

Appendix 4: Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
LBH Building Control	Further to our recent discussions and your e-mail dated 24 June 2024, Building Control has no objections to the increase in the number of events up to 30. Each additional event will require a Safety Advisory Group meeting at least one month before the event, of which this office will chair, and any safety issues can be raised at the SAG by the relevant authorities.	Comments noted.
LBH Environmental Health (Noise)	1. The current number of events permitted at Tottenham Hotspur Football Club (THFC) is 16 non-football events. THFC have requested a further increase to 30 non-football events a year in this application. 2. The request for these additional event days is likely to lead to additional complaints about noise, public nuisance and antisocial behaviour from residents. Concerns have been raised about the increase in concerts where it is understood that crowd entry to the stadium occurs more slowly and over a longer period than when compared to sporting events. 3. The council received the greatest number of noise complaints associated with a single event at the THFC stadium during the first week of the 5-day Beyonce residency last year. We received 25 complaints in the first 3 days, the majority of which were reporting excessive and intrusive low frequency noise and vibration at a significant distance from the agreed monitoring points. If the increased number of events are permitted, we will require the applicant to demonstrate how they will minimise / prevent similar noise impacts with the increase in concerts proposed, and at off-site locations. The applicant should be required to provide details of the noise assessment undertaken for this event (identified as our worst-case scenario) and advise how similar issues will be avoided in the future.	Noted and a suitable condition as well as monitoring contribution of £1,000 has been recommended

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	4. Currently the noise impacts of stadium events (as Music Noise Levels) are measured at the nearest noise sensitive receptors on Worcester Avenue and Park Lane. The applicant must be required to consider the inclusion of at least 1 other additional monitoring point that would permit the assessment of off-site low frequency noise. 5. The applicant should be required to submit a noise management plan (NMP) for each non-football event, which should include details of all external monitoring locations, noise criteria and the noise control management procedure. A robust complaints management system will need to be implemented which should agreed in advance by the Local Authority. A post-event meeting shall be convened to discuss complaints made, corrective actions employed and changes that may need to be made to future NMPs to address / prevent future complaints. 6. We need a stepped approach to managing noise and nuisance impacts of the increase in concerts if agreed. The applicant shall be required to confirm what they propose as mitigation for the additional events and controls should be set based not only on the number of complaints but also the total number of concerts per annum, for example consideration should be given to a) a cap on the total number of concerts within the 30 agreed event days to avoid the possibility of all 30 days being used for concerts. b) a limit placed on the number of consecutive nights concerts will be held (say 3 per week?) and this should be planned around football season to avoid any more than 4 days of any one week being used for non-football, concerts and football events combined. c) A limit placed on the capacity for specific events 7. If the application is granted, this should be subject to the following limits –	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	a) For Up to 6 concerts – Music noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor should not exceed 75dB (LAeq, 15 minutes) b) For any additional concerts - Music noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptor should not exceed at 70dB (LAeq, 15 minutes) c) All other non-football and non-concert events should be limited to 65dB (LAeq, 15 minutes). Where limits are capped at 70dB this should be specifically in relation to octave bands at 40, 63 and 125Hz. 8. To further address concerns raised about the potential disturbance from excessive low frequency noise we also request the applicant include at least 1 additional location to the current monitoring regime that would be appropriate for measuring off-site dB(C). Comments received 23/07/2024: Please note the additional points below and reference to my original comments: a. I understand that 16 non-football events have been approved for 2023 and 2024. This has been increased from 6 concerts in the original application. For the avoidance of doubt, I recommend (as per the below, see 7a) that a further music noise control limit of 70dB should be imposed for 17 or more events. b. Agreement about the best location for the additional monitoring point should be made on an event-by-event basis, as part of the event planning process and shall be covered within the noise management plan.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	c. I have also noted an error in my response and ask the reference to 40Hz is removed as a measurement criterion.	
LBH Licensing (Regulatory Services)	In Licensing we would consider the cumulative impact of having x number of events and all that comes with it and the frequency of the events. Licensing has the four objectives that need to be considered; • The prevention of public nuisance. • Prevention of public nuisance • Public safety • The protection of children from harm. There is a disadvantage already in place from the initial PP, as complaints relating to events at Spurs all go to Spurs to handle. As a consequence of this the ability to build a picture of issues that have impacted residents has been gathered from the off compliant that may reach the Council or whilst officers attend BCLG and hear from residents in attendance. That notwithstanding the Councils Enforcement Team have faced significant challenges in dealing with illegal activities that arise from the existing events at the stadium. A football crowd behaves differently to a concert crowd, and this can be further broken down dependant on the artist and genre of music that is coming to the stadium and the impacts that will be felt in the locality. The residents are accepting of the fact that the football happens in the area. But this is an additional 30 plus concert days they will potentially have to contend with. The Council needs to have safeguards in place, that help to protect the environs for the residents who have to live, work, shop etc on these event days. The disruption from increased crowds on the street, traffic diversions, buses curtailing at various different points etc.	Noted and HoT for £4,000 per event for regulatory enforcement is recommended

