

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE A 29 MARCH 2021
--

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE A HELD ON MONDAY 29 MARCH 2021, AT 1000 HOURS, AS AN ONLINE MEETING

PRESENT: - Councillor Mike Leddy in the Chair;

Councillors Nagina Kauser and Bob Beauchamp.

ALSO PRESENT

Bhapinder Nandhra – Licensing Section
Joanne Swampillai – Legal Services
Mandeep Marwaha – Committee Services

(Other officers were also present for web streaming purposes but were not actively participating in the meeting)

NOTICE OF RECORDING

- 1/290321 The Chair advised, and the Committee noted, that this meeting would be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Internet site (www.civico.net/birmingham) and that members of the press/public would record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 2/290321 Members were reminded that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests arising from any business discussed at the meeting. If a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared a Member must not speak or take part in that agenda item. Any declarations will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

- 3/290321 An apology was submitted on behalf of Councillor Mary Locke and Councillor Phil Davies and it was noted that Councillor Nagina Kauser and Councillor Mike Leddy was the nominated substitute member.

Members had agreed during the pre-briefing meeting that Councillor Mike

Leddy would be chairing this Committee.

MINUTES

- 4/290321 The Minutes of meeting held on 25 January and 15 February 2021 having been circulated, were confirmed and signed by the Chair.
-

LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – GRANT MOSELEY FOLK EVENT, SW CORNER OF Highbury Park, Amenity Fields and Grassed Area, Birmingham B14 7SU

The following report of the Interim Assistant Director of Regulation and Enforcement was submitted:-

(See document No. 1)

The following persons attended the meeting.

On behalf of the Applicant

- Gerv Havill, Moseley Folk Limited
- Carl Phillips, Moseley Folk Limited
- John Fell, Moseley Folk Limited

Those Making Representations

- Jenny McCabe, Seaton Grove resident
- Paul Davies, Pineapple Estate resident
- Anne Gilbert, Chair, Highbury Park Friends
- Alys Fowler, Local resident and park user
- Richard Hawley, Local resident and Uffculme Allotments Committee Member (park user)
- Lucy Reid, Local resident and Uffculme Allotments Committee Member (park user)
- Dr Alison Millward, Vice Chair, Chamberlain Highbury Trust
- Sharif Khan, Committee Member, Birmingham and District Bee Keepers Association

* * *

Councillor Leddy informed those present of having previously met Sharif Khan whilst acting as Lord Mayor.

The Chair introduced the Members and officers present and asked if there were any withdrawals of representation.

The Chair invited if there were any preliminary points for the Sub-Committee to consider. There were no preliminary points to consider.

The Chair explained the hearing procedure prior to inviting Licensing Officer, Bhopinder Nandhra to outline the report. He confirmed the applicant had reduced the scope of the application.

The Chair invited the applicant to make their submission. At this stage Gerv Havill requested that Members refer to documentation submitted and made the following points:-

- a) Lots of consultation was undertaken prior to the submission of the application, with general agreement to the event and resulting in a multi-agency group being formed consisting of the Chamberlain Highbury Trust, West Midlands Police, Birmingham City Council, Kings Heath Business Improvement District and Kings Heath CIC. They were all supportive towards this application.
- b) The application had been submitted as a contingency event due to the limited size of Moseley Park, where the event usually took place. The additional space may be required in observance of Covid regulations should restrictions not be fully lifted by the planned event date of 9th – 11th July 2021.
- c) There was no desire to disrupt the good will of local residents and the positive impact the event has had on the local economy whilst based in Moseley Park.
- d) Any concerns raised during the consultation had been addressed and Members were referred to the submitted documentation to review the consultation outcomes, agreements and actions.
- e) Concerns raised and addressed were detailed as follows:
 - i. **Traffic and parking** – event attendees were encouraged to walk or cycle. Parking would be restricted in local roads to discourage car use. In future years, Kings Heath train station would be in operation and would provide an additional travel option.
 - ii. Traffic marshals would be in position to manage vehicular and pedestrian traffic and to ensure access into the park was maintained for the bee keepers.
 - iii. Vehicular access to park visitors would only be restricted during the three days of the event and not during the set up and take down time. Consultation with Queensbridge School was underway regarding parking opportunities.
 - iv. **Covid restrictions** – it was hoped that these will be eased or lifted by then but cautious planning was underway for any eventuality.
 - v. **Conservation concerns** – Vehicle trackways and pedestrian matting would be used and a commitment to reinstate any damaged areas had been given. Should a license be granted, an ecology impact report would be commissioned and shared.
 - vi. **Nuisance concerns** – the proposed license was for one, 3-day event running from 11am – 10.30pm, with no late-night activities requested. Sound systems would ensure that noise levels were kept to a minimum and effective methods had been used at Moseley Park in previous years.
 - vii. **Litter** – wheelie bins would be sited around the park, litter picking will be undertaken and there will be no use of single-use plastics.

