

DECISION OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE OF EAST HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2025

APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE

APPLICANT: Sound Live Limited

ADDRESS OF PREMISES: Tewinbury Farm, Welwyn, Hertfordshire, AL6 0JB

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE: Cllr Simon Marlow (Chair)
Cllr Maura Connolly
Cllr Carolyn Redfern

NAMES OF OTHERS PRESENT:

(1) FOR THE PLH: David Dadds (Solicitor for the Applicant)
Claudia Langfield (Far and Beyond event producer)
Geoff Cox (Tracsis Events Traffic Management)
Gareth Hance (Electric Star Acoustic Consultant)
Steve Durham (Promoter)
Jack Williams (Tewinbury)
Jack May (Head of Events at Far and Beyond)

(2) FOR THE RA: Claire Ramirez (Licensing Sergeant Hertfordshire Police)
Nathan Howson (Inspector for the Neighbourhood Policing Team for East Herts)

(3) FOR THE INTERESTED PARTIES: Sue Wilson
Keith St Pier (Tewin Parish Council Chairman)
Chris Hayden
Jeff Tipper
Dianne Heath
Paul Haggers

(4) FOR THE AUTHORITY: Ally Darwood (Senior Licensing and Enforcement Officer)

(5) OTHERS:

Dimple Roopchand (Legal Advisor)
Michelle Aves (Democratic Services Officer)
Erica Carter (Democratic Services Officer)

EVIDENCE

- (1) Agenda pack for LSC – including LSC report, Premises licence application, site plan, map of proposed licensable area, draft sound management plan, written representations from Interested Parties and Responsible Authority
- (2) Documents submitted by Applicant after the expiry of the consultation period – Traffic management proposal v1 dated 27/11/25, proposed Bus and Coach Routes, Proposed Road Closure, and Traffic Marshall Positions
- (3) Police response dated 12 December 25 highlighting concerns raised by Hertfordshire County Council Highways and the Police to the Traffic Management proposal submitted by the Applicant.
- (4) Speaking note prepared by the Applicant's representative dated 18th December 2025.
- (5) Proposed conditions submitted by the Applicant on 19 December 2025.
- (6) Oral representations from the Applicant, Police as the Responsible Authority and Interested Parties.

THE HEARING

1. The application was for a premises licence submitted by Sound Live Limited in respect of an annual festival with a capacity of 19,999 persons at Tewinbury Farm, Hertford Road, Tewin, Hertfordshire, AL6 0JB for the following licensable activities:
 - (i) The Sale of Alcohol (for consumption on the premises)
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00
 - (ii) The provision of live music
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00
 - (iii) The provision of recorded music
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00
 - (iv) The provision of films
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00
 - (v) The performance of dance
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00

(vi) Entertainment of a similar nature
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 23:00

(vii) Opening hours
Saturday and Sunday 12:00 – 00:00

2. During the 28-day consultation period a number of objections were received based on the public and prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives:

- thirty-two objections were received from members of the public. The objections expressed concerns regarding:
 - Routes to the festival site not being safe; blind corners, local infrastructure susceptible to wear and tear impacting public safety
 - Increase in traffic causing nuisance
 - Noise pollution
 - Insufficient planning regarding vehicle access for both the public and emergency services
 - Public safety relating to the location of the proposed premises licence being next to River Mimran.
- One representation was received from Tewin Parish Council. This expressed similar concerns regarding:
 - Noise management measures including noise pollution, with focus on new buildings being erected not included in the plan
 - Public access to premises
 - Vehicular access to premises
 - Traffic management
 - Crowd control at the end of the event
- One representation was received from Hertfordshire Constabulary who have concerns regarding:
 - The lack of a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan
 - The insufficient pedestrian safety management
 - The absence of agreed conditions

3. The Applicant's representative submitted a speaking note to the Committee, a copy of which is attached to this decision notice and made the following representations to the Sub Committee:

- The application seeks a premises licence for the Tewin Sound Festival, a two-day music and entertainment event at Tewinbury, Hertfordshire, for the 18th and 19th July 2026 and thereafter an annual two-day event to be held between June and July.

