

## Julia O'Brien

---

**From:** Licensing  
**Sent:** 26 March 2013 11:12  
**To:** Julia O'Brien  
**Subject:** FW: Temple Island Meadow, Remenham Farm RG9 3DB License No PRO338

Jayne Squires  
Licensing Officer  
Licensing Service  
West Berkshire and Wokingham  
Environmental Health and Licensing Service  
PO Box 155, Shute End, Wokingham, Berkshire RG40 1WW

[Jayne.Squires@wokingham.gov.uk](mailto:Jayne.Squires@wokingham.gov.uk)

☎ 0118 974 6402    ☎ Ext no 6402    ☎ 0118 974 007479

---

**From:** Ron Emerson [mailto:[ronemerson@btinternet.com](mailto:ronemerson@btinternet.com)]  
**Sent:** 26 March 2013 11:04  
**To:** Licensing  
**Subject:** Temple Island Meadow, Remenham Farm RG9 3DB License No PRO338

Dear Sirs

I am writing with regard to the impending review of the above license and would like to register my strong support for a revocation of this licence.

I am a member of the Remenham Farm Residents Association and have been actively involved in discussions with WBC regarding ongoing breaches to the terms of the licence. We have actively monitored the noise levels at the Rewind festival since its inception some three years ago. We have also monitored site management during the set up and taking down of the event as well as during the event itself. You will have seen from the data provided by WBC that there have been consistent breaches of the noise levels defined in the licence. This accords with measurements which were provided by Three Spires Acoustics who are acknowledged experts in this field and who were retained by RFRA to provide further objective data.

Following the 2011 event, the management of Rewind were notified by WBC about breaches of noise levels at that event. Despite these warnings, in 2012 there numerous further breaches of a significant level. During the event WBC warned the management that they were in breach, thus giving them the opportunity to rectify the situation, however the breaches continued at significant levels, thus demonstrating either that they had no intention of complying with the terms of the licence or that they were incompetent in managing to those levels – or perhaps both. As such, it is our firm belief that this event should be terminated.

We believe that any review of this licence should take into account the context in which this event is held. This area is adjacent to a Conservation Area and is also within an Area of Outstanding Beauty under a National Trust Covenant. As such it is supposed to be preserved for the general public to enjoy as a place of peace and quiet where the tranquil and natural character of the environment is preserved. The reality is that from late May through mid July it faces constant noise and disruption from a series of events staged in the Meadows and in the area immediately south of the village, a good deal of this disruption involving the time it takes to set up and take

down these events which, during HRR, goes on throughout the night. With the addition of Rewind this now extends into mid August. It is therefore important not simply to look at the days involved in the events themselves but in the total time involved in staging them. During this time the ability for the general public to access the area is severely compromised.

From the point of view of local residents, our homes are effectively rendered uninhabitable during this time due to the constant noise and disruption. It is certainly impossible to invite guests to our homes during much of this period, and access to and from our properties becomes at times dangerous when faced with reversing around blind bends down single track roads when making way for giant articulated trucks coming the other way to deliver equipment to the various sites. This area is totally unsuited to these events, as we have stated repeatedly, given it is served by poorly maintained single track roads that make access, even in the best of times, very difficult.

It is also only over the past two years that the violence and drunkenness associated with late night drinking in bars around Remenham during HRR has been reduced due to a significantly increased presence of the police – with costs cutting in public services this may not continue. It was not unusual for our gardens and homes to be entered by drunken people. We have had graffiti sprayed on the walls of our house and a neighbour had a bottle thrown through their bedroom window late at night – there are many other examples.

As such, the arrival of the Rewind event meant that what was left of the summer was taken away. Our ability to exercise our legal right to the 'quiet enjoyment of our homes' was further removed. To occupy our gardens unmolested by noise and intruders was further reduced. The month of August which had previously been peaceful now faced a further invasion of people where, as the evidence shows, the organisers have no concern for complying with licence terms, nor respecting their neighbours.

As a further, and perhaps purely technical point, the staging of this event, along with the other events I have referred to, is in breach of Noise Council's recommended sound levels on a single site.

In conclusion, I think it is important to say that few people, who have not been exposed to events here, can probably appreciate what has been going on in this part of Remenham over recent years. There has been a continual creep in the amount of time involved in all of the activities that are staged here and the consequent disruption involved. Some years ago WBC was assured by the landowners that there was no intention to change the 'character' of events held in Remenham after concerns had been voiced by residents that larger events might be staged. Then a "Rocking by the River" concert was held. This was a one day event that was described as a one-off and small (750 people). Then Rewind with 20,000+ people arrived. This is what happens all the time. We think it is time that the voices of local residents were heard and their rights respected.

Yours sincerely

Ron Emerson  
The Reeds  
Remenham Lane

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

## Julia O'Brien

---

**From:** David Law <daviddlaw@msn.com>  
**Sent:** 27 March 2013 16:50  
**To:** Licensing  
**Cc:** JohnHalsall  
**Subject:** Temple Island Meadow Remenham Farm RG9 3DBLicense No. PRO 338

Dear Sir,

My wife and I have lived at Barnside Cottage, Remenham Lane for some 35 years.

Over that time we have seen a huge increase in all sorts of regattas and other events on the Remenham Farm site. The Rewind pop concert which we have suffered for the last three years is second only to Henley Royal Regatta in the numbers it attracts and the disruption it causes to our small village, served as it is by a mainly single track lane with passing places. It is obvious that this is completely inappropriate location for such a huge event, adjoining as it does a conservation area.

No sound monitoring devices have been placed on my boundary, shielded as we are from the worst of the noise source by The Reeds, Remenham Farmhouse, The Church and The Old School House. However I can tell you that the amount of noise that does get through is sufficient to deny us the pleasure of using our own garden for three days. From the sound monitoring reports I have seen, the Rewind organisers are constantly breaching the limits of the license. I imagine if I constantly exceeded the 30mph limit on Remenham Church Lane and Remenham Lane, knowing that my speed was being monitored, the appropriate authority would have taken away my driving license long ago. The point is that the organisers KNOW they are being monitored and STILL breach the conditions leading me to conclude that they are either incapable of enforcing the licensing conditions or do not consider the pop concert viable at the limits imposed or simply choose to ignore the terms of the license. As you know, the noise council's recommended sound levels on a single site are already exceeded when you take the three days of Rewind together with the three days of activity at Henley Royal Regatta at the 65LAeq level.

Although some 20,000 people come each day for 3 days, the setting up and taking down of the event cause huge problems of access and noise for an additional eight to ten days (it has varied over the years) All site traffic is supposed to access Remenham Church Lane avoiding Remenham Lane but I have lost count of bemused lorry and van drivers asking me for directions as they try and find the site. The main noise nuisance is the reversing warning noise from various vehicles, we have asked repeatedly for them to be fixed with white noise "bleepers' All to no avail.

The arrangements for taxi pick up points are completely ignored leading to late night chaos as taxis compete for fares down our little Lane.

Having double the population of Henley camped next door to us for three days causes all sorts of additional smells, noises, light and even Voice pollution. I cannot think of a single benefit to any local resident and would therefore ask you to fully revoke this license as it would appear they will only ignore any fresh conditions you might lay down.

Yours faithfully,

David D. Law

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

**From:** JAHWEST@aol.com  
**Sent:** 28 March 2013 11:43  
**To:** Licensing  
**Subject:** Temple Island Meadow; Rewind Festival; Licence PRO338

The Licensing Officer

Dear Sir,

I would like to support, strongly, the Councils application for a Review of this Licence, and, as the occupier of one of the closest houses to the Event, would make the following points:

- 1 In the light of three year's experience of the Rewind Festival, it is apparent that it is wholly inappropriate to hold such an event in the present location.
  - 2 the Organizers are wholly incapable of complying with the noise requirements of the Licence and of providing adequate monitoring. It is questionable whether the Festival could be effective within the noise constraints which leads to the conclusion that the conditions are incapable of compliance.
  - 3 Even if the noise requirements can be adhered to, the three days of the Festival, coupled with a further three days activity over Henley Royal Regatta, at the 65LAeq level, are in excess of the Noise Council's recommended sound levels on a single site.
  - 4 To erect a facility for 20,000 people per day, including tentage, fairground, music arenas, living accommodation and all ancillary works, creates an intense nuisance to the immediate area, with no commercial benefit to any local residents.
  - 5 The traffic movements, over not only the three day period but also during set up and take down, cause massive disruption to the locality, which is rural and served by narrow lanes which were not designed for such activity.
  - 6 In addition to the music noise levels, there is considerable human voice noise, particularly at the end of each evening, which further disturbs the tranquility of the area.
  - 7 There is light nuisance from floodlights (and similar) and also the noise of generators and other equipment
  - 8 Despite providing for specific taxi pick up points, within the site, these are not adhered to and the village lanes become chaotic by reason of taxis competing for fares.
  - 9 The staging of the Festival in its present location is environmentally unsound, adjoining, as it does, a Conservation Area.
- For all the above reasons, I would urge the Licensing Committee to REVOKE the LICENCE, particularly as warning letters have already been written to the Event Organiser, without achieving any improvement.**  
Please acknowledge receipt of this representation.

**Anthony West  
Remenham Manor  
Remenham Lane  
RG9 3DD**

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

## Julia O'Brien

---

**From:** Halsall <cherwell@btinternet.com>  
**Sent:** 01 April 2013 17:47  
**To:** Karen Court  
**Cc:** Julia O'Brien; Joe Dray  
**Subject:** PRO 338 Rival  
**Attachments:** 2013 03 Submission to Rewind Review by John Halsall.docx; Noise Council Code on Noise Control at Concerts[1].pdf; OBSERVATIONS - 80s Rewind Festival (3).doc

Dear Karen  
Please find attached  
kind regards  
John Halsall  
Cherwell  
Remenham  
Berkshire  
RG9 3DB  
01491 576190  
07939 041227

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

# REMENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

REVIEW OF PREMISES LICENCE  
TEMPLE ISLAND MEADOW, REMENHAM FARM, REMENHAM LANE,  
REMENHAM RG9 3DB (REWIND FESTIVAL)  
LICENCE NO: PRO338

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the four years that Rewind has held a license and during the first year under the Remenham Farm Licence PRO 258, it has not observed the terms of the license, despite being told and warned on several occasions. Issuing a separate license for Rewind, when one already exists for Remenham Farm, the landowner, was both unnecessary and inappropriate. At the time of the hearing, an undertaking was given that the conditions on the Remenham Farm License would be observed and that it would not result in more days of up to 65dBA noise contained in PRO 258; such an undertaking has never been formally acknowledged by Remenham Farm.

The noise council recommends that where there are more than three concert days in any calendar years the music noise level should not exceed the background noise by more than 15dBA over a fifteen minute period; this is approximately 45dBA for Remenham. The Concert is unable to operate without breaching 65 dBA, which is 64 times louder than that recommended.

Whilst river and sporting events are within the tradition of the area, a pop concert is not. Given the full diary of events which currently exist, this has a cumulative effect so that there is very little respite from events through the period. The lanes are inadequate for this size of event without considerable disruption to the community, the village is too small to accommodate 20,000 plus people without nuisance and collateral damage to the village and the villagers..

The concert itself by definition and by the admission of the promoter cannot be held quietly, so there is bound to be considerable nuisance to the villagers. The Thames Valley amplifies and reflects noise in an extraordinary way.

Remenham Parish Council endorses and supports the view of the Environmental Health Authority for revocation of the Licence.

John Halsall  
Chairman Remenham Parish Council

## ENDORSEMENT

1. The attached report prepared by Michael Dudley of the Remenham Farm Residents Association has the full support of the Remenham Parish Council and my family and I.

## DECLARATION OF INTEREST

2. My name is John Halsall. I am sixty three years old and live at Cherwell, Remenham Lane. I live with my wife and three children. I have owned the house for approximately thirty five years, before which I lived in Henley for the previous twenty years. I am a member of the Remenham Farm Residents Association.
3. I have been a member of the Remenham Parish Council (RPC) for just under twenty years and have been Chairman since early 2004. I have been a Borough Councillor for Wokingham Borough Council (WBC), (Remenham, Wargrave and Ruscombe Ward) since 2011.
4. Rewind has kindly invited the neighbouring houses to the event, as far as I know in every year the event has been held. Whilst it is not an event I would normally choose to go to, my family and I have attended and enjoyed it; we have been grateful for the opportunity.

