

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS,
HERTFORD ON FRIDAY 19 DECEMBER
2025, AT 10.00 AM

PRESENT: Councillor S Marlow (Chair)
Councillors M Connolly and C Redfern

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Michele Aves | - Committee Support Officer |
| Erica Carter | - Committee Support Officer |
| Ally Darwood | - Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer |
| Peter Mannings | - Committee Support Officer |
| Dimple Roopchand | - Litigation and Advisory Lawyer |

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| David Dadds | - Solicitor for the Applicant (PLH) |
| Geoff Cox | - Tracsis Events Traffic Management (PLH) |
| Steve Durham | - Promotor (PLH) |
| Paul Haggars | - Interested Party |
| Gareth Hance | - Electric Star Acoustic Consultant (PLH) |
| Chris Hayden | - Interested Party |
| Dianne Heath | - Interested Party |
| Nathan Howson | - Inspector for the Neighbourhood Policing Team for |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Claudia Langford | East Herts (RA) - Far and Beyond event producer (PLH) |
| Jack May | - Head of Events at Far and Beyond (PLH) |
| Claire Ramirez | - Licensing Sergeant for Hertfordshire Constabulary (RA) |
| Keith St Pier | - Chairman of Tewin Parish Council (Interested Party) |
| Jeff Tipper | - Interested Party |
| Jack Williams | - Tewinbury (PLH) |
| Sue Wilson | - Interested Party |

8 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Connolly proposed and Councillor Redfern seconded, a motion that Councillor Marlow be appointed Chair of the Licensing Sub-Committee for the meeting.

RESOLVED – that Councillor Marlow be appointed Chair of the Licensing Sub-Committee for the meeting.

9 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair welcomed all to the hearing and reminded participants to use the microphone when speaking so that they could be heard on the webcast. He confirmed that there were no planned fire drills.

11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

12 SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

The Chair drew the hearings attention to the Summary of Procedure which was included in the agenda pack at pages 5 to 7.

13 APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE FOR SOUND LIVE LIMITED, TEWIN BURY FARM, HERTFORD ROAD, TEWIN, HERTFORDSHIRE, AL6 0JB

The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer presented a report on the application submitted by Sound Live Limited, for a festival at Tewin Bury Farm, Hertford Road, Tewin, Hertfordshire, AL6 0JB.

The applicant's legal representative interjected the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer's summary, requesting that the hearing be adjourned to enable him a short recess with the Committee's legal advisor.

It was proposed by Councillor Marlow and seconded by Councillor Connolly that the hearing be adjourned for 10 minutes to allow the applicant's legal advisor recess with the Committee's legal advisor. Having been proposed and seconded, this motion was put to the meeting and upon a vote being taken, was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the hearing be adjourned for 10 minutes.

The hearing was advised that the applicant had been given the option for a new Licensing Sub-Committee to be convened at a later date, however, it was confirmed that the applicant was happy to proceed with the hearing if the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer retracted his initial opening commentary and this information be disregarded.

The Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer said that he was happy to retract his comments and he re started

his presentation.

There were no questions to the Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer from the Sub-Committee, the applicant, the interested parties or the responsible authority.

The applicant's legal representative made his submission in support of the application and, along with input from the applicant's team, he answered questions from the Sub-Committee, the responsible authority, interested parties and officers.

It was proposed by Councillor Connolly and seconded by Councillor Redfern that the hearing be adjourned for 10 minutes to allow a comfort break. Having been proposed and seconded, this motion was put to the meeting and upon a vote being taken, was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the hearing be adjourned for 10 minutes.

The responsible authority made their submission on behalf of Hertfordshire Police Constabulary and answered questions from the applicant's legal representative and the Sub-Committee. There were no questions from the interested parties or officers.

It was proposed by Councillor Marlow and seconded by Councillor Redfern that the hearing be adjourned until 14:30 hours to enable participants' lunch. Having been proposed and seconded, this motion was put to the meeting and upon a vote being taken, was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED – that the hearing be adjourned for until 14:30 hours.

The applicant's legal representative said that the applicant was willing to modify his application - to one year, to expire on 1 August 2026.

The interested parties gave their submissions. There were no questions from the applicant, the Sub-Committee, responsible authorities or officers.

All parties were invited to give their closing statements in the following order:

- Interested parties
- Responsible authority
- Applicant

In line with the procedure, Sub-Committee Members retired to consider the case. They were accompanied by the Committee Support Officers and the Sub-Committee's legal advisor.

The Sub-Committee reconvened in public session. The Chair asked the applicant's legal advisor if he had drafted the conditions pertaining to ticketing transport options over the lunch break as he had initiated.

The applicant's legal advisor said that he would draft such conditions, which in essence would encourage festival goers to purchase transport tickets with their event tickets, and email these to the Sub-Committee's legal advisor in the next ten minutes.

The Chair said that the Sub-Committee were yet to finish their deliberations and were therefore not able to determine the application by 5pm. He said that their decision would therefore be received by the applicant within 5 working days.