- viii. **Setting a precedent for large events to take place in the park** – there was no desire to hold any further events beyond this year and Chamberlain and Highbury Trust have no desire to host regular large events.

In response to Members questions Gerv Havill made the following points:-

- 1) Safe access to the apiary by bee keepers will be given throughout the duration of the event to allow hive maintenance and avoid swarming. Sharif Khan gave Members some background to the bee keepers association and confirmed that access had been requested as part of the license agreement.
- 2) The event is planned for 9th – 11th July this year, with possible future events to take place in June, July or August.
- 3) The Safety Advisory Group consists of representatives from responsible agencies such as highways, environmental health, fire, ambulance and parks events. The group would meet every few weeks to develop, input and plan for the event and check that any licensing conditions were being met. Any recommendations made by the group then become a legal obligation for the event organisers.
- 4) The event had been taking place in Moseley Park since 2006. Since then issues have been addressed such as litter on Moseley High Street; teams were sent out to litter pick and large bins were situated around the park, anti-social behavior; neighbourhood police assist with planning and event marshalls were appointed to assist with access to the high street and road crossing. The PA company and Environmental Health Officers assist with noise and a good relationship has been formed with local residents. There were very few complaints and the event were running efficiently and safely.

The Chair invited representations;

Jenny McCabe made the following points:-

- a) Efforts to address concerns were acknowledged and appreciated, but some have not been met adequately due to the outcome of this application setting a precedent for events in the park.
- b) The park is for the free use of Birmingham residents, yet this event would prevent local people from accessing the park freely during the period of the event.
- c) There was little control over who accesses the park outside the boundaries of the licensed area and this event was likely to bring a far greater number of the public than those who have tickets to the event. This will impact on litter and the ecology of the park as a result of heavy footfall.
- d) The event organisers will be unable to regenerate the ground fully, particularly if the event was repeated annually.
- e) Engagement of the local community has not been effective and many local residents were unaware of the plans. There was also little recognition of those members of the protocol groups who were not in

support of the event, and acknowledgement of the objection letter signed by 80 local residents.

- f) Should the event be approved, this may set a precedent for other applications. Additional events would have a major impact on the park's eco-system and it should be recognised that this park is different to others.

Councillor Leddy and Councillor Beauchamp informed attendees of the purpose of the committee to consider the licensing application against the four principles of licensing and not the ecological impact.

- g) Jenny McCabe appealed to members to recognise that this meeting has provided the only channel to raise concerns of this nature.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Paul Davies made the following points:-

- a) There was an objective under the Licensing Act for members to seek greater community involvement in decisions and to give local residents a say in how decisions were made. With this in mind there were concerns about the effect on local residents, the natural environment, biodiversity and the wider environment implications of holding the event.
- b) The lack of consultation has raised concerns and the role of the Chamberlain and Highbury Trust in responding to the concerns and needs of the community, with its charitable object to promote the conservation of the estate for the benefit of the public. There has been no communication from the Trust to local residents regarding the event and no recognition of the impact on quality and safety for local residents.
- c) Event organisers have referred to local consultation but this has not included the views of B30 residents or the local Councillor. The impact on local residents including parking access, anti-social behavior, noise pollution and the prevention of regular local enjoyment of the park has not been considered.
- d) The wider ecological impact and carbon footprint of this type of event should also be considered and an environmental impact report should be undertaken in order for organisers to understand and mitigate the potential impact.
- e) The committee were asked to consider the City Council's commitment to embed climate impact into council decision making and align their own decision making to this pledge.
- f) Highbury Park is a precious environment to people who enjoy the wildlife, and this should not be sacrificed for commercial gain as this is the wrong approach to the value of the park. The Chamberlain and Highbury Trust should also consider their role as environmental steward at a site that was accessible, useable and free to all.
- g) There was a lack of transparency and clarity in the proposals submitted, particularly in terms of the future plans for the event, with some

statements regarding a contingency site for this year only and other reference to the use of Kings Heath train station in 2023.

