Scrutiny

TASK GROUP
EVENTS
AUGUST 2019

Scrutiny Task Group – Events – Final Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A review of event management was initiated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in August 2019. A Scrutiny Task Group was set up to look at the following areas:

- the Council's approach to managing events in our parks and gardens within the context of the commercialisation agenda;

- the approval process for events across the borough

- how events are managed once approval is given.

The Task Group engaged with a number of key stakeholders, including event organisers and local residents' groups.

The desired outcome outlined by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's One Page Strategy (Appendix 2) was for the Task Group to identify strengths and weaknesses of the increased commercialisation strategy, and to identify possible improvements to the process of events application, approval and management.

The Task Group recommends a total of 19 recommendations presented under the following key themes;

1. Engagement/Community

2. Process

3. Event Strategy

4. Commercial

5. Enforcement

The details of the recommendations are set out in section 4 of this report.

Photos on covering page courtesy of Marketing Cheltenham

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. A review of events management was initiated by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2019, in view of the strategy to increase commercialisation of the parks and gardens.

1.2. This report sets out the findings and recommendations arising from the Scrutiny Task Group.

2. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

2.1. Membership of the Task Group:

- Councillor Dennis Parsons (Chair)
- Councillor Chris Mason
- Councillor Diggory Seacome
- Councillor Garth Barnes

Councillors Paul Baker and Klara Sudbury were initially on the group but stood down due to work commitments. Councillor Sudbury was replaced by Councillor Barnes.

2.2. Key officers:

- Tracey Crews, Director of Planning and Sponsoring Officer (TC)
- Jess Goodwin, Events Manager at Marketing Cheltenham/Cheltenham BID (JG)
- Louis Krog, Licensing (LK)
- Adam Reynolds, Green Space Development (AR)
- David Oakhill, Head of Planning (DO)
- David Jackson, Manager of Marketing Cheltenham (DJ)
- Andrew Knott, Accountant and Deputy Section 151 Officer (AK)
- Gareth Jones, Senior Environmental Health Officer (GJ)
- Sarah Clark, Public and Environmental Health Officer (SC)
- Jane Stovell, Project Manager (JS)

2.3. Ambitions agreed by the O&S committee:

1. Understand the strategy for increased commercialisation of the parks and gardens
2. Develop knowledge of the events application/approval process
3. Gain understanding of the council's procedures for managing an event (including enforcement if necessary)
4. Understand the impact of not increasing commercialisation

Outcomes desired by the O&S Committee:

1. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the strategy for increased commercialisation of the parks and gardens
2. Identify any improvements/changes to the events application/approval process

3. Identify possible improvements to the council's procedures for managing events (including enforcement)

3.   METHOD OF APPROACH

3.1. The Task Group met on six occasions. The meetings took place on the following dates: 10th October 2019, 4th November 2019, 27th November 2019, 6th December 2019, 13th January 2020 and 30th January 2020.

3.2. The first meeting on 10th October 2019 sought to establish a strategy for the Task Group process. It was agreed that due to the complexity of the subject it would be prudent to split the future meetings into the following topics: strategy, process, previous events, enforcement and a 'mop up' session to determine the final recommendations.

3.3. This section of the report will outline the process chronologically, demonstrating how each recommendation was reached. Each meeting is discussed at the following points:
   - strategy (3.5 – 3.13)
   - process (3.14 – 3.29)
   - lessons learned from previous events through engagement with key stakeholders (3.30 – 3.47)
   - enforcement (3.48 – 3.60)
   - 'mopping up' outstanding issues and deciding on final recommendations (3.61 – 3.74)

3.4. At the first meeting, the Chair sought to focus on the question of engagement with elected Members and members of the community in making decisions around the hosting of events. It was agreed that a wide variety of interests needed to be taken into account, and Members suggested various groups and individuals to contact, from council officers with relevant areas of expertise to residents' groups and event organisers.

