

FESTIVAL OF HOUSE – SAFE EVENTS REPORT BY THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR, COMMUNITIES

CONTENTS

Item 1	Executive Summary
Item 2	Context
Item 3	Methodology of Approach
Item 4	Summary of Collective Assessment, Festival of House Sub Groups
Item 5	Partner Agency Submissions
Item 6	Third Party Submissions
Item 7	Conclusion and Recommendation
Item 8	Copy of Letter from Strategic Director, Communities
Item 9	Petition

ITEM 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In his report into the Hillsborough stadium disaster, Lord Taylor recommended that local authorities should set up safety advisory groups to assist them in exercising their functions under the safety at sport ground legislation. In the past few years, with the increase in the number, variety and complexity of public events from street parties to festivals, many local authorities now convene safety advisory group meetings for other types of activities that fall outside the legal framework for certified sports grounds. Recently published guidance¹, for safety advisory groups, (which has been welcomed and endorsed by industry experts, including the Health and Safety Executive) provides a framework for defining the roles, responsibilities, terms of reference, membership and management of a safety advisory group. The detail contained within this guidance has underpinned and endorsed the council's approach to safe events.

In addition to the safety advisory group guidance, the "purple guide"² to health, safety and welfare at music and other events, contains information, guidance and industry standards that are essential and necessary for the production and delivery of a safe event. This is considered to be the industry standard, and as such is referred to and utilised by the council and other partner agencies in their approach to working with event organisers and the requirements for the delivery of a safe event. There is a raft of other legislation that is relevant to events, all with statutory and legislative requirements; however, all of these elements are contained in detail within the event guide,

The event guide is also quite specific in detailing the accountability and responsibilities that are placed upon the event organiser in meeting all of the requirements during the preparation for, planning of and delivery of a safe event.

Festival of House is a new outdoor electronic dance event being planned by Jigsaw Events and Management Ltd, (known as the event organiser) which is intended to take place at Panmure Estate, Carnoustie, Angus, from Thursday 9 June until Sunday 12 June 2016. The event organiser procured the services of an event management company, Red Pepper Events to develop and deliver the event. On 4 April 2016, a further contractor ID Resilience was obtained to support the delivery of specialist areas of the event.

In line with industry practice, a safety advisory group structure has been in place for the Festival of House event, thereby promoting a standardised, consistent, and collaborative approach for the event organiser and working with all of the partner agencies.

Lessons identified from T in the Park 2015 and the report from Perth & Kinross Council in early 2016 outlined thirty six recommendations which were identified as good practice, improving scrutiny, governance, plans and reports, collective assessment, competence and management structures. This report was subsequently shared across all members of the safety advisory group, and recommendations incorporated where relevant, having regard for the difference in the scale of the events, however recognising the component parts of the delivery of a safe event are ultimately the same.

Further information with regard to the safety advisory group structure is noted in item 2.

¹ EPC, Griffiths, B, Woodham, R, Stuart, E, The UK Good Practice Guide to Working in Safety Advisory Groups

² www.thepurpleguide.co.uk

ITEM 2

CONTEXT

A safety advising group structure was developed and agreed by the festival organiser and all partner agencies. This outlined the remit, aims and objectives, operating authority and autonomy of the groups.

An overarching group, known as the steering group, chaired by the strategic director, communities, alongside a number of sub groups, addressed relevant matters specific to regulatory, traffic, safe events and community engagement.

The steering group met every two months, commencing in September 2015. Sub groups commenced at suitable junctures when planning was at a more advanced stage as per information provided by the event organiser. Timelines were agreed in advance along with meeting schedules, which included the provision of a familiarisation session (roles and responsibilities/command structure for the event), table top exercise (testing the plans) and other key dates for the production of draft and final plans.

Outwith the meeting structure, support, advice and guidance has been provided on a regular basis to the event organiser from all services and partners. In addition, good practice was shared including plan templates, and importantly the provision of training opportunities offered, where gaps were identified in the knowledge and experience of those with key roles in delivering a safe event. This was specific to the multi-agency context, the delivery of a competent command and control structure and major incident and emergency management.

Co-operation and integration across the membership of all of the groups has been positive, with a collaborative, constructive and engaged approach with the event organiser from the outset.

Despite best endeavours and the integration of the approach and advice offered, some concerns started to emerge in February 2016 as a result of the first draft of plans being submitted. Not all plans were available at this stage, and those that were had significant shortfalls in the detail, and little or no input had been sought as would have been expected from partners. Nevertheless, communication continued outwith meetings, providing professional advice and guidance as required to help support the development of plans. Final plans were expected on 31 March. However, at the steering group on 30 March, a number of concerns were raised by council services and partners in terms of the provision of information and competent plans and structures. This was based on an updated position from the event organiser that all plans were not fully complete. Furthermore, concerns were raised at this stage by Police Scotland, in terms of the safety, competence and delivery of the event.

A meeting was arranged by the strategic director, communities and the resilience manager with the event organiser; this was held on 31 March 2016. Significant concerns were outlined at this meeting, including the criticality of timescales, and the need for quick and remedial action in terms of the production of key plans and documentation, and the views expressed by partners in terms of a lack of confidence and competence to deliver a safe event. A follow up letter was sent to the event organiser outlining the key points as discussed. A copy of this letter is noted at item 8.

The next section covers the methodology of the approach by council and partners.

ITEM 3

METHODOLOGY OF APPROACH

As previously outlined, a collaborative integrated approach was adopted from the outset with the event organiser. All of the sub groups agreed to the provision of feedback on a regular basis and continued communication as required with the event organiser on plans, proposals and information. This also included site visits.

It is acknowledged that there is a fine line in providing advice and guidance from a professional perspective and that of starting to stray into the “fixing” of areas requiring attention. The strategic director, communities as chair of the steering group, made it abundantly clear, that council officers and partners were not providing a consultancy service and had to remain objective and transparent in their support and guidance, as the responsibility to deliver the event, resting firmly with the event organiser.

As previously noted, final plans and supporting documentation were due for submission by 31 March 2016; they were submitted to the Resilience Manager, Angus Council, on that due date. This information was distributed to group members on Friday 1 April. Members were asked to review plans and feedback to the event organiser specifically. However, those plans³ specifically relevant to the safety and management of the event were reviewed by members of the safe events sub group prior to attending a scheduled plans review meeting on 7 April.

In assessing the plans, due regard (by the safe events plans review group) was given to the series of plans which specifically related to the planning, management and delivery of a safe event. The plans were assessed as a suite of documents; all should be interdependent and specific to the management of a safe event. The importance of coherent, workable plans is fundamental to the provision of evidence which in part demonstrates that full rigour, assessment and understanding of the requirements of the event have been fully considered and understood by the event organiser. Plans must outline the roadmap of functions, roles, responsibilities, and how they will be applied in the lead up to, during and post event. This includes operational and tactical functions, clear roles and responsibilities across all sectors, occupational competence in those undertaking key management roles and above all else, verification that details in the plans have been confirmed to an end point of worst case scenario.

One hundred and forty eight points were identified during this collective assessment of plans and discussed and noted at the meeting on 7 April; significantly falling short of the required standard for an event of this nature.

Feedback was given to the event organiser verbally, and in writing highlighting all of the issues raised. (This information was also cascaded to members of the steering group, which includes sub group chairs to ensure the issues being raised was shared across partners, to allow any further dialogue and work to be undertaken as appropriate with council services and partners)

A further seven days was requested by a newly appointed contractor ID Resilience to produce final plans with assurance being sought as to the demonstration of a competent command and management structure and coherent, deliverable and workable “match fit”

³ Contingency Plan, Weather and Wind Plans, Event Management Plan, Alcohol Management and Drug Management Plans, Security & Stewarding Plan, Crowd Management Plan, Evacuation Plan, Medical Plan, Welfare Plan, Traffic Management Plan, Communications and Media Plan.

suite of plans. The group agreed to the additional seven day request and confirmed that final plans must be submitted to the resilience manager by Friday 15 April 2016; plans were submitted on this due date.

A follow up date for a further review of the plans was scheduled for Thursday 21 April 2016. The event organiser and contractors were invited to attend to give an overview of the work undertaken to address the gaps in the plans, assurance and provision of a competent command structure and the occupational competence of those in key roles.

Members of the safe events team approached the review of plans with the same methodology as undertaken on 7 April, and, in addition, benchmarked against previously identified issues, noting where gaps were met, partially met or not met. The outcome from this meeting was to determine if plans and the command structure were sufficiently improved to provide much needed confidence and assurance as the safety of the event.

The summary of this meeting and the collective assessment from the other sub groups is noted at Item 4.

ITEM 4

SUMMARY OF COLLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF SUB GROUPS

Information has been collated from all the sub group chairs to ensure that an integrated and full picture is presented under the safe events approach.

A summary of points is provided from each group, culminating in an assessment and overview from the safe events perspective and the conclusion noted at Item 7.

a. REGULATORY

DOCUMENTATION

- Not all relevant documentation has been received.
- Raised structures application or certification not received,
- Full list of vendors yet to be received.
- Feedback and communication has been frequent with the event organiser,

GAPS/RISKS

- Risk assessments have been received, gaps evident and not linked into one coherent plan.
- Lack of confidence in the noise assessment. This relates to traffic noise, and other projections of noise from the event itself and this would require careful monitoring.
- Still gaps in some information and a lack of documents for structures.

SAFETY

- Whilst the points raised are themselves not safety issues, they have an impact on the event and could create public nuisance with noise issues.