Cllr Leddy reiterated that the committee has a remit for licensing only and not for environmental issues.

- h) Paul Davies referred members back to the Licensing Act 2003 and its reference to the involvement of local residents and reiterated that there was no other route to express concerns of this nature to Birmingham City Council.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Ann Gilbert made the following points:

- a) Since Highbury Park Friends made their original representation to the event organisers, some concerns have been recognized and the area under application has been revised in order to avoid furrow and woodlands.
- b) The Highbury Park Friends were very keen to recognise the environmental concerns within the licensing decision and, if not here, there must be somewhere within the Local Authority to take these concerns.
- c) Should the event take place there was a need for a wildlife impact assessment. This should be undertaken by Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust to guarantee minimal impact on conservation.
- d) Concerns were raised about the number of attendees. The proposed 10,000 in a small area requires some health and safety considerations.
- e) Should the license be granted, the Friends would like to the Trust set limits within specific negotiations followed by a full review before any further events were agreed.

Cllr Beauchamp noted that the purpose of the multi-agency safety advisory group would be to ensure these concerns were addressed before and after the event.

- f) Ann Gilbert responded in agreement, stating that concerns have been raised with the safety advisory group, with consideration to be given not just to the event area and attendees but also to the wider use and impact on the park.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Alys Fowler made the following points:-

- a) Although understanding the licensing committee remit, consideration should be given to the new priority to the Council Plan of 25th June 2019,

stating that the council will play a leading role in climate change and this will be embedded in its decision-making processes.

- b) The park is a site of hugely important environmental impact, having been designated as a Site of Nature Conservation and Site of Local Importance to Nature Conservation. Moseley Park was not comparable. As such the eco-system must be protected.
- c) The impact of increased footfall in the park has already caused some soil compaction resulting in local roads being more prone to flooding and reduction in carbon absorption.
- d) An independent wildlife assessment must be undertaken before the license was agreed and following the event to review impact. There was currently no data available regarding the impact of the event on Moseley Park.
- e) The lack of notification and consultation with local residents also raises concerns and more wide consultation should be undertaken.

In response to Members questions, Alys Fowler made the following points:-

- f) The site was used as a car park when the Gardeners Weekend event took place in Kings Heath park. Although cars were heavier than people their weight was distributed differently, causing less impact on soil compaction. The impact of footfall on Kings Heath park was visible however, with high levels of ground water, less biodiversity and less carbon absorption. The field at Highbury park was now a site of environmental value, nurturing insect population and improving the ecosystem. It would take more than a year to bring the site back to its current level.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Lucy Reid made the following points:-

- a) As a local resident and member of the Uffculme Allotment Committee, which was sited in Highbury Park, the lack of consultation must be noted.
- b) There was no objection to the event or the organisers, only the inappropriateness of the site due to the impact on nature and wildlife, and the risk of setting a precedent.
- c) The City is proud of the park, which was managed to promote nature and has been important to local people during the pandemic. The additional use has already caused some impact on paths and land compaction and it was important that this does not increase further.
- d) A wildlife assessment by Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust should be undertaken before, during and after the event.
- e) There was some inconsistency in the license application and presentation to local residents regarding the frequency of the event and the number of days required for set up and take down of the event. Some documents state that this application relates to a one-off contingency event should Moseley Park not be a suitable venue due to Covid restrictions, where others refer to future years.

