

MINUTES

of the

LICENSING COMMITTEE HEARING

held on 19th September 2025 at 11am

Present:

Councillor D. Clark (Chair of Hearing)

Councillors H. Clark, R. Lee and

P. Wilson

1. **Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received.

2. **Declaration of Interests**

All Members were reminded to declare any interests where appropriate in any items of business on the meeting's agenda. None were made.

3. **Minutes**

The minutes of the hearing held on 8th August 2025 were approved as a correct record.

4. **Licensing Act 2003 – Application to Review a Premises Licence - Chelmsford City Racecourse, Moulsham Hall Lane, Great Leighs, Chelmsford, CM3 1QP**

The Committee considered an application for a review of the premises licence under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003, made by Essex Police and had regard to the representations made during the consultation period. These related to the promotion of the below Licensing objectives.

- a) The prevention of crime and disorder
- b) Public safety
- c) The prevention of public nuisance
- d) The protection of children from harm

It was noted by the Committee that there were five options namely;

- Modify the conditions of the licence (either permanently or for up to three months)
- Exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence, (either permanently or for a period not exceeding three months).
- Remove the designated premises supervisor.
- Suspend the licence for up to three months.
- Revoke the licence.

The below parties attended and took part in the hearing:

- Applicant
- Licence Holder
- Other responsible authorities who had made representations
- Members of the public who had made representations

The Committee was informed that the application for review had been submitted by Essex Police after an incident on Friday 4 July 2025. On this day there was a large-scale music event at Chelmsford City Racecourse which was marked by serious operational failures. Traffic management plans (TMP) were not adhered to, leaving attendees trapped in the car park for hours without staff support. Vehicles were abandoned on local roads, causing disruption and danger to residents and road users. Stewarding and security provisions were inadequate, with attendees directed onto the A131 dual carriageway and some crossing live traffic lanes. The Committee were also shown drone footage which showed members of the public crossing the A131.

Essex Police stated that despite prior engagement through Safety Advisory Group (SAG) meetings, many agreed measures were not implemented. The organisers failed to resource sufficient security and traffic management and displayed poor command and control.

Essex Police requested that stringent new conditions be imposed on the Chelmsford City Racecourse premises licence to address the risks identified. They sought to restrict attendance at any future music event to a maximum of 5,000 patrons, arguing that the venue and surrounding infrastructure could not safely accommodate larger crowds. They also required a comprehensive traffic and event management plan to be submitted at least 12 weeks in advance to Chelmsford City Council, Essex Police, Essex County Council Highways, and the Council's Business Compliance Team. Licensable activity would not be permitted if any of these bodies raised a written objection within six weeks of submission, unless that objection was later withdrawn. This requirement was intended to ensure hazards were identified, risks were properly assessed, and effective controls were in place to protect public safety. Essex Police stressed that without these restrictions, the site posed an unacceptable risk of further incidents, including serious injury or fatality, given its location beside the A131 and its history of repeated traffic and safety failures.

The committee heard the representations made by responsible authorities, local councillors and members of the public.

The Licensing Authority supported the review, noting that while the EMP was signed off by the SAG, in practice it was not followed. This caused serious safety failings, particularly in traffic management. Although there had been no previous licence reviews previously, concerns around traffic have been raised for years. The Authority stressed that public safety had been undermined, highlighting footage of abandoned vehicles and pedestrians walking on the A131. Noise was less of a concern as levels were compliant, but the Authority recommended restricting capacity for music events to 5,000 to ensure risks are manageable.

The Business Compliance Team at Chelmsford City Council shared that issues had been raised about insufficient car park lighting, lack of segregation between vehicles

and pedestrians, poor signage, and security staff being unaware of welfare facilities such as water points. It was stressed that, as the holder of the licence, failures in the TMP were attributed to them and not the contractors. It was noted these failings breached health and safety duties, and the team argued the capacity cap of 5,000 should apply across all large events, not just those exceeding 10,000 attendees.

Essex Highways emphasised that safe arrival and exit was ultimately the responsibility of the event organiser, regardless of the use of Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs). While traffic orders could assist, they are insufficient if the organiser's plan is not executed effectively. The Authority reported repeated complaints from residents and stated that although plans were drawn up, they consistently failed in practice.