FINAL COMMENTS, CHAIR, REGULATORY GROUP

Whilst there are concerns about missing information, none of this is seen as critical or of the magnitude that should stop the event going ahead. Conditions should be attached for the provision of information being submitted that is missing and further rigorous assessment of those plans.

b. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

DOCUMENTATION

- All documents have been received.
- Feedback and communication has been frequent with the event organiser.
- Plans are contradictory with minor errors. Traffic risks and concerns summarised as foot traffic, traffic tailing back to the A92, management of egress at night, access for Auchrennie Farm. Some of these risks have been mitigated by the organisers' traffic management and shuttle bus proposals; however these have not been fully detailed including resource schedules.

- Remaining risk with regard to wet weather. The plan does not adequately document the organisers proposals or address the risk of weather impact in the event traffic management
- Wider emergency plans have been developed during traffic planning process, in the event of an incident, access to the event site for emergency services and including emergency rendezvous points need further work.

GAPS/RISKS

- There are a number of sub-contractors involved in the event providing traffic management; parking; stewarding and security. There is a lack of information about who is doing what, where and when.
- A number of gaps are identified in the wet weather planning, access for fully laden fire tender, marshalling, management of broken down HGV or bus or coach on B9128.
- Resourcing of staff plans still not fully developed.
- Police Scotland need further information regarding stewarding, traffic operatives to allow development of their resources.
- Noting the comments above regarding the plans, the planning does not take into account the physical condition of the site, and in particular the pick up and drop off site, which was seeded/rolled circa 25 March, and as of the site visit 18 April, is only just showing signs of early growth with the area still relatively soft. Whilst the traffic management plans notes there will be temporary surfaces as well as trackway, the proposals are not fully detailed and the area would be a risk in terms of numerous traffic movements potentially in and out twice each day, particularly if there is wet weather.

SAFETY

- Given the issues with wet weather, resources and the ground condition, safety is deemed to be an issue.
- Emergency services access and egress to site, remains an issue in terms of movement given the issue raised regarding traffic flow and egress.
- Police Scotland have raised concerns regarding the egress of the site and a lack of confidence in the resourcing requirements.

FINAL COMMENTS, CHAIR, TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

It is recognised that the organisers have made substantial efforts in preparing the plans and information, and dealing with the traffic concerns of the surrounding residents and business, and have concentrated on the traffic arriving at the event, leaving gaps around the contingency and scenario planning. However, as previously identified, risks and gaps remain, and therefore the event is not deemed to be safe at this time.

c. SAFE EVENTS

DOCUMENTATION

- All plans and documents have been received and reviewed. (31 March & 15 April)
- Extensive feedback and communication with and to the event organiser.
- Additional timescales given to support improvement in plans.
- Some improvement in re-submitted plans on 15 April 2016.

GAPS/RISKS

- One hundred and forty eight key issues raised from review of plans (7 April)
- Still significant gaps, issues, risks evident in all of the plans relevant to safe event (21 April)
- Feedback to event organiser on updated plans and gaps.
- Concern over deliverable event management structure.
- Collective assessment and agreement on all areas of risk by partner.

SAFETY

- In assessing all of the plans relevant to safe events, they remain below the standard expected for an event of this nature. Therefore safety remains a critical issue.
- Interoperability of plans is lacking; therefore integration of key components is an issue and therefore lacks assurance of competent workable plans, i.e., crowd management, traffic management, evacuation, contingency plans.
- There remains a concern with regard to the management structure, roles and responsibilities and the level of experience needed to manage an event of this nature.

FINAL COMMENTS, CHAIR, SAFE EVENTS

The rigorous assessment of plans, professional expertise and occupational competence from within the membership of the sub group concludes that the preparation and documentation produced for this event is falling short of the required standard. The group have not come to this decision lightly, and concur that there are significant safety concerns as it currently stands. There is therefore no confidence from partners that that event could be delivered professionally and safely at this time. Concluding comments are noted at Item 7.

Item 5 details the partner agency submissions.

ITEM 5

PARTNER AGENCY SUBMISSIONS – SAFE EVENTS

POLICE SCOTLAND

Festival of House 2016 – Safe Events Group 21 April 2016

At the Festival of House Steering Group meeting of 30 March 2016, Police Scotland had sufficient concerns with regard to the state of planning for the event, adherence to established and agreed timescales and the apparent understanding of issues by event organisers, Jigsaw Events and Red Pepper Events. Consequently, the latter were verbally advised that it was the position of Police Scotland at that time that there was no confidence that they could deliver and manage a safe event. In addition, they were advised that as things stood at that time, the event did not have the support of Police Scotland.

It was already well established on that date that a complete set of finalised plans for the event were due to be submitted by close of business on Friday 31 March 2016. A meeting of the Safe Events Group was already scheduled for Thursday 7 April 2016 to allow partners to scrutinise and reach a collective view on the state of planning for the event.

In advance of the meeting of 7 April 2016, Police Scotland scrutinised key plans. The plans were assessed to be extremely poor, individually and as a coherent suite of documents.

Police Scotland became aware that in the days immediately following that Steering Group meeting, Jigsaw Events engaged the services of ID Resilience to assist with event planning and delivery. Along with key partners, Police Scotland agreed that Ian Kerr of ID Resilience be permitted to attend the Safe Events Group meeting of 7th April 2016 to present to partners what his company intended to deliver in support of the event.

Ian Kerr presented his company's credentials and asserted that it was their intention to turn the planning around for the event organisers. It was made very clear to him at that meeting that timescales for all agencies were very tight and the deadline for plan submission had already expired. He was asked at that meeting how long they would require to rectify the suite of plans. Ian Kerr asked for 7 days to produce a set of finalised plans. After deliberation by the group, this was agreed.

At the close of that meeting, representatives from Jigsaw Events, Red Pepper Events and ID Resilience again met with partners. They were advised that a further 7 days was granted for final plan submission. They were also given a very clear message regarding expectations of a competent and coherent management structure for the event.

Following this meeting, Angus Council produced and shared a document summarising all the areas of concern and assessed shortcomings within the existing plans, as agreed by the members of the Safe Event Group. This document clearly laid out the general high-level concerns as well as 148 specific points for further clarity or work.

A second iteration of final plans was submitted and shared with Police Scotland on Friday 15th April 2016. These were scrutinised in depth and a range of points of concern were documented. It was the unilateral assessment of Police Scotland that the suite of key plans fell well below the required standard in terms of content within individual plans, coherence

across all plans and that they failed to provide an acceptable level of understanding as to how the overall event was to be delivered and managed.

On 21 April 2016, Police Scotland attended the Safe Event Group meeting. As was previously agreed, representatives from Jigsaw Events, Red Pepper Events, ID Resilience and Securigroup were in attendance to present and take questions in relation to the suite of plans and the management structure for event delivery. This provided members of the Safe Event Group an opportunity to jointly assess not only the written plans but also the understanding and competence of the proposed events management team to actually deliver these plans with safety as the paramount consideration.

Following this meeting and the deliberations and discussions with key partners, the following are the central points that represent the Police Scotland position.

1. Event Management Structure & Competence

The following excerpt in relation to event management competence is reproduced from the Event Safety Guide (the Purple Guide) published by the Health & Safety Executive:

“Competence is about ensuring that all employees, self-employed people, contractors and sub-contractors working on your site have the necessary training, experience, expertise and other qualities to carry out the work safely. Competence is also about ensuring the right level of expertise is available particularly in relation to specialist advice. “

The plans propose an event management structure which Police Scotland assess to be unclear and incoherent in terms of roles and decision-making responsibilities.

Notwithstanding the incoherent management structure itself, it is the view of Police Scotland that those intending to fill key management positions have not evidenced or demonstrated that they possess the requisite training, experience, expertise or overarching qualities to manage at the levels proposed.

2. Traffic Management Plan

The Traffic Management Plan is one of the key plans central to the successful and safe delivery of an event of this nature. Police Scotland have contributed views to the relevant sub-group and this sub-group has made a submission to the Safe Events group indicating that the plan contains a range of risks and weaknesses leading to a conclusion that the plan is a) incomplete, b) not viable and by consequence, 3) risks public safety. Police Scotland concurs in full with this position.

3. Event Plans

This second iteration of event plans was produced after the initially agreed deadline and within timescales requested by the planning team themselves. Police Scotland would expect that this set of plans would be clear, sufficiently detailed and absolutely coherent as a set of documents. Thus, partners might be persuaded that planning was at an appropriate stage but more importantly that event organisers were able to present plans in a manner that would give agencies confidence that event organisers fully understood them, their inter-dependencies and the actual mechanics of delivery.

The plans remain of a standard well below what would be expected. This is evident not only in individual plans in isolation but in terms of the links and overall coherence across all plans. They are riddled with gaps, conflicting information and inconsistencies and provide no

confidence that the plans provide the foundation for the delivery of a professionally managed, safe event.

Conclusion

Police Scotland has worked from the outset with key partners and event organisers with the intention of assisting the organisers in an appropriate and collaborative manner to deliver a viable and safe event for all concerned parties. However, the significant issues highlighted within this submission are considered critical at this stage. Moreover, it is the assessment of Police Scotland that these issues are sufficiently critical in terms of magnitude, impact and remaining timescales that they are now irrecoverable.

Safety is as always the paramount and over-riding consideration. Police Scotland concludes that for the reasons provided, this proposed event cannot be delivered safely. It follows as a consequence that Police Scotland do not intend from this time to continue to support the event and would not therefore intend to allocate resources to specifically Police the event.

Graeme Murdoch

Superintendent (Operations)

Tayside Division

SCOTTISH FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

Initial Objections/Concerns to Festival of House 9th – 12th June 2016

The Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) have a number of concerns relating to the operating plans presented to the SFRS and its partners by the organisers of the event. These plans have numerous gaps in the information presented/provided to us, which could have serious safety implications at the festival should an incident occur which requires SFRS assistance.

The plans were assessed by members of SFRS, Police Scotland, Scottish Ambulance Service, NHS Tayside and Angus Council, with the aim of sharing information and to highlight any significant risks and information gaps from the detail contained within the plans.