## BACKGROUND

5. Remenham is a village with about six hundred inhabitants in the Borough of Wokingham, Berkshire bounded by Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire. There are two main roads through the village the busy London/Henley Road and the Wargrave/Henley Road; the remainder are small country lanes. The River Thames makes up one of the boundaries.
6. The village has many stakeholders, who use its facilities constantly. It is an important centre of UK Rowing with three rowing clubs (arguably four) in Remenham. There is a canoe club and a boatyard. The Thames Walk runs through the Village with numerous other footpaths attracting many tens of thousands of walkers each year. Joggers, cyclists and some horse riders use the Parish extensively. There is a small church with a loyal congregation. There are two vibrant public houses and many small businesses.

## HISTORY

7. When we first moved to Remenham, there were no public events other than rowing regattas. The Regattas were very much rowing events and attracted only rowers and their supporters. Even Henley Royal Regatta attracted very few people this far down and there were just teas and a very small simple bar. All events were day time events.
8. Progressively, the quantity of events and the number of people has increased. There is a substantial amount of activity in the evenings and nights. The cumulative impact is considerable.

## REWIND

9. Rewind had its fourth year in 2012. It is an event attracting 20,000 people plus all the staff. The setup starts a week before and break down takes another week. However, the site is not completely clear for another two weeks.
10. It has to be said that it is a very pleasant event and one which is organised well and seems to provide a great deal of enjoyment. Regrettably it is inappropriate for Remenham.
11. The substantial engineering works over a two week period are not suited to the country lanes and seriously disrupt the other users of the roads and village. The works include the setting up of stages, substantial fencing, funfair equipment, bars and other ancillary equipment. The noise is incessant and would be greatly *alleviated by the universal use of white noise reversing horns.*
12. The concert itself by definition and by the admission of the promoter cannot be held quietly, so there is bound to be considerable nuisance to the villagers and other outlying areas. The Thames Valley amplifies and reflects noise in an extraordinary way
13. I do not believe that this is correct venue for a pop concert. Whilst river and sporting events are within the tradition of the area, a pop concert is not. Given the full diary of events which currently exist, this has a cumulative effect so that there is very little respite from events through the period. The lanes are inadequate for this size of event without considerable disruption to the community, the village is too small to accommodate 20,000 plus people without nuisance and collateral damage. Just the noise will create nuisance.

## LICENCE

14. In 2009, Rewind operated under the Remenham Farm Licence PRO 258, which contains provisions for noise and the frequency of events.
15. WBC agreed to issue a licence for Rewind in addition to that of Remenham Farm but at the time an undertaking was given that the conditions on the Remenham Farm License would be observed and that it would not result in more days of up to 65bDBA noise; such an undertaking has never been formally acknowledged by Remenham Farm.
16. The issuance of another licence seems to have been a device to protect PRO 258; a device which should have been apparent to the Licensing Authority.
17. In the four years that Rewind has held a licence and during the first year under the Remenham Farm Licence PRO 258, it has not observed the terms of the license, despite being told and warned on several occasions.
18. Issuing a separate license for Rewind, when one already exists for Remenham Farm, the landowner, was both unnecessary and inappropriate. It leads to the confusion that if one licence is breached then both are.



## REMENHAM PARISH COUNCIL

19. Remenham Parish Council is conscious that the increasing number of events is materially changing the nature of the village. The noise and disruption arising from the Rewind Festival affects everyone in the village not only those in close proximity to the event.
20. Remenham Parish Council and its Borough Councillors propose the Borough adopt a Borough wide policy which welcomes events which accept five governing principles:
  - a. That the cumulative impact of events is taken into account in any particular area
  - b. That the borough, responsible authorities, the parish and the residents fully recover both direct costs and collateral costs arising from any event.
  - c. That events are holistically planned.
  - d. That the Noise Council recommendations are observed.
  - e. That benefit is derived to the residents for any event,.

## COSTS

21. WBC, RPC and the villagers (RFRA) have to continuously incur costs if only to have evidence of nonconformities with licenses. These costs are ongoing and considerable.

## NOISE

22. The Noise Council "Large music events involving high powered amplification give pleasure to Thousands of people each year. However, the noise from these events can cause disturbance to those living in the vicinity. The purpose of this code is to provide guidance on how such disturbance or annoyance can be minimised. Various guidelines and criteria are described in the code, covering a range of events from a single concert to a full season. Compliance with the guidelines and the other criteria given will enable successful concerts to be held whilst keeping to a minimum the disturbance caused by the noise. First published in 1995, the code is currently under review with a view to updating it."
23. The Noise Council recommends that "the Music Noise Level (MNL) should not exceed the following when measured 1 metre from the façade of any noise sensitive premises between the hours of 09.00 and 23.00:
  - a. One to three concert days per calendar year per venue for rural venues "The MNL should not exceed 65dB(A) over 15 minute period
  - b. Four to twelve concert days the MNL should not exceed the background level by more than 15dB(A) over a fifteen minute period."
24. "For events continuing or held between the hours of 23.00 and 9.00 the music noise should not be audible within noise-sensitive premises with windows open in a typical manner for ventilation"

25. Remenham Farm has more than three events so following these guidelines all events should not exceed the background level by more than 15dB(A) over a fifteen minute period and between the hours of 23.00 and 9.00 the music noise should not be audible within noise-sensitive premises with windows open in a typical manner for ventilation
26. The Remenham Farm License under which Rewind operated for the first year (2009) permitted three days of 65dBA until 23.00 hours. RPC and RFRA has monitored the Rewind Festival for Noise and asked WBC also to do so and substantial breaches were recorded. In every year since breaches have been recorded by both RFRA and WBC.
27. These two years of breaches are notwithstanding that the Noise Council guidelines recommend a level of 15dB(A) above the background level not 65dB(A). The background level is about 30dB(A) which would be 45dB(A).
28. The 65dB(A) permitted is therefore 20dB(A) higher than the Noise Council envisages (approximately sixty four times higher) and even this is breached constantly, hence the application for the review.

#### TRAFFIC

29. The traffic is considerable during the event, leading up to the event and after the event.
30. The traffic order is imposed by WBC but is not monitored by WBC and is as competent as the contractors who manage it.
31. The management of the traffic order is poor.
32. The traffic monitors do not observe the traffic order but make their own rules up.
33. The signage is poor, with many drivers believing that there was one way system when there was not and a two way system when it was one way.
34. The traffic monitors disappear after dark when the majority of the problems exist and taxis race down the lanes, mitigate by the one way system existing from 2012 after 9.00pm.
35. There is no representative from WBC traffic to ensure that the order was appropriate, understood or observed.

#### LITTER

36. The first year there were considerable quantities of litter in Remenham which has improved, but Henley still suffers from considerable litter. .

---

#### WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

37. The problems associated with this and other events are that whilst WBC is the Licensing Authority, traffic authority and environmental health authority, it has

done little to enforce adherence but has merely acted as a passive facilitator. If the licence or traffic order is correctly prepared, whether they are appropriate and protect the villagers' interests has not been the primary concern. Rather WBC seems to have bent over backwards to accommodate any new event regardless of the effect on the community.

38. It would be much more helpful if WBC saw its role as defending its constituents interests and promoting the local community. In this was event holders would be much more cautious of the effect on the local community and would tailor their operating procedures to not cause the local community nuisance and be more considerate to their wishes.

39. Anecdotal evidence suggests that an event within a village can only be successful and sustainable in the long term if certain paradigms exist. The villagers must enjoy it, be part of it and feel ownership of it. There must be clear benefit to the village. The event organisers must have an ongoing and open dialogue with the village. The village must have access to all relevant documents concerning the event and results of any studies and monitoring; RFRA and RPC must be a part of the Safety Advisory Group and any other meeting which impacts on the event and the village. The event must be seen to benefit the community. It must seek to minimise the adverse impact on the village and the villagers' concerns. It must deal with them and seek to constantly improve the experience for the villagers and the village. There must be no marginal cost to the villagers; this condition includes collateral damage, monitoring or court costs. Indeed within the spirit of localism, the villagers must be able look forward to the event.

#### NATURE OF THE EVENT

40. The nature of the event is one which attracts families and is generally well behaved. The concern is that in time this will be moderated to a completely different demographic, whose behaviour will not be similar.

#### SUMMARY

41. Rewind should not be held in Remenham, as it is not associated with the traditional Remenham river events and the environment is not suitable.

42. If it is to be held in Remenham, Rival and WBC can make it sustainable only by ensuring that the experience for the village is constantly improved and proposals have been agreed which if applied would alleviate the nuisance of the event.

John Halsall  
Chairman  
31st March 2013

---

# Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts

---

THE NOISE COUNCIL

<b>CONTENTS</b>		<b>PAGE</b>
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Definitions	3
3.0	Guidelines	6
4.0	<i>Recommended Noise Control Procedure</i>	10
	- Planning	10
	- Before the Event	11
	- During the Event	11
Appendix I	References	13
Appendix II	Noise Council Working Party	14
Appendix III	Examples of Licensing Conditions	15

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Large music events involving high powered amplification are held in sporting stadia, arenas, open air sites and within lightweight buildings. These events give pleasure to hundreds and in some cases thousands of people. However, the music from these events can cause disturbance to those living in the vicinity. The purpose of this code is to give guidance on how such disturbance or annoyance can be minimised.
- 1.2 This Code of Practice has been prepared by the Noise Council through a Working Party comprising specialists who are experienced in the particular problems that can arise with environmental noise control at concerts and similar music events. A list of members of the working party is shown in Appendix II and a list of technical papers providing some background data and more detailed information is given in Appendix I.
- 1.3 Various guidelines and criteria are described in this document covering a range of events from the single occasional concert to a full season. It is believed that compliance with the guidelines and the other advice given here will enable successful concerts to be held whilst keeping to a minimum the disturbance caused by noise. It is recognised, though, that full compliance with this code may not eliminate all complaints, and local factors may affect the likelihood of complaints.
- 1.4 This Code is not designed to address the question of environmental noise arising from discotheques, clubs and public houses, nor environmental noise affecting noise sensitive premises which are structurally attached to the venue.

- 1.5 This Code is designed to assist those planning a music event, those responsible for licensing such events and those responsible for enforcing the nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (England and Wales) and the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (Scotland). It addresses the environmental problem of noise from the performance and sound checks only. Other environmental impacts of concerts and the question of meeting the requirements of the Noise at Work Regulations 1989 and the guidance given in the Health and Safety Executive's Guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Pop Concerts and similar events are beyond the scope of this document.
- 1.6 Compliance with this Code of Practice does not of itself confer immunity from legal obligations.
- 1.7 The Noise Council is keen to receive accounts of the practical application of the Code in order to improve and enhance its content.

## 2.0 DEFINITIONS

Background Noise Level:	The prevailing sound level at a location, measured in terms of the $L_{A90,T}$ , on an equivalent day and at an equivalent time when no concert or sound checks are taking place.
dB(A):	The A-weighted sound pressure level whereby various frequency components of sound are weighted (equalised) to reflect the way the human ear responds to different frequencies.
Delay Tower:	An additional set of loudspeakers employed to provide a better spread of sound to the audience.
$L_{Acq}$ :	The equivalent continuous noise level which at a given location and over a given period of time contains the same A-weighted sound energy as the actual fluctuating noise at the same location over the same period.
$L_{A90,T}$ :	The A-weighted sound pressure level exceeded for 90% of the measuring period (T).
Mixer:	The location where the main sound system is controlled. As well as ensuring the correct sound balance between the various performers, the overall level of sound for the audience is controlled at this location.