The remaining representations reported widespread disruption and poor management during the events, including gridlock in Great Leighs, cars blocking driveways, abandoned vehicles, and large numbers of pedestrians walking on roads. They felt community engagement had been a tick-box exercise and that the racecourse failed to take responsibility, instead blaming contractors. Concerns were raised over whether the issue lay in a poor plan, a failure to implement a workable plan, or the site itself being unsuitable for such large-scale events. While noise was generally within acceptable levels, the overriding concern was public safety, with repeated calls for reduced capacity and stricter conditions to ensure events could be managed safely in future.

The Licence holder opened by sharing their apologies to drivers who experienced long delays, to nearby residents affected, and to responsible authorities. They accepted that the event did not go to plan and stated it was not acceptable. They emphasised that such failings would not be repeated, that expert support would be used in future, and that the review process was welcomed as an opportunity to learn and adjust.

The Licence Holder stated that they had hosted many successful race days and cultural events with large attendances and had never previously faced a licence review. The licence holder argued that the recent live event was an exception, not representative of their usual management.

It was stated that the licence holder had assembled a highly experienced senior management team and engaged leading contractors for health and safety, traffic management, security, noise, and medical provision. They said the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) process involved senior representatives across all disciplines, and on paper the Traffic and Event Management Plans (EMP) were deemed satisfactory. They stressed that the site itself ran smoothly.

The licence holder accepted that the main failing was the TMP not being delivered as agreed by their supplier. They noted additional steps were taken, including signage on the A131, reduced speed limits, agreements with Essex Police for two cars and two motorbikes to patrol the road, and hostile vehicle mitigation barriers. They argued the failures arose from contractors not implementing plans, two local nearby vehicle fires and illegal parking. This led to gridlock and pedestrians walking on the carriageway. They stressed they were not reckless and had relied on expert suppliers, but the strategy was not delivered on the day.

The licence holder proposed some amendments to the licence designed to address concerns while maintaining the viability of the venue. They suggested redefining “large music events” to those with over 5,000 attendees. They proposed that no large music event would take place unless a comprehensive EMP, including 22 supporting documents covering matters such as traffic, safety, crowd management, welfare, and noise, was submitted at least three months in advance and approved by the council and Safety Advisory Group. Any subsequent changes to these plans would also require approval. They stressed that no large music-led events would be staged until Essex Police, Essex Highways, the council, and the SAG were fully satisfied with the arrangements, and confirmed that there were none planned for 2026, with only regular race days and smaller events scheduled.

The licence holder argued that a permanent reduction to 5,000 capacity would be disproportionate, given the venue’s history and scale. They concluded that with the right traffic management solutions agreed by all parties, large events could return safely in the future, but until then, the focus would remain on smaller-scale activities.

Members expressed concerns about repeated issues, a lack of accountability, and whether conditions would genuinely be followed in the future. The licence holder accepted the TMP had failed but attributed this to their contractor not delivering the agreed measures. They emphasised that additional police support had been funded, extra checks had been carried out, and staffing levels for security were above Purple Guide recommendations, rejecting claims of cost-cutting.

The Chair asked the licence holder’s representative if the applicant would accept a 10,000 capacity restriction and the response was that whilst they would prefer no restriction, 10,000 would be better than 5,000 (as suggested by the responsible authorities).

The Committee thanked the attendees and officers for their input and advised that the decision would be made during the deliberation after the meeting. It was noted that due to the remote nature of the meeting, the decision would be circulated to all parties within a few working days via email.

The Committee had given careful consideration to this application by Essex Police for a review of the premises licence and to all relevant representations both written and as expanded on in the course of the hearing. In reaching its decision the Committee had also had regard to relevant parts of the Council’s Licensing Policy and to the statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (“the section 182 Guidance”) including Part 11 (Reviews).

The Committee had **RESOLVED** that it was appropriate for the promotion of the relevant licensing objectives that the following steps (which involve modification of the conditions of the licence) be taken:-

- 1) The imposition of the additional conditions as proposed by the licence-holder, and which were set out at TAB 1 (pages 3–9) of the Premises Licence Holder’s Bundle of Evidence, **SAVE THAT** the definition of a ‘Large Music Event’ read as “a music-led event with a capacity of 5,000 persons or more”.

(This meant that a music-led event with an attendance capacity of 5,000 persons or more triggered the requirement for preparation and approval of an 'Event Management Plan' in accordance with conditions nos. 3–20.)

TAB 1 (pages 3-9) are attached to these minutes as an appendix.

