

**Minutes of a Meeting of the
Licensing Committee
7 January 2015**

*Councillor Carson Albury (Chairman)
Councillor David Simmons (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Ann Bridges	Councillor Lyn Phillips
Councillor Brian Coomber	Councillor David Lambourne
Councillor Emma Evans	Councillor Peter Metcalfe
*Councillor Debbie Kennard	Councillor Ben Stride

* Absent

LC/14-15/31 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Simmons stated that he was the Adur Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing, he was also Chairman of the Adur and Worthing Community Safety Partnership and on the Police and Crime Panel. He affirmed that he had an open mind on the application and would hear all relevant representation before coming to a decision.

LC/14-15/32 Confirmation of Minutes

Resolved: that the minutes of the Licensing Committee on the 10 November 2014, and the Licensing Regulatory Sub-Committee that took place on 10 December 2014 and 11 December 2014 be approved as the correct record.

LC/14-15/33 Items Raised Under Urgency Provisions

There were no items.

LC/14-15/34 Questions and Statements by the Public

The Chairperson invited members of the public to ask questions or make statements about any matter for which the Council had a responsibility or which affected the District.

There were no questions or statements

Part B – Licensing Act 2003 Applications

LC/14-15/35 Procedure

Resolved: that the procedure be noted

LC/14-15/36 Licensing Act 2003 – Application for a new Premises Licence at Brighton City Airport, Cecil Pashley Way, Shoreham-by-Sea

Before the Committee was a report by the Director for Customer Services, copies of which had been circulated to all Members and a copy of which is attached to the signed copy of these Minutes as Item 6. Members were requested to consider and determine an

application made by SJM Ltd for grant of a new Premises Licence to authorise the sale of alcohol, late night refreshment and the provision of regulated entertainment.

Senior Licensing Officer Outlines the Application

The Senior Licensing Officer introduced the report to the Committee and outlined the application before Members. The Senior Licensing Officer relayed that the application was for an annual two day event at the Shoreham Airport site and set out the Committee's responsibilities under the Licensing Act 2003 (The Act). The meeting was told that the Committee was apolitical and there were clear guidelines concerning what was relevant to determining the application and although some issues were important some were not necessarily relevant to a Licensing Act application.

The Senior Licensing Officer told Members that the Committee was not determining whether or not an event could go ahead but determining the licensable activity that could take place.

The Senior Licensing Officer confirmed that the applicant had met the statutory requirements regarding the publication of the application. Natural justice dictated that all applications must be treated in exactly the same manner and therefore the Council could not be seen to be seeking representations on the application with additional publicity. However, it was relayed that the Council had reviewed the way it dealt with notification regarding all applications and had made some changes as a result. These changes included the use of social media and wider use of the internet.

The Senior Licensing Officer updated the Committee regarding ongoing mediation between the parties but it was thought unlikely that an agreement could be reached by all those who had made representation due to the large numbers of public making representation. The Senior Licensing Officer explained to Members the areas upon which the police and the applicant could not agree. These included the time of the terminal hour, the wearing of age defining wristbands and capacity for the event. With regards to capacity the applicant was seeking a capacity of 35,000 in the first year of operation and the police 25,000.

The applicant was asked if the Senior Licensing Officer had presented an accurate outline of the application. The applicant responded that the outline had been accurate, however Mr Paul Grime was the potential DPS not Mr Jonathon Howarth as had been stipulated in the papers.

The applicant also wished to clarify that the event was for 35,000 per day over two consecutive days for the first year of operation. It was related that it was volunteered that the event would only go ahead if the Event Management Plan was agreed by the Licensing Authority and the Safety Advisory Group (SAG).

Members question Senior Licensing Officer

A Member asked the Licensing Officer to clarify the attendance figures being asked for in the first year of operation, the Senior Licensing Officer clarified that it was for 35,000 per day.

Those making representations invited to address the Committee

Sussex Police

The Chair invited Sussex Police to make their application. The Barrister for the police, Mr Peter Savill, set out the police's representation as summarised below:

- The police contended that the Committee should be able to consider the traffic management and congestion as it was an issue of public safety;
- It had been stated that the committee could only consider the immediate vicinity when considering the application, which was in line with Licensing Act guidance. However, the barrister for the police stated that a recent high court decision had meant that it was perfectly proper for the Licensing Committee to consider areas away from the immediate vicinity;
- The police wished to differentiate the applied for event from the existing Shoreham Air show as they were completely different;
- Members were told that the proposed event would represent a step in the dark.
- The Barrister informed members that they did not wish to pursue payment to the police as part of the licensing conditions (the meeting had been told that there was separate legislation to deal with that issue);
- The Barrister informed members that the police were inviting the Committee to impose a capacity limit of 35,000 and that any increase of capacity should be applied for by an application to vary the licence. If the licence were agreed under these terms then the Local Authority and other Responsible Authorities would have the benefit of experience of the inaugural year to judge whether this capacity could be increased.
- Members were told that the police did not understand why the application was for such a late terminal hour. There was concern that such a late terminal hour would cause problems because there was no public transport available to allow people to travel home which could lead problems dispersing event goers. This problem could affect other areas in Sussex because police resources would be needed to cover areas such as Worthing and Brighton where some attendees would be 'bussed away' to.
- The Barrister informed Members that the police were not aware of a festival event without camping that had a terminal hour later than 23:00 and could not see the need for the proposed event to have one at 03:00am. The police had concerns that it was proposed that music would be played until the conclusion of the event which would work against a staggered egress as applied for by the applicant.
- Members were told that the police had concerns about the frequency of the event. The applicant had asserted that there was a contract with the airport that limited the applicant to one event per year, however the police had not seen that contract and invited the Committee to limit the applicant to one event per year as a condition of the licence. The Committee were asked to bear in mind that the applicant had applied for a licence Monday to Sunday 365 days a year and the police felt that a limit of 2 days a year should be a condition on the licence, as opposed to an expression of intent on the applicants behalf;
- The police stated that the event being planned would allow under 18's onto the site unaccompanied which created a risk of an underage person obtaining alcohol by purchase or by proxy sales. The police opined that a wristband system which identified underage attendees would help prevent children from harm by allowing the police and festival security to identify underage drinkers. It was asserted that an age verification wristband system was used at 'Bestival' and other types of

wristband system were used at Reading and Leeds Festivals. Members were told that the wristband system could be used in conjunction with a 'challenge 25' system and that the Police felt there could be no legitimate objection to this proposal.

Members questions for the Police

A Member asked why the Police had initially sought to cap the capacity at 25,000 but had changed their representation to ask for 35,000. Jean Irving the Force Licensing & Public Safety Manager for Sussex Police stated that they had changed their representation concerning capacity following sight of the traffic management plan which had asserted that attendees would be bussed away from the event, however, the police asserted that the increased number should be tied to an earlier terminal hour.

Applicant's questions for the Police.

Mr Taylor, the Solicitor to the applicant, questioned Jean Irving the Force Licensing & Public Safety Manager for Sussex Police. It was established that Jean Irving had not been present at a meeting of the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) in November 2014 where the proposed event was discussed, had not seen a copy of the minutes for that meeting and that it had been fed back to her that it was SJM's intention to hold one event per year only. However, it was Sussex Police's opinion that there was a difference about what was agreed verbally and what was agreed in writing.