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Additional ASB: This takes many forms, ranging from crowd behaviour to noise not necessarily from amplified music, ASB, urination, drunkenness, Illegal street-trading, Aggressive touts, general disruption which can affecting the safety to and from the event. We also experience premises breaching licensing conditions in order to capitalise on the increased footfall on their doorstep, Illegal parking etc. Crowds on the street inhibit a resident's ability to go about their normal use of the highway. THS should meet the cost of the resources to cover measures to address public safety and anti-social behaviour such as additional public toilets, public safety reviews, street trading and to tackle pirate parking. These matters arise solely due to the events taking place at the stadium and will increase significantly should this permission be granted. The Regulatory Services play an important role in mitigating for the increased anti-social behaviour Even with noise the Code of Practice from the CIEH acknowledges the impact that 'Cumulative Event Days' may have and guides us that if an event was to exceed three days in any year then the maximum noise level recommended by the Code of Practice is reduced. I know from experience at Finsbury park that residents' tolerance reduces the more an event continues. There should be consideration as to how simultaneous events will be dealt with. If THS gain such a huge increase, there is every likelihood that there will be a clash with what is a very finite window of 'summer festival season' taking place at Emirates or at Finsbury Park. I am surprised that TFL have not raised any concerns around the potential for this and whether they are able to cope adequately should such a scenario arise. The potential costs that will be incurred as a direct result of the proposed increase in major non-sporting events per annum should require the following agreement from THS:	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Contribution of up to £4000 per additional major non-sporting event - This would be spent on measures by the Council which may include: • Licensing enforcement • illegal street trading • obstruction of the footpath to ensure crowd flow & safety	
LBH Transportation	HGY/2024/1008-Transportation Planning Comments. The application proposal is for the amendment to condition B9 which limits the number of non-football events at the stadium to 16 events per year the applicant would like to increase the number of events per year by an additional 14 non-football events. Included in the application are the following restrictions: No more than 4 consecutive non-football events and no more than 5 non-football events in one week, no more than 2 boxing events in a calendar year, no more than 30 events over a 6-week period. On reviewing this application, the following factors were considered: The baseline (existing events and operation) current public transport capacity and ability to cope with the additional events. Existing mitigation secured by the S.106 agreements, how these are performing in relation to the current approved events and monitoring proposal document. Future events and impacts on the transport network, changes to the existing S.106 obligations to mitigate the impacts of the additional events. Non-football Major event day, base line, There has been several non-football major events at the stadium 11 in total, ranging from concerts including: Guns and Roses, Lady Gaga, Beyonce, Pink concert and	Covered in HoTs

