

To: The Licensing Committee

Submitted by: Robert Whitfield-contact details provided.

London Borough of Merton (LBM)

10<sup>th</sup> December 2017

We Are the Fair Ltd. License Application reference: WK/201708658.

I have neither political affiliations nor institutional constraints. What follows is intended to be an objective submission, and should not be misinterpreted/misconceived/misconstrued, and thereby misrepresented.

Residing in the vicinity of Morden Park I submit this contribution as an 'Interested Party'.

I live in a residential community in close proximity to Morden Park and, along with many others, subject to events that take place there. Until the advent of the We Are the Fair 2017 event I, along with many others' in the local community, were under the impression any proposed future events in Morden Park would, themselves, have been subject to more stringent controls than those permitted for the above-mentioned 2017 event, not least by the prevention of avoidable excessive noise pollution intruding on those living within close proximity to Morden Park events. Sadly, any earlier, hoped-for perception there would be not be a necessity to pursue this again has now been subjected to a number of influences, not least by some beyond the control of the local authority- which I will address in *conclusions (a)*.

Since for We Are the Fair their first event in the London Borough of Merton(LBM) was in Morden Park in 2017, for their proposed 2018 event it now becomes possible to draw on that, relevant representations for that event, and earlier experiences and/or expectations, not only for the local community , but also Borough-wide implications and/or potential consequences for staff/officials and attendees at events, as can be determined by the recorded evidence included with this written submission, not least for the local authority, itself.

With this submission I will address:

1; References to the We Are the Fair 2017 License application, other representations on behalf of the applicant, and analysis of same-I will address that latter item separately later in this written submission. Also refer to related matters included in the 10<sup>th</sup> May License Sub-Committee Report.

2; Reference to: written submissions by other interested parties in regard to this same applicant's 2017 event.

3; Where possible-considering copyright implications etc.-and in regard to the 2017 event, I will include some of my own messages/communications , including one to a We Are the Fair official from whom I neither received a response nor an acknowledgement. If it is considered I was due a response, would that be indicative about whom would that say the most?

4; To further assist and support the Committee with its deliberations, along with this written submission the committee will have received as evidence a copy of my 'real-time/on the day' video and audio recordings.

5; Conclusions.

1) I refer the committee to the We Are the Fair 2017 license application:

1a; Page 39; supply of alcohol?-response, yes.

'I'-page 47; Question, "will the provision of late night refreshments take place "indoors" or "outdoors" or "both". The application did not offer a response to this question. One could perceive from that a reluctance to commit to a particular answer for which they could then be held accountable, especially when further considering any potential eventuality during the event for which they could then be responsible, including the potential for later *allegations and/or potential accusations of 'intrusions/intimidation/potential threats'*? (I will return to this in *conclusions*) In support of that last sentence I refer the Committee to the video recorded evidence provided with this written submission. In addition, that inability to respond to that specific question allows for the possibility that 'off-site' provision is not excluded, which could negatively affect 'on-site' developments-potentially denying the event organizers any perceived responsibility but could have a direct effect on what emerges/unfolds as the day/event progresses.

'j'-page 48; question: "will the supply of alcohol be for consumption, "on the premises", "off the premises" or "both"?

### **My observations:**

'a' on page 39 clearly indicates the *provision* of alcohol. It offers no specific exclusions as to where neither 'on the premises', 'off the premises' nor 'both'. However, the answer given to the question in 'j'-page 48-"Will the *supply* of alcohol for consumption.....? Answer given, "on the premises". Once again I refer the committee to the supporting video evidence which clearly supports the reality I've indicated above: *intrusions/intimidation/potential threats*. Since the 12th October Morden forum, the LBM Greenspaces manager has informed me he has no responsibilities regarding the consumption of alcohol in any of the LBM Parks. However, with the video supporting video evidence, does the 2017 event offer an example of what is possible in full view of under-age *minors' and/or young children*? For possible additional implications and/or consequences I will return to this in *conclusions (b)*.