The Solicitor to the applicant stated that it was proposed by the applicant that event capacity would be agreed as part of the Event Management Plan and that the SAG and Local Authority approval of the Event Management Plan was further a proposed condition of the Licence. It was put to Sussex Police that if this was the case why had they put in a representation limiting the capacity to 35,000 instead of the 69,999 applied for. Jean Irving stated that the Police had concerns approving a capacity of 69,999 people on an untested site, and that if a licence were granted and without the need to seek a variation of a licence on capacity then there would be no mechanism by which the public could make representation following the inaugural year.

The Solicitor asserted that the SAG, which included members of Sussex Police had preferred a later terminal hour of 03:00 because it would mean a phased shut down of the event and a staggered egress from the site whilst an earlier 23:00 terminal hour would mean 35,000 leaving the site at the same time. Jean Irving stated that there were concerns that people leaving the site at 03:00 would have nowhere to go and would cause problems where they were dispersed. Jean Irving also stipulated that although Sussex Police were part of the SAG they were also an independent body with their own concerns. Jean Irving asserted that she was not aware of any other festival without camping that had a terminal hour later than 23:00.

The Force Licensing & Public Safety Manager, Jean Irving, was asked about a proposed wristband scheme that would identify under 18's. It was asked why Sussex Police were asking to impose an untried and untested scheme. The Police gave examples of where they believed that the wristband scheme had been implemented, they felt that it was a good way to spot underage drinkers and discourage proxy sales.

The meeting adjourned at 8.25pm and reconvened at 8.30pm

Representations from Members of the Public.

Councillor Liza McKinney made a representation on behalf of the Shoreham Beach Residents Association which is summarised below:

- The application was not publicised well enough and news of the application had reached most residents by word of mouth or by social media;
- Cllr McKinney stated that the site was completely unsuitable for the Event;
- It was an unsuitable location surrounded by hazards: two main roads, the river and the railway line;
- Concern was expressed about the security of the site and it was felt that people without tickets could access the proposed event from lots of different directions;
- There was danger with people drinking all day and underage young people would have access to alcohol and could cause themselves and others harm;
- Plans regarding the 'bussing out' of attendees were questioned and it was asked where coaches would be parked;
- Concern was expressed about the nuisance to the boarding school directly opposite the entrance to the site;
- Cllr McKinney had concerns regarding fencing and contended that organisers would not be able to corral attendees on the site and that attendees would roam around the surrounding area causing disruption;
- Cllr Mckinney expressed concerns that if approved the event could set a precedent for other similar large scale events to come to the airport and could end up with 'rave upon rave'
- Concern was expressed about event attendees parking on Shoreham Beach;
- Concern was expressed about event attendees sleeping everywhere and anywhere.

Mr Batten made a representation which is summarised below:

- The proposed event was too close to a residential area;
- The residents were concerned that the event organisers had applied for a licence for seven days a week 365 days a year;
- There was little provision for parking at the site and there would be noise disturbance from parking in residential areas;
- Events such as the Shoreham Airshow brought the A27 and A259 to a standstill.
- People attending the Airshow parked in the streets of Shoreham which left residents stuck in their houses;
- It was asked if the footpath that surrounded the site would be closed;
- Mr Batten asked if the Committee could consider the noise disturbance of traffic and people leaving the event;
- Mr Batten stated that the Airport was the oldest commercial Airport in the Country and not a venue suitable to the holding of concerts;
- It was related that the event was taking place during school examinations and the event could harm the educational attainment of students.

Mr Bill Freeman spoke on behalf of the Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network as summarised below.

- Mr Freeman drew comparisons with another SJM event in Manchester called 'Parklife' and recounted a community campaign to ban the Manchester event

because of problems of crime and disorder, concern was raised that the same issues could take place at the proposed event at the airfield;

- Mr Freeman stated that the size of the site was too small to hold 70,000;
- Mr Freeman stated that flooding was a real concern and a significant threat to the public safety of those attending the event as there were no real escape routes;
- Concerns were expressed about the noise pollution likely to be caused by the event especially given the site's close proximity to local residences and also the effect noise pollution could have on students studying for their exams;
- The Committee was told of a poll carried out amongst members of the residents association which stated 81% of residents were against the application;
- Mr Freeman asked the Committee to reject the application in its entirety.

Ms Gloria Thompson raised concerns that the four licensing objectives could be breached by the application she asked about the possibility of a park and ride scheme and contended that the hours of the event be reduced should the application be granted.

Mr Phillip Cheeseman recounted three other events that are held in the local area and informed Members that he could hear the public address system of all those events from his house and this was during the daytime not in the evening which would cause an even greater nuisance. Members were told of a marquee set up in the north east corner of the airport that caused noise disturbance until the early hours of the morning and that the noise created by the Red Lion beer festival caused local people to leave the area.

Mr Mark Milling, Bursar of Lancing College, informed the Committee that the College was in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site. Members were told that the College was a boarding school of some 540 pupils who would be in the middle of taking exams during the period the event had been applied for. Half of those students would be leaving for the weekend which would make leaving the site difficult and the other half of the students would be staying at the college to study for their exams. Mr Milling told the meeting that the school could not be run safely if the application were to be agreed and that there were child protection issues that the Committee should consider when making its decision. It was stated that it would not be safe for the children of the College should a festival take place on its doorstep.

Ms Tamsin Haskin stated that she was a regular festival goer but felt that the proposed site was not suitable for the demographic it was aiming at and the conditions under which it would run. Members were told that there were no natural sound barriers around the airport and the sound would travel to residences in the surrounding area. The event would be taking place in hot conditions in June and people would need to have their windows open, combined with the late hours it would mean that small children would be disturbed by the noise and find it difficult to sleep. Ms Haskin stated that if the event were to take place then it should be limited to a capacity of 35,000 and a terminal hour of 23:00. She asked if the applicant would be compensating those affected.

Ms Liz Coward made her representation which is summarised below:

- Members were told of fears that the event in Shoreham would be an extension of the 'Parklife' festival in Manchester including the transfer of artists from one event to the other;
- Ms Coward wanted to know from the applicant which artists would be playing at the event and what the sound levels would be;

- Members were told that the festival in Manchester was the subject of a petition to get it stopped in Manchester which was being led by the local MP and three local ward Councillors;
- Members were told that the 'Parklife' event had presented problems with alcohol, drug taking, littering and that the event had in many ways harmed the local economy rather than putting money into it;
- Ms Coward stated that people in the Manchester area had been forced to leave their houses because of the noise from 'Parklife' and that noise from the event could be heard six miles away;
- Ms Coward told the Committee that the 'Parklife' event had been an insecure site, both inside and out. Security guards at the event were paid the minimum wage and as a result security was not as it should be, there were further claims that there were problems with payments to the police;
- Ms Coward asked about porta-loos at the event.

