

## EXECUTIVE DECISION CALL-IN REQUEST

### Part Four, Section E Council's Constitution

Key decision reference number	HCE S433
Decision title	Implementation of Standard Fees & Charges For Markets Street Trading & Shop Fronts 2025/26
Date of decision	24 November 2025
Decision maker	Cabinet
Date of publication of decision	25 November 2025

<p><b>Are you requesting a call-in of the entire decision, or part of the decision.</b></p> <p><b>If you are requesting a call-in of part of the decision only, please explain which part.</b></p>	<p>The points highlighted in bold are the ones requested to call-in.</p> <p>Cabinet agree to:</p> <p><b>3.1 Approve implementation of the revised fees &amp; charges schedule for permanent and temporary street trading, shop fronts and storage, set out in Appendix 2, from 1 January 2026, in accordance with Section 32 of the London Local Authorities Act 1990 (as amended).</b></p> <p><b>3.2 Approve the phased repayment of arrears and transition to real-time payment by 2027/28.</b></p> <p><b>3.3 Approve the continued application of annual CPI-based, to be passed onto traders from 1 April 2026, and every year thereafter, in line with financial sustainability and cost-recovery policy.</b></p> <p><b>3.4 Approve the application of the annual NLWA disposal charge, to be passed onto traders starting from 1 April 2026, and every year thereafter, in line with financial sustainability and cost-recovery policy.</b></p> <p><b>3.5 Delegate authority to the Group Director, Housing, Climate &amp; Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, Community Safety and Regulatory Services to finalise any minor adjustments before implementation.</b></p>
--	--

In accordance with [Part Four, Section E](#) of the Council's Constitution, the power to call-in an executive decision should only be used in exceptional circumstances in a number of circumstances specified in paragraph 1.2 of that Section.

A request for a call-in must be made within **5 working days** of the decision being published.

Upon receipt of the completed call-in request form, the Monitoring Officer will assess whether the request meets the requirements for call-in. The Monitoring Officer's decision is final, although there is a presumption in favour of the request being valid.

Pending consideration by the Monitoring Officer, the decision is suspended and no action may be taken upon it. If the Monitoring Officer determines that the call-in is valid, the decision will remain suspended until consideration of the call-in has taken place.

The completed request form will be published as part of the report to the Scrutiny Panel, alongside a copy of the report relating to the called-in decision.

**Which of the following circumstances for call-in, specified in the Council's Constitution, do you believe applies to the decision in question (please mark with an 'X' in the relevant box):**

The decision-maker did not make the decision in accordance with the principles of decision-making, namely:

1. Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome).
2. Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers.
3. Respect for human rights.
4. A presumption in favour of openness.
5. Clarity of aims and desired outcomes.
6. Relevant matters have been ignored.
7. Consideration and evaluation of alternatives and reasons for decisions.
8. Due regard to the statutory framework, guidance and Codes of Conduct.

Please list those which apply:

1. Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome).
2. Respect for human rights.
3. Consideration and evaluation of alternatives and reasons for decisions.
4. Due regard to the statutory framework, guidance and Codes of Conduct.

(Numbers adjusted for navigation of the sections below)

--



The decision maker did not act in accordance with the Council's policy framework.

Article 4.7 of the Council's Constitution provides that the following documents comprise the Council's policy framework:

- Local Transport Plan
- Local Development Framework documents
- Local Area Action Plans
- Licensing Statement
- Gambling Statement
- Crime & Disorder Reduction Strategy
- Youth Justice Plan
- Strategic Plan
- Housing Strategy
- Equalities Statement



The decision maker did not act in accordance with the Council's budget.



The decision maker failed to consider relevant evidence when making the decision.



The decision would not be in the interests of the borough's residents and a preferable alternative decision could be adopted.

If you believe that the decision-maker did not make the decision in accordance with the principles of decision-making, please provide details of why you consider this to be the case.

