Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities & Leisure

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on. By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

4. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of Urgent Business. (Late items of Urgent Business will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items of Urgent Business will be dealt with under agenda items 7&10).

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 29 of the Council's constitution.

6. PARK HIRE APPLICATION BY KRANK EVENTS LTD TO HIRE FINSBURY PARK TO STAGE TWO MULTI-EVENT MUSIC WEEKENDS IN AUGUST 2023 (PAGES 1 - 56)

7. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

As per item 3.

8. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Item 9 is likely to be subject to a motion to exclude the press and public from the meeting as it contains exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985); paras 3 and 5, namely information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information) and information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

9. EXEMPT INFORMATION PARK HIRE APPLICATION BY KRANK EVENTS LTD TO HIRE FINSBURY PARK TO STAGE TWO MULTI-EVENT MUSIC WEEKENDS IN AUGUST 2023 (PAGES 57 - 58)

10. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

As per item 3.

Ayshe Simsek
Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager
Tel – 0208 489 2929
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman
Head of Legal and Governance and Monitoring Officer
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Thursday, 20 July 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet Member decision – 28 July 2023

Item number: N/A

Title: Park hire application by Krank Events Ltd to hire Finsbury Park to stage two multi-event music weekends in August 2023

Report

Authorised by: Barry Francis, Director of Environment and Resident Experience

Lead Officer: Sarah Jones, Events & Partnerships Manager
sarah.jones@haringey.gov.uk, 020 8489 5699

Ward(s) affected: Harringay Ward

Report for Key/

Non-Key Decision: Non-Key Decision

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 This report seeks a determination of an application made by Krank Events Ltd (the Applicant) to hire Finsbury Park for a period in July/August in 2023, in order to stage two consecutive multi-event weekends.

1.2 The application is required to be determined pursuant to the Council's Outdoor Events Policy (the Policy), which was approved by Cabinet on 17th December 2013, and implemented on 7th January 2014.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

Not applicable.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Cabinet Member is recommended:

(a) To consider, and take account of, the comments received from recognised stakeholders of Finsbury Park in response to the event notification being sent as part of the decision-making process (attached as Appendix 2).

(b) Pursuant to Contract Standing Order 16.02, to authorise the Director of Environment and Resident Experience to (1) approve conditional, in-principle agreement to hire Finsbury Park to the Applicant for the events and dates detailed in this report as set out in paragraph 6.4 and (2) enter into contract to hire Finsbury Park to the Applicant (for the events detailed in this report as set out in paragraph 6.4) provided that the Director of Environment and Resident Experience is satisfied with the terms of any proposed agreements and permissions.

4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 Under the terms of the Policy, applications of the type detailed in this report are required to be determined with the prior agreement of the Cabinet Member. It is considered that this decision is non-key because it is (a) not likely to result in the local authority incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the local authority's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or (b) to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.
- 4.2 With respect to (b) the impact of the proposed decision on communities is not considered to be significant because the area does not comprise an area of two or more wards. And whilst there is strong local feeling from a section of the community, there is active engagement and opportunity for stakeholders to feedback. Also any impacts of the events are not significant and have no lasting effect given the short duration of the events during the year. However, feedback and those impacts, such as they are, are considered within the report along with proposed mitigations.
- 4.3 If authority is given, then officers will give in-principle agreement to the Applicant for the event applications to progress. The events are subject to lengthy discussions with relevant authorities - including Licensing - before final approval is given.
- 4.4 The rejection of the application would have implications for the Parks & Leisure Service budget and reduce the opportunity for reinvestment into Finsbury Park (the Park). It would also mean that the wider cultural and economic benefits to the borough were lost.

5. Alternative options considered

- 5.1 In adopting the Policy, the Council established its commitment to using the Park for a limited number of major events each year. Accordingly, the only other alternative option which could be considered would be to reject the applications. That option was rejected, on the grounds that the events did not fall within any of the grounds set out in paragraph 5.3 of the Policy for automatic refusal.

6. Background information

- 6.1 In January 2014, the Council adopted the Policy to recognise the value and benefit that a varied, and well-managed, outdoor events programme can offer the residents of Haringey.
- 6.2 The Policy assists the decision-making process behind building a sustainable and varied programme of events. It also seeks to protect the community and the parks and greenspace infrastructure and minimise or mitigate any negative impacts which events may cause.
- 6.3 Some of these restrictions, as set out at paragraph 5.2.2 of the Policy, specifically relate to the Park to ensure a balance of income generation and that of continued public use of the Park through the busiest summer months is achieved. These restrictions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *“Major scale events [more than 10,000 attendance] will be ordinarily limited to 5 per year, save where there is demonstrable community support for additional events*
 - *Duration of major scale events will be of 1 – 3 days per event*
 - *No major scale events will take place during the school summer holidays”*
- 6.4 In July 2022, the Council received an application from Krank Events Ltd (the Applicant) to hire the Park to stage one two-day and one three-day weekend of multi-events to take place in August 2023.
- 6.5 The Policy details the approval process for determining applications. Paragraph 5.2.3. of the Policy requires prior authority for the event to be given by the Cabinet Member before officers give in-principle agreement whenever the following criteria apply:
- *“Event lasts more than 2 days with 5,000 or more in attendance”*
 - *“Organiser occupies a site for more than 14 days including setup and take down periods”.*
- 6.6 All of the criteria detailed above apply to this application, hence this referral to the Cabinet Member.
- 6.7 Public events have been taking place in Finsbury Park since it first opened in 1869. In recent years, Finsbury Park has been the prime location for many international music acts, playing to large audiences within the open arena of the Park. This includes the first open-air symphony concert of the London Philharmonic Orchestra in 1948.
- 6.8 The Applicant has a successful history of organising events in the Park since the first two-day music festival held in 2018. In 2019 they increased their events to run for two consecutive weekends and this was repeated in 2021 and 2022.
- 6.9 In 2022, the Applicant successfully revised its Premises Licence enabling it to provide a fifth day of events on the Friday of the second weekend. 2023 will be the first year that it will provide an event on this day.
- 6.10 In 2018 and 2019, the events included Sink the Pink, an LGBTQ+ led event. In recent years, the events have provided more DJ-led music, playing predominantly house, drum and base and funk.
- 6.11 It is standard commercial practice that, once a park hire application for a previously successful event has been submitted by the Applicant and initially accepted by the Council, tickets go on sale, subject to Cabinet Member approval or contract being in place. The Applicant does this at its own risk. All proposed events for 2023 have subsequently sold out.
- 6.12 Initial figures show that, on average, over 80% of tickets have been purchased by people living in London.
- 6.13 The current proposal seeks to hire the Park to the Applicant to host two consecutive weekends of music festivals – one two-day and one three-day

weekend. By approving this application, the disruption to the Park will be shorter than having two separate weekends of events with their own build and break periods.

- 6.14 This approach will reduce the income level received but will allow the Park to generate sufficient income for its basic maintenance, enhanced staffing levels and a reasonable level of investment within the Park.
- 6.15 The Applicant allocates a number of tickets for residents living in the immediate vicinity of Finsbury Park. These are available through a resident ballot. This year, over 300 local households have applied for free tickets to attend the events.
- 6.16 Due consideration as to the effects these events could have on the Park, park users and local residents has been given, with detailed plans in place to ensure public access is maintained to the Park and all facilities, whilst ensuring the events provide increased recreational enjoyment within the Park environment.
- 6.17 The Applicant has applied to hire a small section of the carriageway and surrounding grassland to the north of Finsbury Park for both weekends of events.
- 6.18 The location provides the perfect space for the street-party style festival to take place. Much of the heavy infrastructure such as the stage and footfall takes place on the carriageway, causing minimal damage to grass areas. It also means that vehicles involved in the build, break and supplies for the event have ease of access from the Endymion Road vehicle entrance, through to the event space, with minimal need to cross grass.
- 6.19 The site location to the north of the Park and the fact that large London plane trees overhang the site, helps contain some sound emanating. In the years of previous operation, only a small number of noise complaints have been received.
- 6.20 The majority of visitors to the event travel on foot or by underground, exiting at Manor House tube station. This provides ease of access into the event arena which is located a few metres within the Park's Manor House gate. Egress from the event takes place in the same way, meaning that the majority of visitors do not pass residential properties.
- 6.21 The event space is designed to hold up to 8,000 attendees, all infrastructure and staff. The Applicant's premises licence specifies that it can hold regulated music events of up to 5 days in the Park, each year.
- 6.22 The total area used for these two weekends of events equates to approximately 5% of the Park. The remaining 95% of the Park, and all facilities, remain open to the public at all times.
- 6.23 The areas used for quieter, informal recreational activity including all formally laid out horticultural spaces such as the Mackenzie Gardens, and the wider expanses of grass areas including the bandstand field, reservoir and Seven Sisters Road field all remain open and accessible to the public while these events take place.

- 6.24 Visits to the Park continue while these events take place, by ensuring that all public facilities including the ball courts, play areas, cafes and lake etc remain open.
- 6.25 During the build and break, thoroughfares are kept open to park users to transgress the Park north to south, east to west.
- 6.26 As part of the carriageway and pavement is encased within the event area, the Applicant installs trackway along grass areas where the path is unavailable. This is done so access is maintained.
- 6.27 The Applicant's premises licence (which will regulate the multi-weekend events in August) requires that all music and supplies of alcohol ceases at 9.30pm on Sunday in consideration of the start of the working week, and 10pm on Friday and Saturday.
- 6.28 It is accepted that, due to the high footfall experienced during events, some short-term damage to the grass used may take place and is weather-dependent.
- 6.29 A full programme of grass restoration is undertaken by the Park operatives once all event infrastructure is removed from site and weather conditions allow. As the proposed events take place within a contained 3-week period and no other events are held in this area, this ensures that the grass has a long recovery period between events each year.

Consultation Exercise

- 6.30 As part of the approval process, the Policy stipulates the need for consultation on the application to take place. Paragraph 5.1.6. of the Policy states, "*Consultation will involve all stakeholders, including Friends Groups, Area Parks Managers, Ward Councillors, Cabinet Member for Environment and the members of the Haringey Safety Advisory Group. Other consultees may be added where appropriate to the specific park or open space*".
- 6.31 In discharging the requirement to consult, officers sent details of the application to 38 external stakeholder groups by e-mail dated 15th March 2023. Details of the list of consultees appears at Appendix 1 to the report. Stakeholders (including: local resident associations; Hackney and Islington Council officers; park user groups and leaseholders; councillors from 6 adjoining wards including those in Hackney and Islington; internal Council stakeholders including licensing and emergency planning; and statutory bodies including the Metropolitan Police and London Fire Brigade) were given 10 working days to respond.
- 6.32 Of the list of consultees, only those highlighted in green at Appendix 1 provided a total of 4 responses, broken down as follows:
- (a) 1 response was received from Parkrun
 - (b) 1 response was received from Edible Landscapes
 - (c) 1 response was received from TfL London Street Traffic Control Team
 - (d) 1 response was received from the Friends of Finsbury Park

6.33 The comments are set out in full at Appendix 2. However, they can be summarised in the main as being concerns around: loss of the park area; safety concerns; loss of oversight; size and number of events; benefits to local area; hire fees; funding and income; disruption to activities; contract; management plan; inclusivity of shared spaces; loss of scrutiny of event planning; anti-social behaviour; effects of studying children; park biodiversity; five-year hire; Outdoor Events Policy.

6.34 Officer responses to the comments are as follows:

Park Run

Issues raised: disruption to activities.

Officers welcome the general acceptance of the events and understand there is a pro-active need for a joined-up approach to limit disruption to the weekly Parkrun activities. Officers will continue to work with the Parkrun organisers to determine how their activities can carry on during the build and break periods.

Edible Landscape

Issues raised: impacts on nature and wildlife, site location, HGVs and generators.

In relation to the environmental impacts, a Biodiversity Management Plan for Finsbury Park is currently being developed. This will be informed by an assessment of baseline ecological conditions of the site, and an assessment of net change in biodiversity using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 4.0 (Natural England). Once this baseline information has been assessed and identified, an 'Events' section will be included within the Biodiversity Management Plan, looking at mitigatory, management and enhancement measure to be implemented before, during and after major events. This will serve to provide guidance on minimising the degradation of any features of ecological importance identified through the survey work.