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	two boxing events. There have been several variations in relation to the availability of public transport service due to Industrial action and planned engineering works which has resulted in the closure of White Hart Lane Station or Northumberland Park Station. This has resulted in changes in the demand forecast which has been fed into the travel demand management and Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) which was informed and supported by a Bespoke Transport Plan. In each event ranging from 45,000-50,632 spectators were able to access and leave the local area using the available capacity on the local transport network, with the support of additional measures such as shuttle bus service to Liverpool Street station as a contingency. The management of the capacity on the local transport network is managed by a number of S.106 obligations attached to the original planning permission HGY/2015/3000 and are listed below: 1) Attraction of Visitors and retention measure to get spectators to arrive early and stay later at the stadium. 2) Bus Priority and Diversion Measures, including the termination of the W3 bus route and the east bus diversion route. 3) Modal Split around concerts and non-football events: concert modal split a target of 90% of all spectators attending a concert at the completed stadium shall use modes of transport other than private car to arrive within the vicinity of the completed stadium. 4) Major Event Day Local Area Management Plan: a Plan to mitigate adverse environmental impacts and nuisance to residents and business which are other wise affected by the use of the completed stadium for major events including in particular NFL Events to cover a geographical area to be agreed with the Council to be prepared in consultation with the Local Ward	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Councillors the Business Community Liaison Group, TfL and the Metropolitan Police in accordance with the framework set out in Schedule Eighteen. 5) Major Event Day Control Parking Zone- Design consultation, Extension, and Monitoring, including changes to the existing CPZ operational hours. 6) Major Event Day Monitoring programme, Major Event Day Review, a monitoring programme in respect of the Major event day Stadium Development Travel Plan 7) Major event day Stadium Travel Plan, to manage the modal split of the stadium. 8) Transport and communication strategy, the strategy for communicating the agreed measures in the Major Event Day Development Travel Plan to spectators and the local community. On assessing the potential impacts of increasing the number of non-football events at the stadium, comments are as follows. Public Transport capacity and arrival and departure, there is sufficient capacity on the network to cater for the additional events at the stadium, this has been successfully demonstrated by the number of non-football events held at the stadium with varying levels of public transport capacity available due to closure of various local stations due to engineering works and industrial actions. The increase in the number of events will resulting creating additional demand on the local area which will require mitigation, whilst the current S.106 agreement provide some mitigation, additional mitigation will be required due to the number of events and the nature of the events and the demand on local infrastructure. Mitigation will be required in the following areas: 1) Parking Management	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	The independent monitoring report has concluded that the actual mode share for football is higher than the approved 23% car mode share, the car mode share for non-football events are high than the 10% mode share required as part of the S106 agreement. The results of on-street parking surveys on an event day concluded that there is an increase in on-street parking in most controlled parking zones although this is described as moderate with some 276 additional vehicles parked in 54% of the CPZ surveyed area. The independent review of the Event Day Parking and Control Parking Zone recommends that that hours are extended beyond 20:30 to improved enforcement for third party events. In addition to the review of the Event Day Control Parking Zone, there are a number of locations which have been identified as requiring additional parking management measures in the form of a potential "Red Route" using camera enforcement to assist in keeping the emergency corridor clear and to enable safe egress of the stadium these are: White Hart Lane, Creighton Road, Northumberland Park m Shelbourne Road, Leaside Road, Bull Lane/ Queens Street, Lordship Lane, High Road North to the borough boundary with Enfield, and the High Road south junction Lordship Lane to junction with Bruce Grove. The applicant Will also be required to pay for the design consultation and implementation of the additional traffic management measures in the form of a potential "Red Route" to deal with ongoing parking issues which are resulting in parking and traffic congestion which is, impeding the free flow of traffic and putting pedestrians (spectators) at risk at the above locations. The applicant will be required to pay for the feasibility design and implementation of the changes to the existing CPZ operational hours, include any extension required to the existing event day CPZ this is in line with the current S.106 obligations secured under Planning Application HGY/2015/3000.	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Impacts on Regulatory Service. Regulatory and Enforcement services are critical for ensuring a safe environment for both residents, business/traders and those attending events at the new stadium. Four of the regulated service are affected by events and the stadium and more so for third part events. In general matters relate to regulating and controlling the main locations 'spectators' come and go to the stadium; manifests in: Illegal vendors, Ticket-Touts and illegal Street trading- affecting the safety, fair trading (due to potential unregulated goods) or impeding the flow of those arriving and departing an event. There are also other issue surrounding ASB and Public Nuisance– in the form of noise arriving and departing the venue, urination, broken glass (before cleaning) and drunkenness. There is also the issue of Community Safety, namely the use of CCTV to monitor issues of safety and welfare from those that might queue early for big acts. Increasing the number of non-football events will require additional resources in the form of 9 officers for lager events larger events 6 of which would be working between 1pm till 23.30 and approximately 5-6officers. The cost of enforcing these additional events is estimated as £4,000 per event. We will therefore require mitigation in the form of a revised management and monitoring strategy to be included in the new LAMP to deal with this issue and for adequate resources to be secured as part of this planning permission to deal with these issues. The transportation planning and highways authority would not object to this application subject to the following S.106 obligations which are in addition to the current obligations secured under planning application HGY/2015/3000. Schedule 4, (existing S.106 Agreement) 1.0 Major Event Day Stadium Development Travel Plan	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	There is currently no non-football Major Event Travel Plan for events at the new stadium. The applicant will be required to submit a Bespoke non-football Event Day Travel Plan covering all non-football Major Events at the stadium. The Travel Plans must be monitored annually to achieve the agreed modal split targets for non-football events with a maximum car mode share of 10%. Schedule Four of the S.106 agreement to be revised to reflect the new obligation including a Travel Plan monitoring fee of £30,000 per year for the monitoring of the non-football event Day Travel Plan and Local Area Management plan for a minimum period of 5 years. 3.0 Stadium Cycle Strategy The applicant will be required to produce a new cycling strategy for non-football events at the stadium the monitoring proposal report has a maximum of 0.5% for a non-football event and 0.6 percent for a football event. The minimum percentage by mode agreed under HGY/20215/3000 is a 1% mode share. 5.0 Stadium Development Coach Strategy. The applicant will be required to submit a revised coach strategy for non-football major events to maximise the number of spectators by coach and reduce the car mode share especially for boxing events which had a 24.1% car mode share. We will need a revised obligation for the applicant to submit a new coach strategy as part of the new travel plan to reduce the car mode share. 9.0 Major Event Day Monitoring A revised obligation is required under the above section to deal with the implementation traffic management measures to safeguard the emergency corridor to and from the Stadium including the possibility of implementing a “Red Route” which is enforced by cameras. Clause 9.5 of the Monitoring proposal report triggers	