The information within the plans relating to the fire service also has an underpinning connection to the other emergency services as all plans are interwoven at some point and will affect all emergency services.

Although Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) does not wish the festival to be cancelled, we will object to the festival going ahead, due to safety concerns, if the following points are not addressed by the organisers.

- 1) Access for SFRS vehicles – The main access route for the majority of SFRS vehicles will be from the A92 onto the B9128 and then entry into the festival site via numerous access sites. Therefore some form of traffic management system and stewarding must be in place to allow SFRS vehicles free movement to the festival site and within it. This traffic management site must also be adequately manned to allow successful operation of the system.
- 2) Emergency access routes – If the B9128 becomes impassable then alternative route(s) for SFRS must be provided. The alternative would be for SFRS vehicles to proceed from the A92 Upper Victoria junction and onto the B961 then onto the B9128 accessing the festival site from the north. A suitable traffic management system is required to allow SFRS vehicles free movement. The traffic management plan must ensure that the selected alternative means of access is adequately manned to allow successful implementation of the traffic plan. The proposed plan takes this route into consideration; however it is also the alternative access route for the festival visitors. This traffic combined with local traffic will make this route difficult for passing and will mean emergency vehicles having to travel on the opposite side of the B961. There is also no identified personnel to man the traffic lights in the event of an emergency within the Traffic Management Plan.
- 3) Emergency access via identified forest road – An additional access route has been identified via a forest track which is accessed opposite Crombie Park entrance. This road terminates at the festival site, at the rear of the production village and can be used by SFRS provided some work is undertaken on the road. This work will involve the filling of a number of large pot holes throughout the length of the road; making secure soft sections of the road surface where SFRS vehicles may become stuck; confirmation that the culverts are suitably reinforced to take the weight of SFRS vehicle; marshalling of the road entrance and adequate directional signage. Consultation between the event organisers and SFRS personnel should be undertaken as soon as possible for discussion regarding the proposed works. This adoption of this road was agreed at the meeting on the 21/4/2016 however it was highlighted to the

event organisers that the road was only to be used if all other roads were impassable to fire service vehicles.

- 4) Water supplies for SFRS use – Due to the lack of fire hydrants within the festival site, a 20,000 litre tanker and ancillary equipment is being supplied by the event organisers for use by SFRS in the event of an incident within the festival site. SFRS will require from the event organisers documentation confirming that they will provide suitable connections on the tanker which can be used by SFRS and SFRS fire appliance and hard standing for the fire appliances during refilling procedures.
The organisers have however failed to forward information with regards to the flow capability of the proposed pump that they will be supplying.
- 5) Command infrastructure – There is a lack of a coherent command infrastructure plan that allows for experienced personnel to be allocated certain roles. There is no supporting evidence from the event organisers as to the qualifications or experience of the personnel that are mentioned within the command structure.
- 6) Crowd control plan – Does not show stewards responsibilities during an incident/emergency or the number of available stewards. If there are insufficient stewards allocated this will have an impact on SFRS undertaking emergency work.
- 7) Site plans – Site plans and grid references do not match up with grid reference numbers mentioned within the plans

Fire risk assessments have been provided and have been sufficient, from the regulatory perspective.

SCOTTISH AMBULANCE SERVICE and NHS TAYSIDE

All plans have been submitted for medical and public health perspective.

There are some issues that require to be resolved, which are minor in nature in terms of the medical management at the event. Public health matters have been raised in terms of sanitation, hand washing and infection control matters and several request have been made to address these areas.

Whilst the medical plan is not of a significant issue, the other elements that form the suite of documents necessary for the event to be delivered safely, still present significant gaps, which would have an impact on the overall provision of medical services at the event.

Overall, the Scottish Ambulance Service and NHS Tayside supports the collective view from the safe events perspective, which at this time, presents a number of concerns in relation overall safety and delivery of the event.

Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)

SEPA can confirm that after consultation on the foul water and sanitation proposals (where all foul water will drain to containment tanks and then taken off site for appropriate disposal), SEPA are satisfied with the drainage proposals. SEPA are also satisfied that there will be an exclusion zone around all nearby water courses which will be fenced off. SEPA have also been consulted on the wet weather operational plan however would highlight the need to ensure that further actions may be required dependant on the ability of the safe guards for preventing polluting matter entering any watercourses. SEPA should be contacted where there has been pollution identified and actions taken to mitigate.

Further third party submissions are included at Item 6.

ITEM 6

THIRD PARTY SUBMISSIONS

There have been a number of concerns raised with regard to the environmental impact and particularly in relation to the protection of species.

The council consulted with Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) as part of the screening opinion for an Environmental Impact Assessment, under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011.

A number of communications were received in relation to the badgers, at Panmure Estate. Recent correspondence from SNH confirms their position and that of the council role and is noted accordingly within this report, due to a further submission from Scottish Badgers who raise further safety concerns.

SCOTTISH NATURAL HERITAGE

Letter of 21 March – Angus Council - Badgers at Panmure

Thank you for your email of 29 February 2016 regarding badgers at Panmure Estate and potential disturbance from a proposed music festival.

I have consulted with our badger adviser. He, in turn, has sought the advice of one of our other mammal specialists. They are of the opinion that this short term disturbance will not have an adverse effect on the badgers.

The badger adviser goes on to say, 'The buffering distances given should be strictly adhered to, especially in terms of vehicle movements. It would have been useful to have more information on the extent of the badger territory away from the application site and of the status of nearby badger territories to be reassured that the badgers had some alternative shelter but I don't think this would change our view'.

Email from SNH 6 April 2016.

It has come to light that there may be a risk of misinterpretation of our advice to Angus Council (letter dated 21 March) in regard to legally protected species on or adjacent to the site proposed for a music festival at Panmure near Carnoustie.

In regard to this case and others, it is the role of SNH to provide advice to decision makers about the potential for harmful impacts upon features of the natural heritage from proposals such as this music festival. In providing this advice SNH neither object to nor endorse the proposal, restricting our response to comments to help the determining authority.

We have advised (letter dated 8 December 2015) that the presence of protected species will, if an offence is to be avoided, require the production of a species protection plan or plans. In providing this advice we do not 'endorse' or 'support' the proposed development. It is for Angus Council to decide if the proposal with all its mitigations is in line with council plans and policies.

SCOTTISH BADGERS

Correspondence has also been received from the Scottish Badgers organisation, who having reviewed the recently updated Environmental Protection Plan, (which is located on the event organiser's website) has written an updated position, to the chair of the steering group and to the resilience manager. The correspondence raises further safety concerns and therefore is included within this report for completeness.

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: Species Protection Plans (SPPs) and Environmental Protection Plan (EMP) submitted by Jigsaw in connection with proposed dance event at Panmure

At the time we wrote to you with our objection on 21st March 2016 the company had not produced their Species Protection Plans (SPPs) and Environmental Protection Plan (EMP).

We hope you will consider our responses below before concluding. There are universal safety issues.

Our comments are as follows.

1. The EMP and SPPs are vague. Basic simple information is missing from the Plans. We have asked for this information on several occasions over the past two weeks but the company has refused to answer our questions.
Critical information missing includes:- start date and stop date of targeted field survey work, a scaled map or accurate plan showing the areas covered by the field survey work, dates on the reports (why is each named "version 1" when it should be the final tried and tested version), and methodologies.
In one reply they have confused two different methods – 'targeted species survey work' and 'monitoring'. Targeted species survey work is systematic data collection followed by development and testing of Protection Plans on the ground, well in advance of the first spade touching the ground. The monitoring they talk about is 'keeping an eye on things' once the disturbance has started, which is an admission that their Environmental and Species Protection Plans have not been tried and tested in time.
2. The SPP for badger does not mention the most intrusive and potentially most grave disturbance to the badgers - the booming noise and vibration transmitted through the ground. Research has shown tripled stress (cortisol) levels in badgers living within a kilometre of low frequency sound. We drew their attention to this research in early February 2016, yet it seems the company has ignored it or decided they know better.
3. The company has repeatedly denied there would be any disturbance in the woods associated with e.g. the management of anti-social behaviour, non-ticket-holders, people walking the woods, frustrated customers. The assertion that staff on site would be given a "toolkit talk" about wildlife is far too vague and does not mention how stewards would be instructed in the event of an incident. We see as impractical the suggestion that stewards meet with the ecologist as the event goes on to "tweak" actions day by day or hour by hour. The Plans fail to specify how stewards would be deployed or issues prioritised.
We do not agree that fencing, notices or suspension of the right to roam could adequately protect either wildlife or people – on the contrary these could easily make things worse by creating barriers and heightening frustrations.

Steel fencing is proposed by the company as the ubiquitous solution to both human and wildlife protection in the plans. On such a small site surrounded by woods, it

could easily block the safe escape of people and wildlife from e.g. fire, crowd surge or other threat. One potential customer posted on the FoH fb page:

"Just read your site info page, sounds like something between an open prison and a concentration camp, can't do this, canny do that, canny leave on foot, can't get in after 10pm?? lol, you must be joking".

How, specifically, would the company deal with the inevitable episodes of disappointment, anger, and frustration about the small prison-like compound they are offering customers? How, specifically, would they identify a trigger to prevent a tipping point in crowd mood and behaviour. Their characteristic pattern for dealing with challenge up till now has been denial and / or vague re-assurances – there is no effective plan for safe control put forward in their EPP. There is no tried and tested detail in the Plans to indicate the company has recognised or acknowledged the risks.

