

REPORT TO: Regulatory Committee

DATE: 13 November 2006

REPORTING OFFICER: Chief Executive

SUBJECT: Creamfields Event 2006

WARDS: Daresbury

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To consider a report from responsible authorities on issues arising from the carrying out of the Creamfields Event.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION: That the Committee considers the reports from the responsible authorities

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

3.1 The Creamfields Event application was granted subject to conditions by the Regulatory Committee on 27th June 2006. The members also requested that a report be presented to the Committee on 13th November 2006 on issues arising from the event.

3.2 The purpose of this report is to present the facts from the viewpoint of the responsible authorities who were involved with the event. This may assist the Committee with the consideration of any further applications which may be made. However, it is not known as yet whether further applications will be made. In any event this report in no way pre-judges the merits of any application which may be made in the future.

3.3 It is also recognised that at the hearing on 27th June 2006 the Committee considered representations from a large number of interested parties as well as responsible authorities. It is not appropriate for this report to either seek or represent the views of interested parties (but it has been open to the responsible authorities to make any comments they wish to make to the Committee).

3.4 Reports on the event have been received from:

- Halton Council Environmental Health – Noise Control
- Halton Council Environmental Health – Health & Safety and Trading Standards
- Warrington Borough Council
- Cheshire Police
- Cheshire Fire Authority

These reports are set out at Appendix 1. The responsible authorities have been invited to attend the Committee to introduce their reports and to answer any questions raised by the Committee.

6.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

None

7.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

None

8.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Document Application Documents	Place of Inspection Legal Services	Contact Officer John Tully/Kay Cleary
---	---	--

Appendix 1

Environmental Health: Noise (Isobel Mason)

Noise was a fundamental concern regarding the impact of the event on the locality. It was agreed at an early stage that the event would be audible at some locations after 23:00 hours, which whilst not ideal was acceptable for a single event if levels were controlled to try to achieve a minimum level. Regulatory Committee approved a number of conditions to the licence to control the level of noise from the site. Following this the Environmental Health Team worked closely with Creamfield's acoustic consultants to further identify and implement suitable controls. This working relationship continued up to and throughout the event.

Prior to the event fundamental changes were made to the layout of the site which included the main stage being relocated from the southwest corner to the northwest corner, facing away from the residents on the A56 towards the villages of Hatton and Stretton. Two of the tents had similarly been re-orientated to face away from the properties on the A56. Further to these changes a last minute alteration was made to the location of the fairground on site. It was relocated to the top of the hill in the centre of the site to prevent any problems associated with heavy rain which had been a feature of the weather in the proceeding week.

On the day of the event Halton Borough Council's (HBC) officers were in the area from 10:00 hours on Saturday during the sound checks, until 06:00 hours on the Sunday morning. Officers were based on site with the acoustic consultants and off site to respond to complaints from members of the public,

and to monitor noise levels for comparison with the licence conditions and the predictions made by the acoustic consultants prior to the event. It was felt that there was the potential for a large number of complaints to be received by phone lines set up by Halton and Warrington Borough Councils, and Creamfields, given the level of local concern that had been voiced with regard to noise. Additional staff were therefore employed by the Contact Centre on the night to ensure that essential services were unaffected should a large number of complaints be received.

During the event HBC received 2 complaints from residents concerned about noise levels. Warrington and Creamfields also received complaints, although the number taken by all three organisations totalled less than 12. One complaint was received at approximately 22:30 hours, all others were received after 23:00 hours and came from the Warrington area, generally Hatton and Stretton. HBC staff visited those residents where complaints had been received by the HBC call centre and the Creamfields hotline. Noise recordings were taken where it was felt appropriate.

Throughout the event noise readings had been taken both on and off site. According to these results there were no breaches of the noise conditions set by Committee. Subjective assessments confirmed our original conclusion that whilst noise from the event was audible outside properties in the area the levels were acceptable for a single event in the location.