*Note: the issues we are raising apply to all markets, we have used Ridley Road as an example throughout the document.*

## 1. Proportionality

1.1 Under Article 1 Protocol 1 (A1P1) of the Human Rights Act 1998, the economic interests of market traders—including the viability of their businesses, the goodwill they have built, and their ability to earn an income—are recognised as “possessions”. Any decision that substantially increases operational costs and risks causing traders to cease trading constitutes an interference with these rights, irrespective of whether licences remain valid.

1.2 For interference to be lawful, it must be:

- (a) in pursuit of a legitimate aim;
- (b) supported by evidence; and
- (c) proportionate and the least intrusive means available.

1.3 The Supplementary Agenda (Item 20) confirms that at the point the decision was made, multiple foundational cost components were unfinished:

- Waste methodology review: “This is an ongoing process” (pp.160–161).
- Market staffing review: “A review of market staffing has been ongoing...” (p.162).
- Waste services staffing model: “...is currently being reviewed...” (p.162).
- Electrical infrastructure review: “These initiatives are in progress...” (p.161).
- Officer admission: “Not all issues (particularly waste and staffing) were fully resolved prior to reconsultation.” (p.32).

**A proportionality assessment cannot be completed where the evidence base is materially incomplete.**

1.4 The fee tables at pages 51–53 show only the baseline percentage increases. They do not include:

- the 2.2% CPI uplift, nor
- the 5% setup uplift applied across categories.

When included, the real increases are:

- Non-fruit & veg traders: 8–12%
- Fruit & veg traders: 12.2–12.4%
- Container storage fees: +20%

**These were not transparently presented to councillors, impairing informed decision-making.**

1.5 The report references a weighted average increase of 19.72%, but does not explain the calculation or reconcile it with the line-by-line fee tables. **This lack of clarity prevents proportionality testing.**

1.6 Officer commentary referenced “increased footfall”, but no footfall evidence appears in the Cabinet papers. This omission is significant because:

- Ridley Road footfall dropped following the closure of Colvestone Primary School.
- Further reductions are anticipated with imminent LTN implementation.
- Traders consistently reported declining footfall during consultation.

**Imposing high fee increases without footfall evidence breaches proportionality requirements.**

1.7 Significant works along Ridley Road—including the derelict indoor market building—remain incomplete. This degrades the market environment, reduces footfall, and undermines trader viability. Raising fees in these conditions is disproportionate.

1.8 Fresh-food traders operate on extremely tight margins. Increases of 12%+ materially affect viability. For many, this is existential.

1.9 The decision approved the application of the annual NLWA disposal charge, to be passed onto traders. It is not clear within the papers what the modelling is. The NLWA increases, and the impact on passing these to traders, is substantial. Traders could be subjected to a large increase as NLWA charges have increased by 47% since 2021/2022. This increase is not proportional to the aim of sustaining a thriving market, especially ones providing low cost fresh produce.

1.10 The Council did not demonstrate that the increases were necessary, evidence-based, or the least intrusive means. The proportionality test is not met.

## 2. Respect for Human Rights

2.1 A1P1 Engagement - Fee increases of this magnitude interfere with the possessions of traders (economic viability, goodwill, and income). The Council must justify such interference with clear evidence of:

- necessity,
- legitimate aim, and
- proportionality.

Given the incomplete evidence base (Section 1), justification fails.

2.2 Article 8 Engagement: Cultural and Community Rights Ridley Road is a cultural, economic and social anchor for Black and Global Majority (BGM), migrant and low-income communities. Article 8 protects community identity, cultural participation, and the right to maintain family life and livelihood structures.

The Council did not assess:

- the cultural role of Ridley Road,
- the impact of increased fees on long-standing community practices,
- the effect on women traders (many of whom balance childcare and trading),
- the effect of reduced affordability for low-income shoppers.