- f) The committee was asked to recognise that Highbury was not like other parks and there may be more suitable venues for an event of this nature.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Richard Hawley made the following points:-

- a) There were no concerns about the event or the organisers, the issue was around the protection of the park.
- b) Organisers should commit to a wildlife assessment, and it was concerning that this was not considered and undertaken as part of the license application.
- c) Consultation of local residents has not been transparent or fully inclusive and notices within the park were misleading. Clarity was required regarding the application in terms of the proposed frequency of the event and whether this will replace the Moseley event or be in addition to.
- d) The significant impact and scale of events in the local area, including ancillary events which take place outside the licensed area.
- e) Moseley Park offers a different environment as access is easier to manage due to its private nature. This was not the case in Highbury Park and levels of attendance outside the specified area will be hard to monitor and manage.
- f) The extended period of eight additional days for set up and take down have not previously been mentioned and the negative impact of this must be considered.
- g) The revised site plan does not provide any detail regarding the location of the stage and its proximity to residential dwellings.

No questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Alison Milward made the following points:-

- a) Chamberlain and Highbury Trust (CHT) was one of the stakeholder groups with responsibility for the wellbeing of the park and users. As Chair of the subgroup recognition has been given to the increased interest in the park as a venue for events due to its size and proximity to the planned train station.
- b) Consideration has been given to reducing impact on park neighbours and wildlife and this will remain under review.
- c) There were no plans to hold regular major events in the park due to its nature and designations and attendee numbers were still being considered.
- d) Heavily designated park and hall on at risk register of historic England, grade 2, sensitive site and much loved.
- e) This was the first company that has approached for a major event
- f) Pleased as an organisation that WMP had said no more than 2 major events to be held in this park - very helpful and appropriate.

Licensing Sub-Committee A – 29 March 2021

- g) The Committee to consider requiring both somebody from CHT or protocol groups, some representative from residents to join multi-agency group to work out finer details to every bodies advantage. This would be welcomed as they remained concerned about public safety and public nuisance issues
- h) The limit of around 10,000 was a concerning number and would ask the committee to consider capacity. Impact on coping with this. Prefer capacity at 4000.
- i) CHT set up by BCC following campaign by local residents who were concerned about the state of Highbury and wider park.
- j) Objectors should consider the requirements on the Trust to raise £8m for completion of the restoration of the estate and its ongoing maintenance.
- k) 1 or 2 major events in the park would generate of funds for Stakeholder Groups to reinvest in the site for the benefit of citizens of Birmingham and wildlife.
- l) Shared frustration about ecological considerations but understand this was not part of this Committees decision-making (4 licensing objectives). Concerns raised around the public nuisance and safety to the park and remains accessible to non-ticket holders therefore, securing safety, traffic impact – important to be considered.
- m) The trust would welcome up to two large events annually but remains mindful of the designation of the site.
- n) Overall, in support of the proposal however, mindful of the park's qualities and impacts.

No questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

Sharif Khan made the following points:-

- a) Recognition was given to the challenges face by the committee in embedding environmental and climate concerns at the heart of all its processes.
- b) The park and estate was complex and needs to be self-sustaining but a balance was required what areas should and should not be used for events of this nature.
- c) Revision of the original plans in response to concerns was welcomed but consideration was still required in regard to the four licensing objectives including public safety. Moseley Park was a more confined, making safety easier to manage than Highbury. Sufficient information regarding health and safety in the wider areas of the park has not been provided. Safety regarding the apiary has been discussed, however plans to ensure safety in this area should be written into the licensing conditions, not simply by verbal agreement.

In response to members questions Sharif Khan made the following points:-

- d) The training apiary was in a discreet and somewhat inaccessible area of the park with fencing to the perimeter. The risk of the public accessing

the area was low and members of the bee keepers association will be on-site throughout the event to ensure safe management.

No further comments or questions were raised by the Members.

No questions were raised by the Committee lawyer.

