

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing on behalf of the Chalk Lane Area Residents Association (CLARA) committee regarding the above licence application and to object to the licence being issued.

I understand from an email sent by Ellie Green dated 8th June 2017, for a representation to be relevant, it must be one that is about the likely effect of the application on the promotion of the four licensing objectives, namely:

Protection of Children from Harm.

Public Safety

Prevention of crime or disorder

Prevention of nuisance.

However, I would respectfully point out that neither of the two versions of the Blue notices that have been attached to the gateway of Trent Park explained this criteria for objection or confirmed that representations could be made via email to licensing@enfield.gov.uk.

With regards to the above, our objections are as follows:

(1) CLARA objects principally on the grounds of public nuisance and safety. This event, where very large numbers of attendees have been consuming alcohol from up to 11 hours, poses real risks to public order and safety, particularly in view of the logistical constraints of the site. Our residents have also been exposed to intimidation and offensive behaviour in the past with little visible police presence to deter this. The Marshals outside of the event could not perform their jobs because of intimidation from some attendees when arriving and leaving. Residents find themselves to be exposed to an intimidating environment especially at the event end when large numbers of people are leaving. Expanding the event from 12,500 last year to 15,000 this year is irresponsible in the face of existing concerns. Feedback from last year's events, regarding resident's intimidation, are documented and were accepted by both the council and last year's organisers at a debrief last Autumn. At a meeting with this year's organisers which took place on 5th June we were advised that agreements to resolve these issues which were made with last year's organisers would not necessarily be honoured.

(2) At our meeting with the organisers and the council on the 5th June we were advised that the organisers had yet to meet with and confirm the final number of Police that would be available both within Trent Park and available to manage the local neighbourhood both during and after the event. We were promised by both the council and the last years organisers that this information would be available before the licence application and certainly before 6th March.

(3) It is clear from last year's events that the organisers had great difficulty dealing with the basic requirements of a crowd of 12500 attendees. From the basics of actually getting them in within a reasonable timescale, at the correct start time, providing basic human needs such as water and having a manageable process for gaining refreshments the organisers accepted that they failed. So much so that that company owner accepted and publicly stated that he was pleased that he had cancelled the 2nd day of the concert as he would not have wanted a repeat of the first day's failures.

The organisers of this years event have obviously accepted that there was failures which were identified by both us and Facebook feedback. They have made a big point of telling all possible attendees on their website what improvements they have made in order to address the issues. However, they have yet to test them to see if the changes work but are still insisting that the Saturday crowd should increase by 2500 to 15000 and there should be a second days' concert.

At our presentation to the licensing committee last year we asked that the licence should only be awarded for a one day concert and then if the organisers proved they could organise all of the events of the day then this year possibly a two-day licence could be considered. The licence was issued for a two-day event and then for commercial reasons the second day was cancelled this is just as well when you consider the above. We do not believe that either the numbers of attendees should be increased from last year or that a second days' licence should be considered until such time as the organisers have demonstrated that they can actually manage all aspects of an event such as those applied for. As was accepted by the organisers last year, if the crowd within the concert are upset that reflects badly on the possible implications for the local residents as the crowd leaves site.

(4) It was made clear at our meeting with the event organisers and the council on the 5th June that the organisers had yet to meet with TFL and organise transport for the proposed 15000 people on the Saturday and the proposed 10,000 people for the Sunday. We would challenge the professionalism of any event organiser who admits to not having made an agreement with the main transport organiser with less than 8 week to go before the proposed events and consider the implications of this matter as a major safety item.

(5) One of last year's conditions included by the Licensing Sub Committee was that there should a robust written policy for noise and that final written policies shall be provided to local residents on request. Quite simply that didn't happen and when this condition of the licence was challenged a hurried meeting with the organisers was arranged for 12 o'clock on the day of the event. An agreement was cobbled together. In order to avoid this happening again an agreement was made with both the council and the previous organisers regarding both the noise policy and how it would be monitored and measured. We were promised a document confirming this by the 6th March and

offered the facility to monitor the noise levels on site. The new organiser has advised us that this agreement would not be accepted by them and that we would not be allowed the monitoring facility promised. To date we have not received any policy at all on noise. As proved by the concert held two years ago Noise is a big issue for both the residents of Cockfosters and Oakwood. It is clear to us that even though the licence applicant was part of the group which made the original agreement the fact that they have advised us that they will not be able to comply with it now is an indication of their commitment to be reasonable with the views of residents. We therefore object to likely noise levels likely to be incurred by the local residents should this concert go ahead