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	the obligation for the Owner/ applicant to pay the cost for the changes required to the CPZ proposal. 17. The Football Season tickets and other major event day ticket for local people To achieve the walking mode split, as per the agreed S.106 agreement local residents should be prioritised for pre-release of ticket to maximise the number of residents that walk all the way as their mode of transport to and from the stadium for non-football events, the monitored concert mode share only had a 0.9% walk all the way mode share. The S.16 agreement had a local ticket allocation of 5000 residents 2500 from each borough (Haringey and Enfield), this obligation must be retained for all new events. Schedule Eighteen, (existing S.106 agreement) Major Event Day Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) The Pedestrian Walking routes attached in ANNEX 1, will require updating as since the drafting of the document and the opening of the stadium including shuttle bus locations, additional routes have been identified which will need to be revised in the ANNEX. The revised walking routes will assist in determine the extent of the cleansing and monitoring required to ensure the cleansing element of the LAMP mitigate the impacts of the additional events. The LAMP must be revised to reflect the impacts of the additional events on the Councils Regulatory Services. We will therefore require mitigation in the form of a revised management and monitoring strategy to be included in the new LAMP to deal with this issue and for adequate resources to be secured as part of this planning permission to deal with these issues, including a financial contribution of £4,000 (four thousand pounds) per event.	
LBH Waste Management	As mentioned, the local area management plan (LAMP) has still not been signed off and whilst we have an informal arrangement that is working for events, we believe	Officers have discussed with the applicant and

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	the LAMP should be finalised and agreed before further events are approved, as the principles of cleansing and waste collection should be consistent across all events and fixtures and the club should lead by example – do we need to insist that this be LBH Platinum service and have that agreement prior to agreeing the extra events or do you think we can leave this to be agreed as LAMP? Event cleansing in the streets & estates surrounding stadium, transport hubs in the locality (White Hart Lane, Northumberland Park, Tottenham Hale, Seven Sisters stations), coach parking zones and shuttle bus pickup/drop off locations, should be performed by LBH or its appointed street cleansing contractor – as above All events will be monitored by a member/s Waste Team staff at a cost of £500 per event, this will form part of the cleansing proposal agreement and is to be met by THFC or the event organisers. <u>Additional clarification on level of cleaning required:</u> It's clear the THFC intend to maximise the stadium's capacity for events and increasingly the events being held have had larger attendances. Beth and I both feel it appropriate now to stipulate that the platinum service be applied to all non-football events and that the council or its cleansing contractor performs the service for these events. Additional to this will be the monitoring cost and the cost of disposal, with disposal to be calculated after each event based on the actual tonnages collected, multiplied by the current North London Waste Authority per tonne gate fee. Aligning the resource with that deployed for match days and formalising it as part of the application process mitigates future risk and minimises officer time in arranging varying levels of resource on what is likely to now be a near weekly frequency.	agreed that the existing arrangement should continue and that level of event be considered on a case by case basis

