

## **Questions pursuant to Council Procedure 10.1**

The following questions have been received, on notice, from members of the public:

### **Question One**

***From Mary Nolan of Stones Green to Councillor Stock OBE, Leader of the Council:***

*"I am a retired pensioner and I live on the Stones Green 'red route' of the proposed Tendring Motor Rally. It is not clear that the MSA insurance policy sent to me for perusal covers damage to me or my property, as promised by the event organisers. It would appear to be a standard business insurance for professional indemnity against their negligence, not for speeding competition driver error. In fact, the drivers are required by organiser to sign disclaimers for any accident or damage and they have no requirement at all to be insured on the competition routes where they will be speeding. This, despite European directive that the 'VNUK' law should be applied and that they should now in fact have cover for all circumstances. Claiming from the MSA in the event of a competitor accident does not therefore appear to be possible when the drivers are all but uninsurable when speeding along the red routes.*

*Given that the Council has a duty of care to its residents, how does the Council plan to protect property from damage and from future substantially increased insurance premiums for the significantly higher risk of living on a racing track, other than to ensure that the event does not go ahead?"*

### **Question Two**

***From Caroline Lindsay of Little Oakley to Councillor Stock OBE, Leader of the Council:***

*"I strongly believe that there is a very grave national security concern surrounding the staging of the Tendring rally event on the 22nd April or similar events that follow in the future. Neither the drivers nor the marshals are required to be criminal or mental health checked and anyone can enrol as a marshal with an hour's online training and no formal identification. The policing will largely be taken on by these lay people. A car could easily be maliciously driven at high speed into the crowds by an aberrant driver on the day.*

*Given that the Council has a duty of care to its residents, how does the Council plan to fully protect them from malicious attack other than to ensure that the event does not go ahead?"*

### Question Three

**From Neil O'Hare of Little Oakley to Councillor Stock OBE, Leader of the Council:**

*"I am concerned about the safety controls for this event in relation to the marshalling of the event. I presume there is a Risk Assessment that the organisers have provided for the rally, in order for this to be "Suitable and Sufficient" the Risk Assessment would, I expect, include the minimum number of marshals required to safely police the event, their locations, duties and level of qualification required. As the event is stretched over a considerable portion of the day it would seem reasonable that there would be sufficient additional marshals to relieve people who have been at their posts for long periods or who need to step away for other reasons. My concern is that I have seen comments in the public press reported as being made by the organisers stating that "between 500 and 1000" marshals (presumably suitably trained and registered as appropriate) would be available.*

*This is obviously a wide range and gives no indication of what the absolute safe minimum of marshals is. Presumably the Risk Assessment is explicit about this.*

*In relation to these concerns, my question is as follows:*

*Has TDC had access to the Risk Assessment and has this been examined by a suitable person who is qualified to comment as to its suitability and sufficiency? Does the Risk Assessment include a minimum number of marshals required to safely run the event and what would happen if the level of marshals available fell below the minimum level before or during the event?"*