On being invited to sum up the following points were made:-

- **Sharif Khan** - The bee keepers association were broadly supportive of the license, subject to conditions being met regarding safety and nuisance within the wider areas of the park around the event area.
- **Alison Milward** - Chamberlain and Highbury Trust were broadly supportive but require more formal involvement as stakeholders within the multi-agency safety advisory group.
- **Richard Hawley** - Objection remains with regard to the event and a request to provide an independent wildlife impact assessment prior to the license being granted.
- **Lucy Reid** - Objections remain regarding the impact on the natural environment, which goes against the City Council's eco objectives. Birmingham and Black Country Wildlife Trust should be commissioned to perform a number of impact assessments, attendee numbers should be reduced and greater consultation with residents should be undertaken.
- **Alys Fowler** - A wildlife assessment should be a condition of the license.
- **Ann Gilbert** - A wildlife assessment should be conducted, the lack of local consultation addressed, and the management of the wider park should be given greater consideration.
- **Paul Davies** - The event would set a dangerous precedent for this and other parks. The proposal does not fit with the city council's climate action plan and was bad for local residents and wildlife. Consultation has included Moseley residents but not those surrounding Highbury Park. The event was against the charitable objectives of the Chamberlain and Highbury Trust and the appropriation of public space in order to raise money for Highbury Hall should be considered.
- **Jenny McCabe** - Objection to the application was now stronger following hearing the representations. The lack of consultation was worse than realised and in representation of 80 local residents should be acknowledged. Highbury Park was the wrong venue for an event of this nature and this meeting provide the only opportunity to raise concerns.

In summary Gerv Havill made the following points:

- He apologised if stakeholders felt there was not enough consultation, particularly to residents of the Pineapple Estate. Community groups have been contacted and notices were all around the park.
- Cost of festival tickets was similar to any event of this type.
- Festivals have been taking place in Highbury Park since the 1970s.
- The organisers always consider green credentials of their events, including use of biodiesel and no single use plastics, and will always look at doing more.
- Commercial events take place in all parks in order to raise money to support their upkeep.
- Organisers would be happy to commission a wildlife assessment before, during and after the event. There was no desire to be responsible for any damage to the wildlife and this goes against the ethos of the organisation.
- The license is sought for one event per year; a contingency event to replace Moseley Park for this year and possibly next year. There were no plans for a regular event.
- Access for vehicles has been reviewed and access to park users will only be restricted for the three days of the event.
- The Highbury event would be more costly to run than Moseley Park.
- Organisers would welcome additional members to join the multi-agency group as appropriate.
- Additional toilet facilities and bins could be sited around the park and a litter picking across the whole park could be provided. 24-hour security could also be extended to the wider park and other areas as necessary.
- The event would end at 10.30pm each day and reassurance were given than any event will adhere to licensing conditions. Support has been received from Kings Heath BID, Kings Heath CIC and the council events team.
- The organisation has a good reputation and was well supported locally. The event would provide something positive to look forward to.
- The 10,000 capacity was sought in order to allow for any contingency in numbers. The reality will be closer to 4,000 and Chamberlain and Highbury Trust have the power to veto numbers as deemed necessary.

At 1235 hours the meeting was adjourned in order for the Sub Committee to make a decision and all parties left the meeting. The Members, Committee Lawyer and Committee Manager conducted the deliberations in private and the decision of the Sub-Committee was sent out to all parties as follows: -

5/290321

RESOLVED: -

That the application by Moseley Folk Event, SW Corner of Highbury Park, Amenity Fields and Grassed Area, Birmingham B14 7SU, **BE GRANTED** for the holding of one event per calendar year, for a maximum duration of three days.

Those matters detailed in the operating schedule and the relevant mandatory conditions under the Licensing Act 2003 will form part of the licence issued, together with those conditions as agreed by the applicant with West Midlands Police in advance of the meeting, namely:

- Events will only take place over a three-day period, from a Thursday to a Sunday or a Bank Holiday Monday
- The maximum number of persons on site will be 9,999 at any one time, inclusive of all persons on site (staff, contractors, artists etc)
- For each event there will be a separate Multi Agency Group Process – “MAG” (or any other approved name)
- After each event a debrief of the MAG group (or any other approved name) will take place. Any learning/suggestions from the debrief will be incorporated by the premises licence holder into the next event
- The first MAG meeting for the first event will be called a minimum of 16 weeks prior to the event date
- The premises licence holder will invite representatives from all the responsible authorities (as defined by the Licensing Act 2003) to attend the meeting
- Any other interested parties as identified by either the premises licence holder or any responsible authority will be invited to the meeting. Interested parties will be classed as experts in their fields that can advise the MAG process in promoting the licensing objectives, who are not classed as responsible authorities under the Licensing Act 2003, such as the city Highways Department and the Ambulance Service. This invitation will not be open to members of the public
- At least 7 days prior to the MAG meeting, the premises licence holder will send the first iteration of the Event Manual Safety Plan (EMSP) (or other terminology) to all responsible authorities (email details as contained within the Birmingham City Council Statement of Licensing Policy) and any interested party
- The EMSP must detail control measures for the promotion of the licensing objectives, and must as a minimum contain:
 - o Site plans
 - o Hierarchy/control
 - o Definitions of roles and responsibilities
 - o Build and de-rig schedules
 - o Command and control plan
 - o Alcohol management plan
 - o Ingress and Egress plan
 - o Security and stewarding plan
 - o Incident management plan
 - o Evacuation plan
 - o Medical and vulnerability plan
 - o Noise management plan
 - o Site capacity plans (and individual units if plans indicate more than one structure)
 - o Major incident plan
 - o Search plan
 - o Weapons/drugs policy
 - o Waste management plan