The following is a crucial part of the LBM Public Health Department's submission in response to the 2017 license application:

### **1. The prevention of crime and disorder**

### **2. The prevention of public nuisance**

### **3 Public safety.**

As a responsible authority is it our duty to ensure the licensing objectives are upheld and this event is safe and sociable with sufficient consideration for risk mitigation in its planning. After discussion with the other responsible authorities, and having attended the Safety Advisory Group we feel that although the applicant has provided a detailed application, the risks outlined above are insufficiently mitigated in part due to the physical constraints of the site,

but also due to the limited time frame remaining to discuss and agree the alcohol management plan (among others they have suggested but not yet published).

**Therefore we would recommend that the license be rejected on this occasion.**

**My observations:**

1&2: 1; The prevention of crime and disorder and, 2; The prevention of public nuisance.

Above in this submission I've referred to the real possibilities of, previously avoidable, *intrusions/intimidation/potential threats*. I did so in response to recent interpretations of earlier, sometimes comparatively historical incidents', including the emergence of *allegations and/or accusations* of criminal behaviour. Although here *not intending* to make such *allegations/accusations*, after viewing the video recorded evidence, in relation to recorded incidents' the subject of this 2017 event, I leave the Committee to decide what is needed to prevent the possible *emergence* of any, *potentially unnecessary, allegations and/or accusations* resulting from the 2017 event, or any future events within the London Borough of Merton. I will return to this in *conclusions (c)*.

The following paragraph from the LBM noise pollution team.

Condition 2 amended to read:

□ A qualified and suitably experienced Noise Management Consultancy will be appointed to produce a Noise Management Plan for the event. This Noise Management Plan will be submitted 6 weeks prior to the event for approval by the councils Pollution Team and include; target noise levels at agreed receptor points, noise mitigation and control measures for the event, during event monitoring arrangements, a process for dealing with complaints and compliance arrangements to ensure target noise levels are adhered to.

**My observations:**

Although the above offers some consideration to noise pollution from the site, the reality of excessive noise levels emitted from this site, as experienced by local residents', should also be considered excessive by the Committee. In addition, the recommended complaints and compliance measures put in place, from my own experience during a 'phone call to the site on the day, proved operationally inadequate, and did not meet those pollution team conditions. During that 'phone call I was informed no LBM officer was available to speak with. Since those with whom I did speak were employees of the organizers their comments/responses needed to be subject to interpretive filtering. That should indicate a bona fide LBM officer should be available to respond to locally generated 'phone calls from local residents' in close proximity to Morden Park and events taking place within the Park. Although the recipient of my call was courteous, I was not at all impressed with the support service provided. I was also told the noise level imposed by the then license Sub-Committee was neither known to them-including the production manager (!)-nor available to me. 'Openness and transparency' a victim? As a result of this experience I decided to visit the site and record my findings. I find it difficult to understand where the License Sub-Committee's required condition for the organizer to mitigate the excessive noise volume was being applied. Being made aware of possible limitations, some of that recording I've now made available to this Sub-Committee in support and to further assist this Committee with its deliberations.

Due to the volume and complexity of the Police submission I hope the Committee will accept this limited reference to that submission to the 2017 Licensing Sub-Committee. However, it is my intention to address and offer legitimate comments on this Police Service submission. I will select parts-indicated by *italic* script-of the Police Service submission and then address them individually. It can be seen some of the comments in the Police submission are from information they have gathered from reputable sources elsewhere, or as a result of information gathered themselves and/or from their own experiences.

#### **Previous history:**

*It was noted that the security search operation was non-existent, until challenged by the Bronze Commander.* Bearing in mind that this was only a one-day event, people were seen walking in with large rucksacks unchallenged. The potential for crime in any large scale crowded event is well documented. *It is reasonable to expect that sexual assaults will be committed within the festival site and many of these will go unreported.* It is also highly likely that there will be thefts of personal property. With all day drinking from the 6 bars listed on the site plan, *the potential for sexual assault and alcohol related violence increases.* Festivals can attract gang attention and violence can flare up very quickly. y a one-day event, people were seen walking in with large rucksacks unchallenged.

#### **My observations:**

The observation *security search operation was non-existent*, that *sexual assaults will be committed within the site*, and *the potential for sexual assault and alcohol related violence increases*, with additional evidence provided to this Committee should that come as a surprise?