Music Event:	A concert or similar event where live or recorded music is performed by a solo or group of artists before an audience.
Music Noise:	The noise from the music and vocals during a concert or sound checks and not affected by other local noise sources.
Music Noise Level (MNL):	The $L_{Aeq}$ of the music noise measured at a particular location.
Noise Consultant:	A person given responsibility by the organiser of the event for monitoring noise levels in accordance with the prevailing conditions, and who has the ability and authority to make decisions and implement changes in noise level during the event.
Noise Monitoring Position:	The location of the microphone within the venue from which the level of sound is monitored and controlled. For outdoor venues, this location tends to be at the mixer.
Noise-sensitive Premises:	Includes premises used for residential purposes hospitals or similar institutions, education establishments (when in use), or places of worship (during recognised times and days of worship) or any premises used for any other purposes likely to be affected by the Music Noise.
Other Urban Venue:	An urban park or similar area which is not normally used for major organised events.

Rural Venue: A park, open space or grounds of a country house in a rural area not normally used for major organised events.

Sound Engineer: Person employed to control the sound quality of the music for the audience.

Urban Stadia or Arenas: A regular venue for major sporting or similar events in an urban area.

### 3.0 GUIDELINES

3.1 The Music Noise Levels (MNL) when assessed at the prediction stage or measured during sound checks or concerts should not exceed the guidelines shown in Table 1 at 1 metre from the façade of any noise sensitive premises for events held between the hours of 0900 and 2300.

TABLE 1

Concert days per calendar year, per venue	Venue Category	Guideline
1 to 3	Urban Stadia or Arenas	The MNL should not exceed 75dB(A) over a 15 minute period
1 to 3	Other Urban and Rural Venues	The MNL should not exceed 65dB(A) over a 15 minute period
4 to 12	All Venues	The MNL should not exceed the background noise level <sup>1</sup> by more than 15dB(A) over a 15 minute period

Notes to Table 1

1. The value used should be the arithmetic average of the hourly  $L_{A90}$  measured over the last four hours of the proposed music event or over the entire period of the proposed music event if scheduled to last for less than four hours.
2. There are many other issues which affect the acceptability of proposed concerts. This code is designed to address the environmental noise issue alone.
3. In locations where individuals may be affected by more than one venue, the impact of all the events should be considered.
4. For those venues where more than three events per calendar year are expected, the frequency and scheduling of the events will affect the level of disturbance. In particular, additional disturbance can arise if events occur on more than three consecutive days without a reduction in the permitted MNL.
5. For indoor venues used for up to about 30 events per calendar year an MNL not exceeding the background noise by more than 5dB(A) over a fifteen minute period is recommended for events finishing no later than 2300 hours.

6. Account should be taken of the noise impact of other events at a venue. It may be appropriate to reduce the permitted noise from a concert if the other events are noisy.
7. For venues where just one event has been held on one day in any one year, it has been found possible to adopt a higher limit value without causing an unacceptable level of disturbance.

3.2 For events continuing or held between the hours 2300 and 0900 the music noise should not be audible within noise-sensitive premises with windows open in a typical manner for ventilation.

Notes to Guideline 3.2

1. The use of inaudibility as a guideline is not universally accepted as an appropriate method of control. References 6 & 7 (Appendix 1) set out the various issues. This guideline is proposed as there is insufficient evidence available to give more precise guidance.
2. Control can be exercised in this situation by limiting the music noise so that it is just audible outside the noise sensitive premises. When that is achieved it can be assumed that the music noise is not audible inside the noise sensitive premises.

3.3 The nature of music events means that these guidelines are best used in the setting of limits prior to the event (see 4.0).

3.4 Assessment of noise in terms of dB(A) is very convenient but it can underestimate the intrusiveness of low frequency noise. Furthermore, low frequency noise can be very noticeable indoors. Thus, even if the dB(A) guideline is being met, unreasonable disturbance may be occurring because of the low frequency noise. With certain types of events, therefore, it may be necessary to set an additional criterion in terms of low frequency noise, or apply additional control conditions.

Notes to Guideline 3.4

1. It has been found that it is the frequency imbalance which causes disturbance. Consequently there is less of a problem from the low frequency content of the music noise near to an open air venue than further away.

2. Although no precise guidance is available the following may be found helpful (Ref 8):  
A level up to 70dB in either of the 63Hz or 125Hz octave frequency band is satisfactory; a level of 80dB or more in either of those octave frequency bands causes significant disturbance.

- 3.5 Complaints may occur simply because people some distance from the event can hear it and that, consequently, they feel the music must be loud even though the guidelines are being met. In fact topographical and climatic conditions can be such that the MNL is lower at locations nearer to the venue.
- 3.6 Although care has been taken to make these guidelines compatible with what occurs at existing venues, this may not be the case at every location. Where arrangements are satisfactory with either higher or lower noise levels than those contained in the guidelines, these limits should continue.
- 3.7 It has been found that if there has been good public relations at the planning stage between the event organisers and those living nearby, annoyance can be kept to a minimum.
- 3.8 The music noise level should be measured using an integrating-averaging sound level meter complying with type 2 or better of BS6698. The background noise level should be measured using a sound level meter complying with type 2 or better of BS5969. Time weighting F (fast response) should be used.
- 3.9 When measuring  $L_{Acq}$  in order to determine the music noise level, care must be taken to avoid local noise sources influencing the result. When the local noise is intermittent, a series of short term  $L_{Acq}$  measurements should be made of the music noise while the local source is absent or has subsided to typically low or mean minimum values. An average of these short term

readings will give an estimate of the music noise level. A further option would be to measure the A-weighted sound pressure level on a sound level meter complying with type 2 or better of BS5969 with the time weighting set to S (slow response) when the music is loudest and not influenced by local noise. If the local source is continuous, make a measurement of the  $L_{Aeq}$  of the local source when the music is not occurring, and make a correction to the measured  $L_{Aeq}$  when the music is occurring to obtain an estimate of the music noise level.

- 3.10 The nature of many concerts requires the sound volume level to be increased during the event to enhance the performance. The prevailing noise control restrictions should be borne in mind so that the sound volume at the start of the event is not too high, hence allowing scope for an increase during the event.
- 3.11 Some concerts are accompanied by associated activities (e.g. fairgrounds) which can be noisy. These should be taken into account when setting the limit for the music noise level.
- 3.12 When monitoring the music noise level, the sound of the audience applause can be a significant contributor. It is not possible to address this issue precisely; instead it is recommended that any such effect be noted.

## 4.0 RECOMMENDED NOISE CONTROL PROCEDURE

4.1 This procedure has been developed over several years and found to provide an effective means of addressing the problem of environmental noise control at events. The main features of the procedure are set out below and references are made to various technical papers which give more details.

### Planning

4.2 Determine the sound propagation characteristics between the proposed venue and those living nearby who might be affected by noise, and carry out an appropriate background noise survey. This should be undertaken by a competent person who is experienced in noise propagation and control, particularly from music events.

4.3 Check the viability of the event against the relevant guideline levels. This is achieved by determining from 4.2 above the sound level experienced by the audience which would allow the guidelines to be met. Research shows that the music noise level in the audience by the mixer position at pop concerts is typically 100dB(A), and that levels below 95dB(A) will be unlikely to provide satisfactory entertainment for the audience.

4.4 Prospective licensees should give the local authority as much notice as possible of the proposed event especially if more than one event is planned during a calendar year.

4.5 The local authority should make use of licensing conditions and statutory powers to implement the procedures described in this Code of Practice. Examples of possible conditions are given in Appendix III.

4.6 The Noise Consultant should be appointed.

#### Before the Event

4.7 Install the loudspeaker system early enough to enable alignment and orientation to be optimised to minimise noise disturbance.

4.8 Carry out a sound test prior to each event to ascertain the maximum level that can prevail at the monitoring position to enable the guidelines to be met. This effectively calibrates the system, taking into account as far as possible prevailing weather conditions, and, for indoor events, the sound insulation of the venue.

#### Notes to Guideline 4.8

1. It should be remembered that the introduction of an audience to a venue increases the acoustic absorption present. This has the effect of reducing the sound level in the venue for a given amplifier setting compared with the sound test. This should be borne in mind when setting the limit levels.

#### During the Event

4.9 Advertise and operate an attended complaint telephone number through which noise complaints can be channelled. This will enable an immediate response to the complaints to be given and the Noise Consultant to judge whether or not any adjustment to the music noise level is needed.

4.10 Establish a communication network between all those involved in noise



control. This should include the local police authority.

Note to Guideline 4.10

1. It is difficult to communicate effectively in noisy environments, especially in the vicinity of the mixer. It has been found helpful for those involved in the communication network to use head-sets with their two way radio systems.

4.11 Carry out noise monitoring within the venue at the noise monitoring position and at sample locations outside the venue throughout the event. If the event is employing one or more delay towers, additional noise monitoring may be needed inside the venue to control the sound output from them.

4.12 Although the limit value set at 4.8 above would be in terms of 15 minute  $L_{Aeq}$ , useful control can be exercised by monitoring the  $L_{Aeq}$  over one minute periods. This enables an early warning to be obtained of possible breaches in the 15 minute limit. It is sometimes appropriate to set an additional control limit in terms of the one minute  $L_{Aeq}$  (typically some 2-3dB(A) above the 15 minute value) and to use a level recorder display to assist the sound engineer in checking compliance with the limit. The Noise Consultant should advise the sound engineer of any breaches in the prescribed noise limit, to enable a reduction in level as appropriate. The sound engineer should also be advised of occasions when the limit has only just been met.

## APPENDIX I

### References

1. Noise Control Techniques and Guidelines for Open Air Concerts, J.E.T. Griffiths (ProcIOA, Vol. 7, Part 3, 1985).
2. A Noise Control Procedure for Open Air Pop Concerts, J.E.T. Griffiths, S.W. Turner and A.D. Wallis (ProcIOA, Vol 8, Part 4, 1986).
3. Noise Control in the Built Environment, edited by John Roberts and Diane Fairhall, Gower Technical, 1988 (Chapters 1, 2 and 3).
4. Environmental Noise Guidelines proposed for the new Health & Safety Executive Guide for Pop Concerts, J.E.T. Griffiths and A. Dove (ProcIOA, Vol 14, Part 5, 1992).
5. A Survey of Sound Levels at Pop Concerts, J.E.T. Griffiths (HSE Contract Research Report No 35/1991).
6. Inaudibility - an Established Criterion, A.W.M. Somerville (ProcIOA, Vol 13, Part 8, 1991).
7. Noise Control at All-night Acid House Raves, K. Dibble (ProcIOA, Vol 13, Part 8, 1991):
8. A study of Low Frequency Sound from Pop Concerts, J.E.T. Griffiths, J. Staunton and S. Kamath (ProcIOA, Vol 15, Part 7, 1993)

## APPENDIX II

### Noise Council Working Party Membership

S.W. Turner*	Technical Director, TBV Science
A. Somerville*	Department of Environmental Health, City of Edinburgh District Council
A.D. Wallis*	Cirrus Research Limited
J. Bickerdike	Leeds Polytechnic
K. Dibble	Ken Dibble Acoustics
J.E.T. Griffiths	Director, Travers Morgan Environment
S.S. Kamath	Director, Pollution & Scientific, London Borough of Brent.
J. Sargent	Building Research Establishment
J. Staunton	Associate, Travers Morgan Environment

\* Full members of the Noise Council

## APPENDIX III

### Sample Conditions Concerning Environmental Noise Control at Concerts

- 1.0 The licensee shall appoint a suitably qualified and experienced noise control consultant<sup>+</sup>, to the approval of the Licensing Authority, no later than..... weeks prior to the event. The noise control consultant<sup>+</sup> shall liaise between all parties including the Licensee, Promoter, sound system supplier, sound engineer and the licensing authority etc. on all matters relating to noise control prior to and during the event.
  
- 2.0 If not already carried out, the noise control consultant<sup>+</sup> shall carry out a survey to determine the background noise levels (as defined by the Code of Practice on Environmental Noise Control at Concerts) at..... locations around the venue representative of the noise sensitive premises likely to experience the largest increase in noise/highest noise level\* as a result of the concert. The information obtained from this survey shall be made available to the licensing authority..... weeks prior to the event.
  
- 3.0 A noise propagation test shall be undertaken at least..... hours prior to the start of the event in order to set appropriate control limits at the sound mixer position. The sound system shall be configured and operated in a similar manner as intended for the event. The sound source used for the test shall be similar in character to the music likely to be produced during the event.