Should we receive any subsequent application for a similar event in the same location there are some areas that would be considered in order to further reduce the noise levels. Neither the 'Strongbow' promotional tent nor the fairground sound system were taken account of within the original application and both were located close to the main stage at the top of the hill on site. Subjective accounts by HBC officers would suggest that these were a significant source of noise in the area after 23:00 hours and yet had not been considered within the licence conditions. It should also be considered that the relatively cool night may have assisted in keeping the number of complaints to the various phone lines low. Measures therefore should be looked into to further reduce noise levels where appropriate and practical, particularly after 23:00 hours.

Environmental Health: Health & Safety, Food Safety & Standards (Yee May Sung)

The largescale music event presented the potential for health & safety concerns both for staff and contractors preparing and dismantling the site and for ticket-holders and other visitors to the site during the event.

To this end conditions were set to ensure this Service would have early sight of all relevant risk assessments for the wide variety of activities occurring on site. In addition all four members of the Health & Safety team were employed

from the preceding week till the week following the event, visiting the site to observe set procedures following from risk assessments.

All risk assessments were received and no problems were encountered except for the generic nature of the work transport and use of lasers documents. Following further discussions and monitoring of radiation levels by health & safety staff on the night, no problems were reported on the use of the lasers.

However the weakness of the work transport risk assessment became apparent on site visits where traffic movement did cause problems with efficient flow although no accidents were observed. If the event is to be run again, the Service will be requiring Creamfields to produce a risk assessment more detailed and more mindful of the local conditions and experience gained from this event.

No notification of accidents on the site was reported and the event ran reasonably safely with no major concerns. The Service is satisfied that Creamfields took all appropriate measures to inform and keep the Service up to date with all health & safety measures and conditions.

With regards to the food safety of all concessions attending the event, the Food Safety Service received early notification of most businesses that were attending and found the in general the standards were good. All five members of the Food Safety team inspected every concession very efficiently on the Saturday morning to ensure that no problems were encountered before the event opened. In the future we would press Creamfields not to allow latecomers to the site, as the Service requires time preceding the event to check with the home regulating authority.

Joint working with Warrington Environmental Health ensured the smooth and expedient monitoring of and timely response to all environmental health concerns.

WARRINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL (Jan Souness Head of Service)

Background

Sections Two and Three of this report relate to operational issues encountered by Warrington Borough Council Officers during the weekend of the event.

Section Four is a summary of the views sent to Warrington Borough Council by residents, which the Council wishes the committee to consider.

2. Operational Issues

- Security was both substantial in numbers and the staff courteous, the suited peaked capped security outside the event were a little over zealous at the outset but relaxed as the day went on.
- Creamfields appeared to have carried out all of their promises in terms of securing properties and preventing unauthorised access to lanes, gates and fields surrounding the enclosure, although some were opened on instructions from the Police
- There was a good atmosphere in Warrington town centre in the afternoon prior to the event. A small number of festival goers were drinking within alcohol free zone, but quickly resolved without aggravation, and most people were gone from town centre by 6.00 p.m.
- At the end of the concert there were no crime and disorder issues from event goers waiting in the town centre for public transport etc.
- Creamfields carried out a comprehensive clean up of the site and surrounding areas, although some residents in Hatton reported litter not picked up.

3. Areas of Concern

- Communication between Warrington Council's help line and the on site Emergency Liaison Team was not as effective as it could have been in terms of regular briefings and responding quickly to issues.
- Severe traffic delays and congestion in Stretton caused serious disruption for residents, this was partly due to the relatively late arrival by event goers to the concert.
- Warrington Borough Council received 30 complaints about noise during the weekend. Higher than expected numbers of complaints were received from areas outside of the initial consultation zone, this was due to the late re-orientation of the stage and speakers. Pre-event tests were based on the original plans submitted by the event organisers, therefore residents within the Appleton, Grappenhall, and Pewterspear areas had not been forewarned about the potential disruption due to noise.
- There appeared to be a delay in the issuing of residents permits to all properties that fell within the road closures of the traffic management plan.