As so often, repeating the same 'lessons to be learned' continues to reveal a degree of apathy, and should be unnecessary where security concerns are threatened and to the fore but-sadly isn't.

#### **Victims of crime:**

*The potential for crime in any large scale crowded event is well documented. It is reasonable to expect that sexual assaults will be committed within the festival site and many of these will go unreported.* It is also highly likely that there will be thefts of personal property.

*With all day drinking from the 6 bars listed on the site plan, the potential for sexual assault and alcohol related violence increases.* Festivals can attract gang attention and violence can flare up very quickly.

#### **My observations:**

*"Potential for crime is well-documented". "It is reasonable to expect that sexual assaults will be committed within the festival site and many of these will go unreported".* Unfortunately, with recent statements and developments, and revealing past and recent evidence emerging, with this inclusion in the Police submission *should this not set alarm bells ringing?* I will return to this in *conclusions (d)*.

#### **Disorder:**

A confined area containing 20,000 people, drinking alcohol, and enjoying dance music will provide potential for disorder.

*Assuming that the security operation is adequate, the biggest risk of disorder will come at the close of the event.*

**My observations:**

The Committee may wish to remind themselves of the video evidence I've provided. That clearly indicates the compacted density of the attendees within the site of the event. That may better inform the committee about what should be accepted as a maximum number of attendees for this site/event? Then, could the Committee concur with the maximum number recommended by the Police Service-not the 20,000 permitted for the 2017 event?

**Searching:**

*Mr Dudley has included in the application that there will be 3-stage searching upon entry to the event, including the use of passive drugs dogs and metal detector wands. It is hoped that this indicates a massive improvement on last year's search regime.*

*The use of electronic ID scanning equipment was strongly advised but this has not been included in the application. Electronic ID equipment will ensure that the organiser's "No ID, No Entry" policy will be strictly enforced thereby preventing under 18s from entry. The MPS will be able to supply details of specific violent criminals to add to the ID Scanning Database to ensure that these individuals are also turned away. Use of ID Scanning equipment can also provide a potential witness list to Police in the event of a serious crime investigation.*

*Details of security firms have yet to be confirmed. The applicant expects to use different firms for various roles, i.e entry, security, safety monitoring.*

*The organiser has not supplied information regarding how many security staff will be present, inside and outside the event site.*

**My observations:**

With the available video evidence, and given required technology is plentiful, this composite response finds the above difficult to comprehend. For those who believe 'less means more' I'll leave that there for them.

**CCTV:**

*The Event Management plan mentions CCTV operation in the event but there is no such mention in the Premises Licence application. Police would like to see a condition that high quality digital CCTV is in operation covering the entire site, and entry and exit, with footage available to Police on request at the time of request.*

My observations: The video evidence I've provided should fully support the above conditions recommended by the Police Service.

**Counter Terrorism:**

The current Threat Level from International Terrorism is SEVERE. The recent event in Westminster has reminded us that attacks are still highly likely and that crowded places are terrorist targets. The World Athletic Championships are also taking place in London on this date. The CT threat in addition to no available parking at this event will further increase Police and Council resources to deal with abandoned vehicles close to the event site.

The application and Event Management Plan does not address the CT threat sufficiently.

**My observations:** The above warning from the Police Service is too often not taken with the seriousness it demands. Unfortunately, that's why it becomes necessary to be continually repeated. One successful terrorist attempt could prove devastating for many. Perhaps Event Management and this Committee should convene alongside the Police Service? In the interests of openness and transparency, any future provision should be entered onto a free publicly available platform.

**Single Entrance/Exit:**

***There is only one entrance and exit into the event site.*** The nature of the perimeter fencing is such that pedestrians will be able to escape into other areas of the park in the event of large scale evacuation, BUT, there is only one vehicular access route into Morden Park.