2.3 Article 14 Engagement: Discrimination in the Enjoyment of Rights. Fee increases disproportionately affect:

- BGM traders,
- migrant traders,
- women traders,
- part-time and casual traders,
- low-income traders,
- families dependent on affordable food,
- communities experiencing the highest deprivation in the UK (e.g., 65% of children in Hackney living in poverty).

*The EqIA acknowledges these vulnerabilities yet concludes "no adverse impact," which is irrational.*

2.4 The Council's failure to assess footfall—particularly after the closure of Colvestone Primary School and ahead of LTN implementation—means it did not understand the real-world impact of increased fees on community access and livelihood.

2.5 A facially neutral policy (fee increases) disproportionately affects protected groups (BGM traders, women traders, older traders, migrant traders). The Council did not assess or mitigate this. Constitutes Indirect Discrimination Under Article 14 as a breach

2.6 Ridley Road is one of the few remaining BGM-majority trading environments in London. Failure to assess cultural harms under Article 8 is a breach.

2.7 The decision therefore engages and breaches Articles 1P1, 8 and 14.

### **3. Consideration and evaluation of Alternatives and reasons for decisions**

3.1 Public bodies must consider reasonable alternatives before taking decisions that adversely affect rights or protected groups. This is a core principle of public law, proportionality, and the PSED (*Bracking*).

3.2 The Council did not model or present alternative fee structures, such as:

- CPI-only increases
- Phased implementation
- Delayed implementation until waste and staffing reviews were complete
- Differential increases based on trading category vulnerability
- Sliding scales for part-time or low-margin traders
- Exemptions or reductions for fruit & veg traders (essential food providers)
- Alternative waste-charging methodologies
- Review of market staffing and service delivery
- Market-by-market differentiated increases based on footfall or public realm quality

3.3 The Council presented no comparative viability modelling showing:

- projected trader loss under each option
- the relationship between footfall and trading resilience

- the impact on low-margin fresh-food traders
- the effect on container traders facing a 20% increase

This omission breaches rational decision-making standards.

### 3.4 Consultation responses consistently stated:

- “not enough work has taken place over the last 10 months”
- “we have not seen evidence to support the cost increases”
- “footfall has declined significantly”

None of these concerns were addressed by producing alternative scenarios or impact models.

3.5 The key fee tables are spread across pages 51–53. The explanatory headings appear on page 51; the fruit & veg tables appear on page 52; the container fees appear on page 53.

This fragmentation made it more difficult for Members to compare “before and after” rates and to understand real percentage increases.

### 3.6 Alternatives such as delaying implementation until:

- the indoor market building is developed (3.7 & 3.8)
- the food court is established (3.9)
- the public realm is restored
- footfall stabilises
- electrification works complete

...were not presented, despite being reasonable and foreseeable options.

3.7 Further, the council has not delivered on improvements to Ridley Road which they themselves have noted as essential to improve conditions and to increase footfall. For example, the council agreed at [Cabinet in 2022](#) to take on the rent of the ground floor of the Shopping Village. From the Cabinet papers in January 2022 (almost 4 years ago) key progress hasn't been delivered:

*3.7.1 “By bringing the shopping village and the street market together both under the Council’s stewardship, it will strengthen Ridley Road’s position as a vital part of Dalston’s economy for the long-term, complement each other and both managed in the*

*interests of local traders, businesses and residents.” - not delivered*

*3.7.2 “The acquisition of the 15 year lease for the indoor market is a key to the refurbishment of the indoor market and to breathing life back into Ridley Road Market.” - not delivered*

*3.7.3 “The Markets Service proposal is that rather than leave the unit in its current dilapidated state, which would continue to have a detrimental impact to the area due to the negative impact of the ASB and other illegal activity, the property should be refurbished at the Landlords cost and operated by Markets for a much improved retail, storage and office facility.” - not delivered*

3.8 The Shopping Village remains partly boarded up with a small “open as usual” sign and is not delivering any of the promised improvements for traders, shoppers or residents. We are aware of the work the council is doing with the private owner of the building but traders should not be subjected to increased fees and charges until these works are completed and the positive impacts yielded.

