Dear Sir or Madam

I write in a personal capacity on this subject and would draw your attention to my letter published in the JEP (in addition to others) as attached.

I have this evening posted the following post on your forum:-

"This debate appears to be confused solely with the policing of Jersey Live, it should not be as this is about the general principle of user pays and not about a single event. I write, however, as a neighbour to Jersey Live (JL) and concerned regarding the level of policing when compared to the general disorder and anti social behaviour experienced in this vicinity. I am also a Trinity rate payer and taxpayer and expect the use of public and voluntary resources to be transparent and accountable. To take JL as an example then this event has been sponsored and supported by Economic Development (EDD) since its inception by direct grants, funding, sponsorship and advertising amounting to in excess of £50,000. It has also received a very significant amount of free policing. The event itself is, however, a commercial profit making, private business venture. I am in discussion with EDD regarding the disclosure for public consumption the profit and loss trading accounts of JL so that the public can be properly informed and make a better judgement regarding the organisers very public protestations about being required to pay for a fraction of this year's policing costs. So far these figures have not been disclosed by EDD and/or the organisers. It cannot be right that personal profits/fortunes are being made on the one hand whilst public resources are being drained on the other. I have a series of correspondence with EDD and would be most keen to share this with the scrutiny panel to assist in their deliberations on this subject. It goes without saying, therefore, that I wholeheartedly support the general notion of user pays in respect of commercial profit making ventures."

I would be very pleased to share my exchange of correspondence with EDD with whomever is considering this topic.

Regards

David Minty

Dear Editor

I write as a neighbour to the Jersey Live venue. Readers may be aware that I am a police officer but I am not involved in any way with the policing operation at Jersey Live and so these views expressed are strictly my own.

Your 3rd Sept editorial asserted that residents' concerns were unfounded and that the event was over policed. On Saturday afternoon I discovered a drunken male adult trespasser urinating in my driveway some 40 yards from the public road. I reported this to a nearby Police Officer and he was taken to the Parish Hall to be seen by the Centenier. On Sunday it was noticeable that in the lanes near the venue there was evidence of stale urine, human excrement, empty alcohol cans, drinks bottles, as well as other litter. Later a group of intoxicated adult males went past our house lobbing partially full beer cans into gardens, including my own, obviously dangerous. A security guard nearby saw the incident and I reported it to an Honorary Police Officer who said that there were not enough officers on duty to deal with such matters. By Tuesday morning there had been no clear up of litter in the lanes. Residents' concerns regarding litter and anti-social behaviour were not unfounded but borne out, unfortunately.

My neighbours and I are tolerant and have put up with the noise,

disruption and traffic diversions. We are not against people enjoying themselves at the music festival. I do believe, however, that we can be entitled to expect a minimum level of policing to eliminate such anti-social conduct. The stewarding and level of policing inside the venue appeared to be adequate this year and certainly an improvement on previous years. I would not like the event to be repeated in future with any less police resources deployed given the potential for volatility. Indeed I will be suggesting to the authorities that the policing effort outside the venue be actually enhanced for next time round.

The organizers are quoted in the JEP as complaining about the high cost to them of the policing operation. As I understand the position they are only meeting the costs of the mutual aid effort. The rest of the expense is being met by the States of Jersey Police and the commitment from them and the Honorary officers from all over the Island is significant.

Clearly this is a commercial event subsidised by public money and consuming other public and voluntary resources. As the policing costs are a contentious issue then it is time for the profit and loss accounts, properly audited, to be published for all to see.

Regards

David Minty Trinity Resident