

**(1) Deputation concerning PRIDE PVP  
Spokesperson Trevor Scoble**

On the 19<sup>th</sup> April 2018 The Kingscliffe Society made a deputation to B&HCC about Health & Safety concerns over the Pride PVP annual event. We were directed to the Tourism Development & Culture Committee and thence to Safer Communities who were to produce a Review in the form of a questionnaire as a public condition. They issued their questionnaire on the day before they surveyed/walked the St James's PVP Area with us (TKS) together with the St James's LAT group. Therefore, none of our issues pointed out during the survey could be included in the B&HCC questionnaire. The results from the questionnaire formed more a Popularity Poll than the Review as promised (which was to cover all residents & business concerns) but were presented as a factual outcome dealing full with all the issues raised.

We have, therefore, continued to pursue our H&S concerns and requirements at Council meetings and by emails, but all to no avail.

In the Agreement the B&HCC made with the Pride organisation in 2014 various clauses were included to improve the management of this event, specifically;

- 3.15 *with the explicit intentions of creating a safer and welcoming event.*
- 3.16 *PVP format aimed at creating an event that achieves a better outcome/or attendees, businesses and local residents (our underlines)*
- 3.19 *Evaluation of the PVP by the Safety Advisory Group (including the councils emergency services) with regard to the event's objectives of delivering a safer and high-quality event was largely very positive. The evaluation process with local businesses and communities is ongoing at the time of report writing and any further information will be provided at meetings.*

We dispute whether these objectives have ever been fully achieved.

In regard to 3.15. As the PVP does not commence until 6 PM, many attendees arrive for the event already intoxicated or drug affected from the 'Party in the Park' where they have been indulging all afternoon.

In regard to 3.16. As the PVP has an overwhelming emphasis on over-loud music (up to 120 DPC inside homes) and the on-street alcohol consumption promoted by the demands of St James's abundant licensed premises. The wishes of residents & unlicensed traders are therefore given very low priority.

In regard to 3.19 During the last 2 years in St James St. Pride has estimated an attendance@ between 35,000 & 42,000 revellers in its narrow adjacent side streets, filled to overflowing with somewhat intoxicated revellers contained behind un-climbable barriers. With no public address system, emergency lighting, and escape signage and no pre-issued escape plan for residents or revellers to follow. The 2-meter-high non-climb barricades are erected from midday on the Friday until late night on the Sunday and for the last 2 years of PVP event and no pre or post PVP meetings have been organized so no relevant information is exchanged and acted upon.

It is recognised that the PVP is raising funds, one aspect of which is a social fund to reduce the effect it has on the wider community, but it is raised by imposing unreasonable distress and conditions on many local residents and non-licensed traders who are bearing the brunt of the true cost.

Any emergency is a tragedy waiting to happen.

With respect, we would ask the Council to withdraw the Pride PVP agreement and employ a Company that will comply with the Council's Requirements & those of Health and Safety.

Which residents' concerns could reasonably be expected to be covered by a Review?

1. Concern, above all else, with the distress/displacement caused to residents (LGBT & Non-LGBT alike).
2. That there would be a continuity of officer/s contact with affected residents and groups.

Larissa Reed & Jo Player (the dedicated officers) seemed to take turns with what few contacts there were.

3. Prior to the Pride weekend residents would be issued with instructions/maps on how to safely exit the area in the event of an emergency.
4. On the Saturday morning of the Party officers would check with stewards, manning any unclimbable barriers, their instructions in the event of an emergency or sudden crush of revellers inside the area.
5. On the night of the Party (Saturday) once it was in full swing (say 10 pm) officers would be appointed to:
6. Check on sound levels in the noisiest streets containing Pubs or outside sound systems (decibel levels)
7. In these noisiest streets they would knock on doors to establish:
  - A. If residents were enduring the noise and B. The sound levels reached inside these private homes.
8. It would seek to establish how frequently homes appeared to be vacated in high noise areas.
9. Check whether public toilets were overflowing and whether/where there was evidence of street urination.
10. On the 2nd day of the Party at say 5 pm before the next round of loud music at 6 pm, check on homes that were non-responders on the 1<sup>st</sup> night to check whether residents had returned.
11. Establish any expenses returning residents had been put to in order to provide a safe place of refuge.
12. Repeat the checks on temporary toilets and street urination.

There was only one pre-Pride public meeting (in May 2018) which was poorly advertised and therefore poorly attended by members of the public. It was attended by Larissa Reed and raised many issues, including severely affected residents being paid expenses to leave the area for the duration of the Pride Weekend.

The next contact with the council was in October nearly 2 months after the Pride weekend in a meeting held by Jo Player. It was to present the contents of her/the Councils questionnaire into the PVP. Jo Player established that she did not attend

Pride and Larissa Reed had also been away on holiday. The number and names of Council officers who had attended was not known at that time.

The Kingscliffe Society, and as far as we know, no other groups were invited to any internal meetings with the Council about the PVP.