- 4.0 The control limits set at the mixer position shall be adequate to ensure that Music Noise Level (MNL) shall not at any noise sensitive premises exceed.....dB(A) over a 15 minute period/the background noise level by more than .....dB(A) over a 15 minute period\* throughout the duration of the concert.
- 5.0 The control limits set at the mixer position shall be adequate to ensure that the MNL shall not at any noise sensitive premises exceed.....dB(A) over a 15 minute period/the background noise level by more than .....dB(A) over a 15 minute period\* throughout any rehearsal or sound check for the event.
- 6.0 The Licensee shall ensure that the promoter, sound system supplier and all individual sound engineers are informed of the sound control limits and that any instructions from the noise control consultant<sup>+</sup> regarding noise levels shall be implemented.
- 7.0 The appointed noise control consultant<sup>+</sup> shall continually monitor noise levels at the sound mixer position and advise the sound engineer accordingly to ensure that the noise limits are not exceeded. The Licensing Authority shall have access to the results of the noise monitoring at any time.
- 8.0 Rehearsals and sound checks are permitted only between the following hours:  
.....hrs to.....hrs.

9.0 Music from the event is permitted only between the following hours:  
.....hrs to.....hrs.

Note: Suitable noise conditions should also be considered with respect to minimising noise exposure to the audience and people working at the event as advised in the HSE document "Guide to Health, Safety and Welfare at Pop Concerts and Similar Events".

\*delete as appropriate.

\*i.e. the Noise Consultant

## THE NOISE COUNCIL

The Noise Council was established by a group of professional bodies concerned with problems relating to noise and vibration in the community and industrial environments. Its aims and objectives are to promote and respond to issues relating to noise and vibration, and to make independent technical and scientific expertise available to international and national agencies, central and local government, commerce and industry.

The Founding Bodies are:

- The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
- The Institute of Acoustics
- The Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland
- The Institute of Occupational Safety & Health

© 1995

The Noise Council, Chadwick Court, 15 Hatfields,  
ISBN 0 900103 51 5      Tel: 0171 928 6006

London SE1 8DJ  
Fax: 0171 928 6953

**RAYMOND JOHN HOFFMEISTER MRICS**

**REPORT**

**80's REWIND FESTIVAL**

**21<sup>st</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> AUGUST 2009**

**TEMPLE ISLAND MEADOW**

**REMENHAM FARM**

**REMENHAM**



**Report by Raymond John Hoffmeister, Chartered Surveyor:-**

1. I am a Member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors and Principal of Ray Hoffmeister & Company, Chartered Surveyors of 114 Lyndon Road, Solihull, West Midlands B92 7RQ.
2. Prior to setting up my own practice in 2005 I was a partner with Ralphs & Janes Chartered Surveyors and I have 27 years experience in all types of licensed property work dating back to the time I joined that firm in 1982. Since that time I have been involved in a considerable number of Applications, Objections and Appeals in relation to Liquor, Betting & Gaming and Public Entertainment licences, throughout England and Wales and also on occasion in Scotland. More recently I have been involved in licensing matters relating to the Licensing Act 2003.
3. Over the years I have been instructed in relation to licensing matters by major retailers, national brewers and pub companies, leisure companies, restaurant operators, leading bookmakers and casino operators as well as other major companies and organisations. Amongst these are Marks and Spencer, BHS, Tesco, Sainsbury's, Aldi, Somerfield, Whitbread, Wolverhampton and Dudley Breweries, J. D. Wetherspoon, Regent Inns, Enterprise Inns, Yates's, Allied Domecq, Seagram, Spar, First Quench, The Restaurant Group, Blockbuster, Luminar Leisure, Thomas Estates, Rank, Gala Coral, William Hill, Stanley Casinos, Totesport, Hammerson and Newcastle United Football Club.
4. My work regularly involves the need to carry out observations either within specific premises or in a general area, for example the drinking circuit in a town centre, in order to assess the impact of and activity associated with licensed premises in a given locality. This also encompasses residential areas where the presence of licensed premises including shops and hot food take-aways can have a significant impact on residential amenity.

5. I am familiar with Remenham and the surrounding area and also familiar with the site where the 80's Rewind Festival was held as I carried out similar observations during an event held at Temple Island Meadow over the August Bank Holiday weekend in 2006.

### **SCOPE OF INSTRUCTIONS**

6. In connection with this matter I was instructed by email on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2009 by Remenham Parish Council to attend at an event known as the '80's Rewind Festival' to be held at Temple Island Meadow, Remenham Farm, Remenham near Henley-on-Thames and to carry out observations before, during and after the event from Friday 21<sup>st</sup> August to Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2009 in order to assess its impact upon residential amenity, both within the immediate vicinity and further afield. I was also asked to observe and comment upon the operation and impact of the 'Temporary Restrictions At Various Roads Remenham Eighties Rewind Festival Order 2009', a traffic order which had been made to manage the anticipated increase in traffic generated by the event.

7. Finally I was asked to set out the results of those observations and present my findings in the form of a report. I duly carried out those instructions and visited the area to carry out a preliminary survey on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> August and attended the site and the Festival itself at various times and intervals between 11.45 am on Friday 21<sup>st</sup> August and 2.00 pm on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2009. The report containing my findings is set out below.

### **INTRODUCTION**

8. Remenham is a rural parish at the extreme northern tip of Wokingham Borough and bounded to the north and west by the River Thames. The Parish contains approximately 230 households and has a resident population of approximately 550. Of these, approximately 15% are children aged under-16 with 26% of residents aged 65 or over. In addition the 2001 census recorded

almost 20% of the population with limiting long term illness. These figures suggest that the proportion of the Parish population falling within potentially vulnerable categories is a not insignificant.

9. Amongst other settlements the Parish contains the villages of Remenham and Aston, both of which lie in close proximity to the 80's Rewind Festival site. Indeed the village of Remenham is particularly susceptible to disturbance from the event with aspects of the operation being mere feet from the boundaries some of the residential properties in the village.

10. That part of the village of Remenham surrounding St. Nicholas Church comprises approximately nine dwellings, a village hall, a small cemetery and the buildings of Remenham Farm. It is approximately one mile to the north of Henley-on-Thames and adjacent to the east bank of the River. Part of the village was designated as the Remenham Church Conservation Area in 2002. St. Nicholas Church is a Grade II Listed Building. The village has all the characteristics of a quiet and tranquil rural environment despite there being some car parking that takes place within the village, adjacent to the church, by walkers and others accessing the river tow path. In line with the Parish profile the residential community in Remenham village is mixed, including families with children and retired residents amongst the population.

11. The roads that serve Remenham and the nearby village of Aston, which lies just under a mile due east of Remenham, are all single track lanes with passing places. There are no footpaths and pedestrians have to stand aside to allow vehicles to pass. These lanes are completely unlit and at night this can be hazardous, particularly for pedestrians.

12. Similarly much of Remenham Church Lane (which at its southern end links to the A4130) is also single track, although in parts it does open out into wider sections where two-way working is possible.

13. The 80's Rewind Festival was an open air music festival and part of a growing trend that has seen a substantial increase in the number of such events across the country each year. The most well known is of course Glastonbury and its popularity has no doubt fuelled demand and interest to the point that there are now hundreds of festivals of varying size and theme taking place every year.

14. The 80's Rewind Festival took place between 21<sup>st</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2009 at Temple Island Meadow in Remenham. Temple Island Meadow is part of Remenham Farm and has the benefit of a premises licence which was granted, subject to conditions, in 2006. A copy of that licence, taken from Wokingham Borough Council's on-line licensing register is attached at Appendix 1.

15. The Premises Licence relates mainly to an area of open farm land that has a frontage to the River Thames of approximately 1.4 miles extending from the village of Remenham in the south all the way around to Hambleden Lock in the north. This land is within the Greenbelt, the Thames River Valley Policy Area and is an area of Special Landscape Importance. At the southern end the area covered by the licence surrounds the residential settlement of Remenham on three sides and incorporates a number of farm buildings which are sited in the midst of the residential dwellings.

16. To the north, the area covered by the Premises Licence faces the Greenlands Administration and Staff College and a number of other residential properties which lie on the north side of the river. The north-easterly extremity of the area covered by the Licence is in close proximity to the village of Mill End which is also on the north side of the river.

17. The Festival site itself was located on the open land, lying just to the north of the village, known as Temple Island Meadow. The site stretched from the river tow path in the west across to Remenham Lane in the east. The

southern edge of the site was marked by the boundary of Remenham Manor and Remenham Manor Cottage and the site extended northwards for over 1 kilometre to a point on the towpath opposite Greenlands Administration and Staff College.

18. A large part of the Festival site was contained within security fencing to which there was access for ticket holders only. The unfenced area was used to provide the ticket offices, main entrance approach and car parking.

19. The area inside the perimeter fence was divided into three further parts. One contained the bars, food outlets, retail outlets, discotheque, comedy club, funfair and children's play area. This area could be completely closed off to the public, including those in the campsite. The campsite was made up of several separate areas including general camping, toilets and other facilities, an area for motor homes and camper vans, a family camping area and an area for hire tents, described in the publicity as 'Glamping'. Finally there was a separate area containing the stage, the audience area in front of it and artist, staff and administration facilities.

### **ON-SITE OBSERVATIONS**

#### **Wednesday, 19 August 2009**

20. I made a preliminary visit to the site on Wednesday, 19 August 2009 at which time construction and preparation work for the event was taking place. This work seemed to be well advanced, perimeter fencing and extensive lighting had already been set up, tents and other structures erected and the construction of the main stage was well underway. It seemed to me that the work had probably been going on for several days.

21. The majority of activity was towards the middle and northern end of the site, well away from the nearest residential properties. Most vehicles were arriving on site from Remenham Church Lane and then via a track across a

field avoiding the village itself. There were some exceptions, however, where vehicles used the farm road which runs between the church hall and Remenham Manor Cottage while the Festival site's perimeter road, which runs along the northern boundary of Remenham Manor, was also in use including use by some heavy goods vehicles.

22. Overall, however, during the period I was there, between 10.30 am and 3.30 pm, the construction activity seemed to cause limited disturbance to residents, the most intrusive element at the time being the noise of warning horns emitted by reversing vehicles.

**Friday, 21 August 2009**

23. I arrived on site at 11.45 am. Apart from a couple of brief showers the weather was fine, dry and warm. Some construction and setting up work was still going on within the site, which was not yet open to the public. I was given access to Remenham Manor and immediately noticed the noise from vehicles using the perimeter road and the warning horns of reversing vehicles which could be heard from within the house itself. Shortly afterwards I left the house to check on the traffic situation.

24. In order to facilitate the 80's Rewind Festival, Wokingham Borough Council made the 'Temporary Restrictions At Various Roads Remenham Eighties Rewind Festival Order 2009'. This Traffic Order came into operation at 9.00 am on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2009 and remained in force until midnight on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2009. (A copy of the Order is attached hereto at Appendix 2).

25. Amongst other things this enabled the implementation of a one way traffic system into and out of the Festival site and the effect of this became apparent from about 2.15 pm when there was definite increase in the volume of traffic travelling in a south-westerly direction down Remenham Lane towards Henley on Thames. From around 2.30 pm the number of vehicles arriving at the site began to build quite rapidly as many of the visitors that

were camping for the weekend began to arrive. Even at this time work was still going on at the site and the reversing sirens could still be heard from some distance away.

26. During the course of the afternoon I noticed a number of violations of the provisions of the Traffic Order which were permitted by staff of the traffic management company that was implementing the Order. On several occasions I noted vehicles being permitted to turn left out of the main gate of the Festival site and travel in an easterly direction along Remenham Lane towards Aston in contravention of Article 7 of the Order.

27. Then, at the southern end of Remenham Lane in White Hill at around 3.00 pm a double-decker coach attempted to turn right from White Hill into Remenham Lane in order to access the Festival site. At first this was prevented by the traffic marshal on duty there and the coach continued into Henley-on-Thames but returned a few minutes later travelling in the opposite direction. It pulled up on the pavement outside the Little Angel Public House whilst its passengers went into the pub, I gather to use the toilet. The coach remained there for some 10-15 minutes despite the presence of 'no waiting' signs and in contravention of Article 3 of the Traffic Order. Indeed several coaches and minibuses parked up here during the half an hour or so that I was observing the traffic.

