

# Trent Park Conservation Committee

The Licencing Committee  
c/o Ms E Green – Licencing Department  
London Borough of Enfield  
Civic Centre  
Silver Street  
Enfield

15<sup>th</sup> June 2017

Sirs/ Madams,

## **Licencing of the Mad Husky Events – 51<sup>st</sup> State 5<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and Moon Dance 6<sup>th</sup> August 2017**

Trent Park Conservation Committee (TPCC) has asked me to write expressing their objections to the above mentioned events.

I represented TPCC at the meeting with council officers on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2017 along with The Friends of Trent Country Park (FoTCP) and Chalk Lane Residents Association (CLARA).

TPCC have had sight of the documents stating the objections from both FoTCP and CLARA and have expressed their full support for those documents.

TPCC have looked at the four areas that are allowed for comment / objection, i.e. Protection of children from harm, Public safety, Prevention of crime or disorder and Prevention of nuisance. We concluded that four matters identified below all impact in some measure on all the areas allowed for objection. A leading concern throughout has been adequate security, which we observe has been inadequate at this event over the past two years. This year the projected numbers attending on the Saturday are up again by 20%. We would remind LBE that the Knebworth Music Festival was closed because the costs of providing adequate security made the event uneconomic.

TPCC have the following objections. These are in addition to those made by CLARA and FoTCP which already have our support:-

1. Mad Husky Ltd. Is a £100 company recently formed with one share holder and therefore no corporate record of running events. This is clearly a financial insulation vehicle for the owner who on questioning at the meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> June 2017 mentioned above, failed to give adequate assurances of any financial substance. It is therefore obvious that Mad Husky Ltd is solely financially reliant on revenue from ticket sales and sale of goods on the event days. We would further point out that the company which previously ran the event became financially insolvent leaving a trail of indebtedness, as described by the sole owner of Mad Husky Ltd. The two previous events in 2016 and 2105 had inadequate marshalling and policing outside the event arena. The details of this are known to LBE. In particular the egress of attendees after the events has caused problems with, public safety, crime and disorder and nuisance to local inhabitants and businesses. This financially fragile company have so far failed to offer detailed plans for resolving these matters. We therefore submit that it would be reckless of the council to proceed with these events backed by this company.

2. We were advised by Mr N Mcdonagh , who is working for Mad Husky Ltd, that they had not at the above mentioned meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June, managed to arrange a meeting with TfL. Without TfL's specific involvement in the planning of these two events, the bringing in and taking away a high proportion of the 15,000 attendees a day will not be viable. Without TfLs involvement the problems for the organisers at both the ingress and egress from the event would be multiplied. All aspects of public safety and nuisance would be at risk. It would therefore be a dereliction of the council's duty to the people of the borough to consider the licence application until clear and acceptable undertakings by TfL are in place.
3. We were advised at the above mentioned meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June that the number of VIP vehicles that would be parked in the field on the west side of Snakes Lane has been increased from 300 to 500. No mention was made of Snakes Lane being the main vehicle emergency route if an incident took place at either of the proposed events. The potential for the marshals to lose control of a dangerous situation does not appear to have been factored into the proposals. TPCC note that on busy nights at the Hockey Club with less than 10% of proposed vehicular traffic, very considerable traffic builds up at the exit from Snakes Lane. The potential for risk to public safety and disorder are clear. Until clear and tested plans to deal with the potential traffic situation in the event of a incident are in place, LBE should ensure that it has not created a liability for itself by granting a licence to hold these events.
4. TPCC noted the lack of a comprehensive risk assessment document for discussion at the above mentioned meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> June. This committee believes that until the risk assessment has passed the scrutiny of the TCP Stake Holder Group, it is premature to put the licencing issue before the Licencing Committee. All four reasons for objection are integral to risk assessment.

Yours faithfully,

Chairman

CC by email; CLARA  
FoTCP  
SHC  
Cockfosters ward councillors  
Bambos Charalambos MP  
licencing@enfield.gov.uk  
xxxxxxx