

## Entertainment Licensing

JA Prem/03871/001

**From:** KEVIN WARD [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 01 November 2016 19:13  
**To:** Entertainment Licensing  
**Subject:** Application PREM/03871/001

01 NOV 2016

RECEIVED

We write to object to the above application by JD Wetherspoon Plc for a premises Licence for the sale of alcohol at the former Elinor Lupton Centre, Headingley Lane, LS6 1B. We live in Orville Gardens, a small road directly opposite the site and would therefore be near neighbours to the proposed pub.

Firstly, the Elinor Lupton Centre is situated in the middle of Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) Area 2, Headingley and Hyde Park. This policy was put in place precisely to ensure that the number of alcohol led premises (bars, pubs and nightclubs) did not continue to proliferate within the area and have a (negative) cumulative impact. Given that Wetherspoons' application concerns a 'super-pub' potentially accommodating some 1,000 customers, it is both nonsensical and dishonest for Wetherspoons to claim that their pub will not add to the cumulative impact of licensed premises in the area. Maintaining, as Wetherspoons have done, that the premises will be 'of a high standard' and 'well managed' are not sufficient grounds for granting a licence in a CIP area.

Furthermore, it is our view that this application contravenes all 4 licensing objectives.

### Crime and Disorder

The impact of the 'Otley Run' and the location of the Elinor Lupton Centre half way between Headingley and Hyde Park is highly significant. As long-standing (40 years) residents of Hyde Park and Headingley, we have noted the ever increasing frequency of disorderly, raucous behaviour in association with this. Students are not the only culprits. Weekend days regularly attract large groups of predominantly male drinkers who come to Headingley specifically for this pub crawl. Traffic is not infrequently brought to a complete standstill by the antics of drinkers spilling out of the Original Oak and Skyrack. Acts of vandalism / removal of traffic cones etc is also a regular feature.

### Public Safety

Further to the traffic issue just outlined, where the proposed pub is sited lies outside of the above bottleneck, between speed cameras, and thus precisely where drivers will invariably increase their speed. The egress at this point, onto a consistently busy road, of large numbers of invariably inebriated young people is not conducive to increased public safety. Additionally, the associated taxi traffic is bound to compromise public safety - this is very visible currently outside the 'Box' in Headingley.

### Public Nuisance

The well documented features connected with excessive alcohol consumption - noise (singing, chanting, shouting), inconsiderate or boorish behaviour to others (in this instance often anyone seeking to walk to and from Headingley on the pavement), the regular presence of vomit /broken glass etc are all issues that local residents have to contend with already. The proposed application will both increase existing levels of public nuisance and add to it by the noise of customers leaving these particular premises. This will be particularly acute for residents of the Buckingham and the Manors.

### Protection of Children

The residents of the streets closest to the proposed pub are in fact families. As more students now choose to live in purpose-built accommodation, the numbers of families with children in our area is increasing. The impact on local children of a 'super-pub' virtually on their doorstep cannot surely be identified as a positive one. Additionally, there are primary schools close to the Elinor Lupton in both directions and if plans currently being discussed for Spring Bank pupils to be accommodated

at Rose Court, then young children will be moving between the two sites during the day and having to pass the proposed pub.

We strongly object to this application for a premises licence and would urge the licensing authority to refuse it.

Marianne and Kevin Ward