In addition to this, and to inform us whether the events do have an impact on the air quality within the Park – specifically with the increase in vehicle movement and use of generators - baseline data is initially needed. It is planned that this will be gathered during 2023 and, as detailed above, will then inform any improvements needed to take place.

In regard to HGVs being used by the Applicant and mitigating the environmental impact of use, a no engine idling policy is implemented while on site, in which any suppliers arriving in vehicles are required to switch off engines once parked.

London Street Traffic Control Team

Issues raised: Road closures.

There are no roads closures that are put in place for the Krankbrother events, and this has been shared with the stakeholder.

Friends of Finsbury Park

Issues raised: continued objection to events; safety concerns; loss of oversight; size and number of events; hire fees; funding and income; contract; loss of scrutiny of event planning; anti-social behaviour; park biodiversity; five-year hire; Outdoor Events Policy.

The Friends of Finsbury Park submitted the same response to the Krank Events Ltd applications than they did in response to the Festival Republic applications, with the same responses applying to both. Many of the issues raised by the Friends of Finsbury Park within its 15-page submission have been included above. However, for clarity, responses to its direct questions are below:

Noting two distinct organisations (Live Nation /Krank), did the Council solicit this length of application from prospective customers? What was the basis of this solicitation?

It is not unusual for event organisers to want security of knowing hire has been agreed, and not unusual for these organisations to submit multiple hire applications. Anyone wishing to submit a park hire application can do so through EventApp. It is then up to Council officers as to whether these applications are progressed.

Is this a political decision to extend the licences to five-year periods? If not, why are officers relying on the political manifesto to justify? On the basis of the above, in what way do they feel it is justified?

The Outdoor Events Policy sets out terms of hire and how park hire applications will be considered.

Does the Council track on a formal, minuted / governed risk-register, its material reliance on a 3rd party for funding park services in Finsbury Park, and if not, why not?

Yes. The risk of failure to secure major event income for future years is detailed on the Council's risk register.

What efforts has Haringey Council made to follow through on promises to residents in 2022 to

- i) look at alternative funding models, and**
- ii) undertake a bottom up assessment?**

The scale of the income generated by hosting events in the Park (£1.2m from all events) could only be replaced in whole or in part by the Council funding the park from other Council resources. Given the ongoing constraints on local government finances for the past 12 years, replacement funding is not available at this time or within the foreseeable future.

What about having smaller events: - Having smaller events has been suggested in the past as an alternative. However, given the level of income is approximately 1/10th of that derived from the two weekends of major events then a series of ten weekends of events for up to 10,000 people would be required. This would lead to a far greater level of disruption in the Park of around 20 weeks

compared to the 4 weeks of disruption by the major events detailed in this application. Therefore, this option is not recommended due to the increased level of disruption.

What about spending less money: - The need to generate so much income could be reduced in a number of ways:

- No money for reinvestment – Saving £300k
- Scale back the dedicated and expanded Parks Operational Team to the same level of other parks – Saving £300-400k

Some income would still be generated by those current events below 10,000 attendees - circa £200k. However, this would still mean the Council needs £400k per year to support the Park.

The consequence of such an approach would mean that the Council had to fund an additional £400k per annum for a park whose maintenance was significantly reduced and a park that had no additional money for investment. Therefore, this option is not recommended.

What published document evidences this? Has the council changed the fee charged for major events in the last five years?

Yes. The hire fees and charges are agreed by the Cabinet each year as part of the Council's budget-setting process and are a matter of public record. However, specific fees charged to individual hirers remains exempt. Hire fees have increased year on year, with a 5% increase being levied on commercial hire for 2023/24.

How has the council benchmarked this fee, or effectively re-assured itself that this represents a good deal for residents?

Individual hire fees are commercially sensitive, and therefore authorities do not make this information publicly available. However, anecdotal benchmarking suggests that Haringey's fees and charges are in line with comparable London parks used for major events.

Was any independent opinion taken into any review of fees charged?

No.

Does Haringey Council have no other services where it incurs a multi-year cost but has a 'risk' of an annual income / budget approval process?

There are other Council services that have costs which need to be met by income generation, such as parking. The Council's Cabinet determines fees and charges for various services on an annual basis, based on specific policies and advice from officers.

How will this change of contract type affect the mean cost for staff affected?

No change is being sought in relation to the type of contract being entered into. The Council will enter into the same contract as it has done in previous years.

What would stop Haringey Council defining some proposed dates to give residents some certainty should it seek to undertake major events in future years, without licensing them for five years?

Krank Events Ltd already hold indefinite Premises Licences for Finsbury Park. These cannot be activated without agreement to hire the park. This report is seeking agreement for park hire in 2023 only.

What ‘improvements’ is the council proposing, how has the council valued them (£, impact) and how are they tied to this extension?

‘Improvements’ refers to those which can be made to both the Park infrastructure and those within the event planning process and delivery.

What would happen if, two years into the proposed agreement, licence terms were breached?

This report seeks the determination of 2023 park hire application only and is separate to the Premises Licence. The Premises Licence is overseen by the Licensing Authority with processes in place to review the Licence, if and when needed. If park hire approval is given, and the Licence was revoked, the events will not take place.

Noting our objection to the proposal, what freedom does the council have if, after two years, it changes its major events policy and no longer wishes to hold major events in Finsbury Park?

This decision is based on the current park hire application process, that is in line with the Outdoor Events Policy. There is currently no plan to review the Policy.

Will promoters pay the same amount of fees as if they had licensed each year, if they get a 5 year deal?

The Council is committed to getting the best commercial deal on all park hire applications. The hire fee for the 2023 application is based on fees and charges already agreed by the Council.

Please clarify whether you have included any ‘new’ investment in response to this question, that might appear to net that reduction off.

It is not clear what this question means.

In what way does the Council believe the potential breaches of their outdoor events policy 2014 are acceptable, and how does it feel it meets the [Haringey] Labour Party manifesto 2022–2026?

The Council is clear that the Outdoor Events Policy has never been breached. The Labour Party Manifesto is a matter for Labour Group Members to determine but is very much in line with the aims of the Outdoor Events Policy. There is a clear interest from residents to attend these events, as between 74% and 88% of

attendees are based within London and over 500 tickets being given to local residents around the Park in 2022.

7. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 7.1 Hosting large and major events within the borough's parks contributes to supporting the local economy, developing the cultural offer in the borough and provides an opportunity for local people to enjoy these types of events with minimal travel.
- 7.2 The recommendations made will contribute to policy and practice primarily in relation to the Corporate Delivery Plan 22/23 and 23/24. However, much of this is focused on Theme 7: Culturally rich borough, which sets out how the Council will build a fairer, greener borough by 2024.
- 7.3 Theme 7: 'Culturally rich borough' within the Corporate Delivery Plan 'prioritises this because of the role we know that arts, culture and heritage will play in helping us to build a vibrant and inclusive economy, welcoming and inclusive neighbourhoods and communities, and healthy and fulfilling lives for our residents'.
- 7.4 This can specifically be seen in the following intermediate outcomes:
- The Council will have a more fully developed vision for the role of arts, culture and heritage in the borough which reflects what is important to Haringey's diverse communities, creates wider opportunities for residents and attracts the interest of visitors;
 - Celebrating and inspiring will enhance Haringey's cultural reputation and profile in London and beyond;
 - There will be an increase in resident, cultural sector and community collaboration and participation in arts and culture.

8. The Open Spaces Act 1906

- 8.1 The income generated from these events is for the benefit of the Park itself and is fundamental to keeping it open as a viable facility.
- 8.2 All income generated through events specifically held in the Park, will be spent in the Park as required under the Open Spaces Act 1906 (the Act). In the first instance, this will assist with all management and maintenance costs associated with running the Park. Any surplus event income derived will be used to make improvements to the Park's infrastructure, as set out in the Outdoor Events Policy at 8.2.5.
- 8.3 The above said, the Cabinet Member is made aware of the fact that the Council does have a statutory duty under the Act as trustee to hold the land comprising the Park on trust for the public. As such, in coming to a view on the recommendations contained in the report, account has to be taken of the existence and impact of all material circumstances which arise from a decision to grant in-principle approval for the events to take place prior to the Cabinet Member coming to a settled view.

- 8.4 Officers have set out the concerns from objectors and how they can be overcome, at the sub-paragraphs under 6.34 above. Officer responses to the concerns raised recognise that a large proportion of the Park will remain open whilst the events take place, and that the event days take up no more than 5% of the Park for 1% of the year / 6% of the year, including build and break days. These responses also take into consideration the outcome of the EqIA at Appendix 3.

9. Statutory Officers' comments

9.1 Finance

This information is exempt and is attached as Part B of this report.

9.2 Legal

- 9.2.1 The Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) has been consulted in the preparation of this report and makes the following comments.
- 9.2.2 The law which governs the Council's powers to hire the Park in these circumstances was settled in a High Court challenge for judicial review brought by the Friends of Finsbury Park (the Friends) against the decision to permit the application to stage Wireless 2016 in the Park.
- 9.2.3 In summary, the judge ruled that the provisions of section 44 of the Public Health Amendment Act 1890; The Ministry of Housing and Local Government Provisional Order Confirmation (Greater London Parks and Open Spaces) Act 1967 and section 145 of the Local Government Act 1972 – all of which govern the ability to permit entertainment in open spaces such as the Park – *“creates different powers for different places subject to different limitations”*. Accordingly, the judge went on to rule that *“s145 of the 1972 Act, of itself and standing alone, provides the Council with the necessary power to permit Wireless 2016 to take place in the Park”*.
- 9.2.4 The significance of that ruling, was that the restriction placed on the amount of the Park which could be enclosed or set apart to facilitate the event, and the duration for such enclosure as prescribed under the 1890 and 1967 Acts – *“one acre or one tenth of the [Park] whichever is greater” / “12 days in any one year, nor four [six in London] consecutive days on any one occasion”* – simply did not apply.
- 9.2.5 The Friends then appealed to the Court of Appeal. However, the appeal was dismissed on 16th November 2017, with all three judges ruling that the High Court judge had correctly identified what the legal power position was.
- 9.2.6. The Friends then sought permission to appeal to the Supreme Court. However, that application was dismissed on 26th June 2018 on the grounds that it “does not raise an arguable point of law”.

The Current Applications

- 9.2.7 During the course of the hearing in the Court of Appeal, the Friends and the Open Spaces Society introduced new representations not made in the High Court,

concerning the fact that the Council holds the Park on trust for the enjoyment by the public as an open space pursuant to section 10 of the Open Spaces Act 1906 (the 1906 Act).

- 9.2.8 The Council conceded that the 1906 Act did apply. Accordingly, in coming to a view on the recommendations contained in this report, the Cabinet Member is required to consider whether in light of the duty under the 1906 Act, it would still be reasonable to exercise the power under section 145 of the Local Government Act 1972, to close off part of the Park to facilitate the Krank Events Ltd and associated events applied for. In so saying, the attendance at music and dance events is itself recreational, and therefore within the statutory trust.
- 9.2.9 Any decision reached by the Cabinet Member is required to be one which is balanced, rational and in the interests of all park users in terms of an overall assessment of the benefits and detriments of public recreation in relation to different sections or user groups within the community. The analysis of the objections to the events, the comments made by officers on those objections, and the outcome of the EqlA are key to aiding the Cabinet Member in the decision-making process. In adopting that approach, the Head of Legal and Governance (Monitoring Officer) sees no legal reasons why the Cabinet Member could not adopt the recommendations in this report.

9.3 Equality

- 9.3.1 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to:
- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
 - advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
 - foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.

Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

- 9.3.2 An equality impact assessment was completed to accompany the decision in December 2013 to adopt Haringey's Outdoor Events Policy, which governs the assessment of event applications to Finsbury Park. The policy does not permit events where the sole purpose is as a religious act of worship. The impact assessment acknowledged that this restriction could have the effect of discouraging religious or belief organisations from using the Park for major worship-based events. However, it reasoned that this restriction could be justified because such religious/belief-based events by their very nature could exclude others who do not share that religion/belief from attending the event or using the park more generally.