28. Eventually, with the aid of the traffic marshal, the coach reversed and was allowed to turn left into Remenham Lane where it stopped in the village adjacent to St. Nicholas Church. Here it unloaded all its passengers and their luggage (I learnt from one of them that they were bar staff arriving to work on the site) and then they made their way to the site on foot whilst the coach returned in a south-easterly direction down Remenham Lane towards White Hill. (This was in contravention of Article 7 of the Traffic Order and also possibly Article 6).

29. At approximately 4.30 pm what I took to be a sound check of the main stage sound system began. At that point I was inside the house at Remenham Manor. This continued intermittently for about half an hour. The music being played was audible in every part of the house even with all the doors and windows closed. Indeed, such was the volume that, in those rooms facing towards the Festival site, the glass in the windows was vibrating.

30. At the time I noticed three people standing in the garden of Remenham Manor adjacent to its northern wall facing the Festival site. They were taking readings using sound measuring equipment. I later learned that one of these people was an acoustics expert monitoring noise levels on behalf of the event organisers. During breaks in the music I was able to hear him use a two way radio to talk to someone whom I took (due to the content of the conversation) to be in control of the sound equipment on the main stage.

31. When the music wasn't playing, the sound of diesel generators powering equipment on the Festival site was clearly audible within the north-facing rooms of Remenham Manor, especially the bedrooms, and there was a continual movement of vehicles along the perimeter road adjacent to the property's rear boundary.

32. Between 6.30 pm and 8.30 pm I made an inspection of the Festival site itself. The bars, food stalls, funfair and other attractions were open from 6.00 pm onwards and non-camping weekend ticket holders were given access to the site facilities in addition to those who were campsite pass-holders. The crowds inside the festival site began to build from about 6.30 pm onwards with a constant stream of people arriving both into the campsite and also from along the towpath on foot. Indeed quite large numbers of people were seen arriving via the towpath including many who had presumably arrived at the campsite early and had then walked into Henley Town Centre, as there were a considerable number of people returning to the site along the towpath carrying orange Sainsbury's carrier bags.



33. I left the festival site at approximately 8.30 pm and noted that the traffic system seemed to be operating well. There was a one-way system in operation in accordance with the Traffic Order and despite the large increase in traffic flow on Remenham Lane, there did not appear to be any significant traffic congestion or delays.

34. I returned to the Festival site at around 9.25 pm. There was a considerable amount of noise being generated, the majority of which was being created by the funfair, from the music played on the rides, the generators powering the equipment and the screams of those enjoying the attractions.

35. By this time a number of mobile floodlight towers had been brought into operation and the generators powering them were also rather noisy. There were two located adjacent to Remenham Manor on the edge of the perimeter road and in addition to the noise of the generators there was also light from both towers shining into the bedroom windows of both Remenham Manor and Remenham Manor Cottage.

36. Later in the evening at around 10.15 pm the noise of the overall general activity was added to by the so-called "silent disco." Whilst there was no music from this attraction (participants are given headphones through which the music is played), the participants were singing along with each track that was played and again the sound of this was audible from within Remenham Manor.

37. At around 10.45 pm there were hardly any people now arriving at the Festival site and a significant exodus of people began. A large proportion of these left on foot, walking towards Henley on the towpath, some had come by car but there was also a significant number of taxis looking for fares.

38. I returned to Remenham Manor at 10.50 pm and on leaving the house again at 11.15 pm I found four men in the front garden of the property who



appeared to be urinating in the bushes. They then began to make their way across the garden towards the back of Remenham Manor Cottage when I then called out to them and they stopped. I asked them to leave and directed them towards the towpath and fortunately they followed my directions.

39. At 11.30 pm I found that there was no traffic marshal manning the road closure specified in Article 4 of the Traffic Order (this is situated adjacent to St. Nicholas Church on Remenham Lane and prohibits vehicles from travelling between this point and the junction of Remenham Church Lane in a north-easterly direction).

40. I also drew the conclusion that the control point at the bottom of Remenham Lane, at its junction with White Hill, was also unmanned as there were a considerable number of vehicles ignoring the Traffic Order restrictions. Vehicles were using Remenham Lane to access the Festival site (in conflict with Article 4 of the Order) and although the large majority were taxis there were also private vehicles as well.

41. At about 11.45 pm I saw about half a dozen people coming from the towpath past Remenham Barn towards St. Nicholas Church in a very noisy and rowdy manner. They were returning to several vehicles that were parked adjacent to Remenham Farm and The Reeds opposite St. Nicholas Church and they left in these vehicles travelling south down Remenham Lane towards Henley on Thames.

42. At midnight back at the Festival site, the disco and funfair closed down, as did most of the bars, although some food outlets continued to trade. At 12.30 am the security personnel began to clear the area and the final food and retail outlets were closed. Security personnel shepherded campers towards the campsite and asked others to leave via the main entrance and by about 12.40 am the area was relatively quiet and I ceased observations.

Saturday, 22 August 2009

43. The day was again fine, sunny and warm and activity started on the site before 8.00 am. Again the warning sounds emitted from reversing vehicles could be heard within the north-facing bedrooms of Remenham Manor. Traffic on the perimeter road was also in evidence and more campers were already arriving.

44. A pedestrian entrance/exit to and from the campsite had been opened at the northern end of the site onto the towpath and the towpath itself was extremely busy with people travelling in both directions between the Festival site and the town centre. It was obvious from the wristbands they were wearing that many people had left the campsite and walked into Henley-on-Thames whilst others were arriving for the first time at the venue on foot.

45. The ticket office, where tickets could be purchased and exchanged for wristbands, opened at 11.00 am, and prior to this a queue began to form and a substantial number of people were milling around and waiting around the entrance adjacent to the northern boundary of Remenham Manor. The festivals day parking provision was also located in close proximity to the northern boundary of Remenham Manor with the nearest cars parked just a few feet from the boundary of the dwelling. Sound checks were also taking place intermittently from 11.00 am onwards.

46. A check of the traffic at around 11.30 am revealed no congestion or delays with everything running smoothly, although the road closure barrier at the eastern end of Remenham Lane in Aston had been moved aside and was unmanned. A number of vehicles were noted travelling eastwards along Remenham Lane towards Aston, in contravention of Article 4 of the Traffic Order.

47. I also noticed that the acoustics expert, employed by the promoters, had set up noise measuring equipment again adjacent to the north wall of

Remenham Manor and this had been left unattended taking automatic readings from about mid morning. This remained there throughout the day unattended.

48. After a short break at about 1.00 pm I briefly returned to the Festival site and because I had already obtained a wristband on the previous day, I was able to enter the site without queuing. The food outlets were open as well as bars and retail outlets but surprisingly the numbers of people on the site was building very slowly given that the entertainment was due to start at 2.00 pm.

49. However at about 2.30 pm I went back outside and saw that there had been a very large number of people arriving at the venue and they were being held in an enormous queue extending from the entrance to the site all the way around the perimeter road up to Remenham Lane and then doubling back along the perimeter road parallel with Remenham Lane for some distance. (I subsequently heard reports, albeit unsubstantiated, that some people had queued for two hours to enter the venue.) This was clearly the reason for the less than expected numbers within the Festival compound itself.

50. As I made my way along the perimeter road towards Remenham Lane to observe the queue and traffic entering the site I observed a female traffic marshal who was meant to be directing traffic at the exit gate onto Remenham Lane make her way behind the hedge separating the perimeter road from Remenham Manor Cottage where she then urinated.

51. Due to the extraordinary number of people in the queue and the length of time it was taking to disperse a significant number of people were becoming desperate for the toilet. No toilet facilities had been provided in the car park area, or indeed anywhere outside the compound's perimeter fence, and as a result a considerable number of people were making their way behind the hedge adjacent to the perimeter road and using this as a toilet. I witnessed literally dozens of people urinating behind the hedge, both male and female.

52. Unfortunately, this was also in full view of children playing in the garden of the Old School House and caused the occupier some distress to the point that a call was made to the Police. I made my way to the exit gate onto Remenham Lane by the corner of the perimeter road where there was a female marshal at this exit with a two-way radio. As I stood nearby I overheard a call over the radio from one of the Festival personnel informing security control that there were two females in the queue who desperately needed the toilet. The person on the radio informed security that the two females involved were asking for their money back as they were going to have to leave to find toilet facilities. The response from the person in charge was that the females should be told the queue should start moving soon and to ask them to try to wait. The person on the radio then asked if he could take them to the staff toilets to which the response was no - this was not possible, the rules were very strict followed by the suggestion "*tell them to go behind a bush.*" and then a further crude comment.

53. By this time the music on the main stage had already started and tempers among many in the queue were becoming quite frayed.

54. Subsequently, it became apparent that the organisers began letting people into the site without the need to exchange tickets for wristbands and once this decision was taken the queue rapidly diminished. By the time the Police arrived the queue had dispersed and there was no longer a problem with people urinating behind the hedge.

55. I continued to observe the proceedings throughout the day and the numbers of people arriving by vehicle diminished towards late afternoon although there were still large numbers of people arriving on foot via the towpath well into the evening.

56. At around 8.30 pm I returned to Remenham Manor and went inside the house. The volume of the music from the main stage and, indeed, the

announcements between the acts had been at an extremely high volume throughout the day's proceedings and remained so at this time. The music was clear and distinct even from the inner hall with all the doors and windows closed. In the sitting room, (which has windows within the north and west elevations) even with the windows closed, the volume of music, the announcements and the cheering of the crowd was at such a level that it would have been necessary to increase the volume on the set if one were trying to watch TV. Once again, the volume of the music was such that it caused the glass in the windows to vibrate.

57. At this time the promoter's acoustics expert was still not present, although the noise recording equipment was still in place. He returned to the site much later in the evening, and it appears he was not in a position to advise the promoters of any potential breach of Licensing Conditions during the majority of time that the event was underway on this particular evening.

58. People began leaving the Festival site and making their way home from about 9.30 pm onwards even though the entertainment had not yet finished. Consequently there were people leaving the event in large numbers over an extended period. As the end of the entertainment grew nearer so the volume of people leaving the site increased substantially. It is estimated that up to 10,000 people left the event via the main entrance over the course of about an hour and a half, all of whom dispersed primarily in two directions, either along the towpath adjacent to the western boundaries of Remenham Manor, The Reach and Remenham Barn or along the perimeter road towards the car park adjacent to the northern boundary of Remenham Manor and Remenham Manor Cottage.

59. A significant proportion of those leaving the venue seemed to be heavily intoxicated and some individuals must have been drinking for most of the day. There was typical noisy, rowdy behaviour that is commonly found when people are leaving licensed premises late at night. There were screams,

shouts, laughing and a good many people were looking for opportunities to use the toilet. Those heading towards the car park would use the bushes in the hedge that forms the northern boundary of Remenham Manor and also the farm track that runs alongside the towpath and the western boundary of Remenham Manor. Others on the towpath concealed themselves in the darkness and behind trees on the green to the south of Remenham Farm and to the rear of Barnside Cottage and Cherwell.

60. From about 9.00pm the vehicles that were leaving the venue were directed away from the site up the track across the field above Remenham Lane and then southwards along Remenham Church Lane in the opposite direction to which they had arrived. However as a result, in order to maintain access to the site, the traffic management company then began to allow vehicles to travel in a north-easterly direction along Remenham Lane, this being in conflict with Article 4 (b) of the Traffic Order. Furthermore, from approximately midnight onwards none of the traffic control points (that I observed) were manned and consequently the various road closures and one way systems were largely ignored by most vehicles and particularly by taxis. Large numbers of taxis were constantly arriving speculatively on site travelling northwards along Remenham Lane and returning in the opposite direction. Others were noted turning left out of the Festival site and travelling along Remenham Lane towards Aston.

61. This resulted in a somewhat dangerous situation, particularly as there were pedestrians on Remenham Lane making their way back to Henley-on-Thames. Many of the taxis were travelling at excessive speed. This I assumed was in order that they could drop off their passengers and return to the site for another fare as quickly as possible. Taxis were speeding in both directions along Remenham Lane including towards Aston.