- b) The application is for no more than 19,999 persons which will include ticket holders, staff, artists and contractors. For 2026, the anticipated attendance is 12,500 on Saturday and 12,000 on Sunday but capacity will be limited to no more than 14,000 on a Saturday and 8,000 on a Sunday, subject to a satisfactory sign off, of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP).
- c) The focus of the representations received is on the TMP. The Applicant has acknowledged the representation made by the Police, who in essence will have the final say on the TMP and sign off. The Applicant will work with the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) prior to the event, where proposals will be made for traffic management and the SAG body will come together to discuss the event and agree a plan. The TMP will be agreed in one way or another with the Police and Highways authority.
- d) The Applicant believes the Police will say they cannot have capacity more than 8,000 persons but the Applicant also believes they can have more capacity. This is a discussion that will take place through the SAG and from working through the TMP. The Police will have the final sign off. If the Police say you can only get 8,000 persons or 12,000 or there is an agreement that we can have 14,000 then unless the Police agrees the event will not proceed at the higher capacity; it will only proceed in the capacity which the Police agree is safe and reasonable. On this basis tickets for immediate sale will only be released for up to 8,000 and not until the final capacity levels are agreed will further tickets be released.
- e) It would be the normal course that there would be a proposal, a plan is set up, a licence is granted and then you would invest because the investments will cost hundreds and thousands and possibly millions to put the event on. On this basis the investment is done in certain stages. Once a licence is granted, the next stage would be the SAG discussions.
- f) A condition offered up is that event shall not proceed, unless and until a final TMP with the Highways authority is agreed. The final TMP is normally agreed four weeks before the event but in effect twelve weeks before the event all parties would know what notices will need to be displayed for road closures or diversions. The TMP will include full details of pedestrian safety measures, parking arrangements, closures, diversions, contingency plans, event capacity.
- g) The Applicant expects the event will proceed on the capacity that is agreed, provided it is financially viable and therefore the licence should be granted if the TMP is the only position outstanding because it is subject to a condition that protects and promotes the licensing objectives.
- h) No members of the public will be staying overnight; only staff working at the event.
- i) There will be no general public parking except for limited VIP and accessible spaces. All VIP parking spaces will be pre-booked. When a ticket is purchased, the customer will be encouraged to organise their

coach or their train transport to and from the event. The site is well served by public transport for nearby train stations.

- j) There will be a strategy and full consultation discussion with the residents and businesses within one mile of the site which is roughly 3600 people. One meeting took place on the 26th November 2025 with the residents and the Applicant will continue to have these meetings and a clear and open dialogue with residents who will be told in advance of any road closures and diversions. Passes will be distributed to residents in advance or on request.
- k) There will be accredited marshals at key junctions to assist in the TMP.
- l) The approach is to minimise road traffic; a single 55-seater coach will replace up to 55 cars. This is a much more environmentally friendly way of promoting such an event, reducing congestion and the environmental impacts.
- m) Reference was made to an updated provision within the s.182 Statutory Guidance which states that when the local authority makes a decision it should consider the need to promote growth and deliver economic benefits of a licensed premises, licence activities and employment.
- n) A robust set of conditions have been provided which adopt the concerns of the Police and deal with the attendance, event duration, notification to the authorities, comprehensive traffic and management event plans, sound plans, security, safeguarding and more.

4. The Applicant's traffic management representative Geoff Cox (Tracsis Events Traffic Management) had to leave the meeting by midday, so Members agreed to amend the proposed procedure to allow traffic management issues to be addressed.

5. With regard to the TMP and traffic, Members sought further clarification on how the Applicant planned to manage and enforce people not to drive to the event:

- a) The applicant's representative stated that people will be prevented from driving to the event in so far as making sure the public notices which display the event notify the public that when purchasing the event ticket they also purchase their bus or rail ticket. A lot of the work will be done in advance via notification.
- b) Geoff Cox emphasised that the public will not be able to purchase a ticket unless they choose a transport option i.e. a rail and ride, rail and walk or park and ride. There will be limited parking for VIP parking for up to 800 vehicles on site along with accessible parking for people that apply in advance with proof of accessible needs.
- c) Members noted this proposed plan had not been mentioned within the draft TMP and therefore questioned how people will be prevented from just turning up to the event. Geoff Cox stated they are an expert team who

have done quite a few events, some where there has been no public parking on site and it was made sure when the events were promoted and when the tickets went on sale that all available transport options were made clear.