Mr Johnson of the dogs trust Shoreham made his representation which is summarised below:

- Mr Johnson explained to the Committee the geography of the Dogs Trust in relation the airport and explained that the Trust housed 65 Dogs from bad backgrounds who would be susceptible to the loud noise from the festival;
- Mr Johnson said that all staff would need to volunteer to come into the home to try to keep the dogs calm if the event were to go ahead;
- Mr Johnson warned that if the festival were to go ahead the dogs could need to be medicated although it was felt that this was unethical;
- There were concerns that some festival goers would trespass on Dogs Trust land and camp overnight;
- The planned festival was due to take place on the same weekend as the Dogs Trust open day which usually attracted between three and four thousand attendees. When asked about parking Mr Jackson responded that some people parked along the road, some walked from Shoreham and some parked in a small area behind the trust buildings.

Ms Maureen West made a representation to the Committee which is summarised below:

- Ms West explained that she lived close to the proposed site;
- Ms West stated that local residents did not have enough notice of the event and that no notices were placed along the road at which she lived, She expressed a concern that the application had been hushed up and the matter had not been treated democratically;
- Access from the A259 consisted of a road with dangerous bends;
- If people parked along the road it would be difficult for residents to come and go from their houses;
- Ms West recounted other events in the local area where noise had made her house vibrate and forced her to leave;
- Ms West explained her concerns about the drunk and disorderly behaviour of people leaving the event.

Mr Frank Rose of the Shoreham Society made a representation which is summarised below;

- Mr Rose expressed concerns that the event would create unacceptable levels of noise that would disturb local residents and create a nuisance;
- Members were told that access to the site from the A27 was inappropriate and questions were raised about the ability of emergency services to access the site;
- Mr Rose expressed concerns about children experimenting with drugs at the event;

Questions for the public making representations

There were no questions for Members of the public making representations from members of the Committee or the applicant

Representation from Environmental Health

The Councils' Senior Environmental Health Officer stated that he could not support the application or object to it outright. He stated that currently proposed night time levels were overly generous. The Officer stated that his main concern was noise after 23.00hrs and that still in discussions with the applicants about noise levels. He stated that if members agreed the licence they should set maximum noise levels. He stated that there were possibilities that noise from the event could cause offences under the noise act. The Environmental Officer commented that the DJ stage currently open could be 'closed in' to help reduce noise.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40pm and reconvened at 9:46pm

Representation from the Applicant (Mr Taylor and Noise Consultant Mr Griffiths)

Mr Taylor, Solicitor for the applicant made a representation on behalf of his client.

- Members were told that SJM had been in business for 25 years and the applicant had been personally involved for 25 years;
- The company put on over 2000 concerts a year including events with a capacity of over 80,000 as well as smaller gigs in small venues
- Members were told of the V Festival which was a large successful event that took constant planning. SJM strove to improve the event every year and were subsequently invited back year on year;
- The applicant had addressed noise with the SAG and a sub meeting was taking place to identify a plan to make sure correct sound levels were set and to identify noise sensitive properties and protect them;
- The applicant had set an initial capacity of 35000 per day so that they could prove that they could manage that challenging number although it was felt that the site was capable of holding the 69,999 applied for;
- The meeting was told that a number of conditions had been agreed in principle with the police, however there were some proposed conditions raised by the police that the applicant was not in agreement with as it was felt some could be made stronger and some were not workable in the applicant's opinion;
- The applicant wanted to stop public bringing alcohol into the event;
- The Event Management Plan (EMP) was a key document that directed the management of the event and this would continually be refined leading up to the event in conjunction with the SAG and that it must be submitted 60 days prior to the start of the event. It was related that it was the applicant's intention that a condition be agreed the Licensing Authority in consultation with the SAG be required to approve the EMP prior to the event going ahead. If the EMP were not agreed then

the event could not go ahead; Members were told that the applicant emphasised that it was important that the Local Authority be delegated responsibility to sign off the EMP.

- With regards to security and litter, the Solicitor stated that the applicant had made a commitment to look beyond legal obligations;
- Members were told that the applicant understood concerns about consultation regarding the event and had committed to have public consultation prior to the event and a further debrief following the event. Members were told that the applicant wanted residents' feedback.

Mr Griffiths – (Vanguardia noise consultants)

- Mr Griffiths informed the Committee that he was advising the applicant on noise and had previously advised Government in respect of noise;
- It was acknowledged that the site was a difficult site to control but felt that it could be controlled;
- Members were told that if Mr Griffiths did not think that noise from the site could be controlled then he would not have agreed to be involved with the festival;
- It was important to select the correct type of sound system in order to control the noise;
- It was proposed that bands stop playing at 23:00 after that time DJ's would be playing recorded music which was easier to control;
- Solid barriers could be used to control sound, such as shipping containers. This was a method used at the Olympics;
- It was proposed that residents would be kept informed about when sound tests and rehearsals were taking place and a complaint line be set up to inform organisers about nuisance sound;
- Members were told about a sound preparation test where sound measurements on and off site allowed organisers to meet sound level requirements;
- During the festival there would be sound monitors to test sound levels throughout the event;
- Levels of noise would be reduced incrementally from 23:00 as different areas of the site were closed down;
- Members were told that Mr Griffiths would have overall control of the sound levels;
- Members were told about events Mr Griffiths had worked on near London Zoo and Battersea Dogs Home, he explained the sort of noise that startled animals;
- The Committee was told about events where Mr Griffiths had given advice on events that were near to schools;
- Members were told that the contents of the noise management plan would need to be agreed as a condition of the licence.

Members questions of Mr Taylor and Mr Griffiths

A Member asked what was considered as an acceptable level of noise for residents. Mr Griffiths stated that after 23:00 it was noise that didn't cause sleep disturbance, which was quieter than the noise currently generated by the A27.

A Member asked how it was planned to keep sound away from the Dogs Trust. Mr Griffiths informed members that managing sound would be down to using every natural barrier and create other barriers in order to control the sound.

Public questioning of Mr Taylor and Mr Griffiths

Mr Griffiths was questioned about his experience protecting boarding schools close to the sites of festivals. Mr Griffiths stated that he had not done so in the past but the principle would be that people would need to be able to sleep and he would make sure that they could, he commented that noise from the festival would be below the current noise levels generated by the A27.

Councillor Liza McKinney, representative of the Shoreham Beach Residents Association asked Mr Griffiths about previous advice he had provided to the Government. Mr Griffiths reported that he and his company had advised DEFRA on late night music events and also on the effects of noise on animals. He told Members that DEFRA had incorporated his advice into the Noise Act.

Councillor Liza McKinney asked how it was intended to control the sound created by 35,000 voices. Mr Griffiths explained that he would include the noise planned for people enjoying themselves and that some attendees would be in marquees.

Ms West reiterated that noise from events close to her house had made it shake. Mr Griffiths stated that it might be necessary to remove chunks of low frequency noise out of the event.