4. Minimum compliance with the letter of the law: one company representative explained to me on the 3rd of February 2016 that they see the function of their ecological consultant as to keep them out of prosecution's way. This betrays an attitude of 'only do the minimum', follow the 'the letter of the law' rather than the spirit. There is no practical detail for an effective safety plan on the ground?
5. Their Plans say vaguely they will "follow SNH Guidelines". There are no such magic rules or simple guidelines. SNH have written to Angus Council to clarify this. Their role is neither to support nor to object to proposals such as this event. They give advice about the steps people should take to avoid harm coming to protected species on their website. They do not conduct site visits and cannot make site specific recommendations. They do say clearly that the responsibility is with the proposer to develop and test robust species and environmental plans that would not result in harm or disturbance wildlife. And if there is any doubt not to proceed. Our evidence-based advice was that there are no mitigation measures that could avoid harm to badger (and probably other wildlife), yet the company have either ignored it or think they know better. They have decided they would take the risk anyway. Our issue is not with the ecological consultant(s) but with the company and their instructions.
6. Absence of competencies at a high level for coherency in planning and delivery. We have seen evidence of inability to tolerate any evidence that is in conflict with the company's goals. When a newspaper showed interest in telling both sides of the story, the company reacted by cutting off communication with us. The pattern of not coping with complexity and opposing interests has been apparent throughout. Where is the detailed plan for coping with a wildlife or natural environment crisis?
7. The SPPs and EMP are untried and untested. The company either failed to read or thought they knew better than Brindley Associates' advice (29th June 2015). To be able to bring forward robust, tried and tested environmental and species protection plans the company should not have approached Angus Council before December 2016 at the earliest. Their premature move gives grounds for more questions. Is there a preparedness to cut corners? Is there a hidden desire to get by with minimal compliance? Why did the company risk a premature approach to Angus Council a year before they could present tried and tested environmental and species protection plans?
8. Promises to "reach out" and engage have not been delivered. The Consultation Plan (December 2015) promised:
"Festival of House's organisers fully appreciate that an event of this nature will affect many stakeholders who often represent varying interests and conflicting needs. Listening to, understanding, and balancing the varied and sometimes conflicting

priorities of different stakeholders is a core part of Festival of House's mission and interaction with stakeholders is an ongoing process to which they are committed."

"Relevant representative groups/ organisations will be identified and information will be designed and disseminated to reach them."

The company did not consult or make known their proposals to the local badger group nor to any environmental or wildlife organisation. Their March 2016 Consultation report contains a number of serious inaccuracies about their consulting with a range of interests that were in fact omitted. Failing to consult may not be in breach of the law but the cavalier way it has been dealt with demonstrates an absence of essential awareness of high level planning and destroys trust in the company's competencies to keep people safe.

9. Reference the forest track as an emergency vehicles / access / evacuation route. We would point out that there is a maze of forest tracks (easy to get lost in) most barely 2½ m wide bordered by marshy ground and ditches on each side, with steep dips in some places, triple sharp bends on one stretch, and soft rutted surface with lying water on long stretches. Over 1½ kms of such track lies between the stables block and the Crombie Park entrance. There are active signs of protected species crossing the tracks and living in the area. Ecological survey work specific to that area would be needed before machinery could be considered for upgrading or re-construction.

Yours faithfully

Elspeth Stirling

Local Badger Group and Secretary Scottish Badgers

A petition has also been received by the council, in relation to the environment and impact on the Panmure Estate. This is enclosed for your information at Item 9.

ITEM 7

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Angus Council has worked from the outset with the event organiser and with partners, and endeavoured to provide the necessary assistance, guidance and collaboration.

However, a number of key areas remain of significant concern and fall short of the expected standards required for this event. The key areas are outlined as follows:

- I. The plans remain of a standard well below what would be expected. This is evident not only in individual plans in isolation, but in terms of the links and overall coherence across all plans. There are significant gaps, conflicting information and inconsistencies which provide no confidence that the plans provide the foundation for the delivery of a professionally managed, safe event.
- II. The event management structure remains a concern, unclear and incoherent in terms of roles and decision making responsibilities.
- III. Traffic Management issues remain to the fore, and therefore with gaps evident, the plans are not deemed to be workable.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the view of the constituent members of the steering group that this event cannot be delivered safely and therefore cannot support the application for the public entertainment licence.

ITEM 8

COPY OF LETTER SENT TO THE EVENT ORGANISER ON 31 MARCH 2016.

Dear Craig

Festival of House

Thanks for meeting Jacqui and I today. Following this week's steering group meeting, it is important we are all clear on the current state of play and importantly how things are progressing, and, in simple terms provide you with direct feedback on our confidence in our ability, at this stage to form positive input to the Licensing Committee.

We all acknowledged there is a great deal of work to be done between now and any decision that Angus Councillors will be asked to make. In particular, a great deal of work to be done before the submission of the plans by today; 31 March.

I would make the following observations:-

General Confidence and Perceptions

As of today there is a low level of confidence in what we have seen and experienced to date. I say that not to berate you but to leave you in no doubt that the steering group want to see a great deal more professionalism in the development of the plans and their operability. The group are clear the plans will not be developed in a manner of consultancy through iteration. It is solely your responsibility to develop and submit plans that are comprehensive, detailed and final. I believe that message has landed with you and your team and I expect to see complete plans by the required submission date.

Consultation

I provided some feedback yesterday regarding community consultation. There is a steady stream of letters and issues many of which are connected to the timing of the submission of the plans and the lack of detail on the specifics the community wish to see. We agreed that it is up to you to handle that. I do feel this is an area you should reflect on and come to a judgement on, whether or not you want to do things differently with the community.

Transport

This is an area that has been fluid. The change to the use of the Montague Bridge is one area; the fact that the closure of that option as a planned or emergency vehicle route, raises very real concerns for the statutory agencies. I am aware that Police, Fire and Ambulance intend to engage with you on a wide range of matters, I expect the entrance and egress in emergency situations to be of critical importance. Similarly the preparations for the fruit farm are important to Angus Council as well as the farmer and their customers. I very much hope a suitable arrangement can be made, tested and implemented with the farmer. Ian Cochrane is aware of the concerns with this issue.

Site Safety

One of the enduring issues has been that of on-site security, to control the entrance and egress and the movements within the estate to protect festival attendees and residents. Having walked the site a couple of times I can see where a number of the concerns have validity. It would not be unreasonable to expect the Steering Group make some recommendations in this area and I hope to see this proactively covered in the plans.

The joint preparations command function is one that, at this stage, appears to be a long way off being at a level where confidence can be taken in the event. Police Scotland are particularly concerned about this critical element of the event planning and management. I share their concerns. I trust this will be rapidly developed with appropriate, experienced and skilled input. As noted above this is an area that we will not develop through an iterative process, it will either pass or fail.

Emergency Situations

Feedback from the Steering Group's experience of working with other major events and feedback from other parts of Scotland where similar events have been held indicates that the highest quality of onsite medical expertise can and has saved lives. I will be looking to test this area extensively during the table-top exercise and again I hope to see the submitted plan generate the necessary confidence in this area.

Conclusions

As we approach the end of the preparation and consultation period and begin to enter the formal processes and testing phase of the event, the Steering Group are looking to see a much more in-depth and professional set of submissions. At this moment in time as you have clearly gathered, the confidence in the quality of what we have seen to date is low, unless there is a marked and sustained change to the submissions and interactions where you are clearly in the lead of events it is by no means certain one or any of the statutory agencies can support the event at this time.

Yours sincerely

Alan McKeown
Strategic Director – Communities

ITEM 9

PETITION

Alan McKeown, head of communities at Angus council, Angus, Scotland

Dear Mr McKeown,

Panmure Estate is a unique and secluded natural environment which is home to thousands of woodland animals and birds. The proposed Festival of House threatens their welfare and the survival of protected badgers. Please refuse the public entertainment licence which will forever damage this beautiful and unspoiled place.

	Name	From	Comments
1.	John Gregoire	BURDETT, NY	
2.	Derek Richardson	Wallsend, United Kingdom	
3.	Mafalda Fonseca	Vila Nova de Milfontes, Portugal	
4.	Patricia Hudson	Northwich, United Kingdom	
5.	Barbara Vieira	STATEN ISLAND, NY	
6.	Tony Guzman	Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic	
7.	m smithurst	Morden, United Kingdom	
8.	michaelann bewsee	SPRINGFIELD, MA	
9.	Kathy Moore	GARDNERVILLE, NV	
10.	Robin Mann	Crawley, United Kingdom	
11.	Fi Tse	Hong Kong, China	
12.	Kathryn Irby	GULFPORT, MS	
13.	Carol Jacklin	Barton, United Kingdom	
14.	Janet Clarke	Burgess Hill, United Kingdom	
15.	Natasha Salgado	Toronto, Canada	
16.	Jelena Skipina	foca, Bosnia And Herzegovina	

Page 1 - Signatures 1 - 16

	Name	From	Comments
17.	Catman Purrfect	ATHENS, GA	
18.	Judith Downey	CHELSEA, MA	
19.	One Heart inc	BARABOO, WI	
20.	Ed Vieira	STATEN ISLAND, NY	
21.	Carl Rosenstock	BARABOO, WI	
22.	James Mulcare	CLARKSTON, WA	
23.	Lisette de Waard	Lelystad, Netherlands	
24.	brigitte hoin	herzogenrath, Germany	
25.	Catherine Aldham	Gosnells, Australia	
26.	Animal lover	Workington, United Kingdom	
27.	Alan Smith	Leeds, United Kingdom	
28.	yolanda schultes	Wittenbach, Switzerland	
29.	Hanneke Mol	Poortvliet, Netherlands	
30.	Warren Wright	DENTON, TX	
31.	Bettina Lorenz	Rhede, Germany	
32.	MTJ Kniese	Amsterdam, Netherlands	
33.	Silvia Steinbrecher	Euskirchen, Germany	
34.	Gerda Zimmermann	München, Germany	
35.	pam wright	PASADENA, CA	
36.	Dina Smith	NEWINGTON, NH	
37.	Mary Frances	CLAREMONT, NC	
38.	cheneval catherine	chambery, France	
39.	Djamila Grouci	Nanteuil les meaux, France	
40.	Sandy Faison	FAIRBANKS, AK	
41.	Janny Hage	Anchorage, Netherlands	
42.	Ted Williams	RALLS, TX	
43.	Caroline Debaille	Braine-le-comte, Belgium	
44.	Gonny Stevens	Lanaken, Belgium	