- d) The public will be prevented from just turning up because the proposed road closures that will be put in place will stop anyone from turning up at the event. The Applicant is looking at an area of 1.5 miles down as far as Welwyn Garden City which will be restricted access for residents with passes and the shuttle buses which will run from two stations which are planning on being used and the park and ride.
- e) The applicant's representative stated that the accepted practice and norm is that people are more sustainable with their transport. He always uses public transport these days rather than his car. When people purchase a ticket that is when they will make their arrangements of how they are going to travel to the event.
- f) Further clarification was sought by Members regarding transport. The Applicant's representative clarified that at the time of ticket purchase the customer will be asked about transport and as part of the ticket also offered to purchase a transport ticket for the coach, network rail or VIP parking.
- g) The Applicant was asked whether he was offering a condition up on this and said he would draft something up over lunch break which would deal with how transport tickets will be sold.
- h) One member then queried, if transport needs to be booked when tickets are sold, how would she be able to buy a train ticket if there are no trains running to take her home. The Applicant's representative stated that a train ticket would have to be purchased directly with the train network. To clarify this question the Applicant was then asked to provide train times. The Applicant stated that as part of the consultation detailed conversation will be had with the train operators to see if they can put on extra services. Having checked train times, the Applicant confirmed the last train from Welwyn Garden City to Liverpool Street is 00:28 on a Saturday and 23:52 on a Sunday and transport (coach/shuttle bus) will be provided to and from the station which will need to be booked at the same time as ticket purchase.
- i) Members then asked for further information and clarification about the park and ride locations. Geoff Cox informed that he is looking at a couple of options; to rent some space at Hatfield University and to use Fairlands Valley Park in Stevenage which has been used before for other events which they have run. There is no final decision, and the Applicant has not had any conversations with landowners about these options. If a licence is granted, this will be crystallised via the SAG.
- j) Members asked for further information about the pickup and drop off locations and the capacity. Geoff Cox advised that no plans have been

finalised for the pickup and drop off locations, but they have two possible options. One is the use of land at the golf club from which they can set up a walking route to the event site and the other option is the tarmac car park at the Panshanger development. Discussions were had regarding the suitability of the Panshanger development which is too far to walk to the event. The Applicant stated if they used the Panshanger Development then they would need to put on a shuttle bus service to get people to the event.

- k) The Applicant informed the Sub-Committee that access to the event via Uber vehicles will be controlled by geo-fencing.

6. Members asked a number of other questions in relation to the application, namely:

- a) Why SAG had not been consulted prior to the hearing? The Applicant stated that they would not normally consult with SAG until after the application is granted and the SAG and the Police would be given the final veto to decide whether the event should proceed.
- b) How the Applicant would ensure that residents are not affected by the traffic and transport.
- c) How many meetings had the Applicant had with the Highways authority about the event? The Applicant informed that no discussions had taken place with Highways yet and would anticipate this would be done once the application is granted. Highways are not a responsible authority, however, they have raised their concerns through the Police and for this reason a condition has been added that unless the Police and the Highways Authority are content with the event planning, the event won't proceed. The Police do not object to the event happening at a capacity of 8,000. They object to the higher capacity; this can be dealt with by way of a condition. The presumption for the Licensing Sub Committee is to grant the licence based on the promotion of the licensing objectives and the evidence.

7. The Police, as the Responsible Authority asked a number of questions, namely:

- a) Whether the Applicant had a percentage of the expected use of each transport method. Geoff Cox made reference to a number of other events held to demonstrate how transport options to the event. It is anticipated (as referenced in previous events) that people will use public transport. There will be a regional 55-seater coach service that will come from outer towns (Birmingham, Bristol, Essex, London etc) which will be dependant on demand. There will also be a shuttle bus service running from the rail stations and double decker buses will be used for the park and ride. These buses have a capacity of 80 people and there will be approximately 40-50 buses running on the day. The Police calculated with 50 buses running this will accommodate 4000 people.

- b) Why the Panshanger development had not previously been mentioned in the draft TMP submitted? Geoff Cox stated that he was not aware of this location when the TMP was submitted. It is now being considered because the field previously marked as the transport hub is not suitable for buses and is not to be used by taxi's to pick up and drop off as it is too close to the vicinity of the event. Geoff Cox stated that he wanted to keep transport hub purely for buses and coaches and have a separate area for taxi's to drop off and pick up from which the public can either get a shuttle bus to the event or have a walking route to the event from there.
- c) Clarification on the number of buses that can be used over a particular weekend and location. Geoff Cox stated the transport options will be discussed at the SAG and proposals will be finalised depending on the capacity agreed and ticket sales. If more coaches or buses are required, then these will be provided. The Applicant will use the service of the Big Green Coach and will also work closely with First Bus and with National Express and other national bus providers.