- 2) The imposition of a further condition to the effect that the capacity of any music-led event did not exceed 10,000 persons.

A. REASONS FOR DECISION

- (1) In setting out its reasons for this determination the Committee did not propose to go through in detail the extensive material (including oral amplification of representations and submissions) which had been before it at the lengthy hearing. Members of the Committee hearing this Review application had familiarised themselves with the written material in advance of the hearing. The Committee considered that at the hearing itself all issues were ventilated and explored and the reasons given below for its decision were predicated on that. The Committee was grateful in particular to Essex Police, Counsel for the Licence-holder, and the Licensing Authority (Chelmsford City Council), for their substantial contributions and assistance in this exercise, including identifying the chief issues.
- (2) The Committee found on the balance of probabilities, the evidence was, in fact, compelling, that as regards the music-led event on Friday 4th July 2025 (featuring Justin Timberlake, and with an attendance of 22,993 people) there had been catastrophic failure in operational management on the part of the licence-holder which resulted in chaos. The public, by venturing onto the A131 in their hundreds as pedestrians, had been potentially at risk of sustaining serious injury or even death, and furthermore there had been widespread traffic disruption which amounted to a public nuisance that detrimentally impacted on, among others, residents in the locality and motorists.
- (3) The operational failings had been several fold, but the significant one concerned traffic management failure, in particular the failure to implement properly the traffic management plan (including signage, stewarding, security, lighting, and management of the car parking ingress and egress). It was a matter of grave concern to the Committee that because of the severe traffic congestion literally hundreds of people abandoned their vehicles (on the side of the roads, grass verges, and roundabouts) and ended up walking along and even crossing the A131 dual carriageway to access the venue, and to return to their vehicles when the concert ended. Essex Police had been required to deploy officers to the scene to implement emergency measures to mitigate the risk of injury and to restore order. These emergency measures had included a succession of rolling roadblocks. The Committee was left in little doubt that were it not for the taking of these measures by Essex Police, serious injury or even death could have resulted as pedestrians sought to navigate the A131, together also with an

intensification of disorder among some elements of the public, as people trapped in the car parks or trying to access or exit the sites became increasingly frustrated and angry.

- (4) The Committee had taken into account the fact that at approximately 18:38 hours on the day of the event a car caught fire on the A133 (near the Tesco Store) with the fire spreading to the verge and central reservation, which necessitated the police having to close the carriageway until 20:42 hours, when they were able to open one lane. This incident and road closure prevented all traffic from accessing the event from the most direct route to the north and would have contributed to the build up of traffic. Furthermore, there had also been a vehicle fire at approximately 18:45 hours in the layby on the A133 near the junction of Regiment Way, although this fire was quickly responded to and put out. The Committee accepted the licence holder's counsel's submission that these incidents had been contributory factors to the traffic issues and were outside the control of the licence holder. However, on the evidence the Committee found the main cause of the chaos that ensued on 4th July had been due to the operational failings on the part of the event organisers as referenced above and set out in the evidence produced by Essex Police and Chelmsford City Council in its capacity as a Responsible Authority (i.e. evidence of the Licensing Authority, and of the Business Compliance Lead Officer – Health & Safety) and that of those individuals who had attended the event and made representations.
- (5) The Committee found that as regards the 4th July event, the three licensing objectives cited by Essex Police as grounds for the Review application (namely, public safety, prevention of public nuisance, and the prevention of crime and disorder) had been seriously undermined. In this regard, the Committee noted the licence holder's apology made in the course of the hearing on behalf of his client to everyone who had been detrimentally affected by these failings.
- (6) The Committee also found that as regards the music event on day 2 (Saturday 5th July, featuring Duran Duran) there had still been operational failures on the part of the organisers (for example in terms of car park management at the South car park, lack of security, and communication) which led to the licensing objectives being undermined, and to Essex Police having to intervene, notwithstanding the fact that this event had significantly fewer people attending (12,534 people). Among other things, the police had to implement a 5 mph rolling roadblock for around an hour, utilising six police vehicles, because patrons were walking along the A131 carriageway.
- (7) On day 3 (Sunday 6th July, featuring Olly Murs) the event had 8,350 people attending and passed off without significant issues. However, the Committee noted that even then Essex Police had concerns about stewarding and management of traffic from the North car park.
- (8) The Committee noted that the licence holder, in their written representations and as amplified by the licence holder's counsel at the hearing, had asserted that they had been let down by certain contractors and other individuals and that many of the operational failings, especially in relation to car parking and other

traffic management, could be attributed to this. So far as the Committee was concerned, this assertion carried little, if any, weight and was indicative of a failure on the part of the licence holder to recognise and accept their ultimate responsibility for ensuring health and safety requirements were met and that traffic management plans were fully implemented.