In the event of a serious incident, the first few emergency vehicles attending could immediately block access route and thus prevent further emergency vehicles from getting close to the site. Emergency vehicles will be forced to park on the actual escape route to be used by pedestrians in the event of evacuation. *Organisers failed to address this issue during the SAG meeting.*

**My observations:** Apart from 'surprised'?-no comment.

**Psychoactive Substances:**

Possession with Intent to Supply Nitrous Oxide (Laughing Gas) became an offence under the Psychoactive Substances Act in 2016 due to health risks associated with misuse. Misuse can cause displacement of oxygen and death. Combined with alcohol, the affects of both are dramatically increased eg impairment. The use of recreational use of Nitrous Oxide at festivals is huge, with **800 - 900kg of used and unused N2O canisters disposed of at last year's Eastern Electrics festival.**

*Although not illegal to possess, the organisers have agreed to have a strict No N2O policy. Police would like to see clear communication to attendees of this in advance.*

**My observations:** Psychoactive Substances include legal and illegal substances-they all have the psychological implications and/or consequences. At the 12<sup>th</sup> October Morden Forum meeting the LBM Greenspaces manager admitted that where the organisers "agreed to have a strict N2O policy". N2O substances were prevalent on the day at the event-demonstrating a failure.

**Crowd Safety:**

*The Event Management Plan and Risk Assessments appear to show measures to ensure crowd safety inside the event, but specific numbers and ratios of security staff are not.*

*Crowd Safety outside the event site will require additional event security and MBC staff to work alongside Police resources.*

**My observations:** Police Service numbers are already stretched. With the unavailability/failure of LBM staff to answer 'phone calls/potential complaints from those in the surrounding residential community, and to support the Police Service, perhaps this Committee can apply conditions to ensure LBM staff can be made available to perform 'phone enquiries/complaints duties?

**Alcohol Consumption:**

Attendees will be given RFID wristbands to use as payment for alcohol in the site. The wristbands will be "charged" by credit card and remove the necessity to carry cash, and therefore reduce theft opportunity. BUT, the organisers will not be issuing automatic refunds of unspent money left on the wristbands. Customers will be expected to apply to have surplus funds returned to them. *This will undoubtedly encourage drinking to excess towards the end of the event, as attendees will be keen to get value by spending the money that they*

*have charged to their wristbands.*

**My observations:** For those wishing to reduce their expenditure on alcohol, the long-standing trend to avail themselves' with cheaper alcohol before visiting pubs etc. attendees at events such as this could take similar advantage with what's available prior to attending the site/event.

**Police recommendation:**

**The Metropolitan Police strongly advise that this application is rejected.**

**My observations:**

If in the event the above strong advice from the Police Service was not accepted, they did request conditions to be applied to the License. In my view, the case made by the Police Service should not be taken less-seriously than society demands, not least those resulting from recent developments', imposed by contemporary interpretation of past incidents'. In the Licensing objectives document, reference to para 5 of 'The Prevention of crime and disorder' inclusion, 'opposite sex searches' did take place-as demonstrated in the video evidence provided with this written submission. That could create, previously avoidable, wide/broad implications and/or consequences, not least for the LBM itself, which may not only be realized shortly, but also in years' to come. Inflictions and afflictions can affect on-going reputation and integrity. Perhaps the Committee should reflect on that. However, within this submission I will include a short, but flexible, article I'd written earlier which, it is hoped, the Committee will give due attention.

**I will now address representations to the 10<sup>th</sup> May Sub-Committee meeting.**

For the applicant: Mr Bromley-Martin.

Mr Bromley-Martin observed that there had been no objections from any residents or Councillors, and that the Councils' Greenspaces Department were very much in favour of the application.

**My observations:** Since leading up to this event the majority of residents' in close proximity to Morden Park was unaware of this proposed event, and there had been little, none to my knowledge, information from local ward Councillors', it should come as no surprise no objections were forthcoming from either of those. When I became aware of it I attempted to contact local ward councillors', and did message the recommended individual representative for We Are the Fair-copied and pasted within submission-from whom I received neither a response nor acknowledgement.

Mr Bromley-Martin assured the Committee that they had a zero tolerance policy regarding Psychoactive Substances and they were confident that they could ensure they would not be on site.

**My observations:** As stated by the Greenspaces Manager at the 12<sup>th</sup> October Morden forum that assertion by Mr Bromley-Martin was not substantiated at the event, on the day-N2O was available.