8. The objectors then raised several questions/representations to the Applicant regarding traffic management, namely:

- a) Their concerns over people walking to the event and how the Applicant will prevent people from accessing the site. The Applicant stated that any walking routes to the site will be managed.
- b) Regarding the rail and walk option with the proposed rail journey to Welwyn North train station, the objector pointed out that trains from this station do not run directly to Liverpool Street. The Applicant stated the times given earlier were for trains running from Welwyn Garden City to which the objector stated that the trains are also not direct to Liverpool Street. The objector informed that Hertford North would be the closest station but no trains run late from this station so suggested the Applicant will need to consider this again.
- c) In relation to a question regarding the road closures and restrictions noted in the draft TMP. With several other roads that can lead the public to access into Tewin and there are a possible three junctions along the Hertford Road which could be used to access the village, how would the Applicant ensure and prevent people from parking on the narrow roads and causing congestion? Geoff Cox informed that he could apply for no waiting restrictions on the roads within the village but then residents will not be able to park in the village and it would be up to the enforcement authority to issue parking tickets. Under the present proposals, all local residents affected by road closure will be given vehicle passes to access their properties. The Applicant confirmed that discussions taken place with residents prior to the meeting were fruitful and they had been furnished with a few ideas which they would look at. The Applicant was willing to consider any proposals the

residents may have which could be discussed at the forthcoming residents meetings.

- d) One objector asked the Applicant whether they were aware that proposed route from Welwyn Garden City station to use double decker buses passes a bridge which has height restrictions. Geoff Cox asked for the road name in order that they can investigate into this.
- e) One objector also asked the Applicant if they were aware of restriction placed on train travel near the Digsowell viaduct where there is a bottleneck on the railway. Geoff Cox stated he was not aware of this and will discuss this with the rail operating companies to make sure that any proposals that are offered are workable for both the event and the rail network.

9. The Licensing Officer raised a question regarding the tight timescales proposed within the licensing conditions submitted by the Applicant. Paragraph 3 seeks a premises licence for the period 1st June to 31st July. Paragraph 5 of the proposed conditions states that the TMP will be submitted no later than four months prior to the scheduled date of events for which written confirmation must be obtained from East Herts Police and the Hertfordshire County Council. Paragraph 7 requires that a Traffic Regulation Order must be applied for no later than three months prior to the commencement of the event. The Applicant confirmed that it generally takes about 12 weeks for TTRO to be approved, to which the Licensing Officer noted that this would be beyond the 4-month limit proposed in condition 5. The Applicant's representative stated that as soon as a draft TMP is fully agreed, the TTRO application will be submitted. Three months is the minimum timescale required for the TTRO application to be submitted. The Applicant stated that whilst the time frames are incredibly tight, it would be disproportionate to refuse the application and offered up a further condition:

"The event shall not proceed unless a final traffic Management Plan (TMP) has been submitted to and approved by the Safety advisory Group (SAG), Hertfordshire County Council Highways and Hertfordshire Constabulary, no less than 12 weeks prior to the event. The TMP shall include full details of pedestrian safety measures, parking arrangements, road closures, diversion routes, contingency plans and event capacity. Any amendments to the TMP must be agreed by SAG prior to implementation".

10. Moving on from traffic management, Members raised the following questions in relation to the application:

- a) Regarding the Protection of Children from Harm licensing objective, Members sought further information as to how this licensing objective will be met. With a proposed capacity of 15,000, Members noted that very limited information was given by the Applicant as to what provisions would be put in place to protect young children under 18. The Applicant advised

that at present they were still considering whether young people would be able to attend the event, subject to discussions through the SAG. If young children do attend then they will have to be accompanied by a responsible person or adult, there will be no sale of alcohol, individuals in their own right will be responsible for the children with them, the Applicant will make sure that all front facing staff have appropriate training (which will be delivered via the licensing connect system), there will be a security plan to ensure that all SIA are accredited and understand their responsibilities in relation to children, there will be a dedicated welfare area which will deal with any issues that arise, there will be a lost and found area and any safeguarding issues will be addressed via trading standards. Wristbands can also be given out for parents to write in their telephone number on so if a child is lost then the parents can be called.

