

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 05, 2020 5:14 PM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
**Subject:** Re Licensing Application No. 873212

I am writing to make my representation against the above licensing application.

I write as leaseholder of [REDACTED] that is directly above Chapter 72 as well as freeholder of the terraced building that is [REDACTED]

The basis for my objection is that the existing mixed use balance of this part of Bermondsey St in particular should not be allowed to move towards more usage that causes an increase in noise nuisance both internally and externally.

The buildings of this terrace are of unique historical significance and are recognised as such under their listing. They are not however designed to be compatible with loud commercial usage. The cultural mix of Bermondsey St is to be applauded but the current balance should not be undermined.

Internal noise: a move to later opening simply allows that there will be more public nuisance by way of noise transfer through the fabric of the building and dwellings that have adjoining walls and ceilings with the premises of Chapter 72. The division between commercial ground floor and residential first floor of 72 Bermondsey St dates back to 1970s and therefore not to the current standards required for any new conversions. As such it does not have sufficient sound insulation to deal with noise transmission. A later license will mean that late night noise interference to the first floor residential dwelling will increase. This is not in accordance with the licensing objectives, namely the prevention of public nuisance.

External noise: the move to later opening means that there will be noise nuisance from Chapter 72 customers using the external tables. One of the historical characteristics of the terrace of buildings is the low heights between floors. As such the windows of the first floor flat have very little clearance above the table level on the street. Certainly in warmer weather when the windows on first floor will be open there will be increased late night noise interference from Chapter 72 customers using the external tables. This also is not in accordance with the licensing objectives, namely the prevention of public nuisance.

In summary, the license extension would have an adverse effect on licensing objectives. Please note that the triangle bounded by Bermondsey Street, Tower Bridge Road and the Railway has been co-opted as the Borough and Bankside 'Strategic Cultural Area' and as such it is recognised that this area, although of mixed use, has a high residential usage and consideration for the later hours beyond those recommended for a residential area should be accompanied by evidence that the proposal is intended to enhance the provision of arts, culture and tourism in the area. That is not the case with this application.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 05, 2020 6:46 AM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
**Cc:** O'Brien, Damian; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Premises Licence No: 873212

### **Southwark Licensing**

#### **Variation of Premises Licence No: 873212 at Chapter 72, Bermondsey Street**

On behalf of my company Shiva Ltd and myself personally we object to the extension of the opening hours at these premises.

I live in Globe House on the [REDACTED] and the late opening of drinking establishments in Bermondsey St causes regular disturbance on the Street, frequently till 3am, particularly from the Hide Bar where noisy groups remain gathered on the street outside the premises long after its far-too-late closing time of 2:00am. Shiva Ltd owns the Tanneries site opposite Chapter 72. Some of our tenants in this complex need to operate overnight providing a 24 hr IT monitoring service to emergency service to clients.

The licensing objectives of 'Public Nuisance' and 'Prevention of Crime and Disorder' are engaged in this instance.

The current opening hours on Monday to Saturday till 22:30 are adequate and suitable for where the premises is located. Bermondsey Street is partially residential street and there are houses and flats situated on either side of and opposite Chapter 72.

The hours are sought to be extended to:

Monday to Saturday till 00:00 hours

Sunday till 23:00 hours

That Bermondsey Street is a partially residential street is acknowledged by Southwark Licensing but completely ignored when the hours and the conditions of licences are granted. The suggested closing times of licences premises applicable to residential areas must be applied to Bermondsey Street, i.e. no later than 23:00.

The triangle area bound by Bermondsey Street, Tower Bridge and the Railway has been 'designated' as a part of the Borough and Bankside strategic cultural area even though it lies outside a town centre.

The Council's Licensing Policy Statement 2019-21 Section 7 says of the 'Bermondsey Street triangle' (and 2 other areas) as follows:

'Clause 170

*It is recognised that these areas, although of mixed use, have a high residential usage and consideration for the later hours beyond those recommended for a residential area should be accompanied by evidence that the proposal is intended to enhance the provision of arts, culture and tourism in the area.'*

A bar or drinking establishment clearly does not fulfil this requirement and extended opening hours should not be permitted.

That other premises on Bermondsey Street have, in contravention of the Council's own policy, been granted later opening hours cannot be a reason to continue this practice for new applications. Rather, other inappropriate late licences should be reviewed, specifically that of Hide Bar.

