

**Minutes of the meeting of Licensing Sub-Committee held at  
Online meeting / Conference Room 1 - Herefordshire Council,  
Plough Lane Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE on Wednesday 2 July  
2025 at 2.00 pm**

**Present:**                **Councillor Polly Andrews (chairperson)**

**Councillors: Dave Davies and Peter Hamblin**

**Officers:**                **Licensing technical officer and Senior Lawyer - Civil Litigation**

**8.            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received.

**9.            NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)**

There were no substitutes present at the meeting.

**10.          DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**11.          APPLICATION FOR A GRANT OF A PREMISES LICENCE IN RESPECT OF  
NOZSTOCK, ROWDEN PADDOCKS, WINSLOW, BROMYARD, HR7 4LS -  
LICENSING ACT 2003**

Members of the licensing Sub-Committee from the Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee considered the above application, full details of which appeared before the members in their agenda published on 24 June 2025 and three supplements; one published on 24 June and two on 27 June 2025.

Prior to making its decision the clerk presented the report which outlined the options available to the Sub-Committee. Two representations were received from the responsible authorities; West Mercia Police and Trading Standards. The conditions proposed by both responsible authorities were agreed with the applicant. Sixteen (16) relevant representations were received from members of the public that the licensing authority accepted as being relevant and eight (8) letters of support were received. The clerk summarised the application and provided an overview of the representations received.

The Sub-Committee heard from the public representatives that:

- The major concern with the application from the local community centred on the impact on public amenity. The local community was prepared to collaborate with the applicant to reach a considered and satisfactory outcome.
- The application for the licence and decision-making of the sub-committee should take account of the requirements of the Herefordshire Core Strategy, the National Planning Policy Framework and Herefordshire Council Licensing

Policy. Such policies placed significant weight upon the protection of the amenity of local residents.

- The Noise Management Plan that had been submitted by the applicant was provided late in supplementary papers and lacked necessary detail.
- Rowden Paddocks was a beautiful and tranquil location that was affected adversely by noise in the evening.
- Crumplebury Farm was a local venue that hosted events such as weddings that was an exemplar of how a local business should regulate its activities with: appropriate conditions for the limitation of sound levels; restrictions on the location of amplified music; an appropriate curfew for events; clear communication with the local community; and a good system to deal with complaints. Crumplebury Farm had a robust, objective and evidenced noise management plan (NMP) which adhered to legislation and protected residential amenity.
- In comparison with Crumplebury Farm, the NMP submitted by Nozstock Ltd contained far less detail and arrangements for the handling of complaints at Rowden Paddocks was inadequate.
- During consideration of the application an assessment of noise and disruption were crucial in decision making.
- The current application proposed a series of events that was very different to the annual Nozstock festival that had taken place previously. Local residents' experience of Nozstock had not been positive but there had been a forbearance of the event once a year.
- The festival was once a year and did not extend into the early morning; the current application proposed a series of events which lasted late into the evening and early morning.
- The location of the application was a peaceful rural environment and 11:00 p.m. was a more suitable terminal hour for events. There had been a suggestion previously that there was not a problem with artists breaching the terminal hour.
- In the application it was conditioned that noise and vibration would not emanate from the site that would cause a disturbance. The events proposed would be in breach of this condition. Although smaller events than the Nozstock festival were proposed, there would still be significant disruption and nuisance caused.
- Legislation including the Licensing Act and the Human Rights Act were intended to protect the rights of local residents. Commercial events should not prevent enjoyment of property and land by the individual. The events proposed in the application would impact on the work, leisure and sleep of local residents including children.
- Monitoring of the nuisance and the disruptive impact of the venue was offered but it was felt that this should be independent and objective and not undertaken by an individual employed by applicant. It was proposed that the council undertake monitoring at locations agreed with local residents.
- Clarity was required from the applicant regarding how complaints would be handled and resolved.
- Strict adherence to noise levels and monitoring of the impact of the site was required and equitable finishing times for events.
- The application was based on a maximum number of operating days and it was queried what was defined as a 'day' and whether an event that continued past midnight would occupy two days.
- It was explained that compromise between the applicant and local residents was required. Respect of the needs and rights of local residents was required.
- Local residents had attended the hearing to discuss the impact the application posed on the on the local community and raise concerns around noise/vibration from the site.
- More detail was required about the nature of events that were proposed. Information contained in the application was vague.