- b) Members sought clearer clarification from the Applicant whether children will be allowed to the event. The Applicant stated that they were still discussing whether to put a cap on age limits and then confirmed at the hearing that only children over the age of 14 will be allowed into the event. Members noted this was an amendment to the application.
- c) In relation to the River Mimram running through the proposed location, the Applicant confirmed that the area is going to fenced off for everyone. Members noted this was not addressed in the plan attached to the application.
- d) Members noted that the proposed walking route will cross the river and queried if there will be a bridge and how and when it will be constructed. The Applicant's representative confirmed that during the consultation period, they had walked around the site with the Police and Responsible Authorities and there is a narrow footbridge which will be used. This will form part of the Event Management Plan, and the Applicant will ensure that there is no access to the water.
- e) Member's queried why the Tewin residents meeting held on the 26th November 2025, had only taken place one day before the end of the consultation period. The Applicant's representative stated the Applicant had complied with the statutory requirements in terms of the application process and said it would continue to consult where appropriate. The Sub Committee was reminded of the condition offered up by the Applicant that unless the Police and SAG sign it off the event does not proceed.
- f) Members then asked for further clarification regarding the Applicant's suggestion that the licence be granted with conditions attached to the licence and queried how many conditions the Sub Committee was required to attach to this licence. Members noted that the application and supporting documents gives little information about what will actually happen at the event. Questions regarding whether there should be wristbands for the children and whether this needs to be conditioned, the

cap for over children over the age of 14's – does this needs to be conditioned, the river being fenced off is not mentioned within the documents submitted, does this need to be conditioned, does there need to be a condition that a risk assessment needs to be undertaken for use of the footbridge, what size is it, what construction, weight capacity, is the area going to be lit? All these questions remain unanswered which emphasises the difficulty as to how Members can apply conditions when they don't know what they are actually applying conditions to. The Applicant's representative suggested the Sub Committee, as per the s.1.16 of the s182 statutory guidance, take a light touch approach and only attach conditions that do not duplicate other statutory requirements. The river will be covered under other health and safety legislation; the age of the child is still being considered but doesn't need to be conditioned because the protection of children from harm licensing objective will be met.

- g) Clarification was sought in relation to capacity. Members noted the initial application being for 19,999 persons but condition one of the proposed conditions submitted by the Applicant limits capacity to 15,000 persons. Members noted this contradicts the submissions made by the applicant's representatives at the start of the meeting. The Applicant's representative clarified that the Applicant is still asking for capacity of 19,999 but for the first-year capacity will not exceed 15,000. However, realistically the Applicant does not want to ask for more capacity than needed and is happy to reduce capacity to 14,000 for the Saturday and 12,000 for the Sunday for 2026 only. The capacity is to include staff.
- h) Members queried the reservation for use of glass within the VIP area within the application and queried how the use of glass will be safely managed with approximately 1000 people within the VIP area. The Applicant's representative stated the Applicant was happy to concede that drink will only be served in polycarbonate paper or aluminium vessels.
- i) Members queried the change in the application re alcohol being permitted at the event, noting that paragraph 1.8 of the summary of events attached to the application states that the public will not be able to bring food and drink onto the site but the proposed conditions offered up by the Applicant at paragraph 10 states that alcohol over the allowance of 16 cans/ 8 litres of beer or cider, or 2.25 litres of wine per person will be allowed on entry. The Applicant informed the Sub Committee that no alcohol will be allowed to be brought onto the site.
- j) In response to a question asked about why the map of the site and the sat nav postcode having been removed from condition 19 of the proposed conditions, the Applicant stated that they want the public to follow event signage and avoid any cut throughs that can be shown via sat nav's. However, if any relevant authority wants this amended then it can be done via the SAG.

11. Questions were asked by the interested parties in relation to the following:

- a) Whether the notification of the event can be extended to three miles to cover the whole of Tewin and those affected by the event? The Applicant's representative said the Applicant would be happy to have further discussions as to who should be consulted and gave assurance that those who will be impacted by the event will be consulted with. Another interested party stated that her area falls within Welwyn Hatfield District (to whom she pays her Council Tax), but her property is affected by the event. The Applicant's representative accepted that Welwyn Hatfields constituents who are immediately affected by the application will be consulted.
- b) Whether the road marshals will have full authority to direct traffic? The Applicant's representative informed that the accredited marshals will have certain responsibilities and powers to direct traffic but limited enforcement powers.
- c) Whether vulnerable adults can be included in safeguarding policy which the Applicant's representative accepted and stated that full training will be provided to all staff.

12. A question was asked by the Licensing Officer regarding the TMP which proposed the creation of a Hackney Carriage rank for egress if permission is granted by Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council. The Licensing Officer clarified that this application would need to be submitted to East Herts District Council. The Applicant's representative confirmed that permission will be sought from the appropriate authority.