3.5. At the strategy meeting on 4th November 2019, AK informed Members about the council's overall commercial strategy, which seeks to make better use of council assets and improve their commercial potential.

3.6. He reported that officers look at assets through the lens of commercial activity to generate income, reviewing commercial rates in order to produce the most reasonable figures. Different rents are offered depending on the nature of the event that is proposed to be held there: commercial, charity or community. Members emphasised that if the goal is to make as much money as possible from the parks, then the public should be aware of it. Members also emphasised that a balance must be struck between generating profit and enabling free access for residents and visitors. It was resolved that the rates charged by CBC assets should be reviewed in the context of the events strategy.

3.7. DJ outlined the council's five year marketing strategy, which is aimed at increasing the value of tourism in Cheltenham from £150m to £170-180m, and to a total of 20% of all Gloucestershire tourism, across a five year period.

3.8. Members discussed the merits of different event strategies considering the seasonality of the events calendar, and agreed that the priority should be to improve the troughs in the event

season rather than stretch the peak season. It was noted that some parks are used more heavily due to their proximity to the town centre, and Members agreed the strategy should focus on improving venues across the board and increasing demand for smaller venues across the town. Members agreed that the wider effect of events on the local economy (e.g. the effect on business for local restaurants) must be taken into account.

3.9.   JG informed Members about the general principles of the emerging events strategy. These are based around increasing tourism, economic impact, cultural opportunities and promoting Cheltenham. Social value is a key thread of the emerging strategy. Prospective events are assessed not only according to commercial value but also in terms of the broader benefit they can bring to the town. She emphasised that any events strategy must take into accounts the interests of the whole town rather than just the council, and must complement the cultural strategy currently being developed.

3.10. To ensure the events strategy is fully reflective of the cultural strategy, it was agreed that the events strategy should be interim and reviewed again when the cultural strategy is approved.

3.11. A tier system for events was proposed, with the top tier being for high-profile events bringing national and international visitors, second tier events bringing national and regional attention, and the bottom tier being for bespoke, Cheltenham-centric, community-led events.

3.12. Members suggested that there is a real difference between events that allow non-attendees to walk around experience the event (e.g. the Literature Festival) and those that put up fences and exclude them entirely unless they have paid the entrance fee. The current approach applied by officers in considering the use of parks and gardens for events includes openness and accessibility as key criteria. The Task Group agreed that this needs to be preserved.

3.13. Members discussed the wider purpose of the emerging events strategy. TC clarified that the existing approaches are not borough-wide, and now that Cheltenham is being promoted as The Festival Town, a more rounded approach was needed. An events strategy will provide a clear structure within which to consider and promote events.

3.14. The 27th November meeting focused on process, and broke down the current process into its key elements: Events Consultative Groups (ECGs), Safety Advisory Groups (SAGs) licensing, planning and land use agreements.

3.15. LK explained that ECGs offer an opportunity for Members to sit down with prospective organisers and discuss their aims and various other issues. It is particularly helpful for less experienced organisers, who can consult the relevant officers and Members with significant experience of Cheltenham events. Members reported that they had had positive experiences with ECGs in the past, and found them a useful and informative part of the process.

3.16. LK further explained that events tend to be referred to a SAG, which has blue light services as its core membership in addition to officers from licensing, environmental health, building control and planning. Though the SAG has no statutory powers and cannot veto events, it can compile technical advice on safety issues like noise mitigation and environmental concerns, and feed it back to the relevant individuals.

3.17. The SAG can also recommend the imposition of conditions of required formal consents such as licensing or planning consents. The council would not enter into a land use agreement with an organiser that was ignoring clear SAG advice.

3.18. There was detailed debate around communication, especially the question of whether Members should be part of SAG. It was agreed that SAG was a technical forum with the focus on the safety of events. It was agreed that it was not appropriate for Members to be part of this group. It was agreed that ECG was the appropriate vehicle for member engagement and that Members should continue to act as the conduit with the local community. There was discussion around a committee should be established for events akin to that of licensing committee. It was agreed by the Task Group that this would add unnecessary administrative burden into the events process and slow down decision making.