3.9 The council’s 2021 [Good Growth Fund project](#) for Ridley Road and Ashwin Street totalled £1.5million (which included £770,000 council funds). The plans included the development of a food court for the east end of Ridley Road. The intention of this was to bring more traders to this end of the market and encourage shoppers to move through the market. **This has not been delivered.**

3.10 In public law, a failure to consider obvious and less harmful alternatives, particularly where the evidence base is expressly incomplete, is irrational and unlawful. Here, the Council appears to have treated its preferred option as the only option, contrary to basic standards of good decision-making.

3.11 The above points have not been properly considered in making the decision to increase fees and charges for market traders. The projects outlined above should be delivered and positive outcomes yielded before market fees and charges are increased.

3.12 The decision should therefore be revisited to enable proper evaluation of alternatives, including staged implementation, CPI-only increases in the first instance, revised waste-charging methodologies, and targeted mitigation for the most affected trader groups.

3.13 The failure to consider reasonable alternatives renders the decision unlawful.

#### **4. Due Regard to Statutory Framework, Guidance and Codes of Conduct**

4.1 Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, Hackney Council must have “due regard” to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination;
- advance equality of opportunity; and
- foster good relations between persons with protected characteristics.

This includes:

- gathering adequate equality evidence before deciding (*Bracking*);
- assessing cumulative and intersectional impacts;
- documenting the reasoning;
- considering less intrusive alternatives;
- preventing foreseeable disproportionate harm.

4.2 Ridley Road traders and shoppers are predominantly:

- BGM
- migrant
- low-income
- living in areas of high deprivation
- reliant on affordable fresh food
- working in precarious or part-time roles
- caring for children or dependents

The Poverty Reduction Framework 2022 confirms Hackney has some of the highest levels of deprivation in England, which is further reported to have increased *the English Indices of Deprivation 2025*.

4.3 The EqIA states:

- It acknowledges that BGM traders, older traders, women traders, and low-income microbusinesses are “vulnerable to cost increases”.

- It admits female traders (38%) may “drop off” due to the increases.
- part-time/low-income traders are vulnerable

Yet concludes “no adverse impact”. This is unlawful. The EqIA’s proposed mitigations (Trading Places, Young Traders) are irrelevant to fee increases.

4.4 The PSED requires assessment of combined impacts, including:

- race + poverty
- gender + caring responsibilities
- migrant status + precarious income
- LTN + reduced footfall + fee increases
- unfinished works + reduced footfall

None of these interactions were analysed.

4.5 Ridley Road is culturally and economically central to BGM communities. The Dalston Plan confirms:

“...the Council will protect and promote Ridley Road Market...”

Fee increases inconsistent with this duty require PSED justification. None was provided.

4.6 Fresh-food traders face the steepest increases (12.2–12.4%). Increases on essential goods harm:

- deprived households
- single-parent families (majority women-led)
- large BGM households
- families already in food insecurity

The Council did not assess affordability impacts

4.7 In the context of Ridley Road, the Council was under a heightened duty to examine equality impacts because both the trader base and the core customer base are disproportionately Black, Global Majority, migrant and low-income. The decision to increase fees by 8–12% for key categories was therefore highly likely to have a differential impact on protected groups.

4.3 Despite this, the EqIA provided to Cabinet is generic, high-level and does not contain any race-specific analysis, any cumulative impact assessment, or any focused assessment of Ridley Road as a BGM-majority trading environment. It does not consider the combined effect of fee increases, unresolved