62. There were also a number of taxis using the area in front of St. Nicholas Church as a pick-up point. Some people had booked taxis and were

waiting there to be collected and they would hail each taxi as it passed to find out if it was the particular taxi they had ordered.

63. In addition, the designated taxi pick-up point was largely ignored; again this was mainly due to the fact that the traffic marshal post there was unmanned after midnight. The result was that taxis would enter and drive around the site via the perimeter road stopping any passers-by and pedestrians enquiring as to whether they required a taxi. This of course was taking place in very close proximity to Remenham Manor.

64. After completion of entertainment on the main stage, the bars, funfair and "silent disco" continued to operate after 11.00 pm generating a noticeable degree of noise that could be heard from the north facing bedrooms of Remenham Manor with the windows open. This again included the music from the funfair, the singing from the "silent disco" and the noise of diesel generators from the lighting towers and other equipment on site.

65. Most of the food and drink outlets, bars and the funfair had ceased operating by 1.00 am. Nevertheless, there were still a few people leaving the site even at 1.30 am, making their way either along the towpath or towards the car park. I saw some who seemed to be unsure of the way to return to Henley-on-Thames; some used the towpath, some wandered into Remenham Lane whilst others were seen making their way down the farm track between Remenham Manor Cottage and the Church Hall and climbing the gate in order to get out at the far end. Most of those leaving at this later hour were noisy to some degree.

66. However by 1.35 am virtually all activity had ceased on site and nearly everybody had left the area, although taxis were still seen arriving and making their way down from the site entrance along the perimeter road beside Remenham Manor. Observations were ceased at 1.45 am.



67. After dark there was a considerable degree of light pollution from the Festival with the lights of the funfair, strobe lighting from the disco, a blue laser-type light from the funfair, lighting for the campsite and for the site generally and the floodlights on towers lighting the car park, again some of which were shining into the bedroom windows of Remenham Manor and Remenham Manor Cottage. Furthermore the general campsite lights and car park floodlighting remained on throughout the night.

68. At its peak I estimated that there were approximately 15,000 to 17,000 people in attendance (excluding staff) of whom around 10,000 were day or weekend visitors not camping on site. These people arrived by a variety of means, primarily car, with a substantial number arriving along the towpath having walked from Henley-on-Thames town centre or having arrived by boat, including private vessels moored alongside the towpath as well as a number of water taxis. A significant number of people also arrived on site by taxi.

**Sunday, 23 August 2009**

69. The weather was again warm, dry and sunny but early morning activity was less noticeable on this day,

70. A substantial congregation of people accumulated in front of the entrance to the site prior to the gates opening but the queue quickly dispersed once the gates were opened and there was no repeat of the long delays to gain access observed the previous day. This was largely due to the abandonment of the wristband system with visitors gaining access by ticket instead. There was a steady stream of people arriving at the venue similar to the previous day. Large numbers of vehicles arrived and were parked in an area immediately adjacent to the nearest residential properties. The traffic system seemed to work well however and although there was congestion in Remenham Church Lane as vehicles queued to access the Festival site, no particular problems were noted.

71. Music on the main stage again began at 2.00 pm and was, again, at a very high volume although it did seem slightly lower than the previous day. I was not sure whether this was because the level had been reduced or that I had become accustomed to the level of sound generated. Nevertheless the music was still clearly audible from inside the house at Remenham Manor and from the beer garden of the Flower Pot Hotel in Aston.

72. Measuring equipment was again in place adjacent to the north-facing wall of Remenham Manor and had been set there by the promoter's acoustics consultant earlier in the day. Again he was not present and readings were being taken automatically.

73. At its peak, I estimated the attendance to be in the order of 12,000 to 15,000 people, slightly less than the attendance of the previous day. In fact some of those who were camping had already begun to leave the site and by mid afternoon there was a steady trickle of vehicles leaving the campsite car park.

74. During the early evening at about 6.00 pm, I noticed several vehicles travelling along Remenham Lane towards Aston and at approximately 6.15 pm I saw two articulated lorries arrive at the festival site which contravened Article 6 of the Traffic Order. Then at around 6.25 pm I saw a van belonging to the traffic management company, CTM, travelling along Remenham Lane towards Aston, again in conflict with the Traffic Order. Shortly afterwards I saw a number of vehicles being permitted to travel along Remenham Lane in a north-easterly direction from St. Nicholas Church towards the site against the one-way system that was in operation. This in turn contravened Article 4 (b) of the Traffic Order.

75. By 8.30 pm there was a stream of vehicles leaving the site including a number of very large motor homes. However the one-way system providing access to the site along Remenham Church Lane was still in place and thus all

vehicles exiting the site were directed south down Remenham Lane. At the same time there were a number of taxis arriving at the site and they began to park up near the exit gate which consequently narrowed the perimeter road at this point and I witnessed one collision between a car and motor home as a result. There were also a significant number of private cars also waiting here to pick up passengers.

76. By 9.00 pm the flow of people leaving the site had grown, both in terms of vehicles and pedestrians. However, the one-way system had not yet been reversed (as provided for by Article 5 (b) of the Traffic Order) which resulted in a very substantial and continuous flow of traffic along Remenham Lane in a southerly direction. The flow included camper vans, motor homes, private cars and taxis as well as some smaller commercial vehicles.

77. The consequence of this was that, due to the narrowness of Remenham Lane, it was almost impossible for any vehicles to travel against such a heavy flow of southbound traffic, effectively restricting access to any properties on Remenham Lane and in particular those in Remenham itself. The only means of access to the properties in Remenham therefore was via Remenham Church Lane. This problem was much more severe on Sunday evening owing to the early build up of traffic leaving the site and the greater numbers involved, as campers were also leaving along with day visitors. The size of vehicles was also a factor which included large motor homes, camper vans and some commercial vehicles.

78. Eventually at 9.30 pm the one-way system was reversed and traffic began leaving the site via Remenham Church Lane. However, at the same time the road closure prohibiting traffic from travelling along Remenham Lane in a north-easterly direction between St. Nicholas Church and Remenham Church Lane was again removed (in contravention of Article 4 (b) of the Traffic Order).

79. At about 9.45 pm I noticed about four or five taxis waiting in the area in front of St. Nicholas's Church, whilst other taxis passing through the village would stop to enquire about the location of the pick-up point. Unfortunately, throughout the weekend the taxi pick-up point on site had not been signposted and was not clearly identified and thus both taxi drivers and potential customers were unaware of its location which substantially undermined its function.

80. There were also some people who had ordered taxis and arranged to meet them outside St. Nicholas Church and, again, this resulted in people waiting in the village and stopping every taxi that passed by to see if it was the particular taxi they had ordered.

81. By 10.30 pm substantial numbers of people were leaving the event even though there was the headline act to come. The music eventually finished at about 11.00 pm and was followed by a professional firework display launched from the top of the hill to the south of and overlooking the site. There was then a further surge of people leaving the venue.

82. A significant number of people left with drinks and bottles in hand, many of which were later discarded on the towpath, in hedges etc. As before the location of the entrance/exit, close to the boundary of the nearest dwellings, meant that several thousand people that had either parked in the car park, or who were making their way to the taxi pick-up point, had to walk along the perimeter road past the back of Remenham Manor. At the same time several thousand more that used the towpath also passed close to Remenham Manor as well as a number of other dwellings including The Reach. Indeed the layout of the site including position of the entrance/exit and the location and means of access to the car park meant that somewhere in the order of 10,000 people exited the event within a few feet of nearby residential dwellings on each of the two main nights.

83. However the make-up of the crowd seemed slightly different on Sunday compared to Saturday's event. Whilst on both days the crowd was mixed, on Sunday there appeared to be a larger proportion of families and people with children whereas on Saturday there were substantially more young people in their teens and early-20s as well as groups of adults without children.

84. This subtle difference did have an effect on the way people left the venue. People on foot walking back towards Henley dispersed more quickly, there were fewer of them and behaviour was less boisterous and rowdy than it had been on the Saturday night. That is not to say that there were no incidents of rowdiness, shouting, screaming etc., but they were less pronounced than they had been on the previous night and there seemed to be less drunkenness.

85. The funfair and "silent disco" had closed by midnight and most food and drink outlets, including the bars, had closed by 12.30 am. Most people had left the site by 1.00 am with the last few noisy stragglers leaving shortly afterwards, including two very drunk girls, one screaming at the top of her voice.

86. At 12.30 am I checked the traffic point adjacent to St. Nicholas Church to find that this was no longer manned. Strictly speaking the Traffic Order had ceased to be in operation at midnight but the one-way signs had been left in place indicating to drivers that a one-way system was in force. However, with no personnel to oversee its operation a similar situation developed to that which occurred on the previous night whereby taxis would speed in both directions along Remenham Lane in an effort to collect as many fares as possible. I observed vehicles leaving the site in whatever direction they chose.

87. What developed was effectively a taxi free for all with literally dozens of taxis being attracted to the site and competing with each other to pick up any fares. If anything the situation was worse than it had been the night before.

I noticed taxis driving down the site perimeter road to the pedestrian entrance and even some driving into the site compound itself.

88. Vehicles continued to leave the site after 12.30 am, including a number of commercial vehicles. Work was also continuing in dismantling equipment and at 2.00 am work was going on dismantling the main stage. Several forklift trucks were in use and the sound of the warning sirens when they reversed was piercing and audible from some distance. I ended observations at 2.00 am but at 2.45 am the noise from the reversing warnings on the forklift trucks was still audible from inside the bedroom in Remenham Manor with the window ajar. As far as I know, dismantling work continued throughout the night.

**Monday, 24 August 2009**

89. By 8.00 am there was already considerable activity on site with dismantling continuing to taking place and the proprietors of stalls, bars and food outlets were packing up their equipment and leaving. Some vehicles were also leaving and entering the site via the farm track running between Remenham Manor Cottage and the Church Hall.

90. I was also surprised to see that although the Traffic Order had ceased to be in operation at midnight, the promoter's Traffic Management Company were still operating parts of the Order. Also, a one-way system was being operated in Remenham Lane between its junction with Remenham Church Lane and the Festival site entrance with vehicles travelling in a north-easterly direction. There was no authority for the traffic management company to operate this one-way system.

91. In addition, a one-way system was also being operated in Remenham Church Lane with traffic being directed away from the site in a southerly direction. Again there was no authority for the traffic management company to operate this and in any event, had the Traffic order still been in force, this would have contravened the order as it provided for traffic to be directed

southbound along Remenham Church Lane only between 9.00 pm and 2.00 am

92. Furthermore, although one-way signs were in place along the length of Remenham Church Lane and traffic was being directed by the traffic management staff, the company had failed to erect 'no entry' signs at the junction of Remenham Church Lane and White Hill and failed to prevent unsuspecting traffic from entering Remenham Church Lane and travelling north.

93. Consequently, vehicles were turning into Remenham Church Lane from White Hill against the flow of one-way traffic creating a potentially dangerous situation. This situation prevailed until at least 1.00 pm.

94. The majority of campers had left the site by shortly after midday and most of the traffic thereafter was commercial vehicles leaving the site. The farm road between the Church Hall and Remenham Manor Cottage was used throughout the morning by some very substantial vehicles and just before 1.00 pm, I saw the extremely large and heavy trucks carrying the funfair equipment leave by this route. They passed through the village and turned left onto Remenham Lane at St. Nicholas Church and then made their way along Remenham Lane and into Remenham Church Lane along the one-way route.

95. At the same time, there was a group of about 30 or 40 people waiting for a coach outside Remenham Church. I recognised some of the same people that had alighted there on Friday afternoon from the double-decker coach. A large group of them were playing football in the road.

96. Work on dismantling the site continued, with a constant flow of vehicles up and down the perimeter road and a general noise and clatter as worked progressed. I noted a considerable amount of litter all along the towpath including beer bottles, cans, fast food wrappers, plastic cups and

discarded food. There were even a number of black bags which appeared to have been left by boats that had used the hired moorings.

97. Rubbish bins had not been provided by the organisers, either in the car park or anywhere outside the perimeter fence of the compound. There were none near the exit/entrance and no bins provided for those using the moorings. Litter was evident not only on the towpath but also in the village itself and there was considerable evidence that much of this litter actually came from the Festival site (such as branded packaging from outlets operating at the Festival).