3.19. Members were also informed of the situation regarding licences, the most important of which relate to entertainment and alcohol, but which are also required to play commercial music, collect for charities and many other things. In the past, the council allowed some events to use its licences, but this is no longer the case. Some smaller events are still allowed to use the council's licences, but Cheltenham Festivals (as an example of a large provider) now has its own premises licences. Most licences last for 12 months, though alcohol licences are granted in perpetuity for an annual fee.

3.20. DO outlined the implications of planning consent for events, explaining that the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) generally allows venues in Cheltenham to be used for events for 28 days each calendar year without planning permission. Montpellier and Imperial Gardens are the exceptions, benefitting from planning permission to use up to 70 days per year.

3.21. The level of restriction depends on the kind of activity taking place on the land: motor racing, for example, is much more tightly restricted than other events. It was emphasised that each event is assessed according to the specific licences and legal permissions required, and that it is important for planning to be seen as an enabler rather than a blocker.

3.22. AR informed Members about land use agreements, which are brought in after the consultative scrutiny stage (ECG/SAG), when the event has been greenlit and the relevant licences procured. The land use agreement covers the specific land to be used, fees and charges, health and safety requirements, ground protection measures, procedures for dealing with noise and nuisances, and more.

3.23. Land use agreements for smaller events tend to mostly follow an established template, while larger events require a bespoke agreement tailored by One Legal for a fee of £150. This legal cost lies with the Finance and Assets division.

3.24. Members questioned the lack of public involvement in the land use agreement stage. It was clarified that public and member consultation has already happened at the ECG stage, before the land use agreement is formulated.

3.25. JS outlined the current process of how events are booked, emphasising that it is highly complex and requires a large amount of officer time, but is in the process of being modernised. Streamlining the process will save money and improve the experience of event organisers, who often find themselves waiting for responses. Members agreed that it would

be beneficial to centralise the process, so that officers and organisers can access the information they need in one place.

3.26. LK added that the lack of a specific events officer at the council means that responsibility is naturally more stratified and decisions take longer to make. JS suggested that the council's case management system, which uses software called IDOX Uniform, ensures that event organisers know who to contact. Members asked whether the council had investigated what other authorities and whether Cheltenham could do better. JG responded that she was in the process of examining alternative options, such as the Apply4 system used by Bristol City Council, and whether greater value for money could be achieved elsewhere.

3.27. Members asked whether the complexity of the planning process dissuades smaller event organisers from applying. LK that as long as events are organised and run properly, with the correct licences, then the council's role is relatively minor. Particularly small events do not need to go through the full process: for example, ECGs are only required when the event is expected to attract more than 500 visitors. It was acknowledged that this was an imperfect threshold, since even the smallest event can cause problems if inadequately overseen.

3.28. Members asked whether a greater amount of information could be included in member briefings on events. TC suggested that briefings, which are publicly available should residents wish to read them, should be published in one easily accessible place. LK clarified that every event has its details logged on the IDOX Uniform system, and the majority of regulatory information is in the public domain already.

3.29. It was suggested that it might be wise for Members to receive updates on all events and choose who to inform of this on their own initiative. It was agreed that this is the point of councillors, to represent the public and report directly back to their constituents. It was agreed that the possibility of new member training be explored, to clarify what Members can and should relate directly to constituents.

3.30. The 6th December meeting, relating to previous events, sought to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the events process from a wider set of perspectives. In order to achieve this, invitations were circulated to various stakeholders, including residents' groups and event organisers, outlining the purpose of the meeting as follows:

The purpose of the meeting you have been invited to is to hear your thoughts and reflections on the processes adopted by the borough council in supporting events across the town, lessons we can take forward when developing our event strategy, how we strike a balance between commercial interests and residents' interests, and how to ensure that every event has a positive impact on the wider community.