Representation from the Applicant (Mr Rob Ballantine – the applicant)

Mr Ballantine made his representation which is summarised below:

- The applicant was applying for a premises licence not an event licence. That licence would be for two days per year;
- It was proposed that there would be a staggered egress from the event with the main artist finishing at 23:00 and the site gradually closing down from that point and there would be a staggered egress. The applicant did not want a situation where 35,000 people attempted to leave at the same time (23:00) which could cause problems;
- Buses would be parked on the airport runway and would go to and pick up from places identified by and tailored to ticket data collected. It was put that people would take an offer of a cheap ticket to be picked up and dropped off by bus;
- The applicant stated that he understood that residents would have concerns about the festival and that he wanted to hear and address them;
- The applicant told members that he was not aware of a single festival that used the age identification wristband system suggested by Sussex Police. He stated that the system was not practical. Wristbands couldn't be sent out in advance because there would be no way of checking age before they were sent. There would be challenges of providing wristbands across both days and the system was contradictory to the 'challenge 25' system that was proposed to be in place. It was related that under 'challenge 25' staff would challenge anyone appearing to be under the age of 25 including those who were wearing an over 18 wristband and it was purported that this could cause 'flashpoints'. It was submitted that if someone was under 18 and wearing an under 18 wristband they would conceal that wristband if consuming alcohol;
- The applicant expressed concern that the Police representative had not read the minutes of the Safety Advisory Group(SAG), which was the group set up by statute after Hillsborough to advise on large events;

- The site would be surrounded by a three meter high fence;
- The event would not be 'Parklife in Sussex';
- The company paid several million pounds per year to police forces around the country, there was legislation in place 'Special Police Services' that provided for payment to the Sussex Police;
- There were plans to include a field hospital on the site;
- The applicant was hoping to use local people to service the event;
- The reputation of the applicant's company was very important and the event at Shoreham was important. He would be present at the event along with the noise consultant and head of the catering company to make sure that the event was run smoothly;
- Mr Ballantine offered apologies at the way the public found out about the event and accepted that he had not been totally aware of how the Council operated concerning publicity for upcoming applications. He did however note the large number of public representations received in respect of the application and the debate on social media concerning the application. He also informed members that he had sent correspondence to all those who had made representations with more details concerning the application;

At 23:10 The Chairman of the Committee stated that it was getting late and that he was of a mind to seek the adjournment of the meeting until 7pm on the following day. He therefore asked members of the public who made representations to ask questions of the applicant so they needn't attend for the second day of the hearing if they did not wish to.

Public questioning of Mr Ballantine (The applicant)

Ms Joss Loader of the Shoreham Beach Residents Association disputed the statement that all those making representations had been sent correspondence. The applicant stated that he would provide records to that effect. (note: the applicant provided proof of emails sent to those making representations to the Chairman of the meeting the following evening)

Mr Jack Johnson stated that Battersea dogs home was different to the dogs trust in Shoreham and reiterated his fear that dogs (who were sensitive to noise) would be upset by the festival. Mr Griffiths stated that he would attend the kennels to consider the noise issues.

The applicant was asked how long it took to set up and take down at conclusion of the event and explained that there would be no flying during the event.

There being no further questions from the public the Chairman adjourned the meeting until the following evening at 7.00pm

The meeting reconvened at 7.00pm Thursday 8 January 2015

The meeting adjourned at 7.00pm so the police could consider a list of proposed conditions suggested by the applicant

The meeting reconvened at 7.23pm

The Senior Environmental Health Officer announced that he was withdrawing his representation as he had agreed noise objectives with the applicant, these would include agreement that levels would not breach levels set within the noise act.

Members questions for the applicant

A Member asked if tickets would be sold at the venue or in advance on the internet. The applicant stated that tickets would be sold in advance and any spare would be sold on the gates.

Mr Ballantine was asked how many days the airport would be out of operation he informed members that it would be for two days.

A Member asked about the parking. The applicant stated that he had made a reserve booking for Adur Rec for the weekend. He explained to the committee the process regarding the traffic management plan.

A Member asked if the proposed date for the inaugural event was moveable. The applicant stated that the date had been set to coincide with the end of student exams and was not moveable. He was further asked why he was seeking a licence for the whole year if he only intended to hold the event on two specific days. The applicant stated that there had been occasions in the past where adverse weather or other major incident had given cause for an event to be moved, so whilst he had no intention of moving the date of the event he wanted to be prepared for the rare eventuality that he would need to.

A Member sought clarification on the name for the event, it was related that 'Worthing weekender' had been bandied around but the proposed event was in Adur and not in Worthing. Mr Ballantine stated that the event would not be called 'Worthing Weekender' and Worthing would not be used in the title.

A Member asked how long the site would take to be clear following the proposed terminal hour of 3am. Mr Ballantine stated that the later terminal hour would allow for a steady egress from the site and that he would like to say that the site could be cleared and closed within an hour.

A Member recounted a recent festival experience where a silent disco had taken place and asked if this was a good way to end the event quietly. Mr Ballantine explained that the novelty of the silent disco had worn off a bit and was not being considered for the event, although it was something that the organisers may consider.

A Member asked about the possible damage caused by the buses on the runway and the applicant informed the Committee that the Airport had no issues in that regard.

Further Public Questions for the Applicant

The Chairman announced that some of those making representations had asked for a further opportunity to question the applicant. He had agreed to allow some additional questions because of the late hour of the previous meeting.

Ms Haskin questioned the applicant on the target audience for the event and if he considered it to be a family event. She asked how the event would prevent 'keeping children from harm' if noise kept small children up at 3am in the morning. Mr Ballantine

recounted measures would be put into place to prevent that happening as part of the noise management plan and that it was up to individual families to decide if the event was suitable for them. Ms Haskin stated that an event continuing beyond 11pm was not acceptable and would disturb the sleep of small children in the local area.

Ms Liz Coward asked what percentage of acts appearing at 'Parklife' would be attending the event in Shoreham. Mr Ballantine stated that he had not yet received a Licence so had not begun to book artists and he was not able to answer the question.

Ms Liz Coward asked if Vanguardia (the noise consultants) had been involved with the 'Parklife' event and if they were aware that the event could be heard six miles away. Mr Griffiths stated that he had been present at the event but was not aware that it could be heard six miles away. He informed the meeting that sometimes the weather could cause noise to be heard further away due to 'inversion temperature'.

Police questions for the applicant

The Barrister of the police questioned the process used to notify of the intention to apply for the event. Mr Ballantine was asked why the police were only informed about the event when called up by the Chairman of the SAG. Mr Ballantine said that it was the standard industry procedure to contact the Chairman of the SAG first because they had in-depth knowledge of all of the agencies that would need to be contacted, and who within those agencies would need to be contacted. It was relayed that in this instance the Chairman of the SAG was able to pull together all of the responsible agencies within ten days (this included responsible authorities).

The Barrister said that there had been significant opposition to the application, that it had been an alarming application. The applicant responded by saying that there had been support as well as opposition and that he had taken the opposition into account.

The Barrister asked why the applicant had trouble agreeing a mediated condition limiting the capacity of the event to 35,000 and seeking a further variation in for future years. The applicant relayed that the Police had originally sought a capacity limit of 25,000 with no scientific or logistical reason for this capacity and had changed this to 35,000 as a result of seeing the traffic management plan. This did not make sense to the applicant as the traffic management plan worked on the basis of a 03:00 terminal hour and the police were seeking a 23:00 terminal hour, the applicant added that the police were constantly changing their minds. The applicant stated that a condition of the licence was that the event would not go ahead without approval of the event management plan which included capacity. If the SAG and local authority were not happy that an increased capacity they could reject the Event Management Plan and the event would not go ahead. It was the applicant's contention that the site could comfortably manage an event with a capacity of 69,999.