- 9.3.3 The Council's Outdoor Events Policy ensures that event providers operate in accordance with the Equality Act and do not discriminate against groups who share a protected characteristic.
- 9.3.4 The Policy aims to strike a balance between ensuring that the parks, such as Finsbury Park, can be used as a community asset for all groups to access for the majority of the year, against the need to generate income from hosting major events and for these to contribute to the borough's cultural and leisure offer.
- 9.3.5 An equality impact assessment has been completed to accompany the Krank Events Ltd application and can be found in Appendix 3. The assessment explores impact on residents in the immediate wards surrounding Finsbury Park: Stroud Green (LB Haringey), Haringay (LB Haringey), Brownswood (LB Hackney), Finsbury Park (LB Islington) as well as groups who shared protected characteristics.
- 9.3.6 The assessment identifies that children, women with children and people with disabilities will be, to a limited extent, impacted negatively by the proposal, as they are more likely to use the Park. However, this needs to be balanced against the wider aims of the scheme. The Council is taking a number of actions to mitigate the negative impact on specific groups with protected characteristics arising from the events, and as such the decision is considered a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.
- 9.3.7 The Council is committed to working with event organisers to reduce the effects of noise from events on all residents living near the Park and will enforce the individual conditions that accompany the event's permission including those related to reducing disruption, number of days (including set up) and maximum event space.

10. Use of Appendices

- 10.1 Appendix 1 – List of Finsbury Park stakeholders who were consulted
- 10.2 Appendix 2 – Finsbury Park stakeholders' full responses to park hire applications
- 10.3 Appendix 3 – Equality Impact Assessment: Applications by Krank Events Ltd to hire Finsbury Park for two multi-event weekends in 2023
- 10.4 Part B – Not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972

11. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

- 11.1 Haringey Outdoor Events Policy -
<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s48887/OEP%20-%20CLEARED%20COVERING%20REPORT.pdf>

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1:

List of Finsbury Park stakeholders who were consulted

| Recognised stakeholder consultation | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| As set out in the Outdoor Events Policy, stakeholders were emailed on 15 March 2023 with details of the Krank Events Ltd (Krankbrother) 2023 park hire application received for Finsbury Park. | | |
| 38 external stakeholder groups, plus internal Council colleagues and statutory bodies including the police, fire, ambulance and transport providers were emailed giving 10 working days to respond to the application with comments. | | |
| A full list of stakeholders is below. Those marked in green provided a response to the notification. | | |
| External stakeholders | Internal council colleagues | Statutory bodies |
| Access to Sport | Cabinet Member for Communities and Civic Life | London Fire Brigade |
| Alpha Dog Club | Parks Service | Metropolitan Police Service |
| Ambler Primary School | Licensing / Regulatory Services | London Ambulance Service |
| Be Military Fitness | Food Safety Team | Transport for London |
| Edible Landscapes | Emergency Planning Team | Govia Thameslink Railway |
| Finsbury Park Art Hut | Health & Safety Team | |
| Finsbury Park Boats | Highways | |
| Finsbury Park Bowls Club | Neighbourhood Action Team | |
| Finsbury Park Café | Parking Services | |
| Finsbury Park Sports Partnership | Veolia | |
| Finsbury Park Trust | | |
| Furtherfield | | |
| Harringay Green Lanes Traders Association | | |
| Hermitage New River Residents Assoc | | |
| Highbury Community Association | | |
| Ladder Community Safety Partnership | | |
| London Borough of Hackney | | |
| London Borough of Islington | | |
| London Mets Softball Club | | |
| Manor House Development Trust | | |
| Museum Of Homelessness | | |
| Park View Café | | |
| Parkrun | | |
| Parkwood Primary School | | |
| Pedal Power | | |
| Regiment Fitness | | |
| Stroud Green Residents' Association | | |
| Stroud Green School | | |
| Stroud Green Traders Association | | |
| The Friends of Finsbury Park | | |
| Try Tag Rugby | | |
| Harringay Ward Members x 3 (LB Haringey) | | |
| Stroud Green Ward Members x 3 (LB Haringey) | | |
| Seven Sisters Ward Members x 3 (LB Haringey) | | |
| St Ann's Ward Members x 3 (LB Haringey) | | |
| Brownswood Ward Members x 2 (LB Hackney) | | |
| Finsbury Park Ward Members x 3 (LB Islington) | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Highbury West Ward Members x 3 (LB Islington) | | |
|--|--|--|

Appendix 2:

Finsbury Park recognised stakeholders' full responses to Krank Events Ltd 2023 park hire application

From: Finsbury Park Parkrun

parkrun has no objection to other events taking place in the park and we accept this means that we sometimes need to cancel. We have no opinion on whether event permission should be granted permission on a year-by-year or multi-year basis. We appreciate when efforts are made to allow parkrun to take place alongside other events. parkrun is a free community sports event where around 500 local people walk, jog or run 5km each Saturday morning, supported by 25 volunteers each week.

For the large festivals we typically cancel for event days at a minimum. However, we are sometimes able to run during the set-up and take-down period. In order for us to be able to run while event infrastructure is on site we would need:

- A traffic curfew on the main carriageway around the park between 8.45 and 9.45 am
- The main downhill stretch of the carriageway to be clear of barriers. Previously the 'water fill' clip together barriers have been used to make a zig-zag down the carriageway and we're not able to go ahead if these are in place. Similarly we really need a good 5m of useable carriageway space so if temporary crowd barriers are used to separate motor vehicle and cycle space on the carriageway the main section need to be at least this wide.
- Access to most of our normal route (see attached image). We can normally divert from the carriageway parallel to Seven Sisters on to the grass, but we need a clear space of about 3m wide from the tree line (rather than from the wooden fence) to any steel shield to allow our runners to safely pass any pedestrians coming the other way. We are not typically able to divert around blockages to the carriageway parallel to Green Lanes.

Our three other points to note are:

- We historically find it difficult to recruit volunteers for one-off events. Therefore, depending on how the dates fall, if it ends up that there is one viable parkrun week in between the Festival Republic events and the KrankBrother events we would normally cancel that week.
- We understand that sometimes things don't go to plan (like with the record-breaking heat last year). But ideally, where it looks like take-down is not running to plan or the event staff are not able to accommodate a traffic curfew or barrier removal, someone would let us know on Thursday at the latest, so we can warn people that we need to cancel and they have the opportunity to make other plans.
- If we are going to go ahead with a diversion, we need about 3 weeks notice of this so we can submit an updated risk assessment and get it approved by parkrun HQ.

As ever, once the application process has been completed, please let us know what the plans are so we can make arrangements to cancel or go ahead as needed.

From: Edible Landscapes

Although the size of this event is more manageable and less impactful on the environment and ecology of the park than the major events we have in the summer, it's held in the most nature sensitive part of the park. We have many old trees and habitats that suffer from the loud music, lights, generators and traffic. We ask that this event goes on the south side of the park where it's just amenity grass. Perhaps near Manor House gate/Seven Sisters road. We would also like air quality monitoring along with soil

and ecological monitoring. Before, during and after to assess the damage. A limit of the diesel HGVs and generators is also needed to align with Parks and Green Spaces strategy/biodiversity plans and the Climate Emergency Haringey declared in 2019.

From: London Street Traffic Control Team

will there be any road closures for this event?

From: Friends of Finsbury Park

Summary: Haringey Council propose Major Events for FIVE YEARS in Finsbury Park

- **No peaceful summers for five years:** the proposal to extend Major Events in Finsbury Park for five years, with less oversight, and without any benefit for local residents – despite an incident prone resumption in 2022 and [a petition](#) of 2,406 local objectors – is stunning
- **No repairs, limited investment, no local support:** almost nine months on, with three months till the proposed resumption, our park has [not recovered](#) from damage in 2022. Nor received commensurate investment that might ‘mitigate’ the loss of access for a material period of the summer. The lack of public support for these events from neighbouring boroughs, or indeed their Local Authorities – and vocal private criticism – is deafening!
- **Dumping a power station in Finsbury Park:** we understand a longer commitment is proposed to enable promoters to fund a large permanent sub-station in Finsbury Park. This ‘gesture’ at greening is a fallacy, with the bigger green step to not run Major events in Finsbury *Park*. It does nothing to mitigate the broader [environmental](#) and [ecological impacts](#) of their setup, or attendance, to which the promoter nor Haringey Council currently do no monitoring of impact
- **Dubious relationship:** The Council has failed to set out any good case to do this; their tacit acknowledgement that it is linking park staff salaries and ‘green’ investment to income from an alleged [monopolist](#), with a challenging safety record in the US and the UK, is remarkable. Why would the Council weaken scrutiny or oversight of such a complicated customer? And does this deal reduce the overall amount they’ll pay as a result?
- **Letting the promoter (further) mark its own homework:** removing or weakening the process of a formal annual review cycle would remove any incentive for the promoter to engage with the community, or go beyond the marginal mitigations the Friends of Finsbury Park has ‘won’ in recent years – like noise monitoring, ecological monitoring – or safety reviews. We worry the commercial pressure to maintain income will further trump local concerns. Constructively, we have set out twenty-one proposals for licensing consideration
- **Policy breaches? And lack of scrutiny:** Whilst we are very concerned to hear the cabinet member responsible for parks is off on long term sick, and we do wish her well, the promises for a review of major events and parks funding 2022 have not been kept. The Council appears to have breached in 2022 its own [Major Events policy](#) (p9) by [closing](#) the Tennis Courts to facilitate event toilets, likewise the ad-hoc closures to play spaces;

generally, some residents found monitoring and enforcement through events frustratingly re-active. We are deeply concerned that the same department responsible for Trees is distracted with other community '[challenges](#)' in Stroud Green – and that this proposal lacks proper attention and scrutiny

- **STOP! FUND OUR PARKS!** Haringey Council should meet the elected party's 2022 manifesto commitments: co-produce with concerned local residents, assure this ecologically critical space, and deliver a funding plan for green spaces that is either not, or is much less, dependent on major events.

Dear Haringey Council

The Friends of Finsbury Park (FoFP) is a charitable Trust, founded more than 30 years ago, that seeks to protect and preserve Finsbury Park. With over 3,650 followers on Twitter, and a more formal registered member base of more than 400, the democratically elected management committee seeks to represent local views from residents in the three neighbouring boroughs. The FoFP in recent years has operated a broad set of campaigns, including re-wilding the park, fund-raising in partnership with Haringey Council a new skate plaza, and promoting safety in the park, encouraging the Council and neighbouring police forces to better collaborate.

Unlike Haringey Council, which has not conducted any formal engagement with the community on Major events in recent years, the FoFP maintains active dialogue with a range of community groups and residents of all backgrounds and views. We believe we work hard to represent that diverse opinion.

In November 2022, alongside the MET and some representation from invited Haringey Council officers and councillors, the FoFP held a well attended community meeting to discuss major events. In short: whilst we acknowledge a very small number of supportive voices, and some history, the overwhelming sense of our community engagement was *against* major events in 2023, with a deep desire for Haringey Council to address the state of the local park, and materially improve its safety.

As such, our answer seeks to do

1. Set out our views on major events
2. Rebut the arguments set out for the proposal and pose questions to the review
3. Provide constructive next steps, and a position on effectively funding Finsbury Park

Our position on major events

The FoFP has long disagreed with Haringey Council's major events policy, and we are keen to clearly set out our position. As a reminder, Major Events constitute events in Finsbury Park, with up to 49,999 people a day; whilst often unsaid, this number excludes the many thousands of support staff that make the event happen. The narrative often frames this as a limited area within our park, as opposed to much of the southern portion of it; and that is only 'weekends', as opposed to the elapsed period where areas are closed off up to 6 weeks around the events themselves.

- **Parks are parks:** Finsbury Park is an island of open green space in one of the most densely populated areas of Haringey, North London. It is a well loved area for exercise,

socialising and relaxation. Haringey suffers above average levels of obesity and mental health issues. And we think that Haringey Council is starting to take these issues seriously, rightly. But the proposal to extend Major Events runs directly counter to these public health considerations.

In 2019, Haringey Council declared a Climate Emergency, and, amongst other initiatives, committed to improving air quality. The Council also pledged to “decarbonise all parks vehicles by 2027”, which in the broadest sense would apply to those that have been granted access to it. Statements such as an intent to “better protect natural spaces from inappropriate usage, and over-use” and “use our land more sustainably – we can arrest the decline of species and improve our biodiversity” are important. But they are impossible to reconcile with the current Major events policy, that permits 1000s of motor vehicles into Finsbury Park over the summer, and perhaps 100,000s in an intense period.