Mr Bromley-Martin advised that the question of searching had been raised by Police, Responding there was a plan to introduce ID scanning but this would be a targeted approach as ID scanning of everyone would take more time which leads to queues and furthers the targets for potential disorder.

**My observations:** Perhaps the Committee should consider that, avoiding legitimate cost implications for the protection of all concerned which could result from providing

ID scanning, and more, better suits the purposes for a commercial enterprise to increase its profits?

In respect of numbers, Mr Bromley-Martin advised that the team had knowledge and experience of 17,000 attendees the previous year at Hatfield House.

**My observations:** As stated by the Greenspaces Manager at the 12<sup>th</sup> October the Morden forum less-than 16,000 people attended this event. Given the available evidence indicates the excessive compacted density experienced by attendees at this event, if any future events by this organizer are to be considered, a much-reduced limit should be among the conditions.

Mr Bromley-Martin advised that in terms of alcohol sales, the intention was to have a cashless system for food and beverages including alcohol, and this would lead to reduced theft/robbery. Mr Bromley-Martin noted the Police concern that this would lead to binge drinking by people wanting to use up the money, but stated that this had not been the experience of the operators, and this was shown in the spend chart included within the paperwork.

**My observations:** I suggest the committee consult the video evidence provided to them. It appears availability of alcohol drinking 'before, during or after the event' negates the inference associated with Mr Bromley-Martin's assertion.

In response to questions regarding security, Mr Bromley-Martin outlined the numbers of staff and their roles, advised that all security staff would be G4S employees, that the Police assistance would be intended as a police presence outside the grounds and that the organisers had learnt lessons from previous years and so felt that the arrangements were the best they could be, given the threats we face.

**My observations:** "Lessons from previous years" could be considered disproportionate when applied to a proposed two-day event-see below.

The Police stated that search measures the previous year had, from what they had been told, needed improvement.

All parties present were then invited to give their closing statements.

Both the Licensing Authority and the Police reiterated that whilst they were not against the event, they both felt it was ambitious to have such a large capacity for a first event, and asked that the limit be set at 10,000.

Mr Bromley-Martin spoke of the organisers' passion for holding and operating festivals, noting that they had a proven track record of holding events with numbers greatly in excess of 20,000. Mr Bromley-Martin noted that there had been no objections from any residents or Councillors to the application, and advised that in relation to ID scanning, 100% would be impractical, but that if the Police wished to propose a level they would be happy to consider it, but that there had been no such suggestion as yet.

**My observations:** As indicated elsewhere above, profit is the principal motivator, ambition the vehicle to achieve it. However, applying a comprehensive 'value' to the



benefit of society, including in the local residential community, has the ability to offer outcomes that could offer greater satisfaction leading to an ultimate ambition-to the benefit of all, denying none.

Mr Bromley-Martin stated that the venue was an ideal location in regards to the Borough, the space, the transport links and wished it to be the beginning of a long relationship with the London Borough of Merton.

**My observations:**

With this organization's ambition to have a long relationship with the London Borough of Merton, should not the safety, security and integrity of the London Borough of Merton its staff and citizens be of paramount concern?

**I now refer to the above issues to where I indicated I would return in conclusions.**

(a): A previous Licensing Sub-Committee was able to ensure the local community's concern for those attending events staged in Morden Park, would in future be reciprocated by those intending to stage events in Morden Park. Up until this 2017 We Are the Fair event the measures introduced by that earlier Licensing Sub-Committee has been received by the local community as mutually successful. However, with the advent of the We Are the Fair 2017 event, it appears that earlier Licensing Sub-Committee-a mutually agreed success-has set a bar at such a standard it appears unable to be followed by later Licensing Sub-Committee's. However, also influencing this issue is the matter of sound volume measurements 'on-site', and the excessive sound volumes *experienced* by those in surrounding residential community in close proximity to Morden Park and events staged there. The video evidence provided to this Committee indicates 'wind' conditions can offer less confirmation for 'carrying sound' than it is usually given credit for. One suggests *technical knowledge* offers *limited empirical knowledge*-temporary, continues to develop- but, *knowledge gained by experience and reason*-as with those in the surrounding residential community-can be limitless. The local residential community also applied reason with their earlier Licensing Sub-Committee request for mutual reciprocation which, up until this 2017 We Are the Fair event, has proved successful.

