

Entertainment Licensing

JA Prem /03871/001

From: Luke Blumler [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 November 2016 17:18
To: Entertainment Licensing
Subject: PREM/03871/001

Importance: High

**OBJECTION TO PREM/03871/001**

As a permanent resident of the above address for 20 years, which is in close proximity to the Elinor Lupton Building I am writing to object to application PREM/03871/001.

Firstly the building is located in the Cumulative Impact Policy Area 2, an area that already has an excessive number of drinking establishments. Secondly I do not accept the findings of the Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision dated 17th August (Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/16/3147594). Here are my main reasons, quoting from the report:

Paragraph 12 ‘..it is proposed that acoustic fencing would be provided within the yard and parallel to this wall.’ ‘The assessment concluded that, even before the omission of the container bar and rear garden area, noise from these sources would not be likely to adversely impact on residential amenity.’

The building is a high two story building and the fence would need to be of equal height for it to be effective, given that the building with a potential of 1000 customers would act as a speaker of sound that would reflect upon the houses below, I believe that the noise level would disturb local residence severely in the evening.

Paragraph 18. ‘The appellant states that the aim would be for the establishment to be a family-orientated establishment where the majority of spending would be on food rather than drink.’

Will this be the case at 10pm? Of course not, the primary activity will be drinking. The term ‘family pub’ is a misleading term that only applies to day time customers, therefore this sentence is wholly false. This is in fact noted and therefore contradicted in paragraph 19;

‘I consider it likely that, given location and the demographic make up of the area, the establishment would be likely to be attractive to a large student element.’

This admission is the main concern behind the numerous objections that have been made by the local residents. Inevitably there will be more footfall of students passing through the residential area from Victoria Road and beyond and back again at closing time. This will mean loud boisterous behaviour, vomiting, urinating and littering on route. This I can attest to bitterly from passed experience. This anti-social behaviour will undoubtable increase in frequency as a result of this proposal.

Paragraph 20. ‘The appeal premises are freestanding. The nearest residential properties to the west on the opposite side of Richmond Road in Norville Terrace, Back Manor Terrace, Manor Terrace and Manor View have predominantly blank gables facing the site. As already noted, the nearest property to the south, No.3 Richmond Road, is set at a lower level and is screened by a tall and substantial solid wall. Buckingham House is set back from Headingley Lane behind the frontage of the appeal building and the residential properties to the north are set back across Headingley Lane and do not principally face the site.’

This does not mention the houses on Buckingham Grove that face the building. All the houses in this area whether they face the site or not will still be effected by both the noise and increased traffic.

Paragraph 21. ‘Assessment also shows that Headingley Lane in the vicinity of the appeal site has a substantially high ambient noise level resulting mainly from road traffic.’

Although the A660 is a main road, due to the speed cameras and speed restriction of 30mph, hardly any noise can be heard from the residential area south of the road.

'As a result, any additional noise that might be associated with customers coming and going, congregating or using the outside area with seating to the front of the building, is likely to be subsumed within this high level of ambient noise'

This is complete nonsense. Firstly there is hardly any noise from the main road especially around late evening time when traffic is sparse and it certainly is not continuous, whereas the hundreds of conversations emanating from the Pub will of course be continuous. Even if there was noise from the road, as someone who teaches the Physics of sound and the Physiology of hearing, I can assure you that sound is NOT subsumed with other high levels of noise. Soundwaves can in fact be amplified as they travel upon the already existing sound levels that the report speaks of.

Paragraph 22 'In reporting the application to committee with a favourable recommendation, the suggested hours were still more restrictive (Sunday Thursday 08.00- 23.00 and Friday and Saturday, and including public holidays, 08.00-23.30).'

This will be no comfort whatsoever to families with young children and for all the reasons and objections made above, there will be no further families of permanent residents wishing to move into the area if this proposal goes ahead. On the contrary this proposal will lead to an exodus of families in the area.

Lastly it needs to be considered how the Anti-social behaviour scheme would work in the area if this proposal goes ahead? I fear that it would make it ineffective. No reassurances can convince me otherwise that a large Pub with 1000 customers will not create unwanted noise at anti-social hours in the immediate residential area.

In conclusion this proposal will adversely affect the area and lead to a further concentration of student properties with fewer permanent residents. Given the problems the area already has due to late-night drinking I am appalled that such a proposal is even considered let alone could be allowed to go ahead.

Luke Blumler