- **Times have changed:** whilst Finsbury Park has a history of big events, three things have changed. First, the consequences of health and safety standards and the industrialised nature of the modern festival, necessitate elaborate ‘build / de-build’ periods around an event weekend. Secondly, festivals are now far bigger, longer, and more commercial; the income required to pay for the expensive / large US headline acts that dominate the billing. Thirdly, Finsbury Park has become more dense, with high rise flats now edging all sides of it. The days of free and easy festivals, operating in a lightly residential neighbourhood for a couple of days a year, are long gone. We are in a declared Climate and Ecological Emergency and protecting all green spaces is the priority of our times.
- **Finsbury Park today is a poor venue for major events:** Whilst superficially Finsbury Park appears a good site for a venue, a big space near some tube lines, in practice it is poor. Over repeated years, entry and exit have proved hard to control for promoters, council and the police. 2022 saw a number of crushes with the ‘riot police’ called to rescue an understaffed private security force on site. To prevent illicit access, a five metre high steel wall is erected for about two months, depriving access to most of the usable southern half of the park.

Key facilities – e.g. the tennis court – are closed. (This is in breach of the Council’s own Major Events policy, we might add). Well-attended activities like the ParkRun are unable to operate for almost two months. Whilst not formally closed, imposing ‘HERAS’ fencing is put around children’s play areas, and the skate park; this makes the space unwelcoming, and given the violent crime and drug-dealing in some areas of the park, unsafe for young users.

With deprivation on all sides, many families have limited outdoor areas on their property and rely on Finsbury Park for exercise and play; most are unable to escape the noise and side effects in stifling summer heat. Many Haringey residents use Finsbury Park as a cycle-way to avoid busy dual carriageways; major events closed that route, and forced cyclists back onto large roads.

Noting some events commence before the end of School term, local parents reported expletive abuse from festival-goers pre-drinking. Beyond noise and diesel pollution, some of the more pernicious effects are not always apparent – road closures with unpredictable timings, licensing changes for local supermarkets, and adhoc defecation and littering in nearby streets.

- **Better locations exist:** Whilst we will address the proposed substation later in the response, Finsbury Park requires promoters to truck in all the required equipment for a modern festival. We believe this constitutes 100s of truck movements, and counted 50,000+ litres of diesel on-site, with 10s of generators. Furthermore, in 2023, unlike the 1970s, Haringey, and nearby boroughs, do not lack major events space that frequently deal with the sort of events proposed.

Two major football stadiums (Arsenal, Tottenham), a large concert hall in Alexandra Palace, and many smaller live music venues that would materially benefit from the money such artists might bring. Noting the vast majority of attendees for major events do not come from Haringey, or neighbouring boroughs, event-venues like Wembley, the Olympic Stadium, The O2, are far better-suited, and operate on a more formal professional basis that do not impact nearby residents to anywhere near the same degree. An argument is sometimes made that even though not ideal - the Council needs the money to run the park. Noting that the money can only ever be spent in Finsbury Park, and that this was not the case pre-2014, we reject that argument. Haringey Council has failed to produce a detailed bottom up assessment of the cost to run the park to an acceptable standard; financials provided are opaque, and reflect odd choices (e.g. the park funding £200k of Haringey Council 'shared services').

- **This doesn't benefit or reflect Haringey, or nearby boroughs:** whilst this debate is about money, at times the Council suggests this is one of culture. These events do not represent local talent, and are mostly dominated by American performers. Our analysis highlighted that out of 73 artists on the 2022 Finsbury Park major events billing, only six had some link to Haringey, Islington, or Hackney. (Frustratingly, a non-trivial number failed to show at all.) Further, Haringey Council commissioned research in 2018 highlighted that most attendees came from far away from Haringey, and that relatively few economic benefits accrued to the borough. In short: these major events have no intrinsic tie to our area, community, nor do they provide some material benefit. Arguments that this provides accessible entertainment for our local youth are also flawed; noting that most attendees come from far away from Haringey, attendance is very expensive and in the current cost of living crisis would prove a challenging expenditure for many. For a weekend, prices run to £240, whereas per day it is £125. (Indeed, we note the tickets are now so expensive, that the promoter offers finance/credit (!) for the purchase.)
- **The council lacks commercial sense:** Since its ejection from Hyde Park in 2012, ejection from the Olympic Park in 2013, and arrival in Finsbury Park in 2014, the promoters have noted Haringey Council's desire for this income. Indeed, having tested the waters in south London in 2022, we note they are affirmatively back in Finsbury Park. Rather than treat it like the unique space it is, and reflect that in pricing, the council appears to capture a relatively limited share of income from the affair. Without repeating 2022 coverage, the *ad hoc* nature of the production highlights the lack of 'muscle memory', with operational lessons being re-learned each year, with different manifestations of commissues (e.g. entry/exit). A stark contrast nearby is found with Arsenal Football Club, receiving >60,000 on a weekly basis, which operates a well-oiled machine that garners limited local objection or basis for complaint.
- **PRO community events:** We believe there is a space – and support! – in Finsbury Park for

small, well-managed, locally-focused events. In practice, we think that is fewer than 10,000 people, avoids ecologically sensitive areas of the park, does not dominate our park nor leaves large chunks un-available through key summer months. We think the Council should nurture events like Latino Life, RISE Anti-Racism, PRIDE, etc. – and ensure they are well managed and sustainable.

Our response to your proposal, and questions

On the 7th March you wrote to us, and other stakeholders, setting out your proposal to contract major events for five years, as well as a ‘smaller’ ~10,000 set of events. Broadly, you set out the following arguments which we have summarised below, along with our questions / queries – Appendix 1 for reference has your original letter.

| Haringey Council letter to stakeholders, key arguments quoted | FOFP Question and comment |
|--|---|
| <p>“not only have we received applications to hold events this summer, but we have also received applications to host events in Finsbury Park each year up until 2027”</p> | <p>It is hard to believe that the council is merely a passive recipient of Applications.</p> <p>Question: Noting two distinct organisations (Live Nation / Krank), did the Council solicit this length of application from prospective customers? What was the basis of this solicitation?</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>“The Council feels that given the commitments in its manifesto to grow and expand the range of events held throughout the borough”</p> | <p>Haringey Council needs no reminder that it holds Finsbury Park in statutory <u>Trust</u>, as recently noted in the Supreme Court judgement (Day v Shropshire 2023); considerations to events held elsewhere in the borough are thus somewhat irrelevant.</p> <p>Although political parties have <i>Manifestos</i>, Local Authorities do not.</p> <p>As regards the Haringey Labour Party 2022 Manifesto, we presume reference to p30–31, which acknowledges an intent to “host or support MORE music festivals and events”, without specifying where or scale; should this refer to major events in Finsbury Park, this would appear to contradict other commitments on the same page, which speak to an intent to “support our local musicians” (Major events do not) and “protect Live Music venues large and small” (noting Finsbury Park is a park, major events here deprive large venues like Alexandra Palace, or smaller venues of vital revenues).</p> <p>We also find no reference online or elsewhere (March ‘23) to the proposed effort to “work with local musicians to develop a Haringey music strategy”, so assume broadly this page of manifesto commitments should be taken as directional rather than policy.</p> <p>Question: Is this a political decision to extend the licences to five–year periods? If not, why are officers relying on the political manifesto to justify? On the basis of the above, in what way do they feel it is justified?</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>“that securing the events in Finsbury Park over the medium [sic] is part of fulfilling this commitment”</p> | <p>The Council makes three material leaps.</p> <p>First, an assumption that Major Events in Finsbury Park are now a permanent fixture ‘over the medium [term]’. We fundamentally disagree, noting that they arrived in the current format only in 2014, and COVID gave two years of much–prized peace.</p> <p>Secondly, the idea that parks funding is now completely tied to major events and thus must be secured. We have yet to see a comprehensive breakdown of park finances, or, a bottom up, community–engaged effort to set out what it would cost to fund our local park.</p> <p>Thirdly, that there is any real security. There is a real risk that the promoter is unable to put on shows at the scale it currently seeks to do (lawsuits, changing consumer preference, another international public health event).</p> <p>Further, many elements of multi–year council spend rely on funding commitments that are approved on an annual basis or with funding sources subject to change (e.g. change of national government, interest rates). This is a fallacy, and reflects an operational and political choice by Haringey Council.</p> <p>Noting our strong disagreement to major events, we see no evidence that the Council charges a rate that reflects the value of Finsbury Park, or, commensurate with the impacts Major events have to it.</p> <p>Question: Does the Council track on a formal, Minuted / governed risk–register, its material reliance on a 3rd party for funding park services in Finsbury Park, and if not, why not?</p> <p>What efforts has Haringey Council made to follow through on promises to residents in 2022 to</p> <p>i) look at alternative funding models, and ii) undertake a bottom up assessment?</p> <p>What published document evidences this? Has the council changed the fee charged for major events in the last five years?</p> <p>How has the council benchmarked this fee, or effectively re–assured itself that this represents a good deal for residents?</p> <p>Was any independent opinion taken into any review of fees charged?</p> |
| <p>“By agreeing dates early, the Council has security in knowing what income is</p> | <p>Further to the above, Haringey Council has broadly offered the same set of dates, only adjusting for COVID and resident feedback around the length. There is nothing stopping the</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>expected and allows us to plan accordingly”</p> | <p>Council offering a set of dates for the next few years, without agreeing to a licence without review.</p> |
| <p>“A large proportion of the income received each year goes to fund the expanded maintenance team in the park. It is acknowledged that this expanded team has made a very real difference to the standard of maintenance in Finsbury Park. What is less well known is that at least 75% of the team are agency workers and not directly employed by the Council. Securing long term income (beyond one year) will give the Council confidence to appoint to these roles on a permanent basis.”</p> | <p>The Council seeks to make two arguments here.</p> <p>First, that the proceeds of event funds in part have been used to fund additional staff in the park. Whilst appreciated and noted locally, that previous administrations chose to cut the Parks budget is the more material consideration. To redress that is a positive step, but the nature of that funding requires change.</p> <p>Secondly, the council makes a political argument that it would prefer to appoint these staff on a permanent basis. The FoFP believes the most important thing is productive, well paid, happy and responsible staff and that it is up to the Council to assure that.</p> <p>Materially, neither of these arguments have any bearing on whether or not the promoter’s request for five years of licence is granted. There is no link. Should the Council seek to make currently contract or temporary staff permanent, it could. Indeed, this expenditure would constitute a relatively small financial risk in the scale of the council’s overall budget, should circumstances change.</p> <p>Question: Does Haringey Council have no other services where it incurs a multi-year cost but has a ‘risk’ of an annual income / budget approval process?</p> <p>How will this change of contract type affect the mean cost for staff affected?</p> |
| <p>“A longer-term view of income will also allow improvement plans to be developed covering multiple years and allows for residents to know event dates much further into the future than has previously been possible.”</p> | <p>As a general point, the FoFP does not seek Major Events in Finsbury Park, and thus would rather prefer the certainty that for the next five years, they will not be taking place.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, noting the above comments, nothing would stop Haringey Council advising residents of future dates without a five year deal. (We note that most local residents would rather not have the prospect of their Council leasing their green space for five years).</p> <p>Question: What would stop Haringey Council defining some proposed dates to give residents some certainty should it seek to undertake major events in future years, without licensing them for five years?</p> |
| <p>“Working over the longer term with the event organisers will allow us to develop further improvements that reduce the environmental impact of the events.”</p> | <p>We believe this starts to get to the nub of the issue. The only credible basis – for Haringey Council – is that the promoter has requested a longer period of licence, to give them – not residents, not council – certainty – to offer funds ‘for investment’ in improvements. We think these proposals, any designs, should be set out clearly, publicly, and consulted upon.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>We suspect relatively few of these would be of benefit to the local community, rather, make the setup of major events in our park more straightforward. We've heard informal suggestions that these improvements might constitute a local sub-station – providing power in the park at scale –to reduce the need for the two huge generators that power the main stage.</p> <p>At first blush, to describe this as a positive move to reduce the environmental impact makes sense. But with a moment of consideration, the lunacy of the statement is revealed: unless the council proposes hosting the event equipment and stock – stages, shops, speakers, wires, drinks, toilets, etc – all of that must still be trucked in. The mass of generators – unless the council is proposing attaching plugs to each tree – will presumably still be required. None of these actions speak to the ecological impact – on soil, wildlife.</p> <p>But in any event, this premise is flawed. Any building in the park would presumably require some specific form of planning permission, that the Council would not be able to provide re-assurance of approval on in advance. In the event that was not granted, and we would strongly object, presumably the Council would have given benefit back to the promoter for no gain?</p> <p>In short: we think the best way to reduce emissions from major events in Finsbury Park is not to have events in Finsbury Park!</p> <p>Question: what 'improvements' is the council proposing, how has the council valued them (£, impact) and how are they tied to this extension?</p> <p>What would happen if, two years into the proposed agreement, licence terms were breached?</p> <p>Noting our objection to the proposal, what freedom does the council have if, after two years, it changes its major events policy and no longer wishes to hold major events in Finsbury Park?</p> |
| <p>“All contractual and licensing controls will remain and therefore, should there be a major concern arising from an event then the Council will be able to take strong action against any event organiser regardless of entering into agreements covering several years.”</p> | <p>The basic business incentive at play is to exchange the certainty of action in return for some discount. What else is the incentive for the business?</p> <p>As such, we suspect this statement to be misleading at best.</p> <p>The critical phrase – ‘the council will be able’ is the key one. As noted, this arrangement would further deepen the financial tie, and thus the incentive to maintain the promoter’s spend.</p> <p>We are generally underwhelmed by the standard to which promoters have been held in the park, noting i) ad hoc monitoring through events, with largely reactive measures; ii) potential contractual or otherwise, breaches of common sense safety standards reported and ignored.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Question: will promoters pay the same amount of fees as if they had licensed each year, if they get a 5 year deal?</p> <p>Please clarify whether you have included any ‘new’ investment in response to this question, that might appear to net that reduction off.</p> |
| <p>“Considering applications in this way is aligned to the Outdoor Events Policy 2014 and the Labour Party manifesto 2022–26.”</p> | <p>We can find no reference to agreeing to multi-year events in either document. What we do note are what appear to be breaches of the Outdoor Events Policy document in 2022. For example “All tennis, skateboarding, basketball, and children's play facilities will be [sic] remain available whilst major events are taking place.” We note the tennis courts were unavailable in 2022, given their use as a toilet site. (The Council will no doubt note that it has since leased this land to a 3rd party to provide tennis services; how they choose to deliver tennis service to the community was not a consideration for the document and thus we would consider it a breach.) Local coaches lost earnings during this period as a result.</p> <p>Further, despite Council protestations to the contrary, maps distributed to residents showed play spaces closed, and, during events, security guards frequently closed HERAS fencing to prevent parents visiting them, only re-opening at the challenge of the FoFP. We again think this is a breach of the Major Event policy.</p> <p>Other sites were closed – the ‘drumming school’ had to shut, depriving them of income and a valuable service to local families for 5–6 weeks. The school is deeply embedded in the lives of ‘hard to reach’ communities, often with complex mental health and social issues that will have suffered disproportionate impact from its closure.</p> <p>Question: in what way does the Council believe the potential breaches of their outdoor events policy 2014 are acceptable, and how does it feel it meets the [Haringey] Labour Party manifesto 2022–2026?</p> |