	Name	From	Comments
45.	Reggie De Man	pittem, Belgium	
46.	angelika wegner	burscheid, Germany	
47.	andrea maertzdorff	rotterdam, Netherlands	
48.	Matthew Harbottle	Blackpool, United Kingdom	
49.	Mariana Lukacova	Moldava nad Bodvou, Slovakia	
50.	Ingrid Heß	Mannheim, Germany	
51.	Tatjana Winn	Langen, Germany	
52.	cornelia heppner	Bremerhaven, Germany	
53.	Mark Stewart	Aberdeen, United Kingdom	
54.	MARIETTE vanseer	REKEM, Belgium	
55.	Joanna van Casteren	Marktheidenfeld, Germany	ICH unterzeichne
56.	conny verbeke	Nieuwpoort, Belgium	
57.	Anneke Andries	Raamsdonksveer, Netherlands	
58.	joyce alexander	edinburgh, United Kingdom	
59.	christine polzin	berlin, Germany	
60.	Karina Utech	Berlin, Germany	
61.	Christiane Neubert	Memmingen, Germany	
62.	Diane Dickinson	Neptune City, NJ	
63.	Brenda Collins	London, United Kingdom	
64.	marleen van campenhout	kapelle op den bos, Belgium	
65.	Christina Frutuoso	Esch, Luxembourg	
66.	Coeta Sudderth	PARIS, TX	
67.	Wendy Leys	belgium, Belgium	
68.	patrick zemp	st. erhard, Switzerland	
69.	Ken Lockhart	ROCHESTER, MI	
70.	Michèle Legrand	Antibes, France	

	Name	From	Comments
71.	Susan Fisher	Calgary, Canada	
<i>Page 3 - Signatures 45 - 71</i>			
72.	Laila Sunde	Odda, Norway	
73.	brigitte donkers	heerlen, Netherlands	
74.	beate treichler	braunschweig, Germany	tierliebe
75.	Thomas Boehm	Nürnberg, Germany	
76.	Joseph Wenzel	MAPLEWOOD, MN	
77.	marie laure vignaud	triac lautrait, France	
78.	kim jackson	Peterboro, United Kingdom	
79.	Bobbi Jo Parsley	Atwood, IL	
80.	Premila Stunkel	Singapore, Singapore	
81.	Maria Pavlou	Athens, Greece	
82.	Annette Berghammer	Munich, Germany	
83.	Manuela Vormittag	Sasbach, Germany	
84.	Marga Star	Zuidlaren, Netherlands	Protect this special environment.
85.	Antoinette Groot	Ankeveen, Netherlands	
86.	Sarah Addis	Abergavenny, United Kingdom	
87.	jocelyne lapointe	terrebonne, OH	
88.	Karin Zimmermann	Hersbruck, Germany	
89.	Clare Wall	Abergavenny Gwent, United Kingdom	
90.	Manuela Arioli	Milano, Italy	
91.	Hertha Claudia Aigner	Passail, Austria	
93.	Paul Shorter	Huddersfield, United Kingdom	
94.	AnnMarie Hodgson	Barrie, Canada	
95.	Leontine Lemmens	Kapellen, Belgium	

	Name	From	Comments
96.	Carol Rushton Algar	LA GUANCHA, Spain	
97.	Brenda Lai	Knoxville, TN	
		<i>Page 4 - Signatures 72 - 97</i>	
98.	Winfried Koschnicke	Meppen, Germany	
99.	Sarika Arora	Alpharetta, GA	
100.	june bullied	Toronto, Canada	stop this now
101.	JEANNE SMITH	exeland, WI	
102.	Margit Pernpeintner	Regensburg, Germany	
103.	Maro Aroutiunian	Forest Park, IL	
104.	Cheryl Chaney	PLAINSBORO, NJ	
105.	Pascal Poitras	Montreal, Canada	
106.	Andy Carlson	Kenosha, WI	
107.	Kristy Highley	Madison, WI	
108.	Holly Oberly	Florissant, MO	
109.	Glendyne Elkins	Jeffrey, WV	
110.	Verity Pink	Burnley, United Kingdom	
111.	Angeles Madrazo	Campeche, Mexico	
113.	Chuck Densmore	Clarkston, MI	
114.	Tanja Lepikkö	Smålandsstenar, Sweden	
115.	mauricio carvajal	santiago, Chile	
116.	Orlando Garay	Lima, Peru	
117.	Dennis Kaplan	MAYFIELD HEIGHTS, OH	
118.	A. O.Schaller	Leimbach, Germany	
119.	Carol Baker	Kansas City, MO	
120.	Cariss Dalton	Saint Peters, MO	
121.	Aria Spenser	FORT MYERS, FL	
122.	Myra Brodett	Muntinlupa, Philippines	
123.	Linda Tarumasely	BEAVERTON, OR	

	Name	From	Comments
124.	Sri yanti	Yogyakarta, Indonesia	
125.	Humanity Khong	Singapore, Singapore	
126.	Michelle Hayward	Kempston, United Kingdom	
127.	HELENA GLAZAR HOFBAUER	LJUBLJANA, Slovenia	
128.	Mike Robertson	toronto, Canada	
<i>Page 5 - Signatures 98 - 128</i>			
129.	Sandra Ferri	Bäretswil, Switzerland	
130.	Paola Scodellari	Roma, Italy	
131.	Hugh Smith	Barnsley, United Kingdom	
132.	Alexandra Gundelfingen	Poprad, Slovakia	
133.	Tanja Udovič	Ilirska Bistrica, Slovenia	
134.	Jennifer Smell	COALDALE, PA	
135.	zab m	b, France	
136.	Annabelle T.	Kings Lynn, United Kingdom	
137.	Damjan Hajsek	Dol pri LJ, Slovenia	
138.	Robert Wiehemeijer	Jemgum, Germany	
139.	Corrina Parker	Toowoomba, Australia	
140.	Sylwia Zielinska	Zambrow, Poland	
141.	Ana MESNER	Ljubljana, Slovenia	
142.	Angelika Kempter	Reutlingen, Germany	
143.	Roberta Limoli	Burlington, MA	
144.	Susan Brown	DUNDALK, MD	
145.	Chris James	Louisville, KY	
146.	Jana Pruse	Talsi, Latvia	
147.	Breanna Lonas	GLEN ALLEN, VA	
148.	SHEILA GILBERT	Kent, United Kingdom	
149.	Rebekka Helgesen Hass	viborg, Denmark	
150.	Helen Auzins	Zirndorf, Germany	
151.	THEODORE SPACHIDAKIS	Piraeus, Greece	

	Name	From	Comments
152.	Suzanne Hamer	WOODINVILLE, WA	
153.	Ivonne Carlson	FORT MYERS, FL	
154.	Nicole Weber	PASADENA, MD	
155.	Adrian Shiva	Trincity, Trinidad And Tobago	
156.	Genevieve Simon	Arusha, Tanzania, United Republic Of	
157.	Karmen Susnik	Šenčur, Slovenia	
<i>Page 6 - Signatures 129 - 157</i>			
158.	WENDY Douglas	ABERDEEN, United Kingdom	
159.	Bartlomiej Tomczak	Lodz, Poland	
160.	sieglinde Frey	neusiedel am steinfeld, Austria	
161.	Melissa Childs	Durand, MI	
162.	Petra Stadtmueller	Erlensee, Germany	
163.	Wilma Lagrand	zeeland, Netherlands	
164.	Maraloi Florin	Medgidia, Constanta., Romania	
165.	Mari Dominguez	LINDEN, CA	
166.	Veerle De Saedeleer	Edegem, Belgium	
167.	patricia WOOD	Malaga, Spain	
168.	Angelika Kohwagner	München, Germany	
169.	Vesna Cajnko	Ljubljana, Slovenia	
170.	bos claudine	poligny, France	
171.	JoAnn Paris	Saint Lazare, Canada	
172.	Elisabeth Bechmann	St. Pölten, Austria	
173.	danjela cermelj	ajdovscina, Slovenia	
174.	Stephanie Rohmer	Toronto, Canada	
175.	George Martin	Viskovo, Croatia	
176.	wendy smith	nelson, United Kingdom	
177.	Jeannet B Bertelink	Ermelo, Netherlands	
178.	Sylvie Auger	Trois-Rivieres, Canada	

	Name	From	Comments
179.	kees preijer	Gronau, Germany	
180.	marianne muijtjens@home.nl	geleen, Netherlands	
181.	Maryann Staron	EVERGREEN PARK, IL	
182.	Nathalie Quesnel	Calais, France	
183.	Nadia Reategui	Bradenton, FL	

Page 7 - Signatures 158 - 183

184.	Natalie Van Leekwijck	Deurne, Belgium	
185.	Yan Loh	Singapore, Singapore	
186.	ROGER WILLIAMS	Lockhart, TX	
187.	Gisela Gama	Esposende, Portugal	
188.	Kate Kenner	JAMAICA PLAIN, MA	
189.	Lise Vandal	Alma, Canada	
190.	Melody Jacobsohn	Johannesburg, South Africa	
191.	rose wild	BUFFALO, NY	
192.	Henri vervoort	Hoboken, Belgium	
193.	Angela Kohn	Cologne, Germany	
194.	Sudeshna Ghosh	Calcutta, India	
195.	Laura R.	Weilburg, Germany	
196.	Maire sole	beachmere, Australia	
197.	Andrew Vallender	Leicester, United Kingdom	
198.	tina deshaies	easthampton, MA	
199.	valerie bocourt	saint-quentin, France	
200.	Rita Schulz	Hamburg, Germany	
201.	adrienne jones	goldcoast, Australia	
202.	Agnès Moreau	tours, France	
203.	Sieglinda Du Preez	East London, South Africa	
204.	phil jackson	wrexham, United Kingdom	
205.	Tiffany Miller	Eatontown, NJ	
206.	Akiko Sakaguchi	setagayaku, Japan	
207.	Barbara Kubaj	Legnica, Poland	