EXTERNAL		
----------	--	--

Barnet Council	No comments received	
Enfield Council	This matter has been considered, and I now write to inform you that this Council has no objections to this proposal but would like to make the following comments: It is understood that the applicant has previously increased the number of events days they host and if permission is given again for an increase this will mean once again there will be an increased demand for event day residents' permits that need to be displayed. Currently there is no charge for an event day resident' permit, although there is a cost to the authority (Enfield Council) for their production and supply. This cost arises as a direct consequence of the applicants use of the site. With further events proposed, the Council would like to take the opportunity to amend the Traffic Management Order (TMO) putting in place charges for permits to help cover the cost to the local authority. In your discussions with the applicant can you look to secure a contribution of £2500 to cover the costs to the Council to change and re-advertise the TMO.	Noted and added as HoT.
Greater London Authority (GLA)	Confirmation that this will not require Stage 1 referral, subject to addressing TfL comments. <u>Additional comment from deputy Chief of Staff:</u> In an increasingly competitive world, it is imperative for London's cultural, music and sporting economy that the city maximises its assets. This makes the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium strategically important they must have the flexibility to perform their role effectively. Additional dates will allow London to attract more global artists, enhancing the city's cultural offerings and ensuring that London remains open for business.	Noted
Hackney Council	No comments received	
Islington Council	No comments received	Noted.
Metropolitan Police	We understand that this is a significant increase of events at THFC stadium. However, we do not consider the planning forum to be the most appropriate place to make	Noted.

	representations and the MPS reserves its position to do so at any future licensing hearing'.	
Transport for London	Thanks for consulting Transport for London on the above application, this is without prejudice to any advice the GLA may provide or subsequent Mayoral decision. For context, TfL is responsible London Overground services, and London Underground services, as well as bus services. We also the highway authority for Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), the A406 North Circular Road, just over 1 km to the north, and A10 High Road/ Bruce, just over a kilometre to the south. The A1010 is part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), for which TfL has oversight responsibility. We have responsibility for regulation of taxis and private hire vehicles, including provision of event day taxi ranks. 1. TfL in principal we can support additional events at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, as in accord with Good Growth in the London Plan, particularly where we promoting access by public transport and active travel. 2. On London Overground, we already have plans for managing such events that can be used to support an expanded event programme. We will always do our utmost to support such events, but cannot guarantee the supply of additional train services for any particular event which depends on the availability of the rail network. This can be curtailed by planned closures to support the maintenance of the network and its ongoing reliable operation. In the past we have focused on ensuring that such planned closures are organised to minimise the impact on football events. Given the planned increase in non-football related events it may be time to reconsider this approach to ensure the optimum network availability throughout the year to support all events held at the Stadium. We would be happy to discuss this further with Haringey and Tottenham Hotspur. 3. On London Underground, similarly we have plans to cope with events, that updated since the new stadium opened. We have particular concerns around both Seven Sisters Station and Tottenham Hale station that can be mitigated through	The fees of £675,000 for LU and £241,548 for LO annual fees for 10 years and £9,290.30 per event for Arriva were put to the applicant but have not been agreed

	Local Area Management Plan (LAMP), and we need to enable through our wider plans at Tottenham Hale in particularly. 4. Event days require extra staff at each station, these need to be redeployed from elsewhere. TfL would request funding for extra staff on both LO and LU network, we open to discuss exact requirement based on more detail discussion with Spurs. The mechanism would be funding of additional headcount over a say 10 year period. This would help with event day workforce planning. 5. For buses, the traffic delays are not easy for bus operators, and impact on passengers who use our services. Provision of information directly to bus operators for football and major events in a timely manner, should be a condition or obligation on the developers. I don't think they can say not, we just need to agree a protocol. This won't solve the problem but will help mitigate impact. 6. We believe marshalling outside Seven Sisters Station is insufficient, we like a commitment for both more and better marshalling, particularly for non-football events, patrons need clear and stronger advice to get the Stadium. This can cause particular problems for bus operations, in context of delays, diversions and curtailments due to traffic and road closures. Also, please confirm highways enforcement will get sufficient funding to help keep buses moving on this extra event days. 7. At Tottenham Hale in particular, we have anti-social behaviour and lack of toilet provision. We like to install pop-up toilets for future events at the stadium and other events on TfL land. We need to consider how many and agree a contribution to fund, or alternative, what additional pop-up provision the Stadium is proposing. I don't think TfL has had much input on this aspect of the LAMP. We need to do this in co-ordination with events at the Drumsheds in Enfield. 8. When the stadium first open, it was set out in Blue book, that taxi rank marshalling would be funded, this was not delivered. TfL would like an update on taxi rank provision. Given Mayoral policy on to eradicate violence against women and girls, would like to know if the stadium is funding taxi marshals, and if not why not.	
--	--	--