(b): I suggest the video evidence provided as part of this written submission sufficiently indicates serious administrative surgery is required, not least to protect the safety, security and *integrity* of all-including, institutionally, the LBM itself-associated with events in any of the London Borough of Merton Parks or any LBM Green spaces.

(c): This item is closely associated with 'b' above. This 2017 event has exposed potential threats not previously realized. Historical 'incidents' have 'reared up', and revealed inadequacies in human understanding of comparatively recent developments, relative to recent past history. Where 'proportionality' is required, it has yet to be realized and/or determined. I'll 'leave that there' assured the Committee will have an understanding of the issues at stake.

(d): Again, this item is closely related to 'b' and 'c' above. The warning identified by the Police Service has proved tangible, not least *many of these will go unreported*. I repeat from above, "*should this not set alarm bells ringing*"? Now I think-*nuff said*.

**At this point in this submission I will copy and paste a selection of my messages relating to We Are the Fair events.**

Dear Jason Andrews,

Dated 1 August 2017

Thank you for your timely response. Due to inadequate dissemination of information about this event, it is now unlikely any further, late input would be welcome. However, due to the above, and more, all information about a repeat of this event, or similar, must be more widely disseminated and ensure everything is being done to meet the concerns of those residents' most affected, is prioritised and uppermost in the minds of all those responsible for its arrangements and administration. I note that this year, no residents made a submission to the License Committee about this event. Those I've spoken with in this vicinity know little, if anything, about this 5 August even-its

quietly 'crept up' on us', especially the, unprecedented, vast scale of this event. It is on such a large scale it is likely we will have to decamp/vacate our home for the whole day, and maybe into the late evening/early hours.

As above, thank you for your timely response

Kind regards

Robert Whitfield

Dear Jason Andrews,

Dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2017

Please, as so often, words can be misinterpreted/misconceived and thereby misrepresented to intent. That said, that could also apply to the words you've chosen. I was given no indication LBM staff were on site at the event-the recipient of my 'phone did not indicate that, other-than identifying herself as LOUISA and her colleague RAMI, the latter with whom I did not speak. With regards to predicted noise levels and the limit set for the event, my message was sent after I assessed the actual noise levels being experienced at different locations, including close to the perimeter fence of the event, and gradually withdrawing towards the perimeter of Morden Park, and at graduating, variable locations off-site of the event. That included conducting/monitoring with my own audio recordings. They have proved sufficient to indicate that, whatever the noise level predicted, or considered compliant with LBMs limitations for the event, those predictions or noise level limits set for the event, appear far higher than should be expected for a surrounding residential community. That suggests insufficient confidence can be associated with the proposed, debriefing meeting, limited to selected representations.

However, one suggests, this event has now given sufficient emphasis for more serious, comprehensive borough-wide discussions/consultations for any proposed future events, especially when considering the potential to negatively affect surrounding residential communities.

I could add much more to the above but, I'll await further developments/what transpires from this point.

Kind regards and best wishes in your continuing endeavours

Robert Whitfield

Dear Robert Hives, Dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 2017

Morden Park event 5 August 2017

Having been away pursuing a project on behalf of another, I now have become aware of your, undated, letter to Morden residents. As is becoming increasingly necessary these few words should not be misunderstood/misconceived and thereby misrepresented as other than observations. After reading your letter it broadly appears you have "consulted with Morden Park residents". Since I've lived in the vicinity of Morden Park for over 40 years' and not had any substantive prior notification about this event-which is on a previously unrealized, vast scale-when your letter includes the words you've "consulted with Morden Park residents" with whom and/or what consultations took place between you prior to this event being 'put on track' to be delivered'? And the outcome of any consultations/discussions between Eastern Electrics and the "Morden Park residents". To whom or what do you refer regarding the latter? That last sentence is necessary since those in the vicinity where I reside-opposite Morden Park-also have had no prior knowledge of this event taking place. Therefore, your assistance would be appreciated by responding to this message identifying those who purport to speak on behalf of others, the latter appearing to be kept blissfully ignorant about this event now due to take place. Currently, I have no idea whomever and/or whatever they could be.

Notwithstanding the above, it appears 'bases have been touched' with the LBM granting the license for this event.

For the benefit of all, including visitors to the event, and those Morden residents who live in the vicinity of Morden Park, one hopes that interprets into an event that reciprocates and meets the benefits and enjoyment of the environment-for all. However, it could also give some indication of whether the interests and welfare of the local residents' is being considered.

Thanking you in anticipation of a positive response

Kind regards

Robert Whitfield

**As indicated above within this submission, and intended to assist the Committee, I will now copy and paste copies of articles I've written which however may, or may not, be of interest to the Committee, but nevertheless intended to support and assist the Committee with its deliberations.**

#### ORAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE MORDEN FORUM 12<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2017

At the outset of this contribution it is necessary for me to indicate: I am an independent researcher-I emphasise INDEPENDENT-with neither political affiliations nor institutional constraints. Also, it is necessary to include that, the greater/vast number of UK citizens' already lead busy, time-consuming lives, surely represented here in this Council Chamber. Perhaps with that in mind I hope those gathered here at this meeting will get some understanding of what follows, and why?

We've just had an oral presentation by Douglas Napier regarding an event that took place in Morden Park in August this year.

Although it was a public event, not only did the event organiser/s receive substantial funds from a paying public but, as a result, the local authority also gained funds. The former for private profit, the latter intended to raise revenue for the benefit of the local community, to provide funding for service provision in the area covered by LBM.

However, if one looks at the wider picture, with reduced funding to local authorities by the Government, either council tax bills need to rise, or reduce services to the local community. One can suggest, the EE event that took place in Morden Park, by the funds raised as a result of that event helped the 'powers that be' in the LBM to maintain, or increase, service provision to the wider LBM local community.

Before I continue I must add here that, the current unprecedented condition of the UK-wide economy was as a result of measures introduced-or earlier successful economic policies being repealed-by successive governments'. They and their 'economic partners' that created this unprecedented level deficit and debt, has since resulted in, previously unnecessary, cumulative economic mismanagement.

What I'm trying to do here with this oral presentation is to link resulting local policies/actions, with government mistakes/errors, which have had no negative material effect on neither the politicians responsible for this economic 'schism', their 'economic partners', instead the burden of such economic mismanagement has been borne by those that elected them to do it!! If someone with the required artistic merit ever gets around to writing a drama about this era, could one believe it would be recognised as a 'farce'?

However, notwithstanding the above, why should the vast majority in a local community, not limited to the LBM, be asked to, ostensibly 'pay twice' for services already payed for? One, through council tax with their hard-earned wages/salaries etc. and two, with the unnecessary noise, polluting interruptions-as indicated with the English Electrics event in Morden Park-to their lives which can lead to unnecessary health risks. There is an, unnecessary, even greater risk for elderly and less-able residents' in the local area.

One way or another, it is likely most in a local community is in receipt of some personal benefit/s of local provision of services, probably too numerous to include here in a simple list but including libraries-which includes on-line access to highly reputable publications otherwise inaccessible. Here I must include that, I'm in receipt of a senior citizens 'Freedom Pass', partly paid for from council receipts and other methods of funding. Again, I will use the word 'emphasise' in the context of a Freedom Pass because without it my-and not only me but many millions more-quality of life would be seriously curtailed which also could lead to experiencing early aging and associated potential health risks, resulting in a potential need for even higher levels of funding.

However, in returning to the above, who has been responsible for this economic debacle that has resulted in these unprecedented levels of public deficit and debt? Why have they never been held accountable? (Some even accumulating vast amounts of wealth the like of which not previously held or even envisaged, by them). Who ultimately, one way or another, 'picks up the bill'?

Those who deny truths can deny untruths. NEVER WAS SO MUCH OWED TO SO MANY, BY SO FEW!!

**Below in the first paragraph is a quotation sent to me and accredited to Dr Samuel Johnson. My response follows that quotation.**

By Robert Whitfield 10<sup>th</sup> October 2015

"If a man does not make new acquaintances as he advances through life, he will soon find himself left alone. A man, Sir, should keep his friendship in constant repair"-unquote.

(Samuel Johnson, 1755) WHY?

*What follows below should be accepted as illustrative when confronted with text that can be perceived as limited by the omission of the context of its original intent.*

Is the above quotation from Samuel Johnson (1755) interesting for what it potentially reveals about the man himself? Does SJ appear to suggest one can be lonely if one fails to continually make/collect new friendships throughout one's lifetime? If so, does that also suggest that, if one fails to continually make/collect new friendships, each current list becomes obsolete and could progressively disappear altogether? While there may be some benefits in friendships, is it possible SJ has an innate need to make/collect new friendships to replenish those he may fail to retain? If so, could that suggest he was a naturally lonely person? Or did he fear the onset of loneliness? In the interests of justice to SJ does it appear the above 1755 quote, attributed to SJ requires an additional explanation of context before possibly reaching ill-informed conclusions based upon limited text? Since SJ is considered a skilled exponent of the literary arts, and formerly an embedded reporter of parliamentary affairs satire, also, would be no stranger to him.

If one considers those 'collected' friendships suggested in Samuel Johnson's above quote to have a greater legitimacy as a result of weight of numbers, could one also consider that legitimacy is questioned since 'value' could be diminished by a 'spread too thin' dilution by numbers? However, could greater 'value' be attained with lesser, concentrated numbers and, conclude a ratio that 'less means more' and has 'greater value' rather than 'greater numbers' and, paradoxically, proportionate

'value' a more acceptable judgement than proportion of numbers? If rarity as a commodity can enhance value, can a disproportionate weight of numbers diminish value?

Note: for the purposes of PC, 'value'='x'. Where 'x' could be subjectively diverse by choice.

However, whatever determines choice, do the above establish that weight of numbers may not have primacy, where variable values of 'x' can determine they have primary legitimacy?

If a 'Billy no mates' is rare can he/she have greater proportionate 'value' determined by 'x', and become an 'exclusive majority' of one?

However, if the above is accepted, and a 'particular' majority outcome is desired and can be achieved by a selected/chosen 'value' (x), with the myriad of possible reasons for particular outcomes ('?'), to determine such a chosen outcome ('?') such a desired outcome could be represented as 'y'- 'y' representing any desired outcome resulting from a required applied value of 'x'. A variable applied value 'x' can be applied to determine required/chosen variant outcomes 'y'. Along with the myriad of reasons, perhaps it is possible to put this theory to a myriad of purposes?

Robert Whitfield

## CONCLUSIONS

Recognising the need for brevity I hope what follows meets that requirement.

With the advent of the We Are the Fair event in 2017, equally important conflicting issues have been raised, none of which was as a result actions taken either by the London Borough of Merton (LBM) Leadership, or supporting politicians-of either persuasion. Those conflicts have influenced local decision making for many years'-not limited to the LBM-and had the effect of inflicting damage on service provision, and the most vulnerable in society.

One is reminded so-called senior politicians have been able to, not only, neutralize any damage to themselves resulting from their own actions/decisions but, also have amassed vast, previously unrealizable, monetary wealth complemented/enhanced with vast amounts of assets-some of the "few" indicated above. This during a, long, period of continuing annual deficits resulting in ever-increasing levels of national debt, to a record level never before known in British history, exceeding the proportionate value debt built-up after WW2.

With due respect to the Committee, and not envious of the position they are in, I feel I cannot continue explaining how we arrived at the status quo. The damage has been done and will be long-lasting. I'm sure, as local decision makers, they already must be aware of the continuing burden this will place upon them. With the equally important conflicting issues facing this Committee, for which they were not originally responsible, I believe any decision this Committee reaches can only attempt to mitigate any damage inflicted upon the many in the local community, resulting from many of the past decisions made by the above-mentioned, privileged few. However, included above in this written submission are issues the Committee may decide cannot be ignored. Perhaps if *truth*, or *jurisprudential determination of a universally recognised truth*, was the paramount *sovereign value*, continuing progress could have resulted. However, the longer the *current legal authority to deny*

*truth continues, continuing progress also can be denied the majority/all. Is that what is meant by the tyranny of the majority by the minority?*

I offer the above to the Licensing Sub-Committee and hope it receives a positive response.