In short: the arguments put forward to give a 5 year licence don’t hold water. Given events of 2022, it would seem a remarkable ‘reward’, and, an evasion of annual public scrutiny, to conduct this.

Input to 2023 review with considerations (‘mitigations’); looking forward

Haringey Council has informally encouraged the FoFP to set out ‘mitigations’ that we could put forward to help offset the impact of events. We think that’s a flawed premise, likewise the analogy to the use of so-called s106 development funds. There are some basic absolutes at play that we feel cannot be mitigated – most notably, the removal of access to a popular local park, the pollution, etc.

Indeed, this position would be reasonably accepted in other contexts. Take a simple example e.g.

why don't we ease congestion on a road by building a new road through a nearby park; for aggrieved park users, perhaps we could use s106 money to build better lights on side streets, or some traffic calming humps. Self-evidently, they still lost access to their park, even if another ill was mitigated. Thus, the suggestion that putting a sub-station in Finsbury Park would be a mitigation is a fallacy; the mitigation is not to put events that require a sub-station in a park!

Having endured almost a decade of major events, the FoFP and local residents have a good sense of some fundamentals that come with their taking place and what can / cannot be mitigated.

Nevertheless, Haringey Council in the short term seems determined to continue these events. Having reflected on 2022, we have tried to constructively summarise things that were raised. We propose the following should be considered seriously for 2023, and where appropriate adopted as licence conditions:

1. DO NOT licence for 5 years and maintain the 1 year process / review cycles, especially around the granting of a land use agreement annually, and the formal process of a licence application/review
2. Conduct a review of major event fees – which appear to have been held flat – reset in line with the true costs of events to the local park (increase by 20%+) and for the period held flat index to inflation (10+%).
3. No events in the area near the New River, given its unique ecological investment, and recent planting
4. A serious review of onsite Council and Promoter management, scale of presence, location of presence, with an explicit focus on the *community livability* as much as enabling the promoter.
 - a. Scale and resourcing: council members of staff expressed repeated exasperation at having to answer basic and reasonable community enquiries, with responses like “We've been working 16 hour days for three consecutive days, over the past couple of weekends”. On another occasion, and to speak to the broader demands, members of the Parks department said they had been so busy with Tree issues in the borough, they had been unable to check and respond to emails for ‘3 weeks’. With sufficient time to plan, we hope this year the team will be suitably staffed for the scale of task at hand.
 - b. Location: whilst we observed members of the council ‘on patrol’, on too many occasions, a casual walk around site highlighted absurd findings –e.g. 4x4 on carriage-way, playgrounds closed, bike path closed, idling etc. The Council should encourage the Promoter to better control the access space near the cafe, and near the railway lines (e.g. public urination, litter) and more frequently get up and around the area to observe.
5. A serious review of access to facilities, notably:
 - a. Do not deploy HERAS fencing around play areas and skatepark, and make sure they are welcoming with sufficient security to assure any equipment is not vandalised by attendees

- b. Keep tennis courts open through the summer, especially Wimbledon Week
6. Conduct a serious review of the quality of comms around the events – both in advance to residence, and through the events – setting clear expectations on what can be used when, with acknowledgement of the disruption caused
7. A serious review of disabled access to site, noting complaints at Finsbury Park in 2022, and more material concerns in the promoter's other venue
8. A pro-active anti-sexual harrassment training programme for direct and in-direct staff on event, including security, noting a number of reports of sexual harrassment and sexual assault on the site in 2022.
9. Conduct a pre-event environmental, ecological baseline, and maintain monitoring through and after. This should include an explicit environmental audit of trees in the area near the event fencing, with sanctions for damaged branches post event, noting many in 2022 many were harmed.
10. Pre-event, the taking of more realistic park damage deposits; post-event, a schedule of park damage made available publicly and with a timetable for rectifying.
11. A re-assurance on security:
 - a. That the non-event security measures – Lighting, CCTV – will be deployed pre-2022 events. If not, effective interim measures will be put in place, and maintained throughout.
 - b. That event security personnel have better guidance on behaviour – not to drive on carriageways around the event site; should rapid transit be required to police their assets, adopt electric mobility like scooters – and a reminder that they too are guests in our public park!
12. An agreement to maintain access to the central carriageway for cyclists passing north/south through the entire summer events period, segregated, with a bias towards cyclists. N.B. We would be against the cycle path being routed along the same space as pedestrians around the outside edge, given the limited space that remains, the many buggy / wheelchair users, etc.
13. A more effective 'clean out' in the period after, with a focus on micro-plastics, metal from scaffolding; likewise, the rapid re-construction of any removed fence lines from Seven Sisters, in days, not weeks or months
14. A focus on pollution, notably:
 - a. A permanent presence throughout the build up and event to monitor engine idling
 - b. Sanction for cars, vans etc parked on green spaces (2022 examples include security dogs on green space next to cafe; the green space near the park staff office being given over to cars)
 - c. A review of the number of diesel generators in the park, with a set of rules on when they can be used (e.g. only during event live periods)

- d. An insistence that event staff, artists travel to the event by public transport, with a massively reduced number of cars given access
15. A better focus on public defecation, notably on the fence line bordering the railway, and in streets nearby the event. Similarly, a heightened focus on drug dealing and ASB around the events.
16. A commitment to fix 2022 damage ASAP / latest by April '23, and that any damage from 2023 major events is resolved within 30 days of the event. A new category of fine, whereby damage is undertaken callously – e.g. drilling into the central carriage way (nr Manor House); unnecessarily driving on pavement with HGVs, damaging trees etc – to encourage a greater sense of intrinsic responsibility for the park.
17. Insistence that major events promote a genuinely diverse and local set – Haringey, Islington, Hackney – artists to top billing slots, with gender parity, for each day of events
18. A review of the effectiveness of licensing enforcement on decency terms – noting the nudity (Summer Walker) and repeat explicit language on stage in 2022 (Cardi B – Wet A*sed P*ssy; Roddy Ricch, to name but 2). N.B. we surmise the Council's logic for 2022 on this issue as follows: so long as the promoter sends a letter to artists / displays posters on site, and asks them nicely not to swear and meet guidelines, but artists still do it, well we tried / it's not our job to police content. We think that's insufficient and fails the spirit of licence changes agreed in 2018. It should better match - for example - whatever conditions govern local radio for a similar time of day, given the many young ears in the vicinity of the park.
19. A serious review of ticket touting, noting a FoFP committee member witnessed an individual in a Haringey Council high-vis shirt offering tickets on site
20. Publication of the Safety Action Group (SAG) review from 2022, so that collective lessons learnt can be shared. Examples include reports of no water on site Saturday 9th July in the early evening; the lack of co-ordination with TFL; etc.

21. A transparent discussion on park finances, including:

- a. A bottom up review of Finsbury Park Trust spend, line by line
- b. A serious commitment from Haringey Council to look at Finsbury Park funding, and 'in the medium term' move away from its reliance on a commercial 3rd party (see: Better Health; Veolia)
- c. An incremental investment of event income in the proposed Skate Plaza

We would be grateful for a point-by-point consideration of the above asks.

We will host a community meeting in April to further prepare residents for the impact. We will also look at how from 2024 onwards, major events could cease and the council seek a more sustainable basis to fund Finsbury Park. The Council might constructively consider:

1. Acknowledge the basic inconsistency between Labour's (admirable) green-focused Manifesto and it's funding constraints that have led it to this position; catch up with local residents and make the political case to fund this properly
2. Take the talented events team and focus them on fund-raising that has a far less impact on Park users, or a dependency on a single source
3. Reach out to Islington, Hackney, and consider an alternative arrangement where in exchange for joint-funding, responsibility is shared. (See: Islington and Camden partnership on parks)
4. Reach out to the City of London Corporation and consider an alternative arrangement akin to Hampstead Heath
5. Genuinely nurture local music, rather than outsourcing the task to large corporations

We continue to believe that Finsbury Park is a gem in the community. We are happy to work constructively with Haringey Council on safety – and are excited at the Love Finsbury Park campaign. We are glad the Council is able to engage in effective partnership and look forward to delivering the Skate Plaza jointly this year. But we believe the Council has got itself to the wrong conclusion on funding, and on major events.

And now's the time to stop, reflect, and change course.

With constructive best wishes,

Tom Graham, Bethany Anderson, Co-Chairs FoFP
Obo FoFP committee.

Appendix 1 – letter from Haringey Council

Dear Stakeholders,

I am writing to you, as we do each year, to let you know that we have received applications to host large and major events in Finsbury Park this summer.

The difference this year is that not only have we received applications to hold events this summer, but we have also received applications to host events in Finsbury Park each year up until 2027.

The Council feels that given the commitments in its manifesto to grow and expand the range of events held throughout the borough, that securing the events in Finsbury Park over the medium is part of fulfilling this commitment. Securing event bookings over several years has many benefits to the Council, residents and staff working in the park.

By agreeing dates early, the Council has security in knowing what income is expected and allows us to plan accordingly. A large proportion of the income received each year goes to fund the expanded maintenance team in the park. It is acknowledged that this expanded team has made a very real difference to the standard of maintenance in Finsbury Park. What is less well known is that at least 75% of the team are agency workers and not directly employed by the Council. Securing long term income (beyond one year) will give the Council confidence to appoint to these roles on a permanent basis. A longer-term view of income will also allow improvement plans to be developed covering multiple years and allows for residents to know event dates much further into the future than has previously been possible.