Licensing Sub-Committee A – 29 March 2021

- o Transport/highways plan
 - o Trader information and food hygiene details
 - o Fire detection and prevention plan
 - o Counter terrorism plan (restricted)
- The number and frequency of any meeting, or the requirement for updated EMSP, will be determined through the MAG
- At least 28 days before the event the final iteration of the EMSP will be signed off by those responsible authorities which were present through the MAG meetings
- Any changes to the EMSP after the 28-day deadline must be notified in writing to all MAG members, and if any MAG member deems the change to undermine any of the licensing objectives, they retain the power to veto the amendments
- This veto to be done in writing with explanation, at which point the signed EMSP remains as the operating condition for the purposes of the premise licence
- If the amendments are agreed (written proof required from the MAG members) then the EMSP can be amended accordingly and this to become the new operating schedule for the purposes of the premise licence
- The signed off EMSP will become the operating conditions for that event and be a condition of the premise licence during its operation

The Sub-Committee also determined that the following additional conditions should be added:

- The additional lavatory facilities, accepted by the applicant company during the meeting, shall be placed at the entrances to Highbury Park
- A Wildlife Impact Report shall be commissioned by the applicant company to the satisfaction of the MAG
- The MAG shall approve an arrangement regarding vehicular access to the site for the Birmingham District Beekeepers Association

The Sub-Committee deliberated the operating schedule put forward by the applicant, and the likely impact of the application - particularly in the light of the agreed conditions to have the arrangements scrutinised by the MAG - and concluded that by granting this application, the four licensing objectives contained in the Act will be properly promoted. Many Birmingham parks regularly hosted similar events, and the proposal was supported by the City Council Events Team.

The applicant company was an experienced operator which had successfully run festivals and large-scale events in the Birmingham area since 2006. The documents in the Report showed that the applicant company had shown a spirit of cooperation with local community groups and was keen to put on an event which would benefit the local area. The Sub-Committee noted in particular that the Chamberlain Highbury Trust had a pressing need to raise funds to maintain the Park and to restore its heritage features.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the representations made by other persons but was not convinced that there was an evidential and causal link

between the issues raised and any effect on the licensing objectives. The issue of wildlife conservation was outwith the scope of the Sub-Committee, and in any event could more properly be dealt with by the commissioning of a Wildlife Impact Report, as offered by the applicant company.

The Sub-Committee did not find it necessary to adopt the conditions suggested by the Chamberlain Highbury Trust. Careful planning and management, scrutinised by experts at the MAG meetings, was more than sufficient to ensure that the event would uphold the licensing objectives and protect the interests of local residents. Members determined that the conditions agreed with West Midlands Police would achieve a sensible and practical balance in protecting the Park and local residents, whilst allowing for a popular local event to safely take place, which would benefit the heritage and maintenance efforts at the Park.

In reaching this decision, the Sub-Committee has given due consideration to the City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Guidance issued under s182 of the Licensing Act 2003 by the Secretary of State, the application for a premises licence, the written representations received, and the submissions made at the hearing by the applicant company and by those making representations.

All parties are reminded that under the provisions contained within Schedule 5 to the Licensing Act 2003, there is the right of appeal against the decision of the Licensing Authority to the Magistrates' Court, such an appeal to be made within twenty-one days of the date of notification of the decision.

OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

6/290321 There were no matters of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 1306 hours.

.....
CHAIRMAN