The Barrister questioned why the applicant had not agreed to mediation that gave the power of veto the licensing authority rather than the SAG and questioned the legal authority and mechanism of the Local Authority to approve the Event Management Plan. The applicant highlighted the importance of the SAG in the process and gave examples of SAGs being involved in the closing other events. The Solicitor to the applicant stated that it was proper for the authority to make the decision with the advice of the SAG on the event management plan and there were powers for them to do this within Section 7 (3) of the Licensing Act.

The Barrister asked the applicant how he intended to deal with proxy sales. The applicant stated that he was not aware of any particular problems of proxy sales at festivals but pointed to the experience of the bar operators in selling alcohol at events. He emphasised the robustness of the 'challenge 25' system in preventing underage sales and reiterated his belief that the wristband system suggested by the Police was not a workable solution.

Applicant summing up (applicant's solicitor)

The applicant's Solicitor summed up and this is summarised below:

- It was proposed that there would be over 200 stewards at the event and part of their training would be to identify underage drinkers;
- An alcohol policy discussed with the SAG would include measures to address the issue of proxy sales;
- The SAG was in place and the parties would be able to sit down together and come up with a workable solution;
- SMG was a leading promotor that was experienced, professional and successful and had never been prosecuted or had an event challenged by review;
- Members were told that the Police had not been fully engaged with the SAG process and some issues brought up by the Police could have been dealt with at the SAG;
- The applicant respected the principal that the Licensing Authority was in control of Licensing the event;
- It was stated that there were a number of authorities satisfied with the plan for the event and satisfied that the event could be increased to a 69,999 capacity, no representations had been received from other responsible authorities and the representation from Environmental Health had been withdrawn;
- Members were told that the applicant was committed to engage with the public and other authorities and had suggested conditions to that effect;
- The Police had changed their minds regarding the inaugural capacity for the event because they had confidence in the traffic management plan, however the traffic plan was reliant on a terminal hour of 3:00am yet the police were insisting on a terminal hour of 23:00;
- The traffic management plan was predicated on a soft finish and staggered egress and a safe dispersal as opposed to a mass exodus;
- The company were prepared to 'go the extra mile' and voluntarily deal with such issues such as the dogs trust (which was technically not a licencing matter) and to introduce stewarding beyond their legal responsibility;
- That the applicant had listened to all the local residents but considered the event would have a wider benefit for the people of Shoreham

Applicant summing up

Mr Ballantine summed up as summarised below:

- Mr Ballantine informed Members that he believed that the Airport was a fantastic potential site;
- Members were told that the applicant had listened to what had been said at the hearing and had taken it on board, he believed that the festival was a major undertaking that would benefit Shoreham;

- It was in the company's interest to run a good and safe event so that it could be repeated in future years;
- The event at Shoreham was important and to reflect this, leaders of each company involved would be in Shoreham to make sure the event ran smoothly.

Police Summing up

The Barrister for the Police summed up as summarised below:

- Suggested conditions had not been agreed between the :Police and the Applicant;
- The applicant had suggested that authority to approve the Event Management Plan would be in the gift of the Licensing Authority, there was real concern that there was no mechanism for the Licensing Authority to make that decision;
- Members were told that it was important that the public were not locked out of the decision making process;
- If the Committee were to accept the application it was put that the capacity should be set and the applicant should apply for a variation to have the number increased, this would mean that the Committee could consider the matter and the public would have an opportunity to make formal representation;
- The Barrister recalled that the applicant had committed to holding one event per year and asked the committee 'why not condition that?'
- The Barrister put forward the police's concerns about the lateness of the terminal hour that had been applied for. It was related that the Police had concerns about problems being caused by event attendees at places they were being bussed away to, particularly because there was no public transport at that late hour. Members were told that it was noteworthy that other similar festivals had a terminal hour of 23:00;
- The Barrister related that Sussex Police had genuine concern that proxy sales would take place at the event and that the 'challenge 25' system did not address the problem of proxy sales. Members were told that it was Sussex Police's understanding that the wristband scheme proposal was in place at other festivals and that it was an appropriate method of identifying and deterring proxy sales;

Summing up from Members of the Public

A representative from the Dogs Trust summed up as summarised below:

- The Dogs Trust strongly objects to the application;
- The event would have a detrimental effect on the Trust's ability to do its job;
- The wellbeing of over 65 dogs was at risk from the event;
- The Dogs Trust was in close proximity to the proposed event as well as being close to a footpath and traffic;
- There are no physical barriers between the Dog's Trust and the Airport and the boundary between the two sites was just 250 meters, the most sensitive dogs are housed the closest to the airport;
- The Dogs Trust did not want to have to sedate the dogs because it was unethical to do so;
- The proposed event was scheduled to take place on the same day as the Dog's Trust open day.

The Chairman announced that the Committee would go into closed private session to consider the decision and that the Council would publish its decision within five working days.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.01pm on Thursday 8 January, it having commenced at 7.00pm on Wednesday 7 January.

Considerations:

This decision concerned an application from SJM Ltd for the grant of a new Premises Licence at Brighton City Airport, Cecil Pashley Way, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5FF. The application was for authorisation for the sale of alcohol, late night refreshments and the provision of regulated entertainment at the site.

In reaching its decision the Licensing Committee gave due regard to the current Home Office guidance, the Council's own Licensing Policy, and the statutory licensing legislation and case law. The Committee also gave due regard to the Human Rights Act 1998, the Equality Act 2010 and the rules of natural justice.

Due consideration was given by the Committee to all the relevant representations received in writing and those made at the hearing in particular from Sussex Police and from local residents.

The Committee considered all the relevant issues raised in respect of the four licensing objectives which are the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.

Resolved: that the Committee grant the licence to be used for one Event (comprising a maximum number of two consecutive (2) event days) in each calendar year

The licence is granted with additional and amended conditions following relevant representations appropriate to the promotion of the licensing objectives (copy attached as an appendix to these minutes), these include, in brief:

- The maximum audience capacity allowable in the Licence for the Event shall be 35,000 ticket holders per day of the Event;
- That the terminal hours for the licensable activities be reduced in order to prevent disturbance to the local community;
- The noise levels from the Event will be limited and managed by a Noise Management Plan which will form part of the Event Management Plan.

Reasons for decision: The Committee carefully considered and took into account all the relevant representations and understood and appreciated the legitimate concerns expressed by Sussex Police, local residents and others. These included the issues of unacceptable noise, the risk of anti-social behaviour and the risk of an increase in crime and disorder if the application were agreed.

However, the Committee were satisfied that the Applicants are a professional company with considerable previous experience of running such events. Further, the Committee took into account the numerous and comprehensive conditions offered by the Applicants in their application and subsequently. Plus the

Committee imposed further conditions following relevant representations and took into account those mediated with a responsible authority and considered these would be sufficient to satisfy the licensing objectives.

The Committee strove to make a decision which would balance all the differing needs in this matter and considered that the application in conjunction with the additional and amended conditions was reasonable and met the licensing objectives.

Additional observations by Members:

The Licensing Committee would like to make it very clear that they will be keeping a close eye on how this licence is used in the first year as it is acknowledged that this Event is on an untested site. If problems arise the Committee would expect that the licence would be reviewed, and any increase in numbers at any future event would require an application for a variation to the licensing committee.

Advice to Parties

The Applicant and all those who have made representations in connection with this application are reminded that they may appeal against this decision within 21 days by giving Notice of Appeal to the Magistrates Court.