Capacity restriction from 29,999 to 10,000 people for music led events

- (9) The Committee had had regard to the submissions made by Essex Police and the Public Health and Protection Services Manager (Chelmsford City), among others, that a condition should be attached to the existing premises licence restricting capacity to 5,000 people for non-horse racing events. The case for this, as put forward by Essex Police in their Review application and amplified at the hearing, had been that they had serious concerns about the suitability of Chelmsford City Racecourse as a venue for events of this scale by reason of its location and surrounding infrastructure. The Committee noted, however, that this argument by Essex Police appeared, on the face of it, to have been inconsistent to some degree with their assertion, also within their application, that the scale of the intervention required by the police had been “entirely avoidable” had the premises licence holder fulfilled their obligations under the Licensing Act 2003.
- (10) The Public Health and Protection Services Manager, in the course of the hearing, had stated that in his opinion the key issue with the event over the weekend of 4th–6th July had been the failure to implement correctly the traffic management plan.
- (11) This failure to implement the traffic management plan had been, in the Public Health and Protection Services Manager’s view, critical and had resulted in, among other things, the public being put at risk. However, he had also expressed his reservations as to the suitability of the site for such large-scale events as the Justin Timberlake concert. It had been his view that traffic management issues were, to a large extent, inherent in the location of the site and that significant infrastructure issues made it very difficult to manage large numbers of people arriving at and leaving events. The Essex County Council Highways representation which had been made at the hearing echoed this view.
- (12) The Committee had been bound to give considerable weight to these professional views, which had been reinforced to some degree by the fact that historically, during previous events, there had been issues with the public using the A131 carriageway, albeit, and as pointed out by the licence holder’s counsel, no Review applications under the 2003 Act had followed from these past events.
- (13) The licence holder’s counsel, however, had argued strongly against any reduction in the capacity figure and maintained that the main cause of the disruption experienced over the weekend of 4th–6th July, and especially in relation to the 4th July, had been the failure to implement the traffic management plan. He had also argued that if the set of conditions which he had proposed had been attached to the licence (namely the requirement to prepare and have approved an Event Management Plan) then SAG and the Council would,

ultimately, have had control and the final say over whether events with a capacity of 5,000 persons or more took place.

- (14) The licence holder's counsel had also sought to place reliance on paragraph 11.20 of the section 182 Guidance which stipulated to the effect that on a Review any remedial action taken should generally have been directed at the causes of the concerns that the representations identified and should always have been no more than an appropriate and proportionate response to address the causes of concern that instigated the Review. He maintained that to reduce capacity to 5,000 persons would have amounted to a 'draconian' measure. In response to a question put to him by the Chair, however, the licence holder's counsel had intimated that if the Committee were to decide to reduce the capacity figure then his client would have been prepared to accept a capacity restriction of 10,000 persons.

The Committee's view

- (15) In all the circumstances and having had regard to the evidence and the arguments on both sides, the Committee considered it to have been of crucial importance and appropriate for the promotion of the relevant licensing conditions that a capacity restriction of 10,000 persons be imposed by way of condition attached to the existing premises licence. What had happened over the weekend of the 4th–6th of July, and especially on the 4th July, had been completely unacceptable and, regrettably, had led to a lack of confidence on the part of the Committee in the ability of the licence-holder to manage large-scale events of this kind, notwithstanding the licence holder's counsel's apology and assurance on behalf of his client that there would never be a repeat of what had happened that weekend. The Committee had been bound to take steps to ensure that there was not a repeat of what had happened over that weekend, and especially that members of the public attending large-scale events were not exposed to the risk of sustaining serious injury, or even death, through venturing as pedestrians onto the A131 dual carriageway.
- (16) The Committee considered that on the evidence it had been more probable than not that the main cause of the chaos and undermining of licensing objectives on the 4th July, and to a lesser degree on the 5th July, had been the abject failure on the part of the licence holder to implement properly the event management plan in relation to traffic management including car parking. However, it was also the Committee's view that the evidence had also pointed to the possibility that Chelmsford City Racecourse, by reason of its location and the infrastructure, was inherently not suitable for accommodating events of the capacity experienced on the 4th and 5th July. Determining the appropriate capacity restriction figure could not have been an exact science. However, there had been some evidence before the Committee (see pages 322–323 of the licence-holder's evidence bundle) to indicate that non-horse racing events with a capacity figure significantly over 5,000 persons had taken place at the venue without major issues of concern. On balance, the Committee considered a capacity restriction of 10,000 persons to