- The local community had been assured that the application would not result in adverse noise and vibration emanating from the site. However, the local community was aware of amplification equipment at the site that would cause such disruption and nuisance.
- It was queried what actions the council could undertake to address noise nuisance. Testing of approved noise levels should be independently assessed at testing stations proposed by the local community.
- The predominant demography of the area was older, retired people. It was understood that beat music impacted on cardiac health and sleep deprivation and also had significant impacts on health.
- There would be an adverse impact on local businesses that relied on the peaceful rural environment around Rowden Paddocks.
- The local community required access to clear information from the applicant. Notification from the applicant should provide detail as to when events would take place that would allow local residents to make appropriate arrangements. A one month notice period was not felt to be sufficient.
- There was a general terminal hour at local venues of 11:00 a.m.; it was queried why Rowden Paddocks was proposing a later terminal hour. Events persisting into the early hours of morning posed a significant impact on the local community.
- The local community was prepared to work with the applicant for a suitable resolution and honesty was needed with no exaggeration.
- The Nozstock festival was once a year and was acceptable but up to 10 days was not.

The Sub-Committee then heard from the applicant's agent that:

- The business was changing. A four day festival had been undertaken for 26 years but the business was applying for more days on which there may be events. This was an appropriate step for the business to take.
- A comprehensive operating schedule had been developed with officers and experts.
- The police and trading standards had suggested conditions which had been accepted by the applicant.
- The event management plan had been compiled in consultation with the Safety Advisory Group (SAG). No members of the SAG or responsible authorities objected to the application.
- It was acknowledged that noise management from the site was a concern to local residents and the applicant had produced a noise management plan (NMP) that had been submitted to the SAG and environmental health. Neither body had made a representation on the NMP. The NMP was a legitimate document; an independent assessment was not necessary.
- A complaints telephone line was provided by the applicant and it was noted there had been no complaints to the licensing authority in preceding years.
- With respect to mention of Crumplebury Farm it was explained that each application was considered individually on its merits. The planning issues that had been raised were not relevant to consideration of the current application.
- In response to comments regarding open ended or vague applications it was explained that the application was for events on up to 10 days per year.
- In written representations there had been a number of concerns regarding alcohol management. The event management plan contained detail on alcohol management and trading standards had provided a condition.
- Anti-social behaviour had also been raised in representations. Policies and procedures in the event management plan would address such issues with appropriate security.

- There had been a number of references to the peace and tranquillity of the local environment. However, this was not a licensing objective and not a relevant consideration during determination of the application.
- The Herefordshire Licensing Policy made significant mention of well managed premises and contribution to local culture. This application met these policy ambitions.
- There was concern about the new operation but all evidence provided by the applicant demonstrated that the licensing objectives would be upheld.
- The impacts of the application would be managed appropriately.
- It was contended that claims that a silent majority objected to the application was inaccurate given the significant expressions of support locally.

Following questioning by the Sub-Committee, the applicant's agent confirmed that:

- It was acknowledged that the change of business model was producing anxiety but if such anxiety informed all decisions on licensing applications, none would be approved.
- Crumplebury Farm was a distinct operation and could not be given weight in decision making over the current application.
- It was anticipated that an event that started during the daytime and progressed past midnight into the early morning would be considered as one day out of the possible 10 that could be undertaken annually.
- Consultation had been undertaken with members of the community including a letter sent to everyone who had made a representation and a public meeting with the local community. The local community had been engaged and would continue to be engaged with details provided about events in reasonable time frames.
- A telephone number was available for the local community to use to contact the applicant. A number would be provided before any events.
- As part of the noise management protocol a procedure would provide details of how complaints would be logged and dealt with.
- A detailed record of events would be kept to ensure that the maximum number of days approved would not be exceeded. The applicant would work with the licensing department and the police.