98. I saw several vehicles containing members of the Traffic Management Team leaving the area at 2.30 pm and ceased observations at that time.

## SUMMARY

### Traffic Order

99. Whilst in the main the traffic system ran smoothly, with relatively few hold-ups given the size of the event, there were a number of issues that arose from the implementation of the Traffic Order by the traffic management company. There were numerous examples that I witnessed where the instructions of the company's traffic marshals were ignored by motorists and other drivers who performed dangerous manoeuvres such as travelling in the wrong direction along a one-way system which the marshals could do nothing about.

100. The second issue relates to the unilateral extension of some of the Traffic Order provisions by the traffic management company beyond midnight on Sunday, 23 August 2009 into the afternoon of Monday, 24 August 2009. The traffic management company had no authority to do this and furthermore, the haphazard way in which it was implemented with vehicles entering the one-way system against the flow of traffic, and with the one-way sign still in place, led to a considerable danger.



101. Furthermore, whilst some drivers performed manoeuvres that contravened the provisions of the Traffic Order and disregarded the directions of the traffic marshals, there were a number of occasions where drivers were given permission by the marshals to carry out such manoeuvres. It is my understanding that such actions could only be authorised by a Police Officer or Traffic Warden in uniform.

102. There was also the failure to implement the reversal of the one-way system in Remenham Church Lane at 9.00 pm on Sunday which led to an exceptional volume of traffic in Remenham Lane travelling towards Henley, a situation which continued for a period of approximately half an hour.

103. Of particular concern were the situations which developed when Marshals were not at their posts after midnight on Saturday and after 12.30 am on Sunday. This led to a degree of chaos ensuing as drivers completely disregarded the traffic signs and worse as fierce competition for fares developed between taxi drivers which led to taxis speeding up and down Remenham Lane and, indeed, around the site in order to maximise fares. This caused particular danger to the pedestrians on Remenham Lane who were making their way back towards Henley-on-Thames in the dark.

104. Finally, there arose the situation where the traffic management company unilaterally amended the provisions of the Traffic Order by creating a one-way system in a north-easterly direction between St. Nicholas Church and the junction of Remenham Lane and Remenham Church Lane contrary to the provisions of Article 4 (b) of the Order.

105. In my view some of these issues gave rise to the significant risk of a road traffic accident and I believe it is only a matter of good fortune that a serious collision did not occur.

**Noise**

106. For many of the residents in the locality I believe the single most distressing feature of the whole weekend's events was the considerable volume of the music from the Festival's main stage. As indicated above this took place over a period of about 9 hours each day on both Saturday and Sunday. Measurements of the noise levels were taken by several different experts and a separate report has been prepared in relation to this particular aspect. However, I understand that on Saturday the noise levels generated by the main stage far exceeded the limits set out by condition (d)(4) of the Premises Licence. This condition was also breached on Sunday although, I believe, to a slightly lesser degree.

107. It also appears that, due to the absence of the licence holders own acoustics consultant for the majority of the time that music was being played, both on Saturday and Sunday, condition (d)(8)(iv) of the premises licence was also breached. This condition requires periodic and regular observation to be undertaken at or near the boundary to ensure compliance with the noise limits specified in conditions (d)(3) to (d)(5) and for those readings to be noted in a log book which should be available for inspection at any time on request of an authorised officer.

108. Both of these breaches are of particular concern from a resident's point of view. In particular, the acoustics consultant's absence from the event meant that on neither day was he able to advise the promoters that the noise level exceeded the level permitted by the premises licence and that the volume should be reduced.

109. From a residents point of view this would seem to be a breach of one of the most important conditions attached to the Licence. I understand that it was agreed to by residents because they believed it protected their amenity, not just from the point of view of the level or volume of sound specifically, but also that it would have an impact upon the type of event that could be held.

It was hoped by residents that by setting the noise levels as indicated in the Condition, this type of very noisy event and also events on this scale would be prevented.

110. There are a number of obvious reasons why outdoor concerts or festivals of this type require the music to be at a high level or volume in order to be successful. Clearly this is partly because they are held outdoors but also to meet the expectations of the crowd, to overcome wind and ambient noise levels such as the funfair and the noise from bars, generators, traffic etc., and also so that the entertainment is audible and can be enjoyed by people elsewhere within the site (i.e. in bars etc. and not in the crowd in front of the main stage.)

111. There is in fact some concern that the licence holders were aware in advance that the sound levels that would be necessary for such an event were likely to be in excess of the level permitted by the premises licence. Furthermore they must have been aware that the acoustics consultant was not on site as the conditions require, if only because they would not have been receiving regular updates from him throughout the day.

112. If the consultant had been properly instructed and made aware of the terms of the licence conditions it is inconceivable that he would have left the site, knowing that to do so would jeopardise his client's premises licence. Furthermore, had he been present, it would have been his professional duty to advise the licence holder that the noise levels exceeded the limits set out in the licence conditions and that the music volume should be reduced.

113. This in turn would have left the event organisers with something of a dilemma because once the music has begun and the level set this becomes the norm or baseline. The audience quickly become accustomed to this level and any reduction in volume is unlikely to be well received by them. Thus if the promoters had been instructed by the acoustics consultant to reduce the

volume, it is likely that they would have been faced with considerable discontent amongst the audience.

114. There is therefore some suspicion that the licence holders were aware that these particular licence Conditions were being breached but did nothing to remedy the problem. Furthermore, the noise consultant's absence from the site at the most critical times (meaning that he was unable to advise that noise levels exceeded the prescribed limits and that the volume should be reduced) could have been deliberate in order to allow the performances to continue at the established volume without interruption.

115. Finally, in relation to conditions attached to the licence, I was unable to find the notice required by condition (d)(8)(i). This condition requires that details are provided at the principle entrance to the premises in a conspicuous position of the telephone number to ring in the event of any enquiry or complaint concerning the event. As far as I am aware no such notice was displayed.

### **General**

116. Overall, within the ambit of the festival site itself, the event was well organised and professionally executed. As far as I am aware there were no incidents of disorder requiring attendance by the Police. It also seemed to be a highly successful event with large numbers attending, most of whom seemed to have a thoroughly enjoyable time.

117. It is difficult to accurately estimate the numbers of people overall that visited the Festival, but as a rough indication, there seemed to be around about 7,000 people at its peak on Friday night, between 15,000 to 17,000 people on Saturday and approximately 12,000 to 15,000 people on Sunday. In total, therefore, I would estimate a combined attendance over three days of between 30,000 and 40,000 people with a peak number on site at any one time (excluding staff, artists etc., but including campers) of around 17,000 people.

To put this into context the total population of Henley-on-Thames is just over 10,000 and that of Remenham Parish about 550.

118. However, the fact that the event was well organised and professionally executed does not mean that it did not cause substantial disamenity, distress and disturbance to the people living in the locality. Indeed simply the sheer scale of the event and the extended period over which it took place were sufficient to cause considerable problems for the local community.

119. Over the three days of its operation the event attracted attendances equivalent to three times the total population of Henley-on Thames and was open to the public for approximately thirty-three hours. The music on the main stage was played intermittently at an extremely high volume (sufficient to shake the glass in the windows of the nearest property) over a total of eighteen hours from 2.00 pm to 11.00 pm on both Saturday and Sunday whilst at other times noise was generated by the funfair and other attractions. Even when the site was closed to the public there remained persistent, low level background noise from generators and other equipment on site.

120. Apart from the disturbance caused by the operational aspect of the event there was also considerable disamenity for residents caused by people arriving at and leaving the event. This included high volume of traffic, urination, drunkenness, trespass, litter, noisy and rowdy behaviour as well as the straightforward impact of the movement of many thousands of people to and from the event.

121. Added to this is the further general low level disturbance caused by the construction, setting up and dismantling of the event infrastructure which took place over several more days either side of the event itself.

122. When taken together of all of these components had a substantial negative cumulative impact upon the residents in the locality.

123. For the record the 80's Rewind Festival is not at all comparable to the previous event held on part of this site on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2006. On that occasion the performances on stage lasted no more than two and a half hours, there was no funfair or other attractions other than a bar and some food outlets, the attendance was less than 1000 people and the site was completely cleared of the public by 11.40 pm. One similarity however was in the volume of the music which was clearly audible from over a mile away.

124. The principal problem with the use of this site for events of this type is its proximity to residential properties. Even though the main stage was situated some distance from the residential area, the main entrance and exit was a short distance from the nearest residential property, the car park was in very close proximity to residential dwellings and the perimeter road used to service many of the commercial enterprises on the site also passed by residential properties.

125. The box office where tickets were purchased and exchanged for wristbands, and from where the substantial queue emanated on Saturday morning, was situated just 54 metres from the rear boundary of Remenham Manor. The southern edge of the compound perimeter fence was 83 metres from the boundary with Remenham Manor and the nearest loud speakers, where recorded music was played, were situated on the Heart FM stand just 130 metres from the property's rear boundary. Adjacent to this was the Pimm's Bar which was 145 metres from the Remenham Manor boundary.

126. The perimeter road, which carried traffic around the site as well as providing access and egress from the car park, was situated just 5 metres from the northern boundary of Remenham Manor, whilst the edge of the car park was just 10 metres from the boundary. Whilst Remenham Manor is the northernmost property in the village and thus the closest to the event site there are nevertheless a number of other

dwelling in close proximity to the site which were equally affected. In fact the event affected not only Remenham Village but also Aston and a wide area of the Parish by virtue of the level of noise and traffic generated.

### CONCLUSION

127. The results of the observations carried out during the course of the 80's Rewind Festival raise serious question marks over the suitability of the Remenham Farm site to hold events of this type. The immediate proximity of the residential properties in Remenham and the relative proximity of further residents in Aston and on the north side of the River mean that such events cannot be successfully executed without causing serious disamenity to local people.

128. I do not believe it is possible to attract thousands of cars and tens of thousands of people, to bring in and carry away the enormous infrastructure required and to play live music at the necessary volume for an open air pop festival until 11.00 pm at night without causing considerable disruption and disturbance to the families living in nearby homes, in some cases mere feet from the activity that takes place.

129. The narrow, single track lanes that must be used to access the site and to bring in equipment and deliveries as well as thousands of visitors are also unsuitable to service such a large event and whilst a temporary Traffic Order assisted in overcoming some of the difficulties it was not properly implemented by the organisers traffic management company and a significant risk remained. Furthermore the Traffic Order officially ceased to be in force after midnight on Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> August despite considerable traffic activity generated by the event continuing well into the afternoon of Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August.

130. Finally there is the question of the breach of certain conditions attached to the premises licence, in particular the failure to regularly monitor the noise levels from the event. Any responsible operator, being familiar with the sensitivity of the site, the proximity of residents and the concerns of those residents following extensive discussions at the premises licence Appeal in 2006 would surely have taken every measure possible to ensure that noise was kept within the limits set out in the licence and that all other conditions were complied with.

131. The operator's failure to do this despite having employed an acoustics expert suggests a remarkable disregard for the problems suffered by residents as a direct result of the event and a cavalier attitude towards the conditions under which the licence was granted by the Magistrates Court on Appeal.

**Raymond J. Hoffmeister MRICS**

**September 2009**



## Julia OBrien

---

**From:** Michael Dudley [michaeldudley@me.com]  
**Sent:** 02 April 2013 21:43  
**To:** karen.court@wokingham.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Julia O'Brien; Joe Dray; Halsall Halsall  
**Subject:** Premises Licence Hearing PR0338 - 22 April 2013

**Attachments:** 2013 03 Submission to Rewind Review by Mike Dudley-1.docx; ATT1145347.txt



2013 03 Submission ATT1145347.txt  
to Rewind R... (152 B)

Dear Ms Court

Would you please accept this document as the formal submission from the Remenham Farm Residents Association.

### DISCLAIMER

You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator.

If you are not the addressee any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you received this message in error please return it to the originator and confirm that you have deleted all copies of it.

All messages sent by this organisation are checked for viruses using the latest antivirus products. This does not guarantee a virus has not been transmitted. Please therefore ensure that you take your own precautions for the detection and eradication of viruses.