have been a proportionate measure. Furthermore, this capacity figure would have accommodated the events planned or scheduled for the remainder of that year and 2026. If the licence holder could demonstrate that non-music events taking place at the venue over the following two years or so had not resulted in problems of the kind experienced over the weekend of 4th–6th July then a variation application to increase the capacity figure might have been successful.

The imposition of the additional conditions as proposed by The licence holder's counsel on behalf of the licence-holder and which are set out at TAB 1 (pages 3 – 9) of the Premises Licence Holder's Bundle of Evidence

- (17) These conditions, including a reduction in the original capacity trigger for requiring the preparation or approval of the Event Management Plan for music-led events from 10,000 persons or more to 5,000 persons or more, had been offered up by the licence holder's counsel on behalf of the licence-holder.
- (18) The Committee considered that imposition of these conditions, together with the capacity restriction referred to above, had been crucial to ensuring, so far as possible, that there had not been a repeat of what happened on the 4th and 6th July. They had been appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives. The content and level of detail of any Event Management Plan would, of course, have varied depending on the nature and capacity of any given event.

Decision not to impose condition stipulating specific Music Noise Level limits

- (19) The Public Health and Protection Services Manager, in his written representation, had requested that conditions be imposed limiting, via stipulated decibel limits, the Music Noise Level at certain noise-sensitive locations. The Committee did not consider it necessary to take this action as the Joynes Nash Acoustic Consultants Noise Compliance Report had established that there had been no breaches of the previously agreed noise levels during the weekend of 4th–6th July. Although there had been complaints received by the Council regarding alleged noise nuisance, the number of complaints had been very low for a three-day event of this size and nature and amounted to nine complaints over the entire three nights. The licence-holder had not been made aware of these complaints during the actual events in question. Furthermore, the imposition of the additional conditions proposed by the licence holder's counsel meant that the Council had had adequate input regarding noise levels via the Event Management Plan. At the hearing, the Public Health and Protection Services Manager had indeed confirmed that whilst he had raised the issue of noise nuisance his primary concern had been with public safety.

The meeting closed at 3:45pm

Chair

TAB 1

Annex 5A Additional conditions for Large Music Events

Large Music Events

1. A Large Music Event is a music-led event with a capacity of ~~10,000~~ 5000 persons or more.
2. This Annex is without prejudice to other conditions of this Licence.
3. For Large Music Events, the following conditions set out below shall be complied with. *Event*

Management Plan

4. An Event Management Plan complying with the conditions set out below must be submitted to the Council and the Safety Advisory Group (include, without limitation, Essex Police, Highways and Chelmsford Licensing and Public Protection) at least 3 months prior to the Event.
5. The Event shall not take place:
 - a) unless approved in writing by the Council's Licensing Authority following consultation with the Safety Advisory Group;
 - b) except in compliance with the Event Management Plan.
6. For the avoidance of doubt, any changes to the Event Management Plan following the above approval may only be made with the further written approval of the Council's Licensing Authority.
7. The Event Management Plan must have full regard to the most recent edition of "The Purple Guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Outdoor Events".
8. The Event Management Plan must include:
 - Appendix 1 - Adverse Weather Plan
 - Appendix 2 - Alcohol Management Plan
 - Appendix 3 - Crowd Management Plan

- Appendix 4 - Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy
- Appendix 5 - Counter Terrorism Plan
- Appendix 6 - Health and Safety Policy
- Appendix 7 - Fire Risk Assessment
- Appendix 8 - Major Incident Plan
- Appendix 9 - Medical Management Plan
- Appendix 10 - Operational Management Plan
- Appendix 11 - Noise Management Plan
- Appendix 12 - Risk Assessment
- Appendix 13 - Sanitation and Waste Management Plan
- Appendix 14 - Security Placement Schedule
- Appendix 15 - Site Map
- Appendix 16 - Traffic and Transport Management Plan
- Appendix 17 - Water Safety Plan
- Appendix 18 - Production Schedule / CDM Build Schedule
- Appendix 19 - Tent Exit Calculations
- Appendix 20 - Fire Extinguisher Allocation
- Appendix 21 - Ingress / Egress Plan
- Appendix 22 – Stages and Structures.