- Environmental Health Officers monitored throughout the event, and it was confirmed by the Principal Environmental Health Officer that the event organisers did comply with the conditions placed on the licence application.
- Reports were received that noise levels increased between 4.00 a.m. and 6.00 a.m. It is the view of Environmental Health that this was more likely to be due to the decrease in general background noise levels and not attributable to an increase in noise levels from the site.

4. Views of Residents

4.1. Observations by Walton residents

- Due to the volume of pedestrians and traffic, some residents felt cut off and frightened
- Prior to, during and after the event, residents reported event goers climbing over fences into gardens
- Issues relating to drink and drunkenness were reported by residents and particularly numbers of people urinating along the roads, on verges and in gardens
- The speed of taxis and mini buses was too high and caused concern
- High levels of traffic were generally felt to be unacceptable and residents felt the Traffic Management plan did not work
- Some stewards provided did not know the area and therefore were not able to provide advice nor did they have any breaks

4.2. Observations by Hatton Residents

- Concerns over the traffic arrangements and the changes made to the traffic plans on the day despite assurances prior to the event
- Hatton residents comments generally reflect the view the traffic arrangements were not satisfactory and delays were unacceptable
- Pedestrian problems – high volume of pedestrians walking through village, and urinating on the road and gardens
- Damaged property and items stolen from gardens were reported

- Not enough Police presence at some points during the event
- Safety issues for pedestrians walking on unlit roads at night
- Signage was not adequate
- Creamfields help line was closed too early
- Police information line did not provide a true picture

4.3. Observations by Stretton Residents

- Hatton Lane – traffic chaos, roads not suitable
- London Road residents – signage not appropriate – could have been better
- Noisy, disruptive ticket touts outside properties
- Public toilets should have been provided at motorway exits
- Country lanes not appropriate to cope with volume of traffic
- No residents passes were issued for Bower Crescent
- No police officers between Hatton Lane/Pill Moss Lane
- Event goers urinating in the road
- Litter in gardens
- Some residents felt event was well planned

4.4. Observations by Appleton Residents

- Unexpected noise levels
- Police deployed elsewhere
- Event goers urinating in the streets
- Appleton Parish Council – event went better than anticipated, but the location is unsuitable

5. General Points

The majority of those residents who contacted the Council still feel the event location is not suitable due to the size

- The changes to the site resulted in higher noise levels for some areas of Warrington and those residents affected had not been included in the consultation.
- Lack of off-site toilet facilities resulted in unacceptable behaviour as event goers used roads and gardens
- Due to the increased pedestrian activity down Hatton Lane the traffic management plan did not work
- Visitors to Walton Hall were seriously affected by the event and numbers were down by 30% on previous years.

CHESHIRE CONSTABULARY Insp. 3718 Dave Price

This report summarises the views of Cheshire Constabulary regarding the planning and operation of the Creamfields 2006 music festival. It is based on a comprehensive debrief process involving all staff who were involved in the event and a number of formal debrief meetings.

PLANNING

The reduced timescales for an event of this nature placed considerable pressure on both the Constabulary and the organiser. However, the relationship quickly developed into a positive working arrangement and, with a few exceptions, identified issues were quickly resolved. The organiser agreed to all license conditions that the Constabulary asked for and participated fully in public consultation regarding the proposed policing arrangements, attending a number of meetings with local residents and parish councils.

OPERATION

From a policing perspective, the event generally followed the agreed timetables. There was a delay in opening the main gates, but this did not cause any issues as very few people attended prior to 3 p.m.. The arrival pattern that we expected (people arriving between 12 p.m. and 6 p.m.) did not occur. Rather, the vast majority arrived between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m., which placed considerable pressure on local roads, especially those leading to the southern car park. This resulted in traffic queues for about 1 hour 25 minutes leading back onto the M56 and a considerable number of visitors walking along Hatton Lane.