13. The Police made the following submissions in relation to the application:

- a) Even with the drop in capacity for the first year, this is a large scale event. Within the TMP which was submitted a couple of weeks ago, the capacity was stated to be 12,500 on a Saturday and 8,000 on a Sunday. Now this has increased to 14,000 on a Saturday and 12,000 on a Sunday.
- b) The event field has not been tested for this type of capacity and the plans are not detailed and/or specific and do not support how 19,999 persons are going to use the site entering and leaving the site on the same day.
- c) The Event Management Plan that has been submitted is very generalised and not specific to this event. It is very much subject to change, with lots of 'ifs' and 'buts' and it is very difficult to trust what is being said as to how exactly this event will be managed.
- d) The TMP was submitted to the Police on the 5th December. Prior to the application being submitted on the 30th October, there had been no contact from the Applicant. A site visit was conducted with the Applicant and the organisers on the 10th November at which the Police raised concerns regarding the lack of a traffic management plan and the concerns regarding

ingress and egress from the site. On or around the 25th November the Police were notified that the Traffic Management Plan would be ready imminently. The 28-day consultation period expired on the 28th November and the TMP was submitted on the 5th December which has given the Police, as the Responsible Authority very little time prior to the meeting today to discuss this and consult with the traffic experts, i.e. the traffic department and/or Hertfordshire Highways Authority. Draft suggested conditions were sent by the Police to the Applicant on the 9th December. These are not agreed but are suggested conditions that need further discussion. On the 10th December, the Police received a reply querying whether further meetings would be required if the condition could be agreed. On the 15th December, the Applicant contacted the Police to request a meeting to discuss the conditions. The Police have not had an opportunity to consider the proposed Licensing Conditions submitted by the Applicant yesterday.

- e) The Police disagree that the site is appropriate for 19,999 capacity and is exceptionally well serviced. This site presents a number of issues and had the Applicant spoken to the Police prior to submitting the application then there could have been more open dialogue, and the Police could have highlighted some of the problems associated with this site. Unfortunately, due to the tight timeframes we find ourselves at this hearing when perhaps some of these conversations we would have had with the Applicant prior to the application having been submitted.
- f) Whilst the Police do want to support the event, this event and the process needs to be managed properly. There are seven months left before the event, and they still don't know what the plans for this event are. The information which has been submitted is not specific, it states possibilities of what may or could happen but there is no specific information tailored to this event. The Police cannot meaningfully engage without knowing what the plan is and give advice.
- g) East Herts Licensing Policy does encourage early consultation and advice with Responsible Authorities but there hasn't been any. This is vital for an event of this size.
- h) Whilst the Applicant has stated that the norm is for people to use public transport options rather than cars, this is not supported by the experiences had within East Herts. We have had experiences of events causing issues where people have not taken up public transport options offered and instead drive to an event. Where organisers have insufficient traffic plans to allow entry for a larger number of cars to park near the event, people will park their cars wherever they can, most of time illegally, and cause obstruction, impacting public safety because cars are abandoned everywhere. This not only presents issues for emergency services to get through hazards, but this also impacts people being able to follow

designated routes to get to the event because footpaths and walking routes become blocked by abandoned vehicles.

- i) The TMP which was submitted to the Police stated capacity to be 12,500 for the Saturday and 8,000 for the Sunday. The Police have sought to consult with police experts and the Highways Authority on these numbers. Today, differing capacity is being submitted although they are still applying for a licence with capacity for 19,999.
- j) There has been a lot of submissions made by the Applicant in relation to granting the application with conditions that the Police and SAG have final veto if the event goes ahead. This places responsibility on the Police and other Responsible Authorities to ensure the event is safely run and the burden shifts from the Applicant. There is no specific power for the Police to prevent the Applicant from running the event. Even if the Police and/or SAG object to the event taking place, the Applicant will still be able to go ahead with the event and possibly be in breach of their licence and/or be prosecuted by which time the event would have already taken place. Any prosecution will take time and be an additional cost for the taxpayer.
- k) It is not reasonable for the onus to be placed on the Police and say no objections have been raised on certain matters when no detailed plans/submissions have been made by the Applicant evidencing how this event can be safely run. The onus is for the Applicant to create these plans and make submissions; it's not for the Police to create and plan a safe event for the Applicant.
- l) The application contains too many variables that are unknown for the Police to properly assess and comment and on this basis submitted that the Sub Committee reject the application.

