

20-08-2026

To the City Council of Copenhagen

Regarding: Protest against the proposed festival site near Ørestad

Dear Members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposal to establish a permanent large-scale festival site on the area currently occupied by the Royal Golf Club, immediately adjacent to Ørestad and Naturpark Amager.

I fully support Copenhagen's vibrant cultural life and recognize the value that concerts and festivals bring to the city. However, placing a permanent venue for repeated events with tens of thousands of visitors directly beside one of Copenhagen's youngest residential districts and a protected natural area is fundamentally incompatible with the interests of both residents and nature.

I am writing this letter in English as I hope that both Danish and international residents of one of Copenhagen's most international neighborhoods can participate in this discussion about the future of our local community.

1. A permanent festival venue of the proposed size is incompatible with a residential neighborhood

Large music festivals attracting up to 60,000 visitors are not unusual. However, such events are typically located where the number of permanently affected residents is limited, or where disturbance occurs only occasionally.

The proposal for a site near Ørestad where currently the golf club is located, would concentrate repeated large-scale events throughout the summer in immediate proximity to thousands of homes, and everyday recreational areas. Residents would not experience a single annual inconvenience but a permanently recurring disruption over many weekends in Spring and Summer.

Ørestad has developed into one of Copenhagen's youngest neighborhoods, with many families choosing to settle here because of the combination of modern housing, schools, childcare facilities, public transport and immediate access to nature [2.1]. It has also become one of Copenhagen's most internationally diverse districts facilitating integration of foreign families in Danish culture [2.2].

The city council is hence kindly asked to detail how the **quality of life of young families can be protected** in an environment that exposes citizens regularly to immense noise, masses of people under alcohol influence, as well as associated traffic chaos and litter.

This is not simply a question of whether one individual event complies with a specific noise limit. The relevant question is the cumulative burden created by repeated concerts, including noise, associated traffic, litter, public drunkenness and logistical activities throughout the season.

If Copenhagen requires additional capacity for major events, **the burden should be distributed** across several suitable locations rather than concentrated permanently next to one residential district in the middle of a nature park with protected status.

2. Noise impacts are being severely underestimated

Festival noise is extremely loud, often stretches until late at night and extends far beyond what traditional noise measurements often communicate. While the noise levels of such events are generally immense, especially the low-frequency bass can travel several kilometers and is experienced as sound as well as vibration [3.1]. For residents, especially families with young children, repeated exposure will significantly reduce quality of life.

These considerations are particularly important because Copenhagen has otherwise made significant efforts to reduce environmental noise elsewhere in the city [1.1]. In the minutes of the meeting of Borgerrepræsentationen d. 25.06.2026, 17:30 [1.2], the impression is left that regulations that count for other districts of Copenhagen specifically regarding noise are here of no concern:

“There are few areas that can be used for the purpose, and the areas that do exist have significant limitations in terms of the number of playing days, capacity, noise and conservation conditions” (Original: “Der er få arealer, der kan anvendes til formålet, og de arealer der er, har væsentlige begrænsninger ift. antal spilledage, kapacitet, støj- og fredningsforhold”)

It is alarming that placing a mega-festival site next to a residential area in the middle of protected nature seems to come without “limitations for number of playing days, capacity, noise and conservation conditions”.

For the above reasons, independent **noise assessments should first evaluate**

- **the cumulative annual noise exposure** rather than individual events alone
- the **full noise spectra** including low-frequency noise, vibration and resonance
- the added burden to **existing noise sources** in Ørestad
- **evening and nighttime disturbance**
- **realistic worst-case scenarios** during multiple consecutive events

3. The proposed location is immediately adjacent to protected nature

The proposed site borders Naturpark Amager and areas with significant ecological value including but not limited to biodiversity, educational value, recreational value, and an important role in climate adaptation.

Wildlife is naturally unaffected by administrative borders and will be affected even if the city council succeeds in revoking the protection status of the land in question [3.2-3.6]. Although event activities may then formally take place outside protected zones, lighting, crowd movement, increased traffic and obviously noise extend well beyond the festival grounds. Further, litter such as cans and bottles disposed by 60.000 people pre-drinking before entering the festival grounds will be notoriously difficult to locally contain.

Any environmental assessment should therefore **consider impacts on the surrounding habitats, rather** than limiting analysis to the immediate festival area. Specifically noise and low-frequency vibration will likely disturb animals of all kinds in the **surroundings, including Natura 2000-område N143**, as previously detailed by Bygge-, Parkerings- og Miljømyndighed [1.3].

Once a permanent venue has been established, repeated events have **cumulative ecological consequences** that differ substantially from those of occasional temporary events. These arguments cannot simply be dismissed by claiming that currently little wildlife can be observed on the golf course alone.

5. Royal Golf Club provides valuable recreational opportunities to everybody

Unlike many private golf courses internationally, the area of Royal golf Copenhagen is well integrated into the surrounding landscape with ponds and bushes as well as regular grassland remaining untouched while the golf-greens are seamlessly integrated in existing natural habitats. The area remains accessible for walking and running and is routinely used by the public for these very purposes. The golf area further is not limited to the Royal Golf Club alone, but the City Golf concept makes it easy for newcomers to try the sport without traditional barriers to participation such as the need of a club membership and hence creates value for all citizens, not just a privileged few.