Most visitors remained at the site until 4:30 a.m., and, generally, the departure went smoothly. Exceptions to this included difficulties in encouraging taxis to enter the site rather than to pick up on the surrounding roads and with people arriving to pick up friends/relatives.

Prevention of Harm to Children

The condition relating to wristbands that we had asked for related to their issue to visitors who appeared to be between 18 and 21. The organiser has told me that approximately 150 were issued during the event. This number seems low and the organiser agrees that the take up of this scheme was not as great as envisaged. However, this must be balanced by the fact that no police officers or staff reported any concerns about underage people gaining access to the event. Indeed, having personally reviewed a number of video recordings made by our staff at the entrances, I am satisfied that there were no significant issues in this area.

Prevention of Public Nuisance

The closure and diversion of local footpaths worked well during the event. I am aware that there were a couple of instances during the construction of the site when the paths were blocked by contractors, but these were quickly resolved.

The major issue regarding public nuisance related to visitors urinating in public. This was especially problematic in the area of Hatton Lane, due to the large number of visitors who walked along that road having been dropped off near to the 'Cat & Lion' public house. As previously mentioned, this was due to traffic congestion and lasted for approximately two hours.

Prevention of Crime & Disorder

A total of 89 crimes have been attributed to the event, a breakdown of which is as follows:

TYPE OF CRIME	NUMBER REPORTED
Robbery	13
Violence against the person	18
Theft	42
Drugs	6
Vehicle Crime	8
Other	2

While the total number of crimes is broadly in line with other similar events around the country, the number of serious offences (13 robberies and 5 serious assaults) was disappointing. This is an area that will be focused on should the event return. Alcohol consumption was not identified as a particular factor in the crimes reported.

A more pleasing aspect was that only two offences occurred outside the main venue. This reflects the scale of the security operation mounted during the event.

Eighteen people were arrested during the event for offences including supplying controlled drugs, violence and theft of a car (from Middlesbrough). Additionally, over 200 people were identified by drugs dogs based at the entrances and subsequently searched. This led to the seizures of a numerous small quantities (personal use) of controlled drugs.

The CCTV system provided by the organisers has provided footage to assist in the investigation of a number of offences, in accordance with the relevant license condition.

Public Safety

The organiser agreed to provide 350 security staff to manage the event. Whilst it was impossible to count these staff on the day, the number of staff provided was adequate to manage the event and the relationship between those staff and the police was positive.

The Event Liaison Team worked reasonably well for the police, although I am aware that provision of information to off-site agencies was not as good as expected.

Whilst traffic management is not specifically covered in this section, it is worth noting that the plan produced and agreed was implemented by the organiser. Despite the congestion, there were no significant road safety issues and a debrief of this area has already identified improvements that could address the problems in the Hatton Lane area, should the event return.

CONCLUSION

The event was well managed and run. The experience gained from this first year will prove invaluable in policing future similar events and I am confident that the issues identified during the debrief process are all capable of being addressed in the future.

Cheshire Fire Authority (Stuart Hurst)

- Lack of adequate access for fire appliances to car park areas. (Accepted at the time but needs reviewing)
- Internal access road was not complete. (accepted at the time but needs reviewing)
- If a fire had occurred in a marquee it was debatable that a fire engine could have got close enough (More hardstanding required?)
- The officer who carried out the inspection during the event was reasonably happy with the control of persons entering and leaving the marquees and procedures to prevent overcrowding. As you know this was some concern prior to the event.
- Also of concern was the fact that a copy of the application was never received by the Fire Service and it was only by chance that the Fire Protection Department became aware and then undertook inspections.

Note to fifth bullet point

This concern relates to a problem with internal communications within the Fire Service. Notification of applications takes place within the statutory procedures using addresses supplied by the Fire Service. Furthermore the

Fire Service was represented at numerous meetings both before and after the premises licence was granted by the Committee.