3.31. The meeting was based around the following questions:
- *In your experience, how effective do you feel the process is for the consideration and booking and managing of events?*
- *In your experience, how effective do you think the consultation process is between the event organiser, elected Members, CBC officers and the wider community?*
- *How do you think CBC can improve its approach to booking and managing events on its land through the events booking process or events strategy to better support events in Cheltenham?*

3.32. A total 13 representatives attended the meeting, representing groups including Friends of Sandford Park, Friends of Imperial Square Gardens, Friends of Montpellier Bandstand and Gardens, the Paint Festival, the Lido, Cheltenham Festivals, the Fiesta, Triathlons and Cyclo-cross, and written feedback was received from those unable to attend.

3.33. Attendees relayed their positive and negative experiences of the events process and discussed what could be done better. Members were able to discuss the reality of the events system directly with those affected by it, and demonstrated a willingness to engage directly with organisers and residents to improve the process.

3.34. A number of attendees described their frustration with what they saw as an unnecessarily complicated application process. The representative for the Paint Festival reported that they were asked numerous questions throughout the process that could have been answered in one go at the very start, had the process been more coherent. They criticised a lack of joined-up thinking, and suggested that the number of different permissions required made it difficult to plan ahead.

3.35. Those representing events that took place in different locations indicated that they felt this was not adequately taken into account during the application process. The Paint Festival, for example, had over 15,000 visitors in total in 2019, but only a maximum of 20 in each location at any one time. The council's questions were ambiguous as to which figure was needed in particular cases.

3.36. Organisers agreed that there needed to be a clearer idea of the council's requirements of them, and a more focused and less stratified system of information and decision making. TC noted that recent business work carried out on the events process had indicated that the process was more complicated than it needed to be. Attendees and Members agreed that when an organiser fills out an online form, they should be given direct contact details for the officer who can grant them the particular permission they need.

3.37. The representative of Cheltenham Festivals indicated that the process had improved considerably in the twenty years they had worked with the council. Cheltenham Festivals tends to organise events several years in advance, so has a different experience of the events process to someone seeking to organise something at short notice. The representative of Cyclo-cross, a relatively small event, reported that they have good communication from officers and a clear idea of what is expected from them. The representative of Tri in the Park agreed that the consultation process had been good for them, responding to their time-critical needs in a proactive way.

3.38. Representatives of residents' groups also outlined their experience of the planning process. The representative of Friends of Pittville suggested that residents' feedback is not adequately taken into account, while the representative of Friends of Sandford Park cited the Cheese and Chilli Festival as a particular example of the lack of contact with the local community. They claimed that there had been no communication whatsoever from the council or the event organiser before the festival took place, only marketing leaflets. Residents did not feel as though the concerns they had voiced a year earlier about the effect of increased noise had been taken seriously. Members agreed that the organisers should have informed the local community, and that residents should always be notified of events in their area and have a chance to respond.

3.39. Written feedback submitted by the Cheese and Chilli Festival organisers indicated that they would no longer be looking to hold the event in Cheltenham due to the high volume of complaints received from residents in 2019.

3.40. The Chair agreed that the consultation process needs to be looked at more closely. Members acknowledged that the theme of residents not being properly consulted has persisted for a long time. Representatives of residents' groups agreed that from their point of view, it is about feeling like their concerns are being taken seriously.

3.41. The representative of the Fiesta agreed that public notification was essential, adding that when her organisation holds events in Winston Churchill Gardens, they put leaflets through every resident's door. This is not a legal requirement, but she suggested that something similar should be. The representative of the Paint Festival suggested that some leeway should be offered to events that take place across the whole town, as it would not be feasible to inform every resident who might be affected by their event.