Any person or responsible authority are reminded that they may apply for a review of this licence after a reasonable interval pursuant to section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003

Any licence granted under the Licensing Act 2003 does not override any planning restriction on the premises or any restriction that may be attached to any lease of these premises.

The applicant is reminded that it is a criminal offence under the Licensing Act 2003 to carry on licensable activity from any premises in breach of a premises licence.

Chairman

Conditions

Note: Throughout these conditions unless otherwise expressly stated for clarification the decision of the Licensing Authority will be made by the Director of Communities in conjunction with the Chair of the Licensing Committee.

General Conditions

1. The maximum audience capacity allowable in the Licence for the Event shall be 35,000 ticket holders per day of the Event. If the Premises Licence Holder wishes to increase the audience capacity after the first Event they shall apply to the Licensing Authority to vary the Licence.
2. This Premises Licence shall only be used for one Event comprising a maximum number of 2 consecutive event days in each calendar year.

3. Terminal Hours

Sale of Alcohol

12.00hrs (noon) to 23.00hrs Monday to Thursday

12.00hrs (noon) to 00.00hrs (midnight) Friday and Saturday

12.00hrs to 23.00hrs Sunday

Sale of Late Night Refreshments

23.00hrs to 00.00hrs (midnight) Monday – Thursday (inclusive)

23.00hrs to 01.00hrs of the following morning Friday and Saturday

23.00hrs to 00.00 (midnight) Sunday

Provision of Regulated Entertainment

(in the form of films, live music and recorded music)

12.00hrs (noon) to 00.00hrs (midnight) Monday to Thursday (inclusive)

12.00hrs (noon) to 01.00hrs of the following morning Friday and Saturday

12.00hrs (noon) to 00.00hrs (midnight) Sunday

4. Each year notification of the Event shall be made in writing to the Licensing Authority, the Responsible Authorities and members of the Safety Advisory Group (or the equivalent) (SAG) at least six (6) months in advance of the commencement of the Event. Following such notification the Event date shall be publicised by the Premises Licence Holder in accordance with the protocol agreed with the Licensing Authority. In an exceptional circumstance the date of an event may be changed with the written consent of the members of the SAG and the Licensing Authority

5. Event Management Plan

No licensable activities otherwise authorised by this Licence shall take place unless the Event Management Plan (EMP), is submitted to and approved by the Licensing Authority and the SAG or the equivalent. The EMP shall be submitted to the Licensing Authority and the SAG not less than four (4) months prior to the proposed Event.

5.1. The EMP will include:

5.1.1. Names, addresses and telephone numbers of persons/organisations responsible for:

- Overall event safety control
- Production
- Medical and first aid provision
- Site management and the structural integrity of all temporary structures
- Crowd management, steward and security
- Fire safety and control
- Configuration and control of sound systems
- Management of any on-site car parking
- Management of concessions and franchises
- Provision and maintenance of water supplies
- Welfare and provision of information
- Provision and maintenance of sanitary facilities
- Reception collection and removal of litter and other waste

5.2 The proposed audience capacity including guests.

5.3 Plans to agreed scales detailing exits, entrances, temporary bars, marquees and all facilities to be provided.

5.4 Details of proposals for entertainments, together with information regarding any special effects.

5.5 Details of proposals for concessionary activities including food franchises, bars, restaurants non-food retail sales.

5.6 An Alcohol Management Plan which will include details of:

- The designated premises supervisor
- Personal licence holders
- Control of the sale of alcohol
- Proof of age policy (including Challenge 25)
- Promotion of responsible drinking
- Appropriate signage

5.7 A Safety Policy and Risk Assessment for the Event.

5.8 Details of arrangements for coordinating and controlling event safety on site.

5.9 A Site Safety Plan including Site Safety Rules, requirements for construction and breakdown of site, structural safety calculations, drawings of temporary structures and safety barriers, details of electrical installations and lighting arrangements.

5.10 Incident contingency and emergency plans (including a Major Incident Plan).

5.11 A Crowd Management Plan including plans for Access, Egress, Dispersal and Evacuation.

5.12 A Stewarding and Security Plan.

5.13 A Crime Prevention Plan and a Drugs Policy.

5.14 A Medical Ambulance and First Aid Plan.

5.15 A Fire Safety Plan.

5.16 A Transport Plan including a Traffic Management Plan.

- 5.17 A Sound Assessment with details and proposals for monitoring and controlling sound emission and a draft Noise Management Plan.
 - 5.18 Details for the provision of cleaning and maintenance of sanitary accommodation, washing facilities and drinking water.
 - 5.19 Details for the reception collection, litter and disposals of other waste.
 - 5.20 Details of welfare arrangements facilities and provisions for information on site.
 - 5.21 Details of the arrangements and facilities for disabled persons.
 - 5.22 The EMP will provide dates specifying the date by which obligations in the EMP must be complied with such as the provision of final plans, provision of information to responsible authorities for approval and completion of the infrastructure for the Event.
- 6. The Event shall be managed in accordance with the EMP approved by the Licensing Authority and the SAG.
 - 7. Any alterations to the running of the event made during the time the licence is in operation must be agreed by the Event Liaison Team (ELT)."
 - 8. The Premises Licence holder will operate the ELT on-site during the Event which will include representatives of the Premises Licence Holder, Responsible Authorities and other members of SAG as agreed appropriate. The ELT will meet at least every hour during the Event or at other frequencies agreed by the ELT.
 - 9. The Premises Licence Holder will convene a public meeting with residents to discuss its management plans for the Event each year two (2) months before the Event and convene a public debrief with residents within one month of the SAG debrief following each Event.
 - 10. A Multi-Agency Debrief meeting will be convened by the Premises Licence Holder within 28 days after each Event which will include representatives from the Licensing Authority, Responsible Authorities and other members of SAG.

Prevention of Crime and Disorder

- 11. The Premises Licence Holder will appoint a Security and Stewarding provider and their Operational Plans will be contained in the EMP. All Security and Stewards will be easily identifiable and have appropriate training for their duties. A register will be maintained of all Stewards and Security staff employed before, during and after each Event containing their full names, dates of birth, home addresses, employers, event specific identification and where applicable their SIA registration details. The numbers of SIA Licensed Security Staff and trained Stewards will be set out in the Security and Stewarding Plan
 - 11.1 The Register of Stewards and Security will be made available to Sussex Police and the Licensing Authority no later than 14 days prior to the Event, subject to minor and unavoidable amendment;
 - 11.2 The total number of SIA licensed security staff and trained stewards will be finalised in consultation with Sussex Police 4 days prior to the event commencing and will only be amended after that time following written agreement from both parties.