Working over the longer term with the event organisers will allow us to develop further improvements that reduce the environmental impact of the events. All contractual and licencing controls will remain and therefore, should there be a major concern arising from an event then the Council will be able to take strong action against any event organiser regardless of entering into agreements covering several years.

Considering applications in this way is aligned to the [Outdoor Events Policy 2014](#) and the [Labour Party manifesto 2022–26](#).

EventApp notices will follow this email and will mark the start of the formal (10 working day minimum) notification process for the event applications. We very much welcome your feedback to the proposed events, to be received by the dates set out within each notification. We will stagger the distribution of notifications to give you time to consider and respond to each event individually. The timeline for you to receive notifications is as follows:

- Week commencing 6 March: Festival Republic applications 2023–2027
Application numbers: HGYEVE000367, HGYEVE000365, HGYEVE000506, HGYEVE000508, HGYEVE000682, HGYEVE000683, HGYEVE000688

- Week commencing 13 March: Krankbrother applications 2023–2027
Application numbers: HGYEVE000631, HGYEVE000666, HGYEVE000667, HGYEVE000668, HGYEVE000692

Appendix 2:

Finsbury Park recognised stakeholders' full responses to Krankbrother park hire applications – 2023-27 events

We will only accept feedback from the Chair of your group or ward member. Any individual responses from members of your group or residents/businesses should be fed back to the Chair of your Group or ward member and should form part of their overall response. Feedback from individuals will not be accepted, as detailed in the Outdoor Events Policy 2014.

All applications are subject to our standard process of internal review. Recognised stakeholder feedback will be subject to lengthy discussions to ensure that operational plans associated with the delivery of the proposed events are of a high standard and not only meet but improve on previous years. Feedback will be included in the Cabinet Member report, along with officer responses. You will receive a copy of this report in due course.

We will continue to work with the event organisers to develop existing and community initiatives that benefit and enhance the local area. The applications will require Cabinet Member approval and events are subject to final agreement of the park hire contract and approval of the Safety Advisory Group.

Further discussions between all relevant statutory bodies and stakeholders will take place over the coming months to ensure that all events are well management and safe, with as limited an effect on the local area as possible. This includes looking at issues raised by stakeholders and members following last year's events.

A proposed schedule of Finsbury Park Events Stakeholder Meetings is below. These provide an opportunity to discuss the 2023 events season as plans progress, and to meet the event organisers. Once dates have been confirmed, invitations will be shared with you all.

| | | |
|---|---------|-------|
| Event planning (week commencing): | 3 April | 1 May |
| | 5 | |
| June Post event analysis (week commencing): | 11 Sep | |
| | 23 Oct | |

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA)

The Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) form is a template for analysing a policy or proposed decision for its potential effects on individuals with protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010.

The council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and people who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not

The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.

Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

1. Responsibility for the Equality Impact Assessment

| | |
|--|---|
| Name of proposal: | Park hire application by Krank Events Ltd to hire Finsbury Park to stage two multi-event music weekends in 2023 |
| Service Area: | Parks & Leisure Services |
| Officer Completing Assessment: | Sarah Jones, Events & Partnerships Manager |
| Equalities Advisor: | Joe Wills: Policy & Equalities Team Manager |
| Cabinet meeting date (if applicable): | Cabinet Member decision 28 July 2023 |
| Director/Assistant Director | Mark Stevens, Assistant Director Direct Services |

2. Executive summary

Please complete this section *after* completing the rest of the form and summarise:

- **The policy proposal, its aims and objectives, the decision in consideration. Please focus on the change that will result from this decision.**
- **Results of the analysis: potential positive and negative equality impacts**
- **Mitigations that will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)**
- **Next steps (this may include: if/when the EQIA will be refreshed, planned consultation, future stages of the project).**

The Council has received a park hire application from Krank Events Ltd to hire part of Finsbury Park to stage one two-day and one three-day weekend of multi-events to take place in August 2023.

The Applicant has applied to hire a small section of carriageway and surrounding grassland to the north of the Park to host both weekends of events.

The location provides the perfect space for the street-party style festival to take place. Much of the heavy infrastructure such as the stage and footfall, takes place on the carriageway, causing minimal damage to grass areas. It also means that vehicles involved in the build, break and supplies for the event have ease of access from the Endymion Road vehicle entrance, through to the event space, with minimal need to cross grass.

The site location to the north of the Park and the fact that large Plane trees overhang the site, helps contain some sound emanating. In the years of previous operation, only a small number of noise complaints have been received.

The majority of visitors to the event travel on foot or by underground, exiting at Manor House Tube Station. This provides ease of access into the event arena which is located a few metres within the Park's Manor House gate. Egress from the event takes place in the same way, meaning that the majority of visitors do not pass residential properties.

The event space is designed to hold up to 8,000 attendees, all infrastructure and staff. The Applicant's premises licence specifies that it can hold regulated music events of up to 5 days in the Park, each year.

The total area used for these two weekends of events equates to approximately 5% of the Park. The remaining 95% of the Park, and all facilities, remain open to the public at all times.

Whilst located in Haringey, Finsbury Park sits on the borders of neighbouring boroughs of Hackney and Islington. Therefore, recognised stakeholders also include residents' associations and schools from the three boroughs, Hackney and Islington council officers, councillors from six adjoining wards including Hackney and Islington and all park user groups and leaseholders.

An EqIA was carried out at the time of developing the Outdoor Events Policy. However, it is recognised that large and major events do have different site layouts and therefore could have differing impacts on park users. To plan for and mitigate these effects, individual EqIA's for specific large and major event applications will assess the level of potential impact on recognised groups with protected characteristics.

The proposal is for 2 consecutive weekends of events – one two-day and one three-day weekend - to take place in August 2023. Krank Events Ltd has a successful history of organising events in the Park since the first two-day music festival held in 2018.

Decision making process

The Outdoor Events Policy, adopted by the Council in 2014, details the approval process for determining applications. The Policy requires that, where event applications are submitted, prior authority should be given by the Cabinet Member, as a non-key decision. The criteria for large events requiring Cabinet Member approval includes:

- *events last more than 2 days with 5,000 or more in attendance;*
- *organiser occupies the site for more than 14 days including set up and take down periods.*

If authority is given, officers will give in-principle agreement to the Applicant for the event application to progress. The event will be subject to discussions between the Applicant, the Safety Advisory Group and Council officers before final agreement is given. This is agreed through Delegated Authority, given by the Director of Environment and Resident Experience.

In adopting the Policy, the Council established its commitment to using the Park for a limited number of large and major events each year. Accordingly, the only other alternative option which would be considered would be to reject the application. This option was rejected, on the grounds that the events do not fall within any of the grounds set out in paragraph 5.3 of the Policy for automatic refusal.

As part of the approval process for every park hire application, the Policy stipulates the need for consultation to take place. Paragraph 5.1.6 of the Policy states “*Consultation will involve all stakeholders, including Friends Groups, Area Park Managers, Ward Councillors, Cabinet Member for Environment and the members of the Haringey Safety Advisory Group. Other consultees may be added where appropriate to the specific park or open space*”.

Users of Finsbury Park come from all ages, backgrounds and abilities. The park holds a wide range of facilities and recreational activities, aimed at both general park users and specific user groups.

However, we can infer that residents who live in the immediate area are more likely to use the park and be impacted by events. We also know that these impacts affect children, women and people with disabilities, who are vulnerable due to their protected characteristic. This assessment addresses the Council and event organiser’s actions, which mitigate any impact.

The tables below summarise the demographic data for residents in Harringay, Stroud Green (LB Haringey); Brownswood (LB Hackney); Finsbury Park (LB Islington) wards.

3. Consultation and engagement

3a. How will consultation and/or engagement inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on protected groups of residents, service users and/or staff? Detail how your approach will facilitate the inclusion of protected groups likely to be impacted by the decision.

The Council’s Events Policy stipulates the need to consult recognised stakeholders, including Friends Groups, Area Parks Managers, Ward Councillors, the Cabinet Member for Environment and the members of the Haringey Safety Advisory Group. Other consultees may be added where appropriate for the specific park or open space.

The Council established the Finsbury Park Events Stakeholder Group, which meets regularly to update and inform all recognised stakeholders of Finsbury Park as event plans are developed. It is in this forum that issues and mitigating actions may be discussed in the lead up to the large and major events. This group is chaired by the Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities and Leisure.

In discharging the requirement to consult, officers sent details of the application to 38 external stakeholder groups by e-mail dated 15th March 2023. The Council requests that all responses are submitted within ten working days. A previous judicial review found this was an acceptable timeframe.

3b. Outline the key findings of your consultation / engagement activities once completed, particularly in terms of how this relates to groups that share the protected characteristics

Of the stakeholders contacted, the Council received four responses, as detailed below:

- (a) 1 response was received from Parkrun
- (b) 1 response was received from Edible Landscapes
- (c) 1 response was received from TfL London Street Traffic Control Team
- (d) 1 response was received from the Friends of Finsbury Park

The comments are set out in full at Appendix 2. However, they can be summarised in the main as being concerns around: loss of the park area; safety concerns; loss of oversight; size and number of events; benefits to local area; hire fees; funding and income; disruption to activities; contract; management plan; inclusivity of shared spaces; loss of scrutiny of event planning; anti-social behaviour; effects of studying children; park biodiversity; five-year hire; outdoor events policy.

The Policy allows for up to five major events (10,000 or more attendees) to take place in the Park in any one year, for a duration of between 1-3 days at a time. This number will not be exceeded. In fact, as detailed within the main report, the Council is seeking to allow substantially fewer events than have happened in previous years.

A cross-party working group has been created, attended by senior officers from Haringey, Hackney and Islington Councils, to focus on issues related to Finsbury Park. Officers use the forum to discuss potential impacts on all three boroughs.

The Council takes extensive steps to ensure the set up and dismantling of the events are sufficient for the safe installation of an event area, while retaining as much public access as possible. The Council work closely with the event promoters' months in advance of events to agree how a phased closure of the event space is managed as build progresses and to ensure that vehicle movement through the park is managed and controlled during these periods. These plans are shared with the Finsbury Park Event Stakeholder Group, to seek feedback and comments for improvement, which can be discussed in detail with the promoters. The proposed 2023 events season proposes to reduce the number of events, thereby reducing the build and break periods. This will mean that vehicle movement is further reduced.

Parking restrictions are implemented in the park during the large major event period. Parking in the park on event days is limited to staff working at the events. Public parking is prohibited, with the exception of Blue Badge holders and pre-arranged parking for recognised park stakeholder groups. The Council and event organisers ensure that parking restrictions are clearly communicated in advance of and throughout the period of the events.

All event attendees are encouraged to travel to and from the events by public transport.

4. Data and Impact Analysis

Note: officers may want to complement their analysis with data from the State of the Borough and ward profiles, found here: <https://www.haringey.gov.uk/local-democracy/about-council/state-of-the-borough>.

Please consider how the proposed change will affect people with protected characteristics.

4a. Age

Data

| | Harringay | Haringey | London |
|---------|------------------|----------|--------|
| 0 – 14 | 13.1% | 17.1% | 19.2% |
| 15 – 64 | 78.5% | 72.4% | 68.8% |
| 65+ | 8.4% | 10.4% | 11.9% |

| | Stroud Green | Haringey | London |
|---------|---------------------|----------|--------|
| 0 – 14 | 17.3% | 17.1% | 19.2% |
| 15 – 64 | 63.7% | 72.4% | 68.8% |
| 65+ | 18.4% | 10.4% | 11.9% |

| | Brownswood | Hackney | London |
|---------|-------------------|---------|--------|
| 0 – 14 | 13.9% | 18% | 19.2% |
| 15 – 64 | 78.6% | 74% | 68.8% |
| 65+ | 7.4% | 7.9% | 11.9% |

| | Finsbury Park | Islington | London |
|---------|----------------------|-----------|--------|
| 0 – 14 | 14.9% | 14.4% | 19.2% |
| 15 – 64 | 77.1% | 76.2% | 68.8% |
| 65+ | 8% | 9.4% | 11.9% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal as a result of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

Ward profile data for Stroud Green, Harringay, Brownswood and Finsbury Park shows that, on average, 14.88% of the local population is aged between 0 – 14, which is lower than the London average of 19.2%.