3.42. The Chair suggested that a key complaint had been the lack of a single point of contact. He suggested that all event details should be accessible in one place, with a single officer responsible for oversight. Members agreed that the best way to achieve this would be to move to an entirely electronic system, which all officers could access rather than having to wait on each other for responses. JG reported that she was in the early stages of talks with a company offering web-based planning applications, which allows all departments and SAG members to view and comment on applications as they progress. An electronic system could allow organisers of annual events to carry over the same preferences year-on-year rather than having to fill out the same information each time they apply.

3.43. Representatives of smaller events indicated that they were concerned about the implications of the council's commercial strategy. If they are asked to pay to use assets that they currently use for free, then their events may become difficult to continue. JG reassured them that there are different tiers of rent, with charities (for example) charged significantly less than general commercial providers. Various criteria are considered when deciding which events to approve, including community benefit and physical and financial accessibility.

3.44. TC reminded the group that not everyone will be supportive of all events, but the events strategy must intend to facilitate a wide variety of events in the context of supporting the visitor economy, contributing to the local economy and offering a range of cultural and event experiences.

3.45. Members discussed the Gardens Forum and expressed scepticism about its value. AR reported that some organisers no longer come to it due to heated exchanges with residents in the past. TC suggested that it does not inform decision making, and Members agreed that its remit needs to be reconsidered.

3.46. TC summarised the key points raised in the public meeting as follows: the need for a single point of contact, up-front guidelines about what is required of organisers, flexibility in consultation, and the importance of working relationships and public engagement.

3.47. Members of the Task Group would like to thank everyone who attended the previous events meeting and contributed to the review of the event process.

3.48.	The 13th January meeting sought to explore the issue of enforcement, especially with regard to the question of public and environmental health.

3.49.	LK explained that while the council endeavours to take a proactive approach to licensing, informing organisers about what is required of them at the earliest possible time, enforcement is more reactive (i.e. responding to a breach of licence).

3.50.	The issues encountered can differ greatly depending on the size of the event. Smaller events are more likely to undergo sudden changes late in the process that require a new or amended licence, or to not realise that they need a particular licence, while larger providers tend to be more experienced.

3.51.	SC outlined issues relating to environmental health, explaining that the aim is to facilitate safe and sustainable events through proactive regulation. A good example of this is food safety: the event organiser is advised to check vendors' registration, food hygiene ratings are fully checked, regulatory advice is given in advance and spot checks are carried out.

3.52.	A proportionate approach is taken to site inspections, based on risk. Major events are checked for noise, and some events are checked for health and safety and food safety, though the key risks are identified and mitigated before the event begins. Key concerns can also include crowd safety, the safe separation of pedestrians and vehicles, and animal safety (e.g. animal welfare and infection control). Advice is given on priority topics from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), such as recent warnings about inflatables after serious accidents elsewhere in the country.

3.53.	SC explained that this proactive approach, based on providing solid advice up front, reduces the likelihood that enforcement action is needed afterwards. It is up to the event organiser to demonstrate that they have planned a safe event and take remedial action if not.

3.54.	Members asked about how enforcement works regarding antisocial behaviour and crime at events, such as violence or drug use. SC clarified that these are police matters and not for the council to enforce, but the council does what it can to help – for example, it works with the police and racecourse in relation to ticket touting at racing events.

3.55.	She suggested that the environmental health service must balance the needs of event organisers, eventgoers and residents, and advised that the council looks at making events more cost neutral in terms of regulation in the future.

3.56.	Members discussed questions of liability in the case of injuries at events. Officers clarified that liability generally lies with organisers unless there is a specific defect with council-owned land. Any serious incidents are fully investigated, taking into account all decisions made by the council in allowing the event and formulating the land use agreement. LK stated that although the land use agreement seeks to limit the risk that the council takes on, any agreement carries an element of liability.

3.57.	Members outlined concerns that event providers will deliberately push the boundaries of what it allowed if breaches are not punished. GJ responded that there are a number of possible sanctions, but treating providers too harshly would discourage others from using Cheltenham venues. LK added that persistent failure to fulfil the requirements of licences can be addressed through the Licensing Committee or by way of prosecution.