	<p>waste and staffing reviews, and cost-of-living pressures on BGM traders and residents.</p> <p>4.4 The Council's own strategic documents underscore the need for such analysis. The Dalston Plan identifies Ridley Road Market as a key cultural and economic asset that must be "protected and promoted". The Economic Development Plan recognises that BGM traders face structural barriers and are overrepresented in vulnerable micro-enterprise sectors. The Equality Plan 2024–26 calls for cumulative impact assessments and an explicitly anti-racist approach to decision-making.</p> <p>4.5 The Poverty Reduction Framework further confirms that BGM households are disproportionately affected by rising food and energy costs, and that access to affordable fresh produce is a critical component of food security in Hackney. Fee increases on fresh food traders at Ridley Road inevitably risk being passed on in higher prices, directly affecting these households.</p> <p>4.6 None of these strategic duties are engaged with meaningfully in the Cabinet report or EqIA. There is no balancing exercise between the Council's cost-recovery objectives and its obligations to prevent the worsening of racial and socio-economic inequalities. Instead, the Council relied on hardship funds and future "flexibility", which do not prevent harm.</p> <p>4.7 In correspondence with the market team following the decision, the EqIA is referred to as "robust" but this is not supported by the content of the assessment as presented to Cabinet. On the contrary, the absence of cumulative, race-specific and site-specific analysis indicates that due regard was not given in substance, as required by s.149.</p> <p>4.8 The decision therefore breaches the Public Sector Equality Duty and should be reconsidered with a full, Ridley Road-specific, cumulative equality impact assessment that takes into account the strategic duties in the Dalston Plan, Economic Development Plan, Equality Plan and Poverty Reduction Framework.</p>
--	--

**If you believe that the decision-maker did not act in accordance with the Council's policy framework, please list which of the**

5. Local strategies form part of the statutory context. Decisions inconsistent with them must be justified. The Council did not do so. This section outlines how the

**documents from within the framework you consider to be relevant and why you consider that the decision-maker has not acted in accordance with it / them (providing page / paragraph references where possible).**

decision conflicts with key strategic documents.

#### **5.1 Dalston Plan 2025 / Local Area Action Plan**

The Dalston Plan explicitly requires the Council to:

- “protect and promote Ridley Road Market”
- maintain affordability for traders
- support BGM traders and microbusinesses
- improve public realm and safety
- support local cultural identity and heritage.

Conflict: Fee increases during a period of unfinished works, footfall decline, and high deprivation contradict these commitments. Traders have specifically reported the negative impacts that the increased fees and charges will have on their ability to trade.

#### **5.2 Economic Development Plan 2025-30 (EDP)**

The EDP prioritises:

- BGM microbusiness support
- reducing structural barriers
- supporting inclusive local economies

Conflict: Fee increases of this scale undermine those objectives.

#### **5.3 Equality Plan 2024–26**

The Equality Plan requires:

- embedding equality before decisions
- preventing unfair outcomes
- assessing cumulative risk
- reducing race and gender inequality
- Building opportunity and well-being
- Celebrate and serve diverse communities.

Conflict: The EqIA did not include cumulative assessment, and contradicted itself regarding negative impacts on BGM and female traders. Therefore, the decision undermines the Equality Plan due to its disproportionate impact on BGM traders and will increase inequality.

#### **5.4 Poverty Reduction Framework (2022)**

The report highlights:

- food insecurity as a major deprivation issue
- rising living costs disproportionately affecting low-income families
- the necessity of maintaining affordable local goods
- the role of local markets in community wellbeing

	<p>Conflict: Increasing fresh-food trader costs (12%+) risks raising prices for some of the most deprived communities in the UK.</p> <p><b>5.5 - Markets strategy 2024 - 2029</b> Although this strategy is referenced in the cabinet papers, it neglects to include relevant points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The strategy states at 7.2 that as social media officers will be in post 7 days a week.</li><li>• The strategy also outlines (at 7.1) the need to implement pay-as-you go electricity points.</li></ul> <p>Conflict: We are not aware that this has happened as the output on social media is not proportionate to this input. This role is vital in supporting increased footfall to Hackney's markets. Progress is needed regarding electricity points before handing down costs to traders.</p> <p><b>5.6 - London Assembly Planning Committee report</b> "Social value in planning and regeneration: Knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing"</p> <p>The report stressed the importance of recognising social value specifically of London's street markets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- "We have found that embedding social value into planning and regeneration policy offers the opportunity to create, enhance and maintain the places and spaces that Londoner's want and need."</li></ul> <p>Conflict: The decision does not adequately consider the social value of Hackney's markets and traders.</p>
--	--