Many of the play facilities within the Park are aimed at children under the age of 14. All these facilities remain open at all times during the events. Wayfinding signage is put in place at various locations around the Park, detailing this.

Strict noise controls for the event are in place and monitored by both noise consultants employed by the Applicant, and local authority noise officers. Events taking place on Fridays and Saturdays end at 22:30, on Sundays it will end at 21.30 (as required in the Krank Events Ltd Premises Licence), taking into consideration that the working week begins the following day.

During previous stakeholder consultation, one residents' group raised the issue that events take place at a time when young people may have end-of-year exams and could be affected by the music. This is not an issue to consider as any exams or assessments should be finished by the time the events take place. However, for those needing a quiet space, the Council will ensure that all libraries within Haringey are open to those wanting a quiet place to work. All of Haringey's libraries are open from Monday to Saturday with many also open on Sundays.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Neutral Impact - The report identifies that children are more likely to use the Park's facilities and, therefore, they are more likely to be impacted by the proposed events. However, the events will occupy approximately 5% of the Park leaving 95% of the Park open to the public, with all formal play and council run sports facilities remaining available to use. The Council and the Applicant will ensure that signage is in place to direct park users away from the events and to all remaining available spaces in the Park.

The Applicant and the Council will ensure, as in previous years that the Park is cleaned throughout the duration of the events. The wider park area (outside of the event perimeter) is restored to 'normal' on the night of the event being dismantled. In doing this, the Council seeks to minimise the impact on park users and ensure that the Park is left in a safe condition for residents to enjoy.

The Applicant is required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4b. Disability¹

Data

Borough Profile ²

4,500 people have a serious physical disability in Haringey.

19,500 aged 16-64 have a physical disability this equates to approximately 10% of the population aged 16-64.

1,090 people living with a learning disability in Haringey.

4,400 people have been diagnosed with severe mental illness in Haringey.

Target Population Profile

¹ In the Equality Act a disability means a physical or a mental condition which has a substantial and long-term impact on your ability to do normal day to day activities.

² Source: 2021 Census

| Disabled under the Equality Act | Haringey | Hackney | Islington | London | England and Wales |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------|
| Day-to-day activity limited a lot | 7.9% | 9.6% | 10.0% | 5.7% | 7.3% |
| Day-to-day activity limited a little | 8.7% | 9.6% | 10.4% | 7.5% | 10.0% |
| Not disabled | 83.4% | 80.8% | 79.6% | 86.7% | 82.7% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

Haringey has nearly double the proportion of people where day-to-day activity is limited to some extent as London, but slightly lower than the national average.

During the build and break and on event days, thoroughfares are kept open to park users to transgress the Park north to south, east to west.

As part of the carriageway and pavement is encased within the event area, the Applicant installs trackway along grass areas where the path is unavailable. This is done so access is maintained.

Pedal Power, a cycling proficiency trainer aimed at people with disabilities, is based on the track within the Park. All efforts are made to ensure the group's activity continues whilst events are taking place in the Park, including maintaining vehicle access for Service users.

By hosting large and major events in Finsbury Park, the Council is able to use some of the income to provide financial support to groups such as Pedal Power. Over the past few years, the Group has received over £50,000 in funding which has provided extra activity days, new equipment including a range of bikes allowing people of different abilities to benefit from cycling training and increased training sessions over the summer.

Parking for blue badges holders

Since the pandemic all public parking within the Park has been stopped, with the exception of Blue Badge holders who make use of dedicated bays just within the Endymion Road entrance. This will continue whilst the Applicant is in the park, along with allowing recognised stakeholders to also maintain access.

The Council use all feedback to work with the Metropolitan Police and other agencies to ensure that any event conditions are enforced promptly. In previous years, the Council has responded to complaints of insufficient parking restrictions on residential roads and enforced

extensions to CPZs and other restrictions. The Council will continue to mitigate any potential impact on residents who live near to the park and those with disabilities.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Negative / Positive Impact - The Council ensures that the majority of footpaths and carriageways in the Park are accessible for park users with disabilities.

Sections of the carriageway and parallel paths will be closed while the event organiser is on site, and in these circumstances, trackway is provided to ensure users can progress through the park. All other remaining footpaths and carriageways will remain open in the Park.

Alternative routes will be made available and publicised to ensure access by park users is maintained. The Council will ensure that all routes allow access for those park users with disabilities. Throughout the duration of the events, stewards will be present in the wider park space and can offer assistance to park users with visual impairments, whose familiarity with the Park may be distorted by the events. In previous years, the Council has not received complaints from park users with visual impairments as a result of the proposed events. However, Council officers will ensure that immediate feedback on the event will be used to improve any actions seeking to support those park users with disabilities.

The Council will ensure that parking for Blue Badge holders is maintained and available throughout the duration of the events, including during the set up and dismantling phases.

But by hosting the proposed events, the Council is able to use some of the revenue to support groups in the Park providing a positive impact. For the last few years, Pedal Power, a cycling proficiency trainer aimed at young people with disabilities, has received over £50,000, allowing it to purchase new equipment and extend its activities.

The event promoters will be required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4c. Gender Reassignment³

Data

Borough Profile

1.24% of Haringey's population gender identity is different as the sex registered at birth. Equating to 3275 of Haringey residents identifying as being Trans.⁴

Target Population Profile

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------|
| Gender Identity | Haringey | Hackney | Islington | London | England and Wales |
|-----------------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------|

³ Under the legal definition, a transgender person has the protected characteristic of gender reassignment if they are undergoing, have undergone, or are proposing to undergo gender reassignment. To be protected from gender reassignment discrimination, an individual does not need to have undergone any specific treatment or surgery to change from one's birth sex to one's preferred gender. This is because changing one's physiological or other gender attributes is a personal process rather than a medical one.

⁴ Trans is an umbrella term to describe people whose gender is not the same as, or does not sit comfortably with, the sex they were assigned at birth.

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| Gender identity the same as sex registered at birth | 89.43% | 89.28% | 91.60% | 91.2% | 93.5% |
| Gender identity different as sex registered at birth | 1.24% | 1.07% | 0.95% | 0.9% | 0.5% |
| Not Answered | 9.32% | 9.65% | 7.46% | 7.9% | 6.0% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

The 2021 Census for the first time collect data on people's Gender Identity. It showed that 1.24% of Haringey's population gender identity (including Trans men, Trans women, non-binary and other) is different as the sex registered at birth, which is the highest in the tri-borough area.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Neutral Impact - It is anticipated that the major event applications will not have a disproportionate impact on this protected characteristic. All the events proposed in this application do not discriminate entry on the grounds of sex or gender identity, which aligns with the Council's Outdoor Events Policy.

4d. Marriage and Civil Partnership

Data

Borough Profile ⁵

28% married or in civil partnership

Target Population Profile

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | Married or in civil partnership |
| Harringay (LB Haringey) | 29.8% |
| Stroud Green (LB Haringey) | 30% |

⁵ Source: 2021 Census

| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Haringey | 33.7% |
| Brownswood (LB Hackney) | 25.4% |
| Hackney | 27.2% |
| Finsbury Park (LB Islington) | |
| Islington | 25.8% |
| London | 40% |
| England & Wales | 44.7% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

The number of married people and those in a civil partnership is significantly lower than in London and England.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Neutral Impact - It is anticipated that this event application will not have a disproportionate impact on this protected characteristic. The Applicant is required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4e. Pregnancy and Maternity

Data

Borough Profile ⁶

Live Births in Haringey 2019: 3,646

Target Population Profile

| | Proportion of 0-4 year olds |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Haringay (LB Haringey) | 5.2% |
| Stroud Green (LB Haringey) | 5.4% |
| Haringey | 5.7% |
| Brownswood (LB Hackney) | 5.6% |
| Hackney | 6.2% |
| Finsbury Park (LB Islington) | 5% |
| Islington | 5.2% |
| London | 6% |
| England & Wales | 5.4% |

⁶ Births by Borough (ONS)

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

Haringey has a lower proportion compared to both the London and England / Wales.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Negative Impact - Please see sections in relation to sex and age. Women with children under six-months old are likely to be impacted by closure of the carriageway. Mitigating actions will be taken, as outlined above, to address this.

The event promoters will be required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4f. Race

In the Equality Act 2010, race can mean ethnic or national origins, which may or may not be the same as a person's current nationality.⁷

Data

Borough Profile ⁸

Arab: **1.0%**

Any other ethnic group: 8.7%

Asian: **8.7%**

Bangladeshi: 1.8%

Chinese: 1.5%

Indian: 2.2%

Pakistani: 0.8%

Other Asian: 2.4%

Black: **17.6%**

African: 9.4%

Caribbean: 6.2%

Other Black: 2.0%

⁷ [Race discrimination | Equality and Human Rights Commission \(equalityhumanrights.com\)](https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/race-discrimination)

⁸ Source: 2021 Census

Mixed: 7.1%

White and Asian: 1.5%

White and Black African: 1.0%

White and Black Caribbean: 2.0%

Other Mixed: 2.6%

White: 57.1% in total

English/Welsh/Scottish/Norther Irish/British: 31.9%

Irish: 2.2%

Gypsy or Irish Traveller: 0.1%

White Roma: 0.8%

Other White: 22.1%

Target Population Profile

| | Black and Minority Ethnic |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Haringay (LB Haringey) | 34.7% |
| Stroud Green (LB Haringey) | 28.7% |
| Haringey | 53% |
| Brownswood (LB Hackney) | 39% |
| Hackney | 56.9% |
| Finsbury Park (LB Islington) | 49.9% |
| Islington | 37.8% |
| London | 46.2% |
| England | 19.0% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

The data shows us that the proportion of residents who are of Black and Minority Ethnicity in the wards immediately surrounding Finsbury Park is comparable to the London average. The proportion of BAME residents is considerably higher than the England average.

As a condition of hiring the Park, the Council requires applicants to install way-finding signage during the build and break, and on event days to inform people that facilities remain accessible to the public and thoroughfares used by park users remain open.

It is recognised that the affected wards contain a high number of different ethnic groups, whose first language may not be English. Therefore, all wayfinding signage is assessed and designed using maps and symbols, with limited use of the written words.

Potential Impacts

- Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).

Neutral Impact - The proposed events will attract a considerable number of attendees, from a range of ethnicities. The immediate wards surrounding the Park are already some of the most diverse communities in the country.

During previous events, the Council has used pictures and symbols in its signage to ensure that communication to park users is clear and inclusive of the diverse range of communities in the area.

The Applicant is required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4g. Religion or belief

Data

Borough Profile ⁹

Christian: 39.3%

Buddhist: 0.9%

Hindu: 1.3%

Jewish: 3.6%

Muslim: 12.6%

No religion: 31.6%

Other religion: 2.3%

Religion not stated: 8%

Sikh: 0.3%

Target Population Profile

| | Haringay (LB Haringey) | Stroud Green (LB Haringey) | Brownswood (LB Hackney) | Finsbury Park (LB Islington) | London | England & Wales |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------------------|
| Christian | 36.1% | 30.2% | 28.5% | 32.1% | 40.7% | 46.3% |
| Buddhist | 1.1% | 0.7% | 1.1% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 0.5% |
| Hindu | 1.8% | 0.6% | 0.9% | 0.6% | 5.1% | 1.8% |
| Jewish | 1.0 % | 1.9% | 2.7% | 0.7% | 1.7% | 0.5% |
| Muslim | 11.1% | 6.8% | 10.5% | 21.1% | 15.0% | 6.7% |
| Sikh | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 0.2% | 1.6% | 0.9% |
| Other religion | 1.4% | 0.9% | 2.4% | 1.5% | 1.0% | 0.6% |
| No religion | 39.9% | 50.8% | 45.1% | 34.6% | 27.1% | 36.7% |
| Religion not stated | 7.4% | 6.9% | 8% | 8.3% | 7.0% | 6% |

What data will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

⁹ Source: 2021 Census

Detail the findings of the data.

The Haringey, Hackney and Islington wards affected by the proposal have lower than average Christian communities compared to the regional and national average but has larger Jewish and Muslim populations. All three boroughs have a larger population who do not have a religion.

Potential Impacts

- Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).