Security Placement Schedule

9. The Security Placement Schedule shall include a suitable and sufficient deployment plan for stewards/marshals and security staff for all areas used in connection with the licensed event as well as the event arena including numbers, locations, training, supervision and management, identification, PPE provision, communications and contingency arrangements.

Traffic and Transport Management Plan

10. The Traffic and Transport Management Plan shall include:

- a) a plan to promote visitation to the site other than in private motor vehicles;
- b) a plan for highway management to promote safe and efficient access to and egress from the site and to prevent potential vehicle / pedestrian conflicts;
- c) a suitable and sufficient internal traffic management plan, including:
 - i. an assessment of any car parking to be used in connection with an event,
 - ii. car park management,
 - iii. car park location signage and lighting arrangements,
 - iv. movement to, from and within any car parks, pick up/drop off points, public transport and taxi areas:
 - v. the management of vehicle and pedestrian separation across the event site and within any carparking or vehicle areas,
 - vi. details of permitted / prohibited vehicle movement.
- d) provision to ensure that:
 - i. entrances and exits to the licensed area including roadways, pedestrian routes and emergency vehicle routes are kept clear and adequately illuminated during periods of darkness;

- ii. all entrance and exit routes leading to or from the licensed area will be provided with clearly visible signage, which should be illuminated after dark.

Crowd Management Plan

11. The Crowd Management Plan shall include:

- a) details of signage and lighting to assist attendees to locate facilities (water, toilets, first-aid); and routes between the arena and any parking / pick up/drop off points;
- b) calculations relating to audience size and arena management;
- c) calculations of exit times and audience flow rates along exit routes and their management;
- d) provision to ensure that crowd movements and egress are carefully monitored and managed across the site including the through the use of CCTV installed at agreed points (eg entrance and exit routes, front of stages) to enable the monitoring of crowd movement and congestion.

Noise Management Plan

12. The Licence Holder shall appoint a suitably qualified and experienced noise control consultant experienced in the production of Noise Management Plans for live outdoor music events to produce and fully implement the Noise Management Plan.

13. The Noise Management Plan shall:

- a) have regard to guidance in the Institute of Acoustics' Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts or any subsequent revision thereto;
- b) include control of low frequency noise;
- c) include designated noise sensitive receptors for measurement purposes
- d) be approved by the Council's Licensing Authority in accordance with condition 6a) above.

14. The appointed noise control consultant will regularly monitor noise at noise sensitive receptors to ensure compliance with agreed noise levels and ensure that such levels continue to be met from time to time during the event. The Council will be given access to this information promptly on request.
15. The licence holder shall provide the Council, in advance of the event, contact details (include telephone and email) for their appointed noise control consultant and their management team who can be contacted in the event that noise complaints are received.

Fire Risk Assessment

16. The Fire Risk Assessment shall include Fire Extinguisher Allocation.

Stages and Structures

17. The Stages and Structures Plan shall include contractors, insurance, health and safety policy, method statement and footprints.

Event Safety and Management

18. The Licence Holder will appoint an Event Safety Contractor who shall be of sufficient competence, status and authority to take responsibility for advising the Licence Holder on safety at the event and be able to authorise and supervise safety measures on behalf of the Licence Holder. Further:
 - a) The details (name and contact arrangements) for the Event Safety Contractor is to be provided to the Council with the event management plan (EMP).
 - b) The Licence Holder in conjunction with the Event Safety Contractor shall prepare a risk assessment for each event which shall be contained in the EMP.
19. The Licence Holder will provide an Event Control within the Licensed Area where agreed representatives of the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) will have a position to ensure good communications. The Licence Holder will provide an experienced Event Control Manager who will oversee and co-ordinate persons within Event Control. The Licence Holder will provide a person within the Event Control to keep a log of all calls from around the event fed into the Event Control.

20. The Licence Holder will ensure that all relevant Health and Safety Legislation and Regulation is complied with. All Risk Assessments and Method Statements provided by contractors shall be collated by the Licence Holder and kept available on site for the duration of the event.