(6) Again, at our meeting of the 5th June with both the council and the event organisers we were promised that we would receive from both parties more information relating to the detail of the event in order that we could circulate that information to members and consider the implications prior to the closing date for submissions. We were also promised minutes of our meeting. We have had neither and therefore must assume that the information gained on the 5th June is the latest information available and will be the information submitted to the licensing committee for their consideration. That being the case we do not accept that the level of security marshals stated on the licence application are sufficient for an increased audience size or for the current raised national security risk. In addition, there is no mention of additional security for the outside of the concert site. Last year most fencing and portable toilets were covered in Graffiti during the evenings/night time demonstrating how easy it was to access the outside of the showground without being noticed. In addition added security for the main residential areas outside of the park is not included within the licence application and therefore we object to the additional security risk that local residents would have during the main access and exit periods.

In addition to the above objections, we would also like the Licensing Sub Committee to be aware of the failures identified with this licence application on the Councils own web site. During our meeting with senior council Officers and licensing on the 5th June 2017, we advised of the following:

!1) The details of this licence application posted on the Enfield Council website and referred to on the blue notice displayed on the entrance to Trent Park incorrectly stated that for recorded music and performance of dance that this application was for the Friday and Saturday. This should have been Saturday and Sunday. Therefore, anybody reading the Enfield Council website would not have been provided with the correct information.

(2) The field stating, "Maximum Numbers" had not been completed and therefore anyone seeking further information would not have gained any further information than was posted on the Blue Posters.

Our view is that identifying the fact that there would be a total of 25,000 attendees over the two days is a crucial consideration to most residents.

(3) The Blue Poster displayed on the gateway of Trent Park states that the application is posted on the Councils website. The application and its details were not posted on its web site. What was posted on the web site was a licence register and the bare details of the event. Only after asking

licensing directly for the application itself were we able to see a copy of the application and its detail.

(4) The Council website also has a section headed "Have Your Say" and invites you to "Select the representation section" and make your relevant representation. The representation section does not exist and therefore cannot be used.

(5) We have had many discussions with Licensing regarding the positioning of the Blue Posters advising of the licence application. We accept and always have done that a poster was displayed on the entrance of Trent Park. What we don't accept is that the majority of other posters were positioned in areas where there is no pavement, and most certainly were not positioned where they could be conveniently read. We remain of the opinion that neither the wording or the spirit of the act have been complied with.

CLARA as a resident's association received a commitment from Senior Officers within the council and the event organisers that prior to a licence application they would be consulted. CLARA as representative on the Stakeholders group were also given an undertaking that they would be consulted prior to this licence application. Not only were we not consulted we were not even advised that the original organisers had gone into liquidation, that a new company had been formed to take over the event and that the Sunday event would Moon Dance or that a licence application had been submitted. It was only after a committee member noticed the poster on Trent park gates on or around the 23rd May that we became aware of the application. After contacting council officers the earliest meeting date offered was 5th June just three days before the consultation period ended. We therefore asked for an extension of 28 days to the consultation period in order to arrange an open meeting with our members and gain the requested information regarding the event structure. This was rejected and we were advised that an extension of the consultation period was not possible. That was until we received an email at 7pm on the 8th of June advising us that the consultation period had been extended for 1 week. Unfortunately, no further information has been presented by the Council or the event organisers for us to consider.

Having considered the above and all of the failures with the licensing process, we do not believe that CLARA has been afforded proper time to consult with members because of what we regard as a blatant disregard of stakeholder consultation processes which were agreed (and documented) with senior council officers. We further assert that the license consultation has been improperly handled in that proper disclosure of information and soliciting of objections from the public and other interested stakeholders has not been designed to result in any input: In fact, it has effectively discouraged comment from concerned individuals. On contacting licensing, approximately 2 days before the original consultation period was due to end on the 8th June 2017, I was advised that at that time no representations had been received. Proof if it were needed that the consultation for this licence application has been ineffective.

In addition to the above, during our meeting with the Council and Licensing we advised that an advert in the Enfield Independent was ineffective in the license application area as the newspaper was not circulated within the Cockfosters. We requested that as had happened over the two previous years, a flyer or newsletter should be prepared and sent to all local residents providing information regarding the event and the licence application. As we had not received a response an email was sent to the council on 9th June requesting again that a newsletter be sent. A letter was received by residents on the 13th June. Unfortunately, the information provided did not confirm any details of the event other than the basic licence information. Therefore, with two days to go residents were still not told the details of the proposed event or even given an indication of the numbers of attendees. However, they were referred to the blue notices on the gate at Trent Park for further information. Apart from the events timing no further information was available on the blue posters. Another opportunity to provide quality information avoided.

Yours faithfully

CLARA