3.58. Members discussed specific aspects of land use agreements such as cut-off times, which might be restricted in order to reassure residents and reduce inconvenience. GJ noted that most events end well before the cut-off time established in the land use agreement.

3.59. LK suggested that any consultation creates an expectation that the process or outcome will be influenced. If an application has gone through the proper channels, acquired the correct licences and is following all the relevant safety requirements, there is no legal scope for withdrawing that licence to due residents' complaints. The council must be clear about the point of the consultation, that residents cannot necessarily influence the holding of an event. Members agreed that consultation should be referred to as 'engagement' instead, as this does not create a false expectation that it is guaranteed to influence the process.

3.60. AR suggested that over time in the events process, the same issues continually crop up and have a significant cumulative effect – for example, the poor enforcement of parking rules. He also suggested that a stronger relationship ought to be built between residents and event organisers, improving scrutiny and accountability while also helping residents understand the work that goes into putting on events. JG suggested that access to a 'how to' pack could help organisers understand the requirements of their role before they start their application. Members agreed that this would be beneficial.

3.61. The final meeting of the Task Group took place on 30th January 2020 and sought to mop up outstanding issues and decide on the final recommendations.

3.62. Members were presented with a total of 20 draft recommendations, split into five categories: engagement and community, process, strategy, commercial and enforcement. The recommendations were discussed in detail, and most were amended in some way.

3.63. The first four recommendations relate to the question of engagement and community. Members insisted that the phrase 'minimum standard of engagement' be amended to read 'agreed standard of engagement', deeming the latter to be too little. The group also clarified that officers would be tasked with engaging with the Gardens Forum and Friends Of groups in order to develop this agreed standard.

3.64. The Chair indicated that he felt Members are marginalised in the events process, as they are unable to prevent events taking place when there is no licensing issue, but are seen as responsible for unsuccessful events by residents. Members discussed the ways in which they are able to influence the planning process, including the ability to raise serious issues to Cabinet and engage with officers about areas of concern.

3.65. TC advised that the Task Group had already discussed this, and that there was consensus that adding committee-based decision-making would delay the delivery of events and add questionable value. She stressed that the process does not seek to disengage members.

3.66. The Chair stated his intention to produce a minority report, dissenting on the level of member involvement in the process. The minority report is attached to the covering report as Appendix 3.

3.67. Members agreed that the second recommendation should say 'engaged' rather than 'informed', offering members a more clearly defined role in the process. They also agreed that due to the overlap between two recommendations regarding public information, they should be merged into one (recommendation 3).

3.68. The prospect of an events website, as proposed in recommendation 3, was discussed in detail. Members noted the potential for misinterpretation, so it was amended to clarify that it would be a broad events platform with information about every event, rather than a specific website for each individual event. Members also agreed that it should be made clearer that they are the primary point of contact by email.

3.69. Members asked about the breadth of the review planned in recommendation 4. TC clarified that the parameters have not been defined yet. Members agreed to expand the recommendation to include a geographical review of the Gardens Forum's remit.

3.70. Members then discussed the recommendations pertaining to process, questioning the need for additional member training when relatively few members represent wards containing a large amount of public space where events occur. TC reminded members that it might not be relevant to all members now, but could easily be in the future. The recommendation was not amended.

3.71. Members moved on to discussing the recommendations listed under Event Strategy. JG reported that the emerging events strategy takes into account four tiers rather than three: headline events, feature events, town events and community events. Members agreed that this offered greater clarity and that recommendation 10 should be amended accordingly.

3.72. Members agreed that recommendation 11 should make reference to the commercial strategy. It was also agreed that the word 'capital' be added to recommendation 12 to aid understanding. These were both amended accordingly.