	Name	From	Comments
208.	lindsey Lewis	selkirk, United Kingdom	
209.	Lorraine Mechanick	Centereach, NY	
210.	Bolly Maus	Rum, Austria	
211.	Goran Abramić	Valpovo, Croatia	
212.	sue barker	chelmsford, United Kingdom	
213.	pat hermans	venlo, Netherlands	
<i>Page 8 - Signatures 184 - 213</i>			
214.	astrid bogaerts	houthulst, Belgium	
215.	BENOIT FELIX	ANDENNE, Belgium	
216.	Andre Ferro	Helmond, Netherlands	
217.	rosa blanckaerts	Antwerpen, Belgium	
218.	Christel Croughs	Riemst, Belgium	
219.	Olga Vinogradova	Borok, Russian Federation	
220.	Alexandr Yantselovskiy	Vyshneve, Ukraine	
221.	Karin Lux	Rheinbach, Germany	
222.	Petra Egging	arnhem, Netherlands	
223.	Lisbeth Jensen	Hjallerup, Denmark	
224.	Elzbieta Wojtysiak	Aleksandrow lodzki, Poland	
225.	Sylvia van der does	Vijfhuizen, Netherlands	
226.	Lori Black	Wheeling, IL	
227.	maureen wraight	Lincoln, United Kingdom	
228.	Siendrre Mehmeti	Tetovo, Macedonia, The Former Yugoslav Republic Of	
229.	Ludmila vorobieff	sao paulo, Brazil	
230.	Paula Lloyd	Burton on Trent, United Kingdom	
231.	katia francisco	sao paulo, Brazil	
232.	LEON TALBOT	CAMBRIDGE, Canada	
233.	April Strohmeyer	mauston, WI	
234.	Suzan Toma	Sittard, Netherlands	
235.	Yael Shimshon	Jerusalem, Israel	

	Name	From	Comments
236.	Connie Palladini	SAN JOSE, CA	
237.	Gina Shirey	BONNER SPRINGS, KS	
238.	Beata Uba	Katowice, Poland	
239.	hilde de meirleir	sint-gillis-waas, Belgium	
240.	Maud Nilsson	Grästorp, Sweden	
241.	Jill Turco	Philadelphia, PA	
<i>Page 9 - Signatures 214 - 241</i>			
242.	elisio almeida	Pará de Minas -MG, Brazil	
243.	Antiope Kalmouki	Athens, Greece	
244.	Andréa Branco	São Paulo, Brazil	
245.	Sandra Bancroft	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
246.	Emma McGregor	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	There is no need to be so reckless with our natural heritage.
247.	Shona Lewendon	Kilwinning, United Kingdom	
248.	Paul Dines	Arbroath, United Kingdom	
249.	Laura Fermor	Spittalfield, Perthshire, United Kingdom	
			Please lists to reason,from the people who have grown up here,in this wonderful rural environment. There are areas of this estate which are extremely dangerous, even more so when you add alcohol or drugs to the equation. The extra human traffic,in addition to the official ticket holders, has the potential to disturb protected species. Simply telling people that the organisers will be asking those without tickets to stay away is both naive and frankly ridiculous. Every body has seen the aftermath photos of the T in the Park site following their festival, and it would be scandalous to see the same destruction to a unique country estate
250.	Lynzi Duncan	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
251.	Elsie Au	BKK, Thailand	
252.	Stephen Mcgregor	Near Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
253.	Karen Bose	MILTON KEYNES, United Kingdom	
254.	Karen BOSE	Milton keynes, United Kingdom	

	Name	From	Comments
255.	elaine shaw	Dumbarton, United Kingdom	
256.	Kathy Wiles	Craigton of Monikie, United Kingdom	
257.	John Stewart	buckie, United Kingdom	
258.	Pat Mair	Salzgitter, Germany	
<i>Page 10 - Signatures 242 - 258</i>			
259.	Elsbeth Stirling	Forfar, United Kingdom	This oasis of natural heritage amidst vast swathes of agricultural fields is threatened with noise and vibration on an INDUSTRIAL scale. It triples the stress levels of badger and its negative impacts on bats, birds, red squirrels, otters and other wildldife are untested. This event is totally unnecessary and could be held somewhere else more suitable.
260.	Gail Renwick	Forfar, United Kingdom	Please, please, consider the impact upon the wildlife in this area. Thank you.
261.	Sharyn Wood	Letham, United Kingdom	
262.	Gillian Hughes	Wrexham, United Kingdom	
263.	Josephine Grimes	St Albans, United Kingdom	
264.	Olaf Janssen	Aachen, Germany	
265.	Elizabeth Blair	Campbeltown, United Kingdom	
266.	Laurel Dittman	Polk, PA	
267.	Raquel De salis	Coulsdon, United Kingdom	
268.	Tracy O'Shea	Nottingham, United Kingdom	
269.	Willem Kom	hoogezand, Netherlands	
270.	Cathy Botha	Johannesburg, South Africa	
271.	melanie craig	Stonehouse, United Kingdom	
272.	James Walker	JANESVILLE, WI	
273.	Steven Elrick	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	Not only where my childhood was but more importantly one of the most discreet areas of high historical importance to Scotland
274.	Tina celestina	kranj, Slovenia	

	Name	From	Comments
275.	Jean McCarthy	Hornchurch, United Kingdom	
276.	Svitlana Vechirko	Vinnytsia, Ukraine	
277.	Ines DeWinter	Dubai, United Arab Emirates	
278.	Peter Stewart	elgin, United Kingdom	
279.	annette Davies	merriott, United Kingdom	
280.	Joan Peters	Davenport, IA	
<i>Page 11 - Signatures 259 - 280</i>			
281.	Patricia Garley	Burlington, Canada	
282.	gil gilbo	tel aviv, Israel	
283.	Licy Quinn	Surbiton, United Kingdom	
284.	Beth Knuth	Roann, IN	
285.	Nicole Hanley	Motherwell, United Kingdom	
286.	Dawnie Fallon	Bradford, United Kingdom	
287.	Magda KOMOROWSKA	Mississauga, Canada	
288.	Virginia Jacques	Norwich, United Kingdom	
289.	p ackroyd	bradford, United Kingdom	
290.	Inayara Bernard	Curitiba, Brazil	
291.	Caroline Gordon	Dundee, United Kingdom	
292.	David McGovern	Monikie, United Kingdom	
293.	john stewart	carnoustie, United Kingdom	
294.	Jo Leather	Kent, United Kingdom	
295.	Maggie McKendry	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
296.	Jessica Black	Denver, CO	
297.	Diane Beeny	Westfield, NJ	
298.	marina holness	SIDCUP, United Kingdom	

	Name	From	Comments
299.	Jaymie Valentine	Palmdale, CA	
300.	Yvonne Wilson	Inverkeithing, United Kingdom	
301.	Wendy Murray	Angus, United Kingdom	Panmure House is an area of national importance due to it's natural and historic heritage. It is the wrong place to hold a festival of this nature. Please hold it on land closer to East Haven and/or Carnoustie where there will be no damage to our important heritage.
302.	Alasdair Murray	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	Don't throw away the heritage of Carnoustie for the sake of a quick buck or a one nighter at a festival which could be held in a much safer place.
303.	Rob Hill	HAWICK, United Kingdom	
<i>Page 12 - Signatures 281 - 303</i>			
304.	Lorraine Morrison	By Arbroath, United Kingdom	
305.	Judy Rees	Glenalta, VT	
306.	Andrew Walker	Panmure, United Kingdom	Panmure is the wrong place for a huge festival of any nature. This particular festival is been forced on local residents when it is almost universally opposed. What happened to democracy?
307.	Jennifer Dobson	Elgin, United Kingdom	
308.	Hayley Jobber	Havant, United Kingdom	
309.	marina cano	palma, Spain	
310.	MIGUEL ÁNGEL FLORES GARCÍA	SEVILLA, Spain	
311.	Joanne Reynolds	Westcliff-on-Sea, United Kingdom	
312.	Tracey Williamson	NORMAN, OK	Selfish, ignorant humans.....
313.	Mairi Stewart	Friockheim, United Kingdom	
314.	Bruce Faichney	Madrid, Spain	
315.	jill Whiteside	monikie, United Kingdom	
316.	William Holden	Isle of Lewis, United Kingdom	Anything to stop the spread of these damned things in SCOTLAND
317.	Kate High	Monifieth, United Kingdom	What possible reason is there for destroying a peaceful country place for something that is going to line someone's pocket and is of no benefit to the surroundings or the people and animals who have to put up with such a nonsense situation. Save our countryside's from such as this.