Following questions from local residents, the applicant's agent confirmed that:

- Noise levels, as set out in noise management plan, had been circulated to the environmental health officer and safety advisory group and there had been no objection from the experts. The applicant was mindful to minimise impact on residents.
- If local residents did not want representatives of the applicant to visit their homes in response to complaints; the applicant would determine a suitable, proximate location to attend to measure the impact of the site on the locality.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered all the representations, reports and evidence before them. They have had regard to their duties under S4 of the Licensing Act and considered guidance issued under s182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and Herefordshire Council's Statement of Licensing Policy 2020 - 2025.

## **DECISION**

The Sub-Committee's decision is to grant the application with the conditions proposed and agreed with 2 of the Responsible Authorities, together with additional conditions considered appropriate by the Sub-Committee in respect of the following:

*'A named single point of contact and contact telephone number will be publicised on the Nozstock Ltd website, so that local residents can report any noise issues or complaints directly to Nozstock Ltd. All calls will be logged by time, location and contact number and an address will be requested and will include details of any remedial action taken. The log will be kept on site and be readily available at the request of a duly authorised Council officer.'*

## **REASONS**

The Sub-Committee has fully considered the detailed report by Senior Licensing Officer, the application and written representations in the report pack, as well as the evidence presented at the hearing by Mr Phipps, the representative of the applicant and evidence from members of the Community who attended the hearing.

The Sub-Committee has taken into account the relevant policy and guidance.

The Sub-Committee noted the 2 representations from the Responsible Authorities and the proposed conditions that were agreed by the Applicant.

Sixteen (16) relevant representations have been received from members of the public. The Sub-Committee understands the concerns being raised by the public representatives and the reasons why the representations have been made.

In particular, the Sub-Committee has listened carefully and notes the concerns relating to the potential for increased noise, disturbance, nuisance, excessive alcohol consumption, substance misuse and for various forms of anti-social behaviour in a predominantly quiet and rural area. The evidence provided by those making representations is based on personal experiences and individual's concerns as to what may happen in the future.

The Sub-Committee appreciates why the concerns have been expressed, in that the proposed activities under this new licence differ from previous events held and may have an impact on the atmosphere in the surrounding rural area. However, the Committee notes that the premises licence will only be used for a limited number of events totalling five (5) and no more than 10 days.

The Sub-Committee listened to the representations and additional information supplied by the applicant. In particular, the committee noted the detailed event and noise management plans that have been provided by the applicant and the experienced members of staff employed by the applicant.

In the view of the Committee, the application is comprehensive and promotes the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee balanced each party's position and have weighed up the evidence presented very carefully. The Sub-Committee is aware they should give appropriate weight to the representations received from members of the public and make their decision with a view to promoting the licensing objectives in the overall interests of the local community.

The Committee has considered that between 2006 – 2024, Nozstock Ltd have applied for and have been granted 18 occasional premises licences for an annual festival and that during this time, the licensing authority have received no complaints from any of the responsible authorities or members of the public. This evidence is important and persuasive, in that it indicates that the event has been appropriately managed over a significant period of time.

Eight (8) letters in support of the application were submitted during the consultation period.

The sub-committee would strongly advise that should the premises licence conditions not be complied with, the residents inform the Applicant and the appropriate responsible authority, for example the Police, Environmental Health or Licensing Department, so that concerns are properly documented and evidenced.

If conditions are not complied with or the premises are undermining one (1) or more of the licensing objectives, members of the public have the right to call for a review of the premises licence.

The meeting ended at 3.50 pm

**Chairperson**