3.73. The final group of recommendations, listed under Commercial, were also discussed. TC clarified that none of the charges to be reviewed in recommendation 13 had yet been determined. Members discussed anomalies in the system that could be ironed out. DS indicated his willingness to assist in any review of rates.

3.74. It was agreed that recommendation 16 be amended to refer to 'all non-community events' rather than 'all large events', as the latter was too ambiguous. CM suggested that recommendation 18 commit to considering a more robust approach to enforcing noise limits. This was also agreed.

3.75. Members of the Task Group would like to thank everyone who attended their meetings and contributed to the review, and also to thank those officers who supported to the work of the group.

4. Recommendations

4.1 A total of 20 recommendations have been agreed by the Scrutiny Events Task Group.

No	Recommendation
Engagement/Community	
1	An agreed standard of public engagement be established as part of the event consultative process, which all event organisers will be expected to achieve. Officers to be tasked with engaging on developing the agreed standard with the Gardens Forum and Friends Of groups.
2	The engagement protocol between Events Consultative Groups (ECG) and Members be reviewed, to ensure that Members are as engaged as possible about events in their ward.
3	Investment be made in an event website to create a forum that connects event organisers, resident and wider stakeholders with a clear point of contact, with the key outcome being to provide clear information regarding events for communities in their ward, providing live updates on events and stages within the sign off process. Members to act as the primary point of email contact.
4	The remit of the Gardens Forum be re-evaluated to include a review of sites covered.
Process	
5	The objectives of the events process align not only with the goals of the commercial strategy, but also those of the cultural strategy and the social value policy.
6	The event process: • be digital wherever possible to aid event organisers and enable back office systems between parks, licensing, planning, event management to be joined up • be clearly set out on Council website • clearly provide a single point of contact • demonstrate the benefits to the wider community as part of the events process
7	A 'how to' pack be compiled and published on the events website in order to help event organisers understand the licensing, enforcement and environmental health requirements of the events process and enforcement.
8	Member training be put in place to support Members in their roles and responsibilities within the events process.
Event strategy	
9	The event strategy be interim, to ensure it can be reviewed to be fully reflective of the cultural strategy once it is approved.
10	The events strategy incorporate a tier system, classifying events as follows: • headline events: a small number of big impact, annual, cultural and sporting highlights which showcase the town • feature events: established, growing or one-off events that contribute to the vibrancy, profile and tourism appeal of the town • town events: events delivered at a town level that, although of a recognised quality, are predominantly aimed at residents • community events: small scale community or community of interest organised festivals and events taking place across the town, with a capacity of 499 or less

11	The events strategy considers options of spreading the impact of events across wider venues, to recognise the potential of commercial opportunities together with reducing the impact on current honeypot sites such as Montpellier and Imperial Gardens.
12	The events strategy considers the infrastructure required to support recommendation 11 and present a business case to Cabinet as appropriate outlining capital investment required. In addition, the strategy should ensure that any new event sites consider infrastructure in the context of the climate emergency.
Commercial	
13	The rates charged by CBC on the assets of parks and gardens be reviewed in the context of the council's commercialisation strategy.
14	The events strategy look at opportunities of improving troughs in the events calendar, to further develop commercial opportunities, whilst recognising the impact of stretching the peak season on heavily used parks and gardens.
15	Officers investigate the commercial opportunities of providing hands-on guidance for event providers.
Enforcement	
16	All non-community events be required to attain their own licence to aid any enforcement measures undertaken by the council.
17	The Land Use Agreement template be reviewed to ensure conditions are sufficiently robust to support enforcement actions where required.
18	A review of noise levels be applied to events once national guidance has been published (anticipated in 2020), and a review of enforcement to follow to ensure the robustness of procedures.
19	An enforcement guidance paper be prepared and published online, clearly articulating the actions the Council may take with non-compliance with Land Use Agreements.

5. PROGRESSING THE SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 In respect of the terms of reference set for us by the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) committee, we feel confident that these have been met.