

Be in no doubt. Brockwell Park is suffering.

Look at the bare, rutted earth that persists months after the events ended, the stumps where mature trees once stood, and compare it with the side kept free from major events. Then look at your own Agrostis report: eight months after the events, it found the ground was still “carrying the legacy” of events, and warns that regular events risk “continual deterioration” in the quality of the park’s very ground.

This damage is cumulative. But you can change this.

When cumulative damage was raised at Planning Committee, councillors said they were directed to consider the event as a one-off. So where is cumulative impact considered, and who is responsible? That must be central to this review.

Reseeding, vertidrainage, repairing – these are mitigations, not a strategy. We need an Events Policy that respects and protects parks rather than exploiting them as cash cows.

And that raises the fundamental question: what is Brockwell Park actually for? And when its different uses conflict, which takes priority?

Even the event organisers’ own biodiversity plan acknowledges that future events increase the risk of biodiversity improvements failing. The park is not as resilient as the promoters claim – when uses conflict, it is the park that gives way.

Brockwell Park is a public park and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. It is not Wembley Stadium.

Lambeth has been approaching this back to front – starting with what event operators need and asking the park to accommodate it. We need to reverse that. Start with what the park needs to flourish as a park, and only then ask what events it can reasonably sustain.