

29 Chapel Brow,  
Leyland  
Preston,  
PR25 3NH

(email is preferred)

24<sup>th</sup> November 2018

The Licensing Section  
South Ribble Borough Council  
PR25 1DH  
(By Hand but also by email to [licensing@southribble.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@southribble.gov.uk))

Sir,

**Indigo, 1A Fleetwood St, Leyland, PR25 3NL -Licensing Application**

My name is Tom Peil. My details above. I wish to object to the application for a Premises Licence/Club Premises Certificate at 1a Fleetwood Street, Leyland, PR25 2NL. These premises are three doors away from me: I am a near neighbour and a directly concerned resident.

Fleetwood Street is, a wholly residential cul de sac with the single exception of the corner premises until recently occupied by the Knights of St Columba Club. The Knights Club was a quiet club of the nature of a working men's club with a membership base of mature local people who being local mature people were often and mostly my neighbours with a regard and respect for the the locality.

The premises are on the corner of Chapel Brow and Fleetwood Street with the entrance being on Fleetwood Street. Chapel Brow is composed almost entirely of commercial properties. Fleetwood St is, other than No 1A, entirely residential. Being a cul de sac, it is shielded from commercial activity which is a mixture of day-time offices and shops but also part of the night time economy providing a number of fast food take-aways. These fast food operations are restricted to closing at midnight and in most cases, probably all, are closed before this but are certainly those near me closed by midnight.

I object on these grounds following:

**Failure of Notification**

I heard of this application by chance yesterday, 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018 and further investigations showed that objections must be with you by 28<sup>th</sup> November. This hardly gives time to put together a coherent objection and I must wonder why this application has been kept so secret. Why were residents not informed? But for a chance, conversation I would not have been able to object until too late. There has been no press publicity, no local

signage, no indication on the premises themselves and no communication with residents.

### **Public Nuisance**

Proposals to permit music until midnight, or 2.15am Fridays and Saturdays together with the lengthy supply of alcohol times (always up to midnight, up to 2 am weekends) will adversely affect quality of life on Fleetwood Street and my home on Chapel Brow, might well be dangerous and will affect property prices. This through the noise of live and recorded music and vehicles, taxis and cars, attempting to park, turn and reverse in this residential cul-e-sac during what used to be called the silent hours and which should, in a residential cul-de-sac, still be the silent hours.. That property prices will be affected is clear; who would buy a house with a near certainty of social nuisance?

There is no place for large brewery delivery vehicles to park. They will use, as they have done in the past, the disabled parking spaces in front of my house on Chapel Brow. From a club membership numbering in the tens into what is proposed to be in the hundreds deliveries and the obstruction caused by delivery vehicles will be increased. Perhaps from once or twice a week to, perhaps, several times a week. Since the KSC club closed it has been a relief to have the disabled parking spaces returned to us.

The fast food operations currently restricted to an earlier closing will now be quite reasonably tempted to stay open later to cater for the newly created market from these premises and this will add to the late night nuisance.

### **Public Safety and Protection of Children from Harm**

**Noise.** Children and adults will be adversely affected by noise and music into the early hours preventing sleep and normal relaxation through the evening. Lack of sleep perhaps contributing to inattention and misbehaviour at school.

**Parking** will be required throughout the opening times and this will cause congestion on the street and in the back lanes. Fleetwood Street is a residential cul de sac with families and vehicles will inevitably have to turn and reverse in the street. This will be a danger to both adults and children but especially to children.

**Intimidation.** Smoking is not permitted inside and smokers will congregate on Fleetwood Street and our back lanes where there will also be the temptation to use them as urinals. Groups of drinkers will congregate around the entrance to the proposed club and by their presence will be intimidating especially to women and children who have no other route but to walk past, and perhaps through, these groups,. Catcalling, wolf whistling and sexual intimidation beyond even midnight.

### **Crime and Disorder**

**Property Risk.** There will be a risk to property. I park my car in our back lane and have done so for almost 40 years; I have nowhere else to park (and why should I?) and the prospect is that it will be the casual target for drunken louts late at night – if use of these

premises permits me a parking space.

**Racial Hatred.** Directly opposite the club on the corner of Fleetwood Street is an Islamic Place of Worship – a Mosque – which presently co-exists amicably with residents. It is next door but one to me. There is a risk that this could become a target of racial hatred. There have been attacks on Mosques all over the country and the fear is very real. You will be aware that there have been racial attacks in the fairly recent past on some of the fast food takeaways on Chapel Brow after some atrocity. I feel the risk is high especially in the light of attacks on Chapel Brow premises in the past and should not be ignored.

### **Contravention of the Human Rights Act**

**Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights** provides a requirement of respect for one's private and family life and home, subject to certain restrictions that are "*in accordance with law*" and "*necessary in a democratic society*".

The proposal contravenes my right to a private life and respect for my home. This right is not absolute and may be restricted if a restriction is in accordance with law **and** is necessary in a democratic society. To breach my right both conditions are necessary.

I have shown clearly above that my home life will be severely affected. The proposals may be in accordance with law if approved but they are **not** necessary in a democratic society.

### **Conclusion**

There has been no notification of the application. There are risks of public nuisance, crime and disorder, danger to adults, intimidation of residents (especially to women), danger to children (who should be protected from harm) and the risk of racial hatred. Human Rights will be restricted.

The application should be refused.

Tom Peil