14. The Applicant's representative sought to ask questions of the Police:

- a) Regarding the suggestion of conditions and if they were agreed then it would meet the licensing objectives. The Police responded and stated that throughout the consultation process there should be a move towards those conditions being met. However, during this consultation process things weren't being addressed, and progress was not forthcoming so it makes it difficult for the Police to place trust in the organisers that the objectives will be met. We are so far behind in the process already, the parties would expect very detailed plans by this stage. The TMP has only been submitted two weeks ago and is in very draft form. Normally the TMP is a large document which takes weeks to assess and consider. The Applicant's representative stated the TMP submitted is an outline of the intended event plan, which gives the Police the veto that if it is not agreed then the event does not go ahead.
- b) The Police's main concerns seem to be around public safety and people being able to ingress and egress from the site. The Police agreed with this

and outlined that it is a massive issue as one person has previously been killed walking home from an event in East Herts in recent years.

c) The Applicant's representative queried what capacity the traffic engineers has said was appropriate at the site to manage public safety. The Police representative advised that the traffic engineers have looked at the capacity numbers proposed within the TMP as submitted (12,500 for a Saturday and 8,000 for a Sunday) and have said that the site is not suitable for these numbers. If the Applicant wishes to propose changes, then the traffic engineers will be happy to discuss this with them.

15. Following the lunch break the Applicant's representative stated that the Applicant was prepared to modify the application for the premises licence to be time limited for one year only, to expire on the 1st August 2026. The following year the Applicant will apply for another licence if they wish to.

16. Members were asked to consider the application for a premises licence and relevant representations and determine what steps, if any, it considers are appropriate and proportionate for the promotion of the licensing objectives to:

- Grant the application
- Grant the application with modified conditions, additional conditions and/or amend the times for hours or activities, or
- Refuse the application.

DECISION OF LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE

In consideration of this matter the Sub-Committee determined to refuse the premises licence application.

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 application 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 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.

This is a true and accurate record of the decision.

Signed:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Simon Marlow".

Councillor Simon Marlow – Chairman of Licensing Sub Committee

Dated: 30th December 2025

YOUR RIGHT OF APPEAL

An appeal may be made against the decision by:

- (a) The Applicant may appeal the decision

Where a licensing authority—

- (a)rejects an application for a premises licence under section 18,
- (b)rejects (in whole or in part) an application to vary a premises licence under section 35,
- (c)rejects an application to vary a premises licence to specify an individual as the premises supervisor under section 39, or
- (d)rejects an application to transfer a premises licence under section 44,

How to make an appeal

An appeal must be made within a period of **21 days** from the date of this letter.

The notice of appeal and relevant court fee must be sent to:

Clerk to the Justices
Stevenage Magistrates Court
HM Court and Tribunal Services
Stuart Street
Luton
Bedfordshire
LU1 5BL

Before the East Hertfordshire Council Licensing Sub-Committee

In the matter of the Licensing Act 2003

Application for a Premises Licence – Tewinbury Farm, Sound Live Festival

Speaking Note: Sound Live Festival Application

Introduction and Context

- This application seeks a premises licence for the Tewin Sound Festival, a two-day music and entertainment event at Tewinbury, Hertfordshire, in July 2026.
- The event is designed for no more than 19,999, including ticket holders, staff, artists, and contractors. For 2026, the anticipated attendance is 12,500 on Saturday and 8,000 on Sunday, but nevertheless we will be limiting the capacity to no more than 15,000, subject to a satisfactory sign-off of the Traffic Management Plan (TMP).

Sustainability and Transport

- I wish to acknowledge the representations made by Hertfordshire Constabulary regarding traffic, highways, and public safety.
- We fully recognise the importance of robust traffic management and the need to protect both residents and road users.
- It is industry standard for the final TMP to be agreed and signed off at the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) prior to the event, not at the point of licence grant. This approach is consistent and normal in relation to other Event Management experiences in Hertfordshire and nationally.
- The TMP is a dynamic document, refined in consultation with all stakeholders as event details and operational requirements evolve.
- We are committed to submitting a comprehensive and detailed TMP for review and approval by SAG and the Highway Authority well in advance of the event, and certainly before any Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) are issued.
- The event's core aim is sustainability. There is no general public parking—only a limited number of VIP and accessible spaces, all pre-booked. Once VIP parking is sold out, all other attendees must use alternative transport.
- The site is exceptionally well-served by public transport: three train stations are nearby, and shuttle buses will run from Welwyn Garden City and Stevenage stations. There will also be regional coach services from major towns and cities, and park & ride options under consideration.