**If you believe that the decision-maker did not act in accordance with the Council's budget, please provide details of why you consider this to be the case.**

	<p>6. We note that the council needs the service to 'break even' to fully recover the costs for the service and it is outlined in statute that the council cannot increase pitch fees to fund other services.</p> <p><b>6.1 Staffing costs</b> The council needs to be able to show that it has ensured that the cost of the service is kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary cost burden for traders. This evidence is missing from the decision documents.</p>
--	---

	<p>The staffing costs below (table 1) were shared with traders outside of the consultation process</p> <p>Traders have challenged the size of the market service team and the amount of money spent on staff which has almost doubled in four years (see table 1).</p> <p>The consultation response states that the in-house operatives add £200,000 to the staffing but this doesn't fully account for the increase seen between 21-22 and 22-23. The consultation report and Cabinet documents are not transparent about the staffing costs and need for this level of staffing. <b>There is no evidence of this consideration.</b></p> <p><i>Table 1: Staffing costs for the market service (including management, market officers, licensing etc)</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th><th>Markets</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>24-25</td><td>1,048,226.71</td></tr> <tr> <td>23-24</td><td>1,031,726.23</td></tr> <tr> <td>22-23</td><td>1,031,726.23</td></tr> <tr> <td>21-22</td><td>672,143.39</td></tr> <tr> <td>20-21</td><td>569,964.53</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>6.2 Waste services operation &amp; NLWA charge</b></p> <p>The papers state that the "Waste services' staffing model is currently being reviewed as part of the broader council-wide transformation programme, which will inform future charging structures. This however is out of the control or scope of the market's Service Management." - it isn't out of control of the council though and it is the responsibility of the Mayor and Cabinet to ensure that all relevant service areas (i.e. waste management) are charging an appropriate amount for these services. Trader's fees and charges should not be increased until this work is completed.</p> <p>Not enough has been done to challenge the large increase (47%) in NLWA charges and the decision approves hanging these down to traders.</p>	Year	Markets	24-25	1,048,226.71	23-24	1,031,726.23	22-23	1,031,726.23	21-22	672,143.39	20-21	569,964.53
Year	Markets												
24-25	1,048,226.71												
23-24	1,031,726.23												
22-23	1,031,726.23												
21-22	672,143.39												
20-21	569,964.53												

	<p><b>6.3 Incomplete comparison</b></p> <p>The consultation claims that “Hackney’s markets will remain among the most affordable in London, even after these changes” yet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The comparison of fees and charges does not include Islington which is recognised as having lower fees and charges.</li><li>- The proposed container storage fee is double the average of comparable boroughs cited in the consultation.</li></ul>
--	---

**If you believe that the decision-maker failed to consider relevant evidence, please explain what evidence you believe has not been considered.**

7.1 The evidence we believe has not been considered is the most recent Hackney Business Survey 2023 that found that almost 9 in 10 businesses (88%) were facing significant pressures, driven primarily by the cost of living crisis (49%), energy prices (34%), and the ongoing impact of Brexit (18%).

7.2 Nearly four-fifths of businesses (79%) reported that the cost of living crisis was already directly harming their operations, with the main impacts **being fewer customers, increased wage pressure, and higher supply costs**.

7.3 This data is significant, recent and must be taken into account when deciding to add up to 20% in rent cost given that since this survey, there is no evidence that the economic growth/increased footfall for traders has increased at the same rate.

7.4 On the contrary, it is clear the level of business and income for traders has not recovered pre-pandemic levels given a number of reasons including a shift in consumer shopping trend (i.e. online and local issues).

7.5 The council’s consultation report states “Traders reported a 50% decrease in market footfall over the past five years, making any price increase unsustainable.” This has not been considered by the decision-maker.