	Name	From	Comments
323.	Ruhi Thallon	Dunoon, United Kingdom	
324.	Andy Martin	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
318.	Alan Kennedy	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
319.	Tammy Gilpin	Glasgow, United Kingdom	
320.	ken kennedy	lossiemouth, United Kingdom	
321.	caroline walker	Dundee, United Kingdom	
322.	Nicki Kelly	Forfar, United Kingdom	Please stop this festival from going ahead near this fragile area. Let's protect the small groups of Scottish wildlife we still have left. Can we perhaps find a different, less important nature environment for the festival? Such a special place....let us preserve it for future generations.
<i>Page 13 - Signatures 304 - 322</i>			
I do not want this licensed rave to go ahead. Not just for the impact that the thousands of ticket holders will have or the surrounding damage caused to property and the distress caused by those without tickets to the surrounding land. Nor just for the upset to the access and egress from my house for my family and neighbours in the weeks before and after the event but really for the upset to my 5 & 7 yr old boys when there will be exceptionally loud music played until 1am only a few hundred yards away when they are trying to sleep.			
325.	Iain McKendry	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
326.	Ann Innes	Cumbernauld, United Kingdom	
327.	Marianne Dobson	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
328.	Finn Innes	Glasgow, United Kingdom	
329.	bill winter	East Kilbride, United Kingdom	

	Name	From	Comments
330.	Margaret Dundas	Arbroath, United Kingdom	
331.	Bryan Kydd	Monifieth, United Kingdom	
332.	Yvonne Murray	Glasgow, United Kingdom	
333.	marie PUDLEWSKA	Forfar, United Kingdom	Our wildlife is so precious - please stop this house musical festival which will harm animals and birds in this special area.
334.	Anne Young	Arbroath, United Kingdom	
335.	Catherine Lloyd	Perth, United Kingdom	
336.	Heather Rabbage	Taunton, United Kingdom	
337.	simone lovack	covas do barroso, Portugal	Wild woodland environments are not an appropriate location for major entertainment events!
338.	Hazel Dunphy	Wicken, United Kingdom	If left alone animals do not disturb our peace so why should we disturb theirs. Red squirrels are trying very hard to make a comeback - this will not help and who will clean up the mess after the festival is over and who will pay for it?

Page 14 - Signatures 323 - 338

339.	Lee, Michaela	Barnesley, United Kingdom		
340.	James Scotland	Carnoustie, Angus, United Kingdom	Name	From
341.	graham thorpe	bradford, United Kingdom	Stop house music festival from threatening badgers, red squirrels and thousands of woodland birds and animals.Protect this special environment!	Comments
342.	sofia madjitov	karmiel, Israel		
343.	Bernadette sisson	Walnut, CA		
344.	Suzanne Ursula Lebon	Zürich, Switzerland		
345.	Charlene Yeates	Johannesburg, South Africa		
346.	Sherri Gillespie	LOS GATOS, CA	We must protect our environment and protect the animals.	
347.	Linsay Miller	Edinburgh, United Kingdom		
348.	JILL YOUNG	FORFAR, United Kingdom		
349.	Maggie Landells	Carnoustie, United Kingdom		
350.	Patricia Smith	Glasgow, United Kingdom		
351.	Bryony Pearce	Southampton, United Kingdom	Share this and sign it pleaseeeee	
352.	Brenda Ivey	Kirriemuir, United Kingdom		
353.	John Cowan	Hägersten, Sweden		
354.	elaine echols	hull, United Kingdom		
355.	cruz isar	Madrid, Spain		
356.	Uwe Simon	Langenselbold, Germany		
357.	irene natures	vienna, Austria		
358.	Gerhard Vollmer	Geilenkirchen, Germany		
359.	Margaret Martin	Dundee, United Kingdom	A sensitive rural environment is put at risk and people's homes threatened in pursuit of money.	
360.	Nelly Nyffeler	Derendingen, Switzerland		
361.	Jean Kershaw	Winchburgh, United Kingdom	For me, the issue isn't so much the music (I have no objection to people enjoying themselves) but the disruption which is bound to be for longer than the two intensive days of the festival.	
Page 15 - Signatures 339 - 361				
362.	Barbara Barski	Berlin, Germany		
363.	Mary Summers	Monifieth, United Kingdom		
364.	marianna dregán	budapest, Hungary		

	Name	From	Comments
365.	pat smith	carnoustie, United Kingdom	
366.	Emily Wylie	Stewarton, United Kingdom	
367.	Barbara Allgoewer	Oakland, CA	
368.	Lorna McCarthy	Newcastle, United Kingdom	
369.	Terry Wataszko	mississauga, Canada	
370.	Hunter Klapperich	Stanley, WI	
371.	Heidi Schmitt-Lermann	Gessertshausen, Germany	
372.	Polly Pullar	Aberfeldy, United Kingdom	
373.	Jacqueline Gerstmann	wasbek, Germany	
374.	bianca balos-fendler	augsborg, Germany	
375.	corine cathala	Pierrelatte, France	
376.	pascale brandt	la touche, France	
377.	fanny mabon	GONNEVILLE SUR MER, France	
378.	stefano frigieri	carpentras, France	
379.	jennifer schreiber	kremmen, Germany	
380.	Birgit Grassow	Hückeswagen, Germany	
381.	bolo jm	nice, France	
382.	Wendy Forster	Newcastle, United Kingdom	
383.	Barbara Mieirs	ORANGEVALE, CA	
384.	NATHALIE HAMARD	MONTPOTHIER, France	
385.	marion mörs	peine, Germany	
386.	Amanda Pearson	HASTINGS, United Kingdom	
<i>Page 16 - Signatures 362 - 386</i>			
387.	Evelyn Veitch	Aberfeldy, United Kingdom	The animals and birds LIVE here. We need to respect and safeguard their environment. There are numerous other noisy music festivals in Scotland that people may attend if they so desire.
388.	Heather Bantick	Boat of Garten, United Kingdom	Please hold it somewhere more suitable

		Name	From	Comments
389.	Andrea Grey	Letham, United Kingdom		ANY area of natural wildlife should be protected and retained without threat to our native and often endangered species. It is essential that this should not go ahead, in order to help preserve our natural bio-diversity here in Scotland.
390.	Dianne bromley	Huddersfield, United Kingdom		
391.	Marilyn Sinclair	Forfar, United Kingdom		Most of the people attending a music festival want a noisy social event with easy transport access and close proximity to urban amenities. The wild life of festival goers should not be allowed to impact on wildlife that live in a tranquil location. Wildlife live in the area on a permanent basis and they should not be harassed by an event which is based on monetary gain.
392.	Lenka Rihova	Prague, Czech Republic		
393.	thomas Wilson	New Cumnock, United Kingdom		
394.	Stephen Fletcher	Forfar, United Kingdom		
395.	Bridget Hunter	Ayr, United Kingdom		
396.	veronique delattre	flines les raches, France		
397.	Ruth Wilson	Paisley, United Kingdom		
398.	Christine Cerqueda	Paranaque, Philippines		
399.	Prairie Moser	Bandon, OR		
400.	hazel terry	Kirkcaldy, United Kingdom		
401.	Marie Van de Panne	Montjoux, France		
402.	JULIE ELLIS	Westbury, United Kingdom		
403.	Ronald Gray	Kirriemuir, United Kingdom		
404.	Melis Basman	Istanbul, Turkey		
<i>Page 17 - Signatures 387 - 404</i>				
405.	Lillyrose Chaperon	B.bassin, Mauritius		Nature is so magnificent. It's the energy that waters our souls. Let them live. Cruelty will bring humanity towards a definitive lost!
406.	Matilda Scharsach	Balrigowrie, United Kingdom		Using valuable ecoligical habitats for festivals in Scotland must stop.

	Name	From	Comments
407.	Nick Throup	Haworth, United Kingdom	
408.	Chris Glisson	Sandton, South Africa	
409.	R Alexander	Abiquiu, NM	
410.	Lens Lucas	Rose Hill, Mauritius	
411.	ziri sam	fitou, France	
412.	Janine Sanders	Fourways, South Africa	
413.	Isabelle Jeffery	Dunfermline, United Kingdom	Please protect this precious special wildlife habitat, there are so very few left, animals and birds need our protection, we can't let them down.
414.	Elsbeth Guthrie	Coylton, United Kingdom	
415.	Wendy Brooksher	Hesperia, CA	
416.	Maria Luísa Santos	São João dos Montes, Portugal	
417.	Dalibor Gajda	Ostrava, Czech Republic	
418.	Joanna Rooke	Southampton, United Kingdom	
419.	Libby Anderson	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	Environmental impact is routinely assessed - why not animal welfare impact? Should be considered in licensing decisions.
420.	Kevin Foster	London, United Kingdom	
421.	Marilyn Wargo	Pagosa Springs, CO	
422.	Terri Melloway	Gold Coast, Australia	
423.	Mitchell Lonas	GLEN ALLEN, VA	
424.	Paris Karali	Zug, Switzerland	
425.	Joanna Hardeman	London, United Kingdom	
426.	Emma Cobb	Walton on Thames, United Kingdom	
427.	Julia Webster	Monikie, United Kingdom	
428.	Lisa Salazar	SHASTA LAKE, CA	
429.	Terri Pigford	DAYTON, OH	

432.	Ray Uriartr	MURRIETA, CA	
433.	jean oudney	Blairgowrie, United Kingdom	Would you like to be terrified every time you went out your front door? Neither do these precious animals!
434.	Sara Scuse	Blairgowrie, United Kingdom	
435.	Fran Jones	Pitlochry, United Kingdom	
436.	Andrena Wilson	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
437.	Elaine Whitelaw	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
438.	Penny Gerrard	London, Canada	
439.	Ellen Gutfleisch	SUSSEX, WI	
440.	Rhona Forrester	PERTH, United Kingdom	
441.	Dennis Sullivan	Zanesville, OH	
442.	Oliver Guenoun	Sydney, Australia	
443.	Barbara Adamson	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
444.	Maria Tsiachtiri	Thessalonique, Greece	
445.	Claudia Wanke	Hoechstadt, Germany	Got a 2nd home in Carnoustie and always enjoy to watch the wildlife there. It's an island of Scottish wildlife surrounded by a vast area of farmland, it's an oasis that must be protected for the animals. Nothing against a music festival, but I'm sure there are more suitable places, where such an event could be held with less impact on the natural heritage.
446.	GORGOT TSAMADANI	LAMIA, Greece	
447.	katerina klepkou	thessaloniki, Greece	
448.	Oana Popescu	Kerkyra, Greece	