Decision of the Licensing Sub Committee

The Licensing Sub-Committee has determined to refuse the premises licence application for the following reasons:

REASONS FOR DECISION

1. The Licensing Sub Committee considered all of the evidence before it including the oral and written representations made by the applicant, the Responsible Authority and the Interested Parties. Members had regard to the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Licensing Act 2003 and the guidance promulgated pursuant to Section 182 of that Act.
2. Members noted that the site plan submitted with the application and referenced within Appendix B was an indicative plan of the site layout and was subject to change. It was only a draft proposed document and therefore Members could not reasonably assess or evaluate the promotion of the licensing objectives for the proposed event alongside the application, the proposed licensing conditions offered up by the Applicant, and the additional amendments and further conditions offered up throughout the hearing.
3. The map of the proposed licensable area at Appendix C did not in the Members view conform with Regulation 23 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Premises licences and club premises certificates) Regulation 2005 which requires that an application for a premises licence under section 17 of the Licensing Act shall be accompanied by the plan of the premises to which the application relates and should include, amongst other things: the extent of the boundary; the location of points of access to and egress from the premises; the location of the escape routes; in cases where the premises are used for more than one licensable activity, the area within the premises which will be used for each activity; and the location and height of each staged area. Members noted that the plan accompanying the application was incomplete. Members were informed that this plan will be amended as the planning of the event takes place. Members were mindful that if the licence

was granted, this plan would be attached to the licence and any changes to the plan will require the Applicant to submit an application to vary the application to attach amended plans.

4. Members concluded that the Applicant's approach in this licensing process was very uncertain and variable due to the Applicant's supply of draft and indicative plans and making fundamental changes to their application during the hearing process. This left many unresolved issues which need to be determined by the Applicant before the plans and proposals could be effectively evaluated by the parties and thereafter the Licensing Sub Committee. On this basis, Members were unable to properly assess the relevance of the representations submitted by various parties alongside the applications and submissions made by the Applicant during the hearing.
5. The draft TMP submitted by the Applicant after the expiry of the consultation period was not comprehensive and did not truly reflect the representations made on behalf of the Applicant at the hearing. For example:
 - The viability of the proposed road closures suggested within the TMP and those stated at the hearing have not been consulted with the Highway's authority,
 - No parking drop off and pick-up areas have been identified or confirmed,
 - No proposed calculations have been done to ascertain which mode of transport will be used by the numbers of people that would be attending,
 - No adverse weather condition considerations have been included,
 - There was no information for Members to assess how emergency vehicles will access the site,

- There was ambiguity between the mode of transport option being conditional upon buying a ticket to the event.

Members were unable to satisfy themselves that the public safety licensing objective would be satisfactorily met when the Applicant has stated that they expect people to turn up in vehicles but have not provided any mitigation save to say this will be discussed and agreed with the SAG. The control measures that the Applicant has said they will put in place to prevent people from getting to and from the event were unclear and the concern was that the public would, when purchasing a ticket, be signposted to transport links which at this stage had not been clearly identified and thought through by the Applicant.

6. Another concern that the Members had was in regard to capacity. The consultation was for 19,999, whilst the draft TMP noted capacity to be limited to 12,500 for Saturday and 8,000 for Sunday. In contrast the draft conditions submitted by Applicant on 18/12 notes capacity to be 15,000 and during the hearing the Applicant proposed that capacity is to be 14,000 on Saturday and 12,000 on Sunday but they still want to apply for 19,999. Members were concerned because public and Responsible Authorities (other than the Police) have not been notified of these proposed changes. Members were unable to consider the application in light of all capacity changes and that no detailed site plan or risk assessments have been carried out to ascertain whether the site is actually suitable to hold such an event of this scale.
7. Throughout the Applicant's submissions a lot of emphasis was placed on how other festivals have been managed, although not by this Applicant and this did not provide sufficient assurance to the

committee that this application was being given the detailed consideration in terms of the local characteristics. For example:

- The area is not serviced by A roads
- The area is a single carriageway,
- It is a flood plain area, and the River Mimram runs through the event site,
- There are narrow bridges in the vicinity of the event location.

8. Members noted that the Applicant was a newly formed company with limited experience and were concerned that whilst the Applicant was happy for the Members to condition that the decisions regarding the EMP, TMP and SMP should be left to the Police and the SAG to have the final veto over whether the event can go ahead, Members are very mindful that the SAG and/or the Police have no statutory authority to prevent the Applicant from continuing with the event.
9. Members noted that paragraph 9.34 of the s.182 Guidance and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy encourages early engagement with Responsible Authorities as being an important element of the licensing process, particularly before applications are submitted so that the mediation process can begin before the statutory time limits come into effect after submission of the application. Applicants are expected to have considered the location and community it is proposing to operate in and Members felt if the Applicant had undertaken such measures, then a lot of the issues identified throughout the hearing could have been resolved in advance of the hearing. The Sub-Committee felt it was unable to carefully consider whether the promotion of the Licensing objectives has been fulfilled by this application when there is so much uncertainty before them.

- 10. Members had regard to the updated s.182 regarding the promotion of growth and delivery of economic benefits. However, whilst there was some merit to this, members felt this application and its lack of planning could also undermine potential business growth in the future. Members also noted that this is not a licensing objective consideration.
- 11. Prior to reaching the decision to refuse the licence, Members gave consideration to whether the imposition of conditions would alleviate their concerns over the promotion of the licensing objectives. However, Members formed the view that that they could not regulate the licensed premises and/or tailor the conditions to this application when it was unclear what would be reasonable, proportionate, appropriate and relevant especially when there was so much evidence from the Applicant that the plans submitted are in draft and indicative form.

14 URGENT BUSINESS

There were no urgent items.

The meeting closed at 4.58 pm

| |
|----------------|
| Chairman |
| Date |