Further, the argument of creating a nature park for the general public on the part that is later not used as festival ground is unrealistic. The public is already free to use the area as detailed above and if instead regularly 60.000 people are crossing this land on the way to a festival, the area will hardly ever contain a nature park with significant ecological value.

The city council is therefore urged to **discuss and consider the true identity and reality of the golf area** and carefully reconsider if parts of the current proposal involving a nature park for the public are realistic.

6. Ørestad already accommodates a disproportionate share of major events and carries an existing noise burden

Residents of Ørestad already experience the impacts associated with several major venues and event locations.

Bella Center regularly generates increased traffic and logistical activity during exhibitions and conventions. Royal Arena attracts large audiences throughout the year, placing additional pressure on roads, parking and public transport. Metro services become heavily congested during major events of all kinds, while local traffic and pedestrian flows are frequently affected. Fields represents a major shopping center in the area, which is generally highly frequented and even more so during specific events.

All the above-mentioned event facilities in addition to the nearby highway roads, the airport, metro and most importantly shooting ranges culminate in an already existing considerable noise burden [2.3]. Adding another permanent venue for events of up to 60.000 visitors would further increase this cumulative burden on the same neighborhood.

The city council is hence urged to **carefully and realistically review the current pressure** on Ørestad and **include the already existing burden caused by noise, transport, logistics and number of event visitors in the planning** of a new event site.

7. The need for a permanent festival site has not been convincingly demonstrated

In the minutes from the city council regarding this decision [1.2], anecdotal evidence is the basis for the argument of needing such a site. “ ØKF has been in initial dialogue with a number of event organizers to get an impression of the demand for an outdoor venue of this magnitude ” (Original: “ØKF har været i indledende dialog med en række eventarrangører for at få et indtryk af, hvilken efterspørgsel, der er på et udendørs venue i denne størrelsesorden”).

This argument is fundamentally flawed: The fact that concert and festival organizers would gladly use a site to host even bigger events and earn even more money is by no means proof of **the need** of such a site. Actual need for a mega-festival site would exist if solid proof could be presented regarding international super stars rejecting coming to Copenhagen because the audience is too small at current locations.

This does not seem to be the case. *Copenhell* in its current size supports a lineup that is full of internationally very well recognized bands and by no means inferior even compared to much bigger festivals such as Wacken in Germany. Generally, when international music stars are touring Europe, they might not always play in every single European capital. However, even international mega-stars such as Sabrina Carpenter have played concerts in Copenhagen where existing facilities were sufficient [2.4].

Further, this issue is in part politically homemade: As detailed in the minutes from June 25th, current locations might soon be unavailable due to “urban development” plans. Hence, the city council has in the past favored urban development over existing festival sites. Now however, Ørestad - an example of successful urban development – shall carry the burden.

The municipality should demonstrate through transparent analysis that a **festival site of this size is truly needed rather than wanted by parties with significant financial interest** in the matter. This includes fully evaluating if existing and alternative venues cannot reasonably meet future demand.

8. Political credibility is at risk

While rarely all promises made before elections can ultimately be kept, it undermines political credibility if political parties adopt positions that strongly oppose what has been promised or campaigned with prior to past elections.

It is concerning if parties that have previously taken the position to make Naturpark Amager and Nature preservation a priority or to preserve and work to expand sports facilities, now end up in favor of closing a sports facility to open a 60.000 people festival area in the middle of protected nature.

Conclusion

Ørestad is a successful example of modern urban development, combining housing, public transport, recreational opportunities and close access to nature. It has become home to thousands of families and an unusually diverse international community. Naturpark Amager meanwhile ensures biodiversity, providing recreational opportunities and is essential for climate adaptation and the green identity of Copenhagen.

These qualities deserve protection.

I therefore respectfully urge the City Council to reconsider the proposed location and to conduct a comprehensive assessment of cumulative environmental impacts, residential quality of life, ecological consequences and alternative locations. A thriving cultural life, attractive residential neighborhoods and preservation of nature are all important objectives for Copenhagen. They should not be placed in unnecessary conflict.

Respectfully,

Alexander Früh
Ørestad Resident

References:

1. Publicly available documents of the city of Copenhagen:

- 1.1 Kommunens støjhandlingsplan
- 1.2 Referat Borgerrepræsentationen Møde d. 25.06.2026 17:30
- 1.3 Bygge-, Parkerings- og Miljømyndighed Dokumentnummer i F2 124621
- 1.4 Referat Borgerrepræsentationen Møde d.13.11.2025, kl. 17:30

2. Newspaper articles and webpages:

- 2.1 [Nye bydele tiltrækker unge og børnefamilier - By & Havn](#)
- 2.2 [4 ud af 10 Ørestad-beboere er fra udlandet – Ørestad Avis](#)
- 2.3 [Flere og flere klager over støj fra skydeklub – Ørestad Avis](#)
- 2.4 [Sabrina Carpenter in Royal Arena Mit Ørestad](#)

3. Scientific literature:

- 3.1 Wheeler et al., 2025 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apacoust.2025.111095>
- 3.2 Shannon et al. 2016 doi: 10.1111/brv.12207
- 3.3 Francis & Barber 2013 <https://doi.org/10.1890/120183>
- 3.4 Kok et al 2023 doi: 10.3389/fevo.2023.1130075
- 3.5 Duquette CA et al. 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13880>
- 3.6 Hooker et al. 2023 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2688-8319.12250>