## Julia OBrien

---

**From:** Michael Dudley [michaeldudley@me.com]  
**Sent:** 02 April 2013 21:43  
**To:** karen.court@wokingham.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Julia O'Brien; Joe Dray; Halsall Halsall  
**Subject:** Premises licence PR0338 hearing - 22 April 2013

**Attachments:** Noise Council Code on Noise Control at Concerts[1].pdf; OBSERVATIONS - 80s Rewind Festival (3).doc; ATT1145353.txt



Noise Council Code  
on Noise C...



OBSERVATIONS -  
80s Rewind Fest...



ATT1145353.txt  
(137 B)

Dear Ms Court

*These attachments are the same as those submitted by Remenham Parish Council, hence have not reproduced them again*

Please also accept these additional documents as part of our submission.

### DISCLAIMER

You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. (The information contained in this message or any of its attachments may be privileged and confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the addressee). The views expressed may not be official policy but the personal views of the originator.

If you are not the addressee any disclosure, reproduction, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you received this message in error please return it to the originator and confirm that you have deleted all copies of it.

All messages sent by this organisation are checked for viruses using the latest antivirus products. This does not guarantee a virus has not been transmitted. Please therefore ensure that you take your own precautions for the detection and eradication of viruses.

# REMENHAM FARM RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

REVIEW OF PREMISES LICENCE  
TEMPLE ISLAND MEADOW, REMENHAM FARM, REMENHAM LANE,  
REMENHAM RG9 3DB (REWIND FESTIVAL)  
LICENCE NO: PR0338

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the four years that Rewind has taken place and during the first year under the Remenham Farm Licence PR0258, it has not observed the terms of either license, despite being told and warned on several occasions.

Issuing a separate license for Rewind (PR0338) when one already existed for Remenham Farm, was both unnecessary and inappropriate.

At the time of the hearing, a verbal undertaking was given that the conditions on the Remenham Farm License would be observed and that it would not result in more days of up to 65dBA noise contained in PR0258. Despite several requests this undertaking has not been formally acknowledged by the landowner/licence holder of PR0258.

The Noise Council recommends (page 6 para 3.1) that for rural areas where there are more than three concert days in any calendar years the music noise level should not exceed the background noise by more than 15dBA over a fifteen minute period; this is approximately 40dBA for Remenham.

The Rewind Concert is unable to operate without breaching 65dBA, which is 64 times louder than that recommended.

Whilst river and sporting events are within the tradition of the area, a pop concert is not.

Given the full diary of events which currently exist, this has a cumulative effect so that there is very little respite from events throughout the summer period.

The lanes are inadequate for this size of event without considerable disruption to the community, the infrastructure is totally inadequate to accommodate 20,000 plus people without nuisance and collateral damage to the village and the villagers..

The concert itself by definition and by the admission of the promoter cannot be held quietly, so there is bound to be considerable nuisance to the villagers. The site itself amplifies and reflects noise directly to adjacent properties.

Remenham Farm Residents Association endorses and supports the view of the Environmental Health Authority for revocation of the Licence.

Michael Dudley  
Remenham Farm Residents Association

## DECLARATION OF INTEREST

1. I am Michael Dudley, living at the Reach, Remenham Lane which is 100 metres from the Rewind site, and these documents represent the views of the Remenham Farm Residents Association, which is the group of eight families who live around Remenham Church.
2. Rewind has kindly invited the neighbouring houses to the event, as far as I know in every year the event has been held. Whilst it is not an event I would normally choose to go to, my grown up children have been grateful for this opportunity.

## BACKGROUND

3. Remenham is a village with about six hundred inhabitants in the Borough of Wokingham, Berkshire bounded by Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire. There are two main roads through the village the busy London/Henley Road and the Wargrave/Henley Road; the remainder are small country lanes. The River Thames makes up one of the boundaries.
4. The village has many stakeholders, who use its facilities constantly. It is an important centre of UK Rowing with three rowing clubs (arguably four) in Remenham. There is a canoe club and a boatyard. The Thames Walk runs through the Village with numerous other footpaths attracting many tens of thousands of walkers each year. Joggers, cyclists and some horse riders use the Parish extensively. There is a small church with a loyal congregation. There are two vibrant public houses and many small businesses.

## HISTORY

5. Until recently, there were no public events other than rowing regattas. The Regattas were very much rowing events and attracted only rowers and their supporters. Even Henley Royal Regatta attracted very few people this far down and there were just teas and a very small simple bar. All events were day time events.
6. Progressively, the quantity of events and the number of people has increased. There is a substantial amount of activity in the evenings and nights. The cumulative impact is considerable,

## REWIND

7. Rewind had its fourth year in 2012. It is an event attracting 20,000 people plus all the staff. The setup starts a week before and break down takes another week. However, the site is not completely clear for another two weeks.
8. Although it brings pleasure to many, regrettably it is inappropriate for Remenham.
9. The substantial engineering works over a two week period are not suited to the country lanes and seriously disrupt the other users of the roads and village. The

works include the setting up of stages, substantial fencing, funfair equipment, bars and other ancillary equipment. The noise is incessant and would be greatly alleviated by the universal use of white noise reversing horns.

10. The concert itself by definition and by the admission of the promoter cannot be held quietly, so there is bound to be considerable nuisance to the villagers and other outlying areas. The Thames Valley amplifies and reflects noise in an extraordinary way
11. We do not believe that this is correct venue for a pop concert. Whilst river and sporting events are within the tradition of the area, a pop concert is not. Given the full diary of events which currently exist, this has a cumulative effect so that there is very little respite from events through the period. The lanes are inadequate for this size of event without considerable disruption to the community, the village is too small to accommodate 20,000 plus people without nuisance and collateral damage. Just the noise will create nuisance.

#### LICENCE

12. In 2009, Rewind operated under the Remenham Farm Licence PRO258, which contains provisions for noise and the frequency of events.
13. WBC agreed to issue a licence for Rewind in addition to that of Remenham Farm but at the time a verbal undertaking was given that the conditions on the Remenham Farm License would be observed and that it would not result in more days of up to 65bDBA noise; such an undertaking has never been formally acknowledged by Remenham Farm.
14. The issuance of another licence seems to have been a device to protect PRO258; a device which should have been apparent to the Licensing Authority.
15. In the four years that Rewind has held a licence and during the first year under the Remenham Farm Licence PRO258, it has not observed the terms of the license, despite being told and warned on several occasions.
16. Issuing a separate license for Rewind, when one already exists for Remenham Farm, the landowner, was both unnecessary and inappropriate. It leads to the confusion that if one licence is breached then both are.

#### REMHAM FARM RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

17. Remenham Farm Residents Association is conscious that the increasing number of events is materially changing the nature of the village. The noise and disruption arising from the Rewind Festival affects everyone in the village not only those in close proximity to the event.
18. Remenham Farm Residents Association, Remenham Parish Council and its Borough Councillors propose the Borough adopt a Borough wide policy which welcomes events which accept five governing principles:

- a. That the cumulative impact of events is taken into account in any particular area
- b. That the borough, responsible authorities, the parish and the residents fully recover both direct costs and collateral costs arising from any event.
- c. That events are holistically planned.
- d. That the Noise Council recommendations are observed.
- e. That the residents do not suffer undue public nuisance.

## COSTS

19. WBC, RPC and the villagers (RFRA) have to continuously incur costs if only to have evidence of nonconformities with licenses. These costs are ongoing and considerable.

## NOISE

20. The Noise Council "Large music events involving high powered amplification give pleasure to Thousands of people each year. However, the noise from these events can cause disturbance to those living in the vicinity. The purpose of this code is to provide guidance on how such disturbance or annoyance can be minimised. Various guidelines and criteria are described in the code, covering a range of events from a single concert to a full season. Compliance with the guidelines and the other criteria given will enable successful concerts to be held whilst keeping to a minimum the disturbance caused by the noise. First published in 1995, the code is currently under review with a view to updating it."
21. The Noise Council recommends that "the Music Noise Level (MNL) should not exceed the following when measured 1 metre from the façade of any noise sensitive premises between the hours of 09.00 and 23.00:
- a. One to three concert days per calendar year per venue for rural venues "The MNL should not exceed 65dB(A) over 15 minute period
  - b. Four to twelve concert days the MNL should not exceed the background level by more than 15dB(A) over a fifteen minute period."
22. "For events continuing or held between the hours of 23.00 and 9.00 the music noise should not be audible within noise-sensitive premises with windows open in a typical manner for ventilation"
23. Remenham Farm has more than three events so following these guidelines all events should not exceed the background level by more than 15dB(A) over a fifteen minute period and between the hours of 23.00 and 9.00 the music noise should not be audible within noise-sensitive premises with windows open in a typical manner for ventilation
24. The Remenham Farm License under which Rewind operated for the first year (2009) permitted three days of 65dBA until 23.00 hours. RPC and RFRA has monitored the Rewind Festival for Noise and asked WBC to do likewise. Substantial breaches were recorded in every year of these recordings by both RFRA and WBC.

25. These consistent breaches are notwithstanding that the Noise Council guidelines recommend a level of 15dB(A) above the background level not 65dB(A). The background level is about 30dB(A) which would be 45dB(A).

26. The 65dB(A) permitted is therefore 20dB(A) higher than the Noise Council envisages (approximately sixty four times higher) and even this is breached constantly, hence the application for the review.

#### TRAFFIC

27. The traffic is considerable during the event, leading up to the event and after the event.

28. The traffic order is imposed by WBC but is not monitored by WBC and is as competent as the contractors who manage it.

29. The management of the traffic order is poor.

30. The traffic monitors do not observe the traffic order but make their own rules up.

31. The signage is poor, with many drivers believing that there was one way system when there was not and a two way system when it was one way.

32. The traffic monitors disappear after dark when the majority of the problems exist and taxis race down the lanes, mitigate by the one way system existing from 2012 after 9.00pm.

33. There is no representative from WBC traffic to ensure that the order was appropriate, understood or observed.

#### LITTER

34. The first year there were considerable quantities of litter in Remenham which has improved, but Henley still suffers from considerable litter as visitors to Rewind also arrive by public transport.

#### WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

35. The problems associated with this and other events are that whilst WBC is the Licensing Authority, traffic authority and environmental health authority, it has done little to enforce adherence but has merely acted as a passive facilitator. If the licence or traffic order is correctly prepared, whether they are appropriate and protect the villagers' interests has not been the primary concern. Rather WBC seems to have bent over backwards to accommodate any new event regardless of the effect on the community.

36. It would be much more helpful if WBC saw its role as defending its constituents interests and promoting the local community. In this event the holders would be much more cautious of the effect on the local community and would tailor their operating procedures to not cause the local community nuisance and be more considerate to their wishes.

37. Anecdotal evidence suggests that an event within a village can only be successful and sustainable in the long term if certain paradigms exist. The villagers must enjoy it, be part of it and feel ownership of it. There must be clear benefit to the village. The event organisers must have an ongoing and open dialogue with the village. The village must have access to all relevant documents concerning the event and results of any studies and monitoring; RFRA and RPC must be a part of the Safety Advisory Group and any other meeting which impacts on the event and the village. The event must be seen to benefit the community. It must seek to minimise the adverse impact on the village and the villagers' concerns. It must deal with them and seek to constantly improve the experience for the villagers and the village. There must be no marginal cost to the villagers; this condition includes collateral damage, monitoring or court costs. Indeed within the spirit of localism, the villagers must be able look forward to the event.

#### NATURE OF THE EVENT

38. The nature of the event is one which attracts mature persons and is generally well behaved but there is concern that in time this will be moderated to a completely different demographic, whose behaviour will not be similar.

#### SUMMARY

39. Rewind should not be held in Remenham, as it is not associated with the traditional Remenham river events and the environment is not suitable.

40. If it is to be held in Remenham, Rival and WBC can make it sustainable only by ensuring that the experience for the village is constantly improved and proposals have been agreed which if applied would mitigate the public nuisance of the event.

41. PRO338 should therefore be revoked and Rewind only allowed to continue under a suitably modified PRO258.

Michael Dudley  
Remenham Farm Residents Association  
31st March 2013