7.6 The current Council’s own Equalities Impact Assessment also confirms that Black and Global Majority traders and older traders are disproportionately vulnerable to cost increases, and that many traders are sole traders and micro-businesses already operating on the tightest margins. While the Council proposes mitigation options, **we believe these increases—introduced without being led by traders—risk reinforcing the now historic and deeply upsetting pattern of Black and Global Majority trader**

	<p><b>displacement across markets in London.</b> This is a pattern residents have already witnessed at Elephant and Castle, Seven Sisters Market, and now again with the displacement of Elephant Square traders. These are lived realities with lasting social, cultural and economic damage.</p> <p>7.7 The council's own consultation report states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- "A majority of survey respondents (58.93%) disagreed that the Council should review and update fees, and an even higher percentage (73.31%) felt that the proposed increases for their site/category were too high."</li><li>- "low profitability mean any further price increase is "unsustainable," leading many to consider closing their pitch."</li></ul> <p>7.8 None of the points above were raised at the Cabinet meeting by the lead Cabinet member in the introduction to the decision and no questions about this were asked by the Mayor or any other Cabinet member.</p>
--	---

If you believe that the decision is not in the interests of the borough's residents, please explain why you consider this to be the case.

	<p>8.1 Traders sustain local employment for over 4,000 people, provide affordable goods, and keep Hackney's town centres and markets vibrant. They must not be asked to carry the heaviest burden of this crisis.</p> <p>8.2 We do not believe this decision is in the interests of Hackney's residents because it risks directly undermining the very local traders, markets and high streets that residents rely on for affordable goods, local jobs, community cohesion and economic resilience.</p> <p>8.3 The Council's report anticipates a up to 20% increase in fees &amp; charges for traders following implementation, explicitly acknowledging that some traders are likely to leave as a direct consequence of these increases. Any loss of traders will reduce access to affordable food and services, weaken local supply chains and threaten local employment.</p> <p>8.4 The Council's own Equality Impact Assessment confirms that <b>Black and Global Majority traders, older traders, and micro-businesses are disproportionately vulnerable to cost increases.</b> These traders form the backbone of Hackney's markets and community economy. While mitigation measures such as phased payments and hardship support are proposed, these do not remove the underlying risk that rising fixed costs will still force the most marginal traders out. The resulting displacement would have a direct</p>
--	--

	<p>and negative impact on residents, particularly those on low incomes who depend on local markets for affordable goods.</p>
--	--

**If you believe that a preferable alternative decision could be adopted, please explain what you consider that preferable alternative to be.**

**9.1 For all markets:**

- Proper review of electricity cost and delivery is completed this must include any grants to deliver renewable energy options
- The review of market staffing as well as agency staff used by the waste service
- More work is done on waste management to maximise income for waste (these were points raised by traders during the last year and they have not been properly addressed).

**9.2 For Ridley Road:**

- Complete the promised improvements to increase footfall for traders before any revision to fees and charges. This includes the completion and reopening of the ground floor of the shopping village and the when the long-promised food court at the St Mark's Rise end starts to attract more people to the market.

**Please provide any other additional information you would like to submit in support of the call-in (please note that this additional information must relate to the reasons under which a call-in can be made).**

**Details of Councillors making the call-in request** (unless otherwise indicated, the first Councillor listed will be taken to be the 'lead requester')

Councillor Zoë Garbett
Councillor Claudia Turbet-Delof
Councillor Fliss Premru
Councillor Liam Davis

Councillor Penny Wrout

**In the event that the request is determined to be valid by the Monitoring Officer, does the lead requester wish to make a statement or representation at the meeting when the call-in is considered by the Scrutiny Panel? [please select an option from the drop down list]**

Yes

Date: 1 December 2025

---

Once completed, this form should be returned to the Council's Monitoring Officer - [monitoringofficer@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:monitoringofficer@hackney.gov.uk)