432.	Ray Uriartr	MURRIETA, CA	
433.	jean oudney	Blairgowrie, United Kingdom	Name From Comments
434.	Sara Scuse	Blairgowrie, United Kingdom	Would you like to be terrified every time you went out your front door? Neither do these precious animals!
435.	Fran Jones	Pitlochry, United Kingdom	
436.	Andrena Wilson	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
437.	Elaine Whitelaw	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
438.	Penny Gerrard	London, Canada	
439.	Ellen Gutfleisch	SUSSEX, WI	
440.	Rhona Forrester	PERTH, United Kingdom	
441.	Dennis Sullivan	Zanesville, OH	
442.	Oliver Guenoun	Sydney, Australia	
443.	Barbara Adamson	Carnoustie, United Kingdom	
444.	Maria Tsiachtiri	Thessalonique, Greece	
445.	Claudia Wanke	Hoechstadt, Germany	Got a 2nd home in Carnoustie and always enjoy to watch the wildlife there. It's an island of Scottish wildlife surrounded by a vast area of farmland, it's an oasis that must be protected for the animals. Nothing against a music festival, but I'm sure there are more suitable places, where such an event could be held with less impact on the natural heritage.
446.	GORGOT TSAMADANI	LAMIA, Greece	
447.	katerina klepkou	thessaloniki, Greece	
448.	Oana Popescu	Kerkyra, Greece	
	Marcin Samarow	Ardfern, United Kingdom	
450.	George Murdoch	Laurencekirk, United Kingdom	
451.	Gilbert Markus	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	
452.	David Whannel	Straiton, United Kingdom	Poor show.

Page 19 - Signatures 430 - 452

There are more than 3300 on the fb. icon

		Name	From	Comments
453.	Theodora Bayly	Edinburgh, United Kingdom		
454.	Almuth Ernsting	Edinburgh, United Kingdom		Humans can change what is to take place but the poor animals have no voice
455.	Anne Clark	Cumbernauld, United Kingdom		
457.	Kathleen Duncan	Forfar, United Kingdom		
458.	Sarah Leaver	By Forfar, United Kingdom		
459.	Mark Waddington	Preston, United Kingdom		
460.	Gill Smart	west kilbride, United Kingdom		there should be better legislation to enable wider public objection to this sort of thing
461.	Gill Lange	Tayport, United Kingdom		
462.	Moira Bolt	Kirriemuir, United Kingdom		
463.	Nicola Haselden	CHORLEY, United Kingdom		Why are people stupid!
464.	j entwistle	lauder, United Kingdom		
465.	Morag Herve	Dundee, United Kingdom		I and my husband are agreived at the fact we were NEVER informed of this event personally, and are now expecting the worst! We are totally against the said event and will expect it to be cancelled NOW!!!
466.	Ingeborg Plescher	Wildendürnbach, Austria		
467.	Gottfried Messmer	Karlsfeld, Germany		

Page 20 - Signatures 453 - 467

Petition to Alan McKeown

Head of Communities at Angus Council

SAVE PANMURE ESTATE

Panmure Estate is home to many historic monuments and thousands of woodland animals and birds which are threatened by a proposed house music festival to be held during the breeding season in June.

We, the undersigned, ask Angus Council to refuse the public entertainment license for the proposed Festival of House music festival on the grounds that Panmure Estate is not a suitable site for a major entertainment event.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
ALFIE DICKSON		3. AWHFESTON GRO. ARTS	8.3.16
L. ARCHIBALD		9 GLENWAT, HILLSIDE, MONTROSE DD10 5JT	8/03/16
P. STEWART		23 CALCOTS CRESCENT ELGIN IV30 6GL	18/03/16
J. DOBSON		23 CALCOTS CRESCENT ELGIN IV30 6GL	18/3/16
CAPTAIN L FERMOR		BANKHEAD, SPITTACFIELD. PH14JU	19/3/16
Scott Mitchell		18 CARLOGIE Rd. Carnoustie	19/3/16
Morgan Stewart		Stirling E. Carnoustie	19/3/16
MAIRI STEWART		15 GARDYNE STREET, FROCKHEIM DD11 4SN	19/3/16
PAUL DINES		15 GARDYNE STREET, FROCKHEIM DD11 4SN	19.3.16.
J STEWART		STANFORTH EAST. CARNOUSTIE	14/3/16.
DOROTHY DONALDSON		20 HARRIS RD CARNOUSTIE	19/3/2016
A. DONALDSON		20 HARRIS RD CARNOUSTIE	19/3/16
GILL SMITH		112 DUNDEE ST CARNOUSTIE	19/3/16

Petition to Alan McKeown

Head of Communities at Angus Council

SAVE PANMURE ESTATE

Panmure Estate is home to many historic monuments and thousands of woodland animals and birds which are threatened by a proposed house music festival to be held during the breeding season in June.

We, the undersigned, ask Angus Council to refuse the public entertainment license for the proposed Festival of House music festival on the grounds that Panmure Estate is not a suitable site for a major entertainment event.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
GARY McFARLANE		MACAMBIRA GASTHAUGH DD7 6LQ	14/3/16
GORDON LUMSDAINE		MAULESHAVERN EASTHAUGH DD7 6LQ	14/3/16
Gaelle LeGros		Mauleshavern Easthaver DD76LQ	14/3/16
IRENE DONALDSON		3 Muirburn DD76LE	19/3/16.
SHEILA MACASKIE		45 Millar St DD7 TAT	19/3/16
SHEILA FINDLA		24 TAYSLIE ST DD76AY.	19/3/16
Loretta Dean		Arbroath DD11 5HH	19/3/16
N. ROY		CARNOWSIE DD7 6DT	19/3/16
TEARL REID.		MONIFIETH DD5 4RT	19.3.16.
JEANNE McFADDEN		MACAMBIRA, EASTHAUGH DD7 6LQ	20/3/16
JEAN STEWART		15 MILLER A ABERNETHY DD11 2AR	20/3/16
ALASDAIR MURRAY		ROCKVILLE, EAST HAUGH DD7 6LQ	20/03/16
WENDY MURRAY		Rockville, East Haugh DD7 6LQ	21/3/16.

Petition to Alan McKeown

Head of Communities at Angus Council

SAVE PANMURE ESTATE

Panmure Estate is home to many historic monuments and thousands of woodland animals and birds which are threatened by a proposed house music festival to be held during the breeding season in June.

We, the undersigned, ask Angus Council to refuse the public entertainment license for the proposed Festival of House music festival on the grounds that Panmure Estate is not a suitable site for a major entertainment event.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
MARY STEWART		58 Lady Road Brechin DD9 6DL	8th March 2016
Frank Stewart		58 Betty Road Brechin DD9 6DL	8 March 2016
SCOTT MITCHELL		18 CARLOGIE RD CARNOUSTIE	19/3/16
KEVIN FERMOR		BANKHEAD, SPITALFIELD	19/3/16
Mary Smith		7 Inchewan, Binnam Dunkeld	21/3/16
K. Stewart		Willowbank car home Carnoustie	21st March 2016

Petition to Alan McKeown

Head of Communities at Angus Council

SAVE PANMURE ESTATE

Panmure Estate is home to many historic monuments and thousands of woodland animals and birds which are threatened by a proposed house music festival to be held during the breeding season in June.

We, the undersigned, ask Angus Council to refuse the public entertainment license for the proposed Festival of House music festival on the grounds that Panmure Estate is not a suitable site for a major entertainment event.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
N. CASSIDY		20 Sunnyside Terrace Dundee	19.03.2016
W. PORTER		3 Cathie Road Cottage, Culroath	19.03.2016
A. PORTER		3 ~ ~ ~ ~	19.03.2016
J. Stewart		5 SEAFIELD COURT BUCKIE	19/3/16
E. Stewart		5 seafield court, Portessie	19/3/16
H. Nimmo		5 Braehead Drive, Carnoustie	22/03/16
G. McAINSH		20 TAYMOUTH ST	22/03/16

Petition to Alan McKeown

Head of Communities at Angus Council

SAVE PANMURE ESTATE

Panmure Estate is home to many historic monuments and thousands of woodland animals and birds which are threatened by a proposed house music festival to be held during the breeding season in June.

We, the undersigned, ask Angus Council to refuse the public entertainment license for the proposed Festival of House music festival on the grounds that Panmure Estate is not a suitable site for a major entertainment event.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Date
WCA Smith		77 BEECHWOOD RD, ARBROATH	10.3.16
LAURA STEWART		8, GLAMIS RD, KIRRIEMUR, ANGUS	10.3.16
DONNA MURRAY		291F Stratmore Avenue, Dundee	10.03.16
IAN CRAIG		38 Alexander Gordon Drive ^{1700ft}	10.03.16
GORDON BOYD		2 DORWARD ROAD, MONTROSE, ANGUS	10.3.16
Lynn Richards		42 Hospitalfield Gardens Arbroath	11.3.16
MARK DALY		2 BALLARTHO PL DUNDEE	11/3/16
LAURA COBURN		76 GRAMPIAN VIEW, MONTROSE	11.03.16.
Jonathan riley		26 A Gown Street, Arbroath	18.3.16
VICKI WINTER		60 BRUCE ROAD Dundee	16.3.16
MAUREEN NEE		2 MORRICH GNS, DUNDEE	16.3.16
JASMIN QUIGLEY		1c Viewfield Rd. Arbroath	18.03.16
ANNE BISHOP		26 PROUDST MILNEGNS, ARBROATH	18.03.16