Neutral Impact - Under the Council's existing Outdoor Events Policy, a large or major event is not permitted in a Haringey park if it excludes entry on a religious basis. Therefore, any event that takes place in Finsbury Park will allow attendees of any or no religion. The proposed events in this report will comply with this direction.

The Applicant is required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4h. Sex

Data

Borough profile ¹⁰

Females: (51.8%)

Males: (48.2%)

Target Population Profile

| | Female | Male |
|------------------------------|--------|-------|
| Harringay (LB Haringey) | 50.3% | 49.7% |
| Stroud Green (LB Haringey) | 52.7% | 47.3% |
| Haringey | 51.8% | 48.2% |
| Brownswood (LB Hackney) | 52.4% | 47.6% |
| Hackney | 52.2% | 47.8% |
| Finsbury Park (LB Islington) | 52.5% | 47.5% |
| Islington | 52.3% | 47.7% |
| London | 51.5% | 48.5% |
| England | 51% | 49% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

- Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**

¹⁰ Source: 2021 Census

b) Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?

As in common with national and regional trends, there are slightly more females than males within the individual wards surrounding the Park.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Negative Impact - Although the ward-level data shows that the male to female ratio is broadly in line with national trends, we know that women are more likely to be carers to young children, who use the Park, and therefore the proposal disproportionately impacts this group.

However, any impact is mitigated as the proposed events will occupy approximately 5% of the Park leaving 95% of the Park open to the public, with all formal play and sports facilities remaining available to use. The Council and the event Applicant will ensure that signage is in place to direct park users away from the event and to remaining available spaces in the Park.

The Applicant will be required to comply with standard Equality Act requirements in order to prevent any discrimination based on this characteristic.

4i. Sexual Orientation

Data

Borough profile ¹¹

5.63% of London residents aged 16 or over identified themselves as lesbian, gay or bisexual in 2013. Haringey has the 17th largest LGB+ Community in England and Wales.

Target Population Profile

| Sexual Orientation | Haringey | Hackney | Islington | London | England and Wales |
|--|----------|---------|-----------|--------|-------------------|
| Straight or Heterosexual | 83.38% | 79.58% | 82.34% | 86.2% | 89.4% |
| Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Other (LGB+) | 5.63% | 7.82% | 8.01% | 4.3% | 3.1% |
| Not Answered | 10.99% | 12.60% | 9.65% | 9.5% | 7.5% |

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic? Census 2021

Detail the findings of the data.

¹¹ Source: ONS Integrated Household Survey

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

The 2021 Census collected data for the first time on people's sexual orientation. It showed that 5.36% of Haringey's population identifies as LGB+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and other) which is the 17th largest LGB+ community in the country. Whereas Islington and Hackney have the 4th and 6th largest LGB+ communities in the country.

Potential Impacts

- **Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).**

Neutral Impact - It is anticipated that this event application will not have a disproportionate impact on this protected characteristic. The events proposed in this application does not discriminate entry on the grounds of sex, which aligns with the Council's Outdoor Events Policy.

4j. Socioeconomic Status (local)

Data

Borough profile

Income

8.3% of the population in Haringey were claiming unemployment benefit on 9 December 2021.¹²

20.8% of the population in Haringey were claiming Universal Credit on 9 December 2021.¹³

29% of employee jobs in the borough are paid less than the London Living Wage.¹⁴

Educational Attainment

While Haringey's proportion of students attaining grade 5 or above in English and Mathematics GCSEs is higher than the national average, it is below the London average.¹⁵

4.4% of Haringey's working age populations had no qualifications in 2020.¹⁶ 4.8% were qualified to level one only.¹⁷

¹² [ONS Claimant Count](#)

¹³ [LG Inform](#)

¹⁴ ONS

¹⁵ Source: Annual Population Survey 2019 (via nomis)

¹⁶ [LG Inform - qualifications](#)

¹⁷ [LG Inform – level one](#)

Area Deprivation

Haringey is the 4th most deprived in London as measured by the IMD score 2019. The most deprived LSOAs (Lower Super Output Areas or small neighbourhood areas) are more heavily concentrated in the east of the borough where more than half of the LSOAs fall into the 20% most deprived in the country.¹⁸

Target Population Profile

[If known, enter the profile of your target population].

What data sources will you use to inform your assessment of the impact of the proposal on people under this protected characteristic?

[Detail the key data sources (quantitative and qualitative)]

Detail the findings of the data.

- a) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by the proposal due to overrepresentation? How does this compare with the wider demographic profile of the Borough?**
- b) **Might members of this group be disproportionately affected by this proposal by dint of a need related to their protected characteristic?**

It can be construed that those who fall within this protected characteristic are more likely to live in accommodation with limited or no outdoor space, so rely on public outdoor space such as the Park to get fresh air and exercise.

Potential Impacts

- Consider whether the proposed policy/decision will have positive, neutral, or negative impacts (including but not limited to health impacts).

Positive Impact - It is anticipated that the event applications will not have a disproportionate impact on this protected characteristic. The event proposed will take up 5% of the Park area, leaving the remaining 95% and all facilities within it, open to the general public to use and enjoy. However, income received from the hire of the park, is used to manage, maintain and make improvements, hence providing a quality park for people to use and enjoy.

5. Key Impacts Summary

5a. Outline the key findings of your data analysis.

Overall the data suggests that although one protected group may be impacted by the proposed event, there are mitigations that are put in place to limit these.

5b. Intersectionality

- **Many proposals will predominantly impact individuals who have more than one protected characteristic, thereby transforming the impact of the decision.**

¹⁸ [State of the Borough](#) (p.21)

- **This section is about applying a systemic analysis to the impact of the decision and ensuring protected characteristics are not considered in isolation from the individuals who embody them. Please consider if there is an impact on one or more of the protected groups? Who are the groups and what is the impact?**

Women with young children

We know that women are more likely to be carers to young children, and therefore the proposal is likely to impact disproportionately on this group. However, the impact is likely to be low because the Council and Applicant will take significant actions to mitigate the disruption caused to the Park. All of the Park's formal play and sport facilities will be unaffected by the events, allowing women with young children to continue to use approximately 95% of the Park.

5c. Data Gaps

Based on your data are there any relevant groups who have not yet been consulted or engaged? Please explain how you will address this

n/a

6. Overall impact of the policy for the Public Sector Equality Duty

Summarise the key implications of the decision for people with protected characteristics.

In your answer, please consider the following three questions:

- Could the proposal result in any direct/indirect discrimination for any group that shares the relevant protected characteristics?
- Will the proposal help to advance equality of opportunity between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?
- Will the proposal help to foster good relations between groups who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not?

Background to the major events proposals

The nature of any proposed event is considered and embedded in the application and planning process. The Council's Outdoor Events Policy also contains a list of events that would not be allowed to take place in a Haringey park. If an application does not fall within this immediate refusal, the individual event proposal is discussed between the Council and the Cabinet Member before any informal decision is made to progress the application.

Terms and conditions of the events (including entry)

The Applicant will ensure that entry to each of their events does not discriminate on the grounds of sex, gender reassignment, age, disability, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, pregnancy and maternity, marital and civil partnership status. In previous years, the events have attracted a significant number of attendees, from a diverse range of backgrounds.

The proposed events provide a significant opportunity to foster good relations between groups who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Previous events in the Park have attracted a range of communities that share a common interest and come together during the events. Representatives from the event, the Council and the Metropolitan Police are in attendance throughout the events to ensure that any potential conflict arising between attendees is extinguished or minimised.

7. Amendments and mitigations

7a. What changes, if any, do you plan to make to your proposal because of the Equality Impact Assessment?

Further information on responding to identified impacts is contained within accompanying EQIA guidance

Please delete Y/N as applicable

No major change to the proposal: the EQIA demonstrates the proposal is robust and there is no potential for discrimination or adverse impact. All opportunities to promote equality have been taken. If you have found any inequalities or negative impacts that you are unable to mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below why you are unable to mitigate them Y

Impact of the proposal

In relation to the potential impact on park users and residents in the immediate area, the Council will take steps to ensure any impact is minimised. It is acknowledged that children and young people are a particular group that use the park and its facilities. The proposed event will occupy approximately 5% of the park's space and will close a small section of the internal carriageway. It is therefore accepted that the events will create a degree of disruption to the park. However, the majority of park space (95%) will remain open to park users during the event period and the Council and the event promoters will take steps to ensure that any appropriate signage that is needed directs park users to available park space and play equipment.

The proposed events will not have an impact on parking availability in the park during the running of the event. The Council will ensure that Blue Badge holders and recognised park stakeholder groups continue to be able to park during these periods.

Benefits of the proposal:

The proposed events raise significant revenue for the Council, which is not only spent managing, maintaining and improving the Park, but is shared with relevant groups who are based or operate in the Park. In previous years, groups have received money, resulting from the event, to support activities in the Park and improve the offer to park users. This has a positive impact on the overall quality of the Park's facilities for residents.

In addition, an Environmental Impact Fee is charged for all events. The larger the event, the higher the fee. This fee is set aside and distributed between community groups who are based and operate in the Park. In 3 years alone, groups have received over £150k in funding, benefiting the local community.

These interventions have fostered good relations between the communities that use the Park and live in its immediate area. They have also sought to advance equality of opportunity between residents, providing funding for specific groups and charities that support groups who share a protected characteristic.

Adjust the proposal: the EQIA identifies potential problems or missed opportunities. Adjust the proposal to remove barriers or better promote equality. Clearly set out below the key adjustments you plan to make to the policy. If there are any adverse impacts you cannot mitigate, please provide a compelling reason below **N**

Stop and remove the proposal: the proposal shows actual or potential avoidable adverse impacts on different protected characteristics. The decision maker must not make this decision. **N**

7b. What specific actions do you plan to take to remove or mitigate any actual or potential negative impact and to further the aims of the Equality Duty?

Action:

Age: Ensure all Council-managed facilities remain open in the Park. Ensure that finishing times as set out under the Premises Licences are adhered to.

Disability: Find alternative and suitable locations for user groups which may be displaced by the events. Ensure agreed thoroughfares are maintained within the Park at all times, and when those agreed are closed, find alternatives which all abilities can access. Ensure wayfinding maps and signage is placed in visible locations to help park users maintain access while events are taking place.

Race & Ethnicity: Ensure wayfinding maps and signage is accessible for those who may not speak or read English, enabling them to access all facilities within the park.

Lead officer: Sarah Jones, Events & Partnerships Manager

Timescale: During build of event, while event is ongoing, and during break of event infrastructure

Please outline any areas you have identified where negative impacts will happen because of the proposal, but it is not possible to mitigate them.

Please provide a complete and honest justification on why it is not possible to mitigate the:

N/A

7. Ongoing monitoring

Summarise the measures you intend to put in place to monitor the equalities impact of the proposal as it is implemented.

- Who will be responsible for the monitoring?
- What the type of data needed is and how often it will be analysed.
- When the policy will be reviewed and what evidence could trigger an early revision
- How to continue to involve relevant groups and communities in the implementation and monitoring of the policy?

Event information and park access information is provided in the run-up to all large and major events taking place in the Park. This is placed on Haringey's website, with both Hackney and Islington Council's encouraged to share it with their residents. This will remain the case for events planned for 2023. This includes contact details for the relevant Council services, encouraging anyone with complaints to report them.

Two weeks before the event build is due to start a letter is sent to approximately 20,000 households surrounding the Park (in all three boroughs) providing useful contact information.

Once the Applicant is on site, they are required to maintain a residents' information phonenumber, for anyone to report issues related to the event. Call details are shared with Council officers and appropriate action is taken.

Stakeholders are encouraged to feedback on any issues that may arise at the time, and these are responded to by officers.

Council officers are present in the Park daily during the time of build, break and the event, monitoring the effects the event may be having on park users. This provides an opportunity for any direct feedback during the events. Feedback is thoroughly assessed to ensure improvements and mitigations can be made both at the time and for future events.

The Council monitors complaints that are received during the events to ensure that, where possible and appropriate, a different approach can be adopted for future events to further mitigate impact.

Date of EQIA monitoring review:

March 2024

8. Authorisation

EQIA approved by (Assistant Director/ Director)

Mark Stevens, Assistant Director Direct Services

Date

20 July 2023

9. Publication

Please ensure the completed EQIA is published in accordance with the Council's policy.

Please contact the Policy & Strategy Team for any feedback on the EQIA process.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank