

Tilley Award 2005

Application form

The following form must be competed in full. Failure to do so will result in disqualification from the competition.

Please send competed application forms to Tricia Perkins at patricia.perkins@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

All entries must be received by noon on the 29 April 2005. Entries received after that date will not be accepted under any circumstances. Any queries on the application process should be directed to Tricia Perkins on 0207 035 0262.

1. Details of application

Title of the project: **POLICING THE GLASTONBURY FESTIVAL**

Name of force/agency/CDRP: **AVON AND SOMERSET CONSTABULARY**

Name of one contact person with position/rank (this should be one of the authors):

T/Superintendent Adrian Coombs

Email address: **Adrian.coombs@avonandsomerset.police.uk**

Full postal address:

**Operations Department
Police Headquarters
PO Box 37
Valley Road
Portishead
BS20 8QJ**

Telephone number: **01275 816884**

Fax number: **01275 816203**

Name of endorsing senior representatives(s): **Rod Hansen**

Position and rank of endorsing senior representatives(s): **Assistant Chief Constable (Operations)**

Full address of endorsing senior representatives(s):

**Police Headquarters
PO Box 37
Valley Road
Portishead
BS20 8QJ**

2. Summary of application

In no more than 400 words please use this space to describe your project. Include details of the problem that was addressed a description of the initiative, the main intervention principles and what they were designed to achieve, the main outcomes of project particularly in relation to the problem, evidence was used in designing the programme and how the project is evaluated.

The Glastonbury Festival at Pilton in Somerset is the largest music festival in Europe and it results in the largest policing operation in the South-West. For most of the year the site is a dairy farm but for five days around the last weekend in June, this farm is transformed into a festival site for 150,000 people. The event is licensed by Mendip District Council.

Throughout the 1990s there were significant crime and disorder problems at the festival. By 2000 the number of persons on site was estimated to be in excess of 250,000 which was over twice the licensed number. The reported crime (excluding drug offences) that year reached 2,276 offences and understandably serious concerns were raised in relation to crime, disorder and safety issues.

As a result, the Avon and Somerset Constabulary, Mendip District Council and several other agencies objected to the licence application for the festival in 2001. After due consideration the organisers agreed to cancel that event.

This action focused both the minds of the organisers and the other agencies and led to the current partnership approach to both the planning and also to the operational delivery of a festival, with a strategic lead being provided by a Tri-Partite Group. In addition to this group, there are seven other key partners, four security companies and a number of voluntary organisations.

This partnership approach has achieved an outstanding improvement for the festivals that have been held since 2002. The reduction in crime since the year 2000 from 2,276 offences to just 376 offences in 2004 (an 80% reduction) is testimony to this effort. All other indicators show similar reductions. For example, calls for police services have reduced by 88%.

Throughout the process, planning and co-ordination within the police has been undertaken by a mix of police officers and police staff from the Operational Planning Unit at Headquarters. This small team has combined the planning function with the normal day-to-day activities of the Unit.

Feedback from the local community, colleagues, partnership agencies and festival goers indicates that the very nature of the event has changed for the better. Many of the crime reduction strategies that have been established over the last 3 years will be implemented for festivals in the future.

This document describes the work undertaken by the partner organisations in recognising the problems and then identifying and implementing solutions.

3. Description of project

Describe the project following the guidance above in no more than 4000 words

SCANNING AND ANALYSIS

The following key issues were identified from the multi-agency debrief process which took place following the June 2000 festival.

Numbers Attending

The festival had grown over a period of 30 years from a small gathering to an event which in 2000 was licensed for 100,000 people. However it is estimated that in excess of 250,000 persons were actually on site that year. A culture had developed where entry could be obtained without a ticket. Criminals set up unofficial entry points which resulted in disputes and serious offences, including one attempted murder and a double stabbing. In addition, excessive numbers compromised many aspects of public safety on the site.

Inadequate Management

The organisers' management structure lacked clarity and resilience. Roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined and too much responsibility was vested in the sole organiser. There was an amateur ethos within the organisation.

Local Disruption

Serious traffic disruption was caused over a wide rural area which does not have a good road infrastructure. The village of Pilton has a population of just 1,500. The bus drop-off point was on the edge of the village which meant that large numbers of visitors had to walk through Pilton and then along unlit lanes. In addition to disturbing the residents, this made the visitors vulnerable to crime. Whilst the organiser encouraged the use of Castle Cary Railway Station, the facilities at that site were inadequate and sometimes unsafe for the numbers using it.

Unauthorised Camping

The event often attracted large groups of people to the area, who sought to hold their own alternative festivals on land without permission. The local authority were somewhat hesitant in tackling the issue and there were no clear agreements in place.

Unauthorised Car Parks

A number of unauthorised car parks were established each year, mainly for the benefit of visitors who arrived without a ticket. They were unlit and unsupervised and became hot-spots for crime.

Crime

Levels of crime were significantly higher than normal for the locality. Many visitors were young and vulnerable, and those near the fence were often the victims of robbery. Overcrowding on the site itself undermined the effectiveness of the police, and neither the organiser nor the Licensing Authority was able to exert sufficient control to reduce the amount of crime.

Security and Stewards

There were failures in the quality, training and performance of the security personnel and there was evidence of dishonest ticketing practices among some of the staff. This in turn contributed to the excessive numbers on site. Many of the stewards were provided by local charitable organisations and whilst well intentioned, were mainly untrained.

Perimeter Fence

The rural location of the 600-acre site made it difficult to secure and the perimeter fence was inadequate for this purpose. It could be climbed over, tunneled under or simply dismantled as part of an organised trespass.

Conclusion

As a result of these matters and the fact that several organisations indicated that they would object to the grant of a licence, the organiser cancelled the event planned for 2001 in order that the issues could be addressed. A Tri-Partite Group was formed consisting of Mendip District Council, the Organiser (Glastonbury Festivals Ltd) and the Avon and Somerset Constabulary. The overriding objective for the group was (and remains) –

To work in partnership to deliver a safer and more crime-free festival and to reduce the impact of the event on the surrounding community.

The SARA and the POP process is in fact a dynamic five-year plan in which working in partnership is seen as the key to success. More details of the problems, the action plans and the results are contained in the following charts.

| THE PROBLEM | ACTION PLAN | RESULTS |
|--|---|---|
| Levels of crime | <p>Create the Tri-Partite Group to address the issues at the strategic level and also to create a Tri-Partite Crime Reduction Group. Identify hot-spot areas by location, time of day, victim and offender.</p> <p>Provide improved lighting, CCTV, watch towers, move fence lines to incorporate dark lanes. Implement joint police/security deployment on site.</p> <p>Implement a media campaign before and during the festival. Organiser to provide a Crime Reduction Manager to work with the police and the Local Authority.</p> <p>Police Crime Reduction Officers to be on duty throughout the festival.</p> <p>Target the deployment of police resources.</p> | <p>Impetus for the Licensing Authority to become involved in crime reduction.</p> <p>Crime reduced considerably.</p> <p>Police resources used more effectively.</p> <p>Quality of life improved for local residents and visitors to the festival.</p> |
| Need to be more intelligence driven | <p>Set up a dedicated intelligence cell before and during the event together with a Crime Management Unit and an analyst at the festival site.</p> <p>Share the intelligence with other police forces.</p> <p>During the event produce an eight-hourly NIM tactical assessment on current crime and also produce briefing sheets for patrolling officers.</p> <p>Share the information with the organiser and the Licensing Authority (including the 8-hourly Silver on-site meetings).</p> | <p>More effective use of intelligence. Police Commanders able to make a dynamic assessment and then brief and deploy resources accordingly.</p> <p>Other agencies more engaged in dealing with the problems.</p> <p>More effective partnership working.</p> |

| THE PROBLEM | ACTION PLAN | RESULTS |
|--|--|---|
| Criminals attending from other areas | <p>Organiser to provide postcode analysis of ticket purchases. Crime Pattern Analysis used to target criminals.</p> <p>Regional collaboration for ANPR vehicle checks.</p> <p>Use arrest records of previous years to identify place of residence – arrange for Merseyside officers to work alongside the Intelligence Unit at the festival site.</p> <p>Use Superintendent's Section 60 PACE Stop and Search authority where appropriate.</p> | <p>Effective targeting of 'visiting' criminals and criminals arrested before they could reach the festival.</p> <p>Merseyside, Manchester and London criminals appear to have 'given up' and arrests of people from those areas have been dramatically reduced.</p> |
| Car park crime | <p>Provide CCTV in official car parks plus lighting and watch towers.</p> <p>Arrange joint police/security deployment.</p> <p>Work with the Licensing Authority and the organiser to remove the unofficial car parks.</p> | <p>Car park crime reduced.</p> <p>Greater reassurance provided for the local community.</p> |
| Thefts from tents and pick-pocketing | <p>Arrange a media campaign before and during the event.</p> <p>Set up a web-site and web-chat before the event.</p> <p>Emphasise the use of property lock-ups.</p> <p>Arrange joint police/security deployment.</p> | Crime reduced. |
| Crime – possible displacement plus a need to re-assure the residents of nearby villages | <p>Recognise that criminals with no ticket will remain outside the festival site.</p> <p>Hold meetings with Parish councils.</p> <p>Install CCTV and additional lighting in the village and fence vulnerable properties.</p> <p>Organiser to provide a security contractor for the villages. Joint police/security deployments in Pilton village.</p> <p>Create the Tri-Partite 'drop in' office in the village for residents.</p> | <p>Very little crime in the village and surrounding area.</p> <p>Residents reassured by the arrangements. Greater understanding of their concerns and more rapid and effective response.</p> |
| Need to improve standard of security staff and stewards | <p>Memorandum of Understanding established with the contractors. Meeting held with contractors and their solicitors.</p> <p>All managers and team leaders briefed by a senior police officer.</p> <p>Agreed vetting process implemented.</p> <p>Agreed training procedures and qualifications.</p> | <p>Standards of behaviour and competence now much improved.</p> <p>Security staff now playing a more effective crime reduction and detection role.</p> |

| THE PROBLEM | ACTION PLAN | RESULTS |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Stewards to be trained to NVQ standards.</p> | <p>Stewards more effective.</p> |
| Inability to control crowd numbers | <p>Agree the design and provision of a new fence and implement security patrols on the perimeter.</p> <p>Change the culture of 'you don't need a ticket to get in!' by use of the media.</p> <p>Tighten up on ticket sales and require proof of purchase.</p> <p>Establish a Tri-Partite Audit Team to monitor fence, turnstile, crowd numbers and other licence issues.</p> <p>Agree and implement an eviction policy.</p> <p>Implement a joint operation to deal with ticket touts.</p> | <p>Fence not breached or dismantled. Crime reduced on the perimeter.</p> <p>The culture has changed.</p> <p>Visitor numbers do not exceed the number on the licence.</p> <p>A safer, more manageable event.</p> <p>The ability of the emergency services to respond to serious incidents no longer compromised.</p> |
| Disruption to the surrounding area | <p>Create a more effective traffic management plan.</p> <p>Move the bus drop-off point to within the festival site.</p> <p>Establish a joint working group to agree and implement improvements at Castle Cary Railway Station.</p> <p>Agree a plan for abandoned vehicles.</p> | <p>Traffic moves more freely with less hold-ups.</p> <p>Visitors no longer have to walk through the village and along unlit lanes.</p> <p>Safer environment at the Railway Station.</p> <p>Less disruption in the narrow country lanes.</p> |
| Unauthorised camping | <p>MOU established with surrounding police forces re. Intelligence, action and resources.</p> <p>Heighten the awareness of the displacement of travellers from the Solstice at Stonehenge to Glastonbury.</p> <p>Implement a Force-wide operation to provide intelligence flow, a management structure and resources.</p> <p>Agree a Tri-Partite MOU and implement a joint action to discourage the establishment of unofficial camp sites near the festival site.</p> | <p>No unauthorised camping occurred in 2004.</p> |
| Inadequate management | <p>Organiser required to produce and implement a business plan showing management structure and the decision making process, together with roles and responsibilities for the managers.</p> | <p>An effective and resilient management team.</p> |

ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT

The Annual SARA Process – Planning, Meetings, Consultation and Operation

Consultation and documents exchanged at all levels where required.

| LICENSING BOARD Mendip District Council | TRI-PARTITE GROUP Glastonbury Festivals Ltd Mendip District Council Avon and Somerset Constabulary | AVON AND SOMERSET CONSTABULARY |
|---|---|---|
| Licence application by GFL (October) | Tri-Partite group planning meetings held monthly after the licence has been granted (January to June) | A&SC hold planning meetings with various police units who then own their business areas (February to June) |
| Licensing Board request submissions from all agencies and the public regarding the licence application (November) | Tri-Partite meetings minuted with all conditions and milestones issues recorded | At first planning meeting the strategy and objectives are set for the festival operation (February) |
| Licensing Board hold public hearing (December) | Sub groups established where necessary, for example the Emergency Planning Group and the Crime Reduction Group, both multi-agency | Operational Order/PowerPoint presentation published on the force intranet as a briefing tool for all staff policing the event (May) |
| Licence granted (or rejected) with conditions to be agreed via the Tri-Partite meetings (December/January) | Table Top Exercise held at MDC one week prior to the event to test command structures and plans (June) | Constabulary briefing session held for command team 2 weeks prior to the event (June) |
| Milestones set for completion of conditions | Festival takes place with Gold/Silver/Bronze command structure for all agencies (June) | Festival takes place with Gold/Silver/Bronze command structure in place (June) |
| Any major variations in the conditions to be reported back to the Licensing Board | Tri-Partite Silver meetings 3 x daily at command compound on festival site (June) | General debrief for all staff takes place via e-mail (July) |
| Conditions signed off by Tri-Partite group and formally accepted by Licensing Board | Tri-Partite "hot debrief" held at conclusion of festival to capture initial thoughts (June) | Command team minuted debrief meeting held (August) |
| Festival takes place where Tri-Partite group Audit Team verify compliance with conditions at festival (June) | Tri-Partite minuted debrief held to capture lessons learnt, establish what went well and what can be improved (August) | Planning team minuted debrief meeting held (August) |
| Licensing Board request debrief submissions from all agencies (September) | Any issues affecting the licence conditions and milestones are recorded and incorporated into the next festival licence application | Evaluation report published by Corporate Development Department utilising statistics from police databases (September) |

Public meetings throughout with Town and Parish Councils and Villages.

ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE

Tri-Partite Group

Glastonbury Festivals Limited, Mendip District Council and the Avon and Somerset Constabulary have agreed measures to deal with the strategic issues emerging from earlier festivals. They are reflected in the following documents.

Statement of Intent

This defines the respective roles and responsibilities of the Tri-Partite Group.

Risk Assessment

The festival is a risk assessed against historical events of similar gatherings, lessons learned from previous Glastonbury Festivals, issues affecting the licence application for the forthcoming event, intelligence and information from any agency, together with terrorism and security issues, staffing levels and emerging safety issues.

Memorandum of Understanding – Festival

This document defines the roles and responsibilities of the three agencies in respect of -

- Structure of Tri-Partite meetings
- Raves
- Unlicensed music events
- Unauthorised camping
- Intelligence co-ordination
- Vehicle removal plan and storage arrangements
- Unauthorised car parks
- Availability of bailiffs to serve injunction notices
- Availability of official car parks
- Provision of welfare and emergency rest centre facilities
- Ticket touts and Trading Standards role / issues
- Tri-Partite village office / drop in centre for the local community

Memorandum of Understanding – Security Companies

This protocol defines the working practices of the security companies in relation to -

- Behavioural standards
- Level of vetting
- Dress code
- Eviction policy
- Property issues
- Evidential awareness and video evidence procedures
- Use of force
- Searching powers
- Safe use of vehicles
- Level of training

The Statement of Intent, Risk Assessment and the Memorandum of Understanding are contained in separate documents which are agreed and 'signed off' at appropriate stages at the Gold level prior to the festival taking place.

Crime Pattern Analysis

Since 2002 the Avon and Somerset Constabulary has produced a Crime Pattern Analysis after each festival. The aim is to provide an overview of the crime and disorder issues for that festival and to identify trends and hot spots using the Victim/ Offender/Location problem analysis triangle as a model. This paper is then used as the foundation for the next festival and acts as an authoritative guide for all partnership agencies in order that an effective crime and disorder reduction strategy can be agreed and implemented.

Pictures

New breach-proof perimeter fence used since 2002.

An example of the effective use of the CPA and working in partnership is provided by the area known as Cockmill Lane. This narrow lane is located just outside the security fence to the North West of the site. It was bordered by high hedges. It was unlit, and yet it was a busy pedestrian area as it provided a cross over link between the car parks and the festival site. Analysis and experience showed that it was a hot-spot for robberies. It was dangerous for festival goers and some police officers expressed concerns for their own safety when deployed to that locality. One officer described it as being 'like Beirut on a bad night'. The Tri-Partite Group agreed to move the perimeter fence and bring the lane within the licensed site area. This resolved the significant robbery problem at that location

ASSESSMENT/STATISTICS 2000 TO 2004

Reported crimes at the festival have fallen by 80% since 2000. Extracts from the crime figures are given below. These statistics can be analysed still further to provide more detailed information. For example they can be sub-divided into crime committed on and off the festival site, at various sectors on and off the site, and at different times of the day and night, given that the event runs continuously for five days.

| CRIME | 2000 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Total (excluding drugs offences) | 2276 | 942 | 534 | 376 |
| Of which - | | | | |
| Other wounding | 27 | 21 | 15 | 9 |
| Robbery – personal | 157 | 84 | 18 | 3 |
| Other theft | 1519 | 439 | 338 | 187 |

Calls for Police Services

Calls for police services have fallen by 85% since 2000. Only 24 calls in 2004 (26%) required urgent or prompt response compared to 344 calls (47%) for the festival in 2000.

| Year | Calls for police services | + / - | % Change |
|------|---------------------------|-------|----------|
| 2000 | 613 | n/a | n/a |
| 2002 | 231 | -382 | -62.3% |
| 2003 | 215 | -16 | -6.9% |
| 2004 | 93 | -122 | -56.7% |

Vehicle Removals

Vehicle Removals have fallen by 88% since 2000.

| Year | Vehicle removals | + / - | % Change |
|------|------------------|-------|----------|
| 2000 | 229 | n/a | n/a |
| 2002 | 86 | -143 | -62.4% |
| 2003 | 49 | -37 | -43% |
| 2004 | 28 | -21 | -42.9% |

Arrests

Arrests have fallen by 47% since 2000. Arrests have not fallen as sharply as the other performance indicators and analysis reveals that police officers are spending more time on patrol, hence providing greater value and visible reassurance. A third of all arrests are now direct referrals to police officers from the four security companies. This again provides useful evidence of a more co-ordinated and effective partnership approach.

| Year | Arrests | + / - | % Change |
|------|---------|-------|----------|
| 2000 | 246 | n/a | n/a |
| 2002 | 208 | -38 | -15.4% |
| 2003 | 189 | -19 | -9.1% |
| 2004 | 131 | -58 | -30.7% |

Cost Recovery for Policing Services

Section 25 of the Police Act 1996 enables police forces to provide special policing services in return for payment at rates determined by the Police Authority. Due to a more professional and audited cost recovery process, the recovery of policing costs in relation to the festival has increased by 85% or £405,530 since 2000. A&SC agreed with the organiser prior to the 2003 festival that it would reach a full cost recovery position over a 3-year period.

| Year | Cost recovery | + / - | % Change |
|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 2000 | £477,000k | n/a | n/a |
| 2002 | £650,885k | +£173,885k | +36.5% |
| 2003 | £790,000k | +£139,115k | +21.4% |
| 2004 | £882,530k | +£92,530k | +11.7% |

Note: If resource levels for 2005 were to remain the same, then cost recovery would have been £964,000 (see below).

Police Resources

The resources deployed to the event are assessed annually as part of the planning process. Resources were increased in 2002 due to the problems experienced in 2000 and the fact this was the first festival held under the new partnership arrangements. Since 2002 resources have gradually decreased whilst cost recovery has increased. Resource levels for 2004 when compared to 2000 have fallen by 7.3% or 3,304 hours which equates to 413 tours of duty. A 26% reduction in police resources is planned for the 2005 festival. This equates to 1,223 tours of duty over a 6-day period. This in turn gives a non-cashable efficiency saving of £176,000.

The cost recovery figure for 2005 has been provisionally agreed at £904,500. Whilst this is an increase in the figure for 2004, it accurately reflects the costs involved and will complete the 3-year cost recovery agreement.

| Year | Resources (hours) | + / - | % Change |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 2000 | 45,332 | n/a | n/a |
| 2002 | 49,356 | +4,024 | +8.9% |
| 2003 | 45,202 | -4,154 | -8.4% |
| 2004 | 42,028 | -3,174 | -7% |

Commendation

A letter of commendation was received from the Director of the Street Crime Action Team at the Home Office in July 2003 which stated... "During our review of last week's crime statistics we noted in particular the considerable achievement of your officers in reducing and preventing crime (especially robbery and snatch theft) at the Glastonbury Festival. Please accept my congratulations on the planning and policing that went into this event..."

LONGER TERM ISSUES AND SOLUTIONS

Whilst the reduction in crime is to be welcomed, there remains the potential to design out more crime and to make the event safer and more enjoyable for visitors. Experience shows that each festival brings slightly different problems to the previous one and there is a need therefore to maintain a flexible approach. In addition, the displacement of crime from one area to another must not be overlooked.

Specific initiatives for 2005 will include better lighting and security presence in some car parks, the need to promote a better use of the property lock-ups on the camp sites, and a more joined-up approach to dealing with crime on the site area once the festival has finished and the infrastructure is being removed.

The work of the Tri-Partite Group, which has seen three diverse organisations all working together with equal energy, has already been mentioned and this work will continue into the future. It was pleasing to note that the Local Authority Co-ordinators of Regulatory Services (LACORS) examined the planning arrangements for the 2004 event and determined that they were to be held as best practice nationally for large scale events.

The improvements made since 2000 have delivered consistent crime and disorder reduction and the aim therefore is to continuously improve the policing of the festival with the help, support and co-operation of all the partner agencies. Very solid foundations have been laid for the future and there is no reason therefore why this aim cannot be achieved.

Prepared by the Operational Planning Unit, Avon and Somerset Constabulary