	We are aware that there are other matters where TfL can assist or facilitate. Colleagues are open to meet to discussion in more detail. To conclude, TfL is not objecting to additional events at the stadium, however, we believe there is room for improvement, and more events means more pressure on public transport services, and operational staff and passengers that needs mitigating. <u>Additional comments:</u> Further to my previous response, you requested indication of how much mitigation is required. To safely operate Tottenham Hale and Seven Sister LU stations, when there are major events on at Spurs, we need additional eight LU staff plus a supervisor. Also, on match days we can lose revenue, as we need to hold open the gate lines for safety reasons. Currently we rely on central pool of staff. To accommodate propose demand safely, on a more regularly basis, we need to create 9 new posts. Therefore, we are seeking £675,000 per annum, for at least 10 years. Therefore, we like the ten-year funding secured in s106, and we open to discuss a payment mechanism, which could be annual. Though to secure the headcount, we need to know there is a long term commitment are secured in s106,. The cost is based on a nominal cost per head per annum plus overhead. If this can be secured, that will enable LU to manage the impact of additional major events on a regular basis as safely as practicable. For background, TfL funding position in 2024 is very different to our position in 2015 post Covid vs post 2011 riots. It seems unreasonable that TfL should absorb all costs arising from this development in current circumstances. TfL has supported regeneration (that helped ensure the Stadium can operate to capacity) in the area by through the upgrade of White Hart Lane station, and Tottenham Hale station and we continue to support capital and service improvement in this area, and by running 36 trains per hour on the Victoria Line. <u>Comments 27/06/24:</u>	
--	--	--

I'm still waiting for further advice from colleagues, LO have undertaken the following analysis:

"I have had a look at the demand and capacity data we have available for some recent football events on Saturdays (15:00 kick off) The impacts are summarised in the table below:

Pre or Post match	Link	Average capacity utilisation	Maximum capacity utilisation	Estimated duration of event related crowding
Pre match	Bruce Grove > White Hart Lane	100%	143%	2.5 hours pre match
Pre match	Silver Street > White Hart Lane	65%	124%	2.5 hours pre match
Post match	White Hart Lane > Bruce Grove	117%	168%	2.25 hours post match
Post match	White Hart Lane > Silver Street	76%	150%	2.25 hours post match

100% capacity utilisation is equivalent to all seats taken and four passengers standing per metre squared of standing space.

The links to the south of White Hart Lane see higher levels of crowding. This reflects the connections they offer. These events are disruptive to other passengers wanting to use the network over the pre and post match period with the risk that they cannot board services. This effect lasts for around 2.5 hours before and after the match. The effect is less pronounced north of White Hart Lane although some very high levels of crowding in

	excess of capacity do occur during the hour before and after the match, leading to difficulties using the network for other passengers during this period and the risk of left behinds. I expect this is not unusual in terms of football matches around London generally although it does show that we are functioning at or above capacity when these matches occur with the current level of background demand. The situation will worsen as redevelopment in the local area increases the background demand for the services.” LO colleagues are looking at similar data for other events, also assessing staffing requirements at match days on LO network. <u>Comments received 28/06/24:</u> I had further advice from LO/ Arriva colleagues For the year 2023/24 (running August to August in line with football season) we will have managed 32 events at this venue (football = 23, NFL = 2, concerts = 7). If the venue operated their full non-football allocation (30) plus an assumed number of extra football matches (FA Cup, Carabao Cup, Europa League, friendlies etc) we estimate 58 events, which would see an uplift of £241,548. As Arriva do use agency staff they could accept an offer guarantee payments based on number of events per year. Whilst LU needs to increase headcount. The most recent similar situation was MSG at Stratford, though refused, we did agree a draft terms on station staffing that could applied here. <u>Comments received 09/07/24 in response to officer question of the final figures:</u> The two figures below [<i>£675,000 for LU and £241,548 for LO</i>] are fine and are annual. We agreed similar obligations for the Madison Square Gardens application for Stratford. If Melvyn did not share them I can forward an example of how such sums could be drawn down in practice. Might give THFC some comfort even if they are resisting the principle. <u>Additional comment received 09/07/24:</u>	
--	---	--

	Please can I clarify the funding request from Arriva Rail London (London Overground); in order to safely manage crowds on the London Overground network during THFC Stadium events, ARL incurs additional costs of £9,290.30 per event. We are asking for this amount of funding for every THFC Stadium non-football event above the original 16 x non-football events. This request would be indefinite (or for as long as the licence is agreed for the 30 x non-football stadium events) as we would be incurring these costs for the life of the stadium.	
--	--	--