- 11.3. All Security and Stewarding staff will sign in and out of the Event and this log will be made available to the Police and Licensing Authority upon request.
12. Where individuals are required on the licensed premises to carry out licensable activities under the Private Security Activity Act 2001 they must be licensed by the Security Industry Authority.
13. An incident and log book will be completed for any incident of crime and disorder or anti-social behavior that takes place within the Licensed Premises. The log book/record will be made available upon request to officers from the Licensing Authority, Trading Standards and Sussex Police.
14. In accordance with the Drugs Policy no controlled substances will be allowed into the Event and anyone found with these substances in their possession will be refused entry.
15. Random searching at a search ratio agreed with Sussex Police will take place at all entrances and within the Licensed Premises for offensive weapons or drugs along with other prohibited items such as but not limited to glass bottles, illegal drugs, legal highs, nitrous oxide or weapons of any kind. In addition, all bags will be searched on entry. Searching of persons shall be carried out by members of the same gender.
16. The ticket conditions shall indicate that searching for prohibited items will be carried out and there will be signage with this message at all entrances.
17. The sale or supply of alcohol will only be permitted by the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) or by his/her written authority. The DPS will remain on-site during the hours of alcohol service.
18. In accordance with the Alcohol Management Plan, ticket holders will not be permitted to bring alcohol into the Event.
19. Anyone deemed to be drunk and/or disorderly or under the influence of controlled substances will be refused entry to the Event.
20. A "Challenge 25" policy will be in place at all gates, all bars and on the website/ticket outlets. Any person attempting to buy alcohol who appears to be under 25 will be asked for photographic ID as proof of their age. The only ID that will be accepted are valid passports and UK driving licenses with a photograph or proof of age cards bearing the "PASS" mark hologram".
21. The Alcohol Management Plan will set out procedures to minimise any contribution to crime and disorder from the consumption of alcohol.
22. Any person displaying drunken or aggressive behavior will be removed from the Event and their removal recorded in the incident log book. Anyone found to be using illegal substances will be dealt with in accordance of the Drugs Policy. No legal highs or nitrous oxide will be allowed into the event. Anyone found with these items in their possession will be refused entry or ejected if there are grounds to suspect that they are selling them. Anyone found using or in possession of illegal substances will be dealt with in accordance with the agreed drugs policy for this event, which will be found in the EMP.

Public Safety

23. The venue and all equipment furnishing, fittings and the like shall be constructed, provided and maintained so as to be in a thoroughly safe condition for entertainment purposes.
24. Suitable records shall be kept by the Premises Licence Holder or his agent regarding fire safety precautions, electrical installations and the construction of the built environment.

25. Authorised officers of the Licensing Authority, authorised officers of the Fire Authority, the Ambulance Service and Constables shall have free access to all parts of the Licensed Premises for the purpose of inspection at all reasonable times.
26. The Premises Licence Holder shall ensure that the Premises Licence and all conditions attached thereto are retained at the Licensed Premises and are available for inspection at all reasonable times by authorised officers of the Licensing Authority, Fire Authority, Ambulance Service and Constables.

CAPACITY AND ENTRY CONTROL

27. The ticketed capacity will not exceed the maximum capacity permitted by the Premises Licence.
28. The agreed capacity on each day will not be exceeded for that Event. Event capacity will be monitored constantly by means of "clickers" or similar scanning devices and the numbers recorded by security control on an hourly basis.
29. Appropriate arrangements by way of barriers, gate systems, security or other provisions will be made, in agreement with the Responsible Authorities, to prevent unauthorised access to the Licensed Premises and manage entry to the Licensed Premises.
30. Admission to the Licensed Premises will be by ticket only unless otherwise approved by the Licensing Authority. Ticket printing manifests and sales figures will be available upon request to the Licensing Authority.

LIGHTING AND ELECTRICAL INSTALLATIONS

31. Entrances and exits to the Licensed Premises including temporary structures within the Licensed Premises will be kept clear at all times and will be adequately illuminated during periods of darkness. If required by the Licensing Authority a lighting check will be carried out in consultation with the appropriate Responsible Authorities prior to the premises being opened to the public.
32. Adequate lighting levels will be maintained within any temporary structure and emergency lighting to the satisfaction of the appropriate Responsible Authority shall be provided in such temporary structures.
33. All electrical installations and equipment will comply with the general requirements at the Electricity at Work Regulations 1989 and with the general provisions of the Event Safety Guide or any replacement guidance. The Premises Licence Holder will employ competent persons to assess the electrical requirements at the event and the compatibility of the electrical supply with the equipment used and take all reasonable measures to ensure so far as is reasonably practicable the safety of all persons at the event.
34. All generators on the Licensed Premises shall be diesel driven.

FIRE SAFETY

35. Suitable and sufficient firefighting provision will be produced and maintained on the Licensed Premises for the duration of each event to the satisfaction of the Fire and Rescue Service.
36. The Fire Retardency characteristics of all tents, drapes and scenery used in or on any temporary structures will be to the satisfaction of the Fire and Rescue Service.
37. The siting of all vehicles, generators, tents, marquees etc., shall be to the satisfaction of the Fire and Rescue Service.
38. Concessions with cooking facilities shall be positioned to the satisfaction of the Fire and Rescue Service.

39. No special effects including lasers, strobe lights, stage pyro, smoke, vapour or fireworks shall be used without the prior approval of the Licensing Authority and the Fire and Rescue Service.

SAFETY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

40. The Licensed Premises shall accord with "the Event Safety Guide - A Guide to health Safety and Welfare at Music and Similar Events" (HSG 195-ISBN 0-7176 -2453-6) in consultation with and to the satisfaction of the SAG prior to the Event and on the day of the Event the ELT.
41. The Premises Licence Holder when requested by the Licensing Authority, shall provide evidence that the Built Environment is being effectively maintained.
42. The Built Environment shall not be altered without the written consent of the Licensing Authority.

HEALTH AND SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

43. The Licensed Premises shall conform to all relevant provisions of current Health and Safety legislation in respect of persons employed in or visiting the venue and the Premises Licence Holder shall comply with all such legislation and the reasonable requests of the Health and Safety Inspectorate.
44. The Premises Licence Holder shall maintain good order in the Licensed Premises and shall appoint a staff of competent stewards for this purpose. The stewards shall be not less than 18 years of age, shall be adequately trained and instructed in their duties, briefed thoroughly before the performance starts and shall wear distinctive dress (badges or armbands are not a sufficient means of identification). They shall be controlled from the central control point and shall be under the control of supervisors, equipped with suitable means of communication to the Event Control Team. While on duty they shall not be engaged on other activities which would prevent them from carrying out these functions. All stewards shall be made aware of the position and arrangements for First Aid. Stewards shall be positioned at all exits and at key points where control is most needed, particularly in a central area near the stage. Stewards shall exercise proper control over the audience.
45. Sufficient stewards shall be available to ensure that all access and exit routes are kept clear until the site is completely cleared.
46. The arrangements for control of crowds and vehicles inside the Licensed Premises shall be to the satisfaction of the ELT.

MEDICAL AND FIRST AID PROVISION

47. The Premises Licence Holder will appoint a suitably competent provider to manage and provide suitably staffed and equipped medical/first aid facilities to the satisfaction of the SAG.

SANITARY PROVISION

48. The Premises Licence Holder shall ensure that adequate sanitary provisions and hand cleansing facilities are provided for the number of people expected to attend the event to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority. Toilets shall be kept in good order and repair and serviced throughout the event to ensure they are kept safe, clean and hygienic. Toilets shall be supplied with toilet paper, in a holder or dispenser at all times. The quantity of toilets provided will be at least the number advised in the Purple Guide.

STAGING OF STRUCTURES

49. Details of all temporary structures (including stages) will be included in the EMP.

VEHICLE MOVEMENT

50. Vehicle movement within the Licensed Premises will be limited to those which are essential and will be controlled to ensure safety of the public and staff. Vehicles moving within public areas will require a Banksman at all times.