- Our transport strategy prioritises public safety and minimises disruption:
- Multi-modal access: Rail & ride, park & ride, and managed walking routes are the primary modes of transport.
- Mass public parking is not planned, and road closures will prevent illegal parking near the site.
- Pedestrian safety: Walking routes will avoid unsuitable roads, be stewarded, and have temporary lighting and managed crossings as required.
- Diversion routes will use A and B roads where possible, with clear signage and advance resident communication. Residents will be issued passes for access.
- Provision will be scaled to match ticket sales, with Trakway installed to ensure safe and efficient bus movements.
- Flood risk is acknowledged; the event will be cancelled if access is compromised. CSAS-accredited staff will be deployed at key junctions.
- These approaches minimise road traffic: a single 55-seater coach replaces up to 22 cars, reducing congestion and environmental impact.
- Drop-off and pick-up arrangements are carefully managed, with dedicated zones and safety measures for private hire, taxis, and accessible users.
- All road closures, signage, and resident access are managed in consultation with local authorities and emergency services, with robust plans for resident vehicle permits and continuous staff presence at closure points.

Community Engagement and Impact

We are committed to minimising disruption for local residents:

- Residents will receive advance notice of road closures and diversion routes.
- Passes will be colour-coded and distributed in advance, with additional passes available on request.
- All road closures and diversions will be supported by clear signage and staffed appropriately.

Capacity and Flexibility

- We are willing to review event capacity and operational arrangements if required by SAG or as a result of TMP review. Our approach is flexible and responsive to feedback from all stakeholders.

Proportionate Licensing and Recommended Condition

- Given the above, we respectfully submit that it would be disproportionate to refuse or defer the licence at this stage. Instead, we propose that the licence be granted subject to the following condition:
- **“The event shall not proceed unless and until a final Traffic Management Plan (TMP) has been submitted to and approved by the Safety Advisory Group (SAG), Hertfordshire County Council Highways, and Hertfordshire Constabulary, no less than 12 weeks prior to the event. The TMP shall include full details of pedestrian safety measures, parking arrangements, road closures, diversion routes, contingency plans, and event capacity. Any amendments to the TMP must be agreed by SAG prior to implementation.”**
- This condition ensures that all parties retain control over the final arrangements and that public safety remains paramount.

Sound and Community Management

There are no objections from Environment Health and a comprehensive Sound Management Plan has been prepared by Electric Star Live, an award-winning Acoustic Consultancy. The plan is tailored to the site's rural context and prioritises the prevention of public nuisance, in line with the Licensing Act 2003 objectives.

Music noise levels are predicted to remain well within recognised limits at all sensitive receptors, with real-time monitoring, rapid response to complaints, and a dedicated community helpline during the event.

- The main stage and sound systems are designed for directional control, minimising off-site impact. The event ends at 23:00 each day, with no late-night activity.
- Community engagement is ongoing, with advance notification to residents, a hotline for concerns, and a proven track record of positive relations at previous events.

General Principles and Guidance

1. **Presumption to Grant:** The starting point under the Licensing Act 2003 and Home Office Guidance is that applications should be granted unless there is evidence to the contrary. Each application must be considered on its own merits.

2. The guidance further states when making licensing decisions, all licensing authorities should consider the need to promote growth and deliver economic benefits.
3. The police are the primary authority on crime and disorder. They have not raised any objections on Crime and or Disorder in relation to this application.
4. The Licensing Authority has not raised an objection to the granting of this application, and they would be duty bound to raise an objection if they thought the licensing objective would be undermined.
5. Any representations must be supported by evidence. The committee must scrutinise representations and focus on steps appropriate to promote the licensing objectives.
6. **Proportionality and Appropriateness:** Any conditions imposed must be proportionate, justified, and tailored to the specific risks identified for this event.

Proposed Licensing Conditions

- The application is supported by a detailed set of proposed conditions, covering maximum attendance, event duration, notification to authorities, comprehensive traffic and event management plans, sound management, security, safeguarding, and more.
- These conditions reflect best practice, statutory guidance, and the requirements of responsible authorities, ensuring robust controls for public safety, crime prevention, public nuisance, and protection of children from harm.

Conclusion

- In summary, the application is fully aligned with statutory guidance and licensing objectives.
- The event's design—no general public parking, strong public transport links, advanced sound management, and comprehensive community engagement—demonstrates a proactive approach to all potential risks.
- It is respectfully submitted that the application **can and should be granted**, subject to the proposed conditions, as the most appropriate and proportionate way to promote the licensing objectives.

David Dadds
Solicitor for the Applicant
18th December 2025