DISABLED PERSONS

51. The Premises Licence Holder will ensure that arrangements and provision for disabled persons, namely access and egress, sanitation facilities and viewing areas are provided and maintained for each event to the satisfaction of the SAG.

REFRESHMENT FACILITIES

52. The siting of all concessions will be in consultation with the SAG and Fire and Rescue Service.
53. All food concessions will be available for inspection at times suitable to the Council's Environmental Health Officers. Any food concession not complying with food safety or occupation Health and Safety at Work Requirements will be closed upon request of the appropriate Environmental Health Officer.
54. Glass vessels shall not be used in any area of the Site that is open to the public.
55. One drinking tap shall be provided for each 3,000 persons and a drinking water supply shall be available at the first aid point.

SITE ACCESS AND EGRESS

56. A Transport Plan including a Traffic Management Plan will be provided within the Event Management Plan.

SIGNAGE

57. Suitable notices shall be provided throughout the Licensed Premises to indicate clearly the location of all available services and facilities such as sanitary accommodation, refreshments, drinking water, first aid points and exits, all of which shall be clearly signposted.
58. All on site signage will comply with the appropriate guidance given in the Event Safety Guide (or any subsequent replacement guidance).

EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION

59. The Premises Licence Holder shall ensure sufficient landline telephones are available at Event Control to enable communication to and from the site should the loss of mobile communication incur.
60. A CCTV system shall be operated throughout the Event and full details of the system including retention of data and access to the data shall be contained in the EMP.

Prevention of Public Nuisance

61. The Premises Licence Holder shall set the day time maximum level of noise to 75dB(A) 15 minutes LAeq.
62. The Premises Licence Holder shall set objectives in the Noise Management Plan to avoid a night time (after 23:00 hrs), noise offence under the Noise Act 1996, as amended.

63. Noise from music and associated sources (such as DJ's and amplified voices) must not be audible to such an extent that it constitutes a nuisance at any noise sensitive properties.
64. Within the timescale specified by the Licensing Authority the Premises Licence Holder will provide a Noise Management Plan which will specify details of the steps that the Premises Licence Holder will take to prevent the likelihood of disturbance by noise.
65. A named person shall be delegated the responsibility of noise control during a concert and during sound tests. The person shall control the sound levels at the mixer throughout the period of the concert and ensure that the agreed levels are not exceeded. This person shall be capable of communicating with an assistant positioned outside the Premises location who will be monitoring noise levels at local residential dwellings.
66. The Premises Licence Holder shall carry out a sound propagation test prior to the event to determine a maximum sound level at the mixer which is required to achieve the external conditions. The Licensing Authority and the Premises Licence Holder shall agree the maximum level.
67. The Premises Licence Holder shall give at least 3 days prior notification to the Licensing Authority's Head of Wellbeing of the intended dates and the times of the testing of the amplification and control system.
68. Continuous monitoring and control shall take place at the mixer location. The equipment shall provide for the recording of 1 minute LAeq sound levels on a Type 1 sound level meter connected to a level recorder that shall be in a view of the Sound Engineers.
69. External noise monitoring shall be undertaken at 1 meter from agreed residential facades during the course of the concert to ensure that the maximum permitted 15 minute LAeq is not exceeded.
70. With regard to the exposure of employees and audience to noise, the requirements of the Guide to Health and Safety and Welfare at Pop Concerts and similar events must be complied with.
71. The musical performance shall start no earlier and shall terminate no later than the times agreed in the Noise Management Plan without the prior consent of the Licensing Authority
72. The Premises Licence Holder shall write to the SAG and the Licensing Authority at least 28 days before each concert day, the letter shall contain pre-event information, including but not limited to when sound checks may be conducted, the times of the performance and associated firework displays and a hot-line number. Once agreed with the Licensing Authority and the SAG, the Premises Licence Holder shall write to residents of streets specified by the Licensing Authority at least 14 days before the first consent day with the pre-event information..
73. The sound checks shall take place only at the times agreed by the Licensing Authority.
74. At least 28 days prior to any event involving lighting or fireworks visible outside the Licensed Premises a scheme containing full details of such lighting or fireworks shall be submitted by the Premises Licence Holder to the Licensing Authority for approval, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed and any such scheme shall be implemented as approved.
75. No firework displays at the end of an event shall be held without the consent of the Licensing Authority.
76. At least 28 days prior to the event a scheme for collection and clearance of litter shall be submitted by the Premises Licence Holder to the Licensing Authority for approval, such approval.
77. The Premises Licence Holder will appoint a litter management company which will produce a litter management plan for the Licensed Premises. The litter management plan will include

sufficient suitably trained and equipped staff who will be employed to collect litter during and after the event. This will include areas outside the licensed site including neighbouring residential areas.

78. The Premises Licence Holder will also ensure that waste generated from sanitary facilities is properly disposed of with details being contained in the Event Management Plan.
79. At least 28 days prior to any event a scheme (a dispersal policy) based on a risk assessment undertaken by the concert organisers for the stewarding of the adjoining areas on the day(s) of the concert(s) shall be submitted by the Premises Licence Holder to and agreed by the SAG, relevant Responsible Authorities (including Sussex Police) and the Licensing Authority.
80. Stewarding shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme save for any amendments or variations at the direction of the event control or security teams for the concert made necessary in the interests of the safety or security of persons attending the concert or living in the immediate vicinity of the Licensed Premises by circumstances arising on the day(s) of the Event.
81. A dedicated landline will be provided and monitored by the event organiser, throughout the opening times of the event. This will facilitate direct communication with the event organisers for members of the public who may need to report matters of concern regarding noise nuisance etc. and for Responsible Authorities. This number will be clearly advertised and provided to local residents prior to the Event taking place.

The Protection of Children from Harm

82. Those under 16 year old are not be allowed into the site without being accompanied by a responsible adult aged over 18 years.

ALCOHOL

83. In all cases where a person under the age of 16 attempts to gain access without an adult or seems to be intoxicated, Site Welfare Staff will be requested to assist to ensure the welfare and safety of that individual.
84. The "Challenge 25" Policy will be robustly enforced. Bar staff shall ask for proof of age ID whenever the customer appears to be under 25 years old.
85. The alcohol policy for all events will take all reasonable steps to minimise the likelihood of supply or consumption of alcohol by persons under 18.
86. The Premises Licence Holder shall prominently display notices at bars stating it is an offence to purchase or attempt to purchase alcohol for anybody under 18.
87. All staff employed in the sale of alcohol will be fully trained regarding age restricted sales and sales to persons who are drunk. All sales training undertaken by staff members shall be fully documented and recorded prior to being allowed to sell alcohol, all training records shall be made available from officers from the Licensing Authority, Trading Standards and Sussex Police.
88. Soft drinks and free drinking water shall be available on the Licensed Premises as an alternative to alcohol.

WELFARE

90. At the point of sale of tickets for events recommendations will be given upon the suitability of the entertainment and the attendance of children.

91. At events when children are present, parents and guardians will be advised to instruct children to contact security, stewards, police or first aiders if they become separated.
92. Staff at the event will be briefed with the protocol for appropriately escorting and caring for children until they are reunited with parents / guardians.