During the opening hours of a bar/ drinking premises there is inevitably an overspill and a steady stream of people who drink and smoke outside the premises shouting and talking loudly and disturbing residents.

Further, it takes at least half an hour - and often much longer for the bars to clear and all patrons to disperse after closing time. A dispersal policy only suggests best practice. A notice on the door is useless in terms of controlling behaviour. The policy is not followed or enforced. The loud noise and drunken behaviour continues unchecked until the last of the groups leave.

This proposed extension of hours would mean that the disturbance continues as late as 1:00am.

The variation will permit up to 4 people to sit outside till 00:00 hours and up to 5 people allowed to smoke outside the premises. The noise disturbance that would be caused by this to the residents till 00:30 is unreasonable and unacceptable.

Chapter 72 is situated in a Conservation Area and the buildings are restored to maintain original features. The windows cannot and should not be double glazed because of the adverse impact on heritage buildings. So sound easily penetrates into homes becoming particularly disturbing at night when traffic noise is low.

Hours on Sunday should be restricted to a more sensible 17:00. Residents should have at least one day in the week which they can rest and recuperate with their family without the sound of noisy drunken people on the street all day long and till late at night.

The noise impact and public disturbance to residents by extending the hours is obvious. The residents have a right to enjoy their property and amenities. An extension of the hours will make what is already an increasingly noisy and anti-social Bermondsey Street even more so. It was once a lively, unique part of London in a conservation area, retaining its heritage and character with a friendly mix of local shops, restaurants, bars and cafes. Licensing should be preserving and restoring this quality to the area, not further eroding it with licensing hours that attract destination drinkers as the expense of local residents and businesses.

██████████



4<sup>th</sup> October 2020

**Licensing Application No. 873212 – Chapter 72, 72 Bermondsey Street SE1**

We are writing today to oppose Chapter72's application to extend the hours on the licence.

[REDACTED] and have watched (and been part of) the transformation from a forgotten backwater to a vibrant live-work community, and then more recently to what has sadly become a drinkers destination, on a frighteningly large scale. For 18 of those years we lovingly restored [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Bermondsey Street, and now live in [REDACTED]. We are pointing this out to make it perfectly clear that Chapter72 is actually surrounded on all sides by family houses, the residents of which have been living here happily and quietly for many years before Chapter72 appeared on the scene.

When Chapter72 first applied for their licence, we were opposed to it because we believed it was the thin edge of the wedge.

And how true that has become - gone are all the promises that "we are a coffee shop with family values". They are citing their business survival as the excuse to contribute to yet more noise and mayhem, but please may we remind the council that the survival of family enclaves such as this is by far more pressing.

And yes, we say noise and mayhem - Bermondsey Street's character has changed so much in the last few years: the large crowds of noisy, dedicated drinkers think nothing of vomiting, urinating and defecating on our doorstep (recently we had SEVEN men lined up against our house about to urinate on our property), and so we please ask the Council to not exasperate the problem of such antisocial behaviour any further by extending licensing hours.

We have also experienced Chapter72's tables extended as far down as to be in front of our business premises (76a) - we had to ask Chapter72's customers to move their chairs and table so that we could gain access to our property – certainly a bit of a nuisance!

We understand from [REDACTED] et, and agree with him, that extending the licence for 72 Bermondsey Street appears contrary to the Councils own policy, namely Paragraphs 168, 169, 170, 236, 243 and of course 14.

Please listen to our concerns.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

4 October 2020

Dear Sir or Madam

**Re: Application for extension of licence at Chapter 72, 72 Bermondsey Street (Application No. 873212)**

We write to object to the application to extend the hours on the premises licence for Chapter 72.

We live at [REDACTED] Street. Unlike other areas of the street, the area around 72 is almost entirely residential with homes all around it. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. This establishment shares an adjoining wall with the [REDACTED] e which comprises home offices [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This room doubles as the room in which guests (often elderly relatives) stay overnight.

Chapter 72 is marketed as a café but in reality operates increasingly as a cocktail bar. It was previously a hairdressers. At the time of obtaining a licence, promises were made to neighbours and to the licensing authority that the business was going to be "*all about the coffee*" with tasting events and book clubs. That either never happened or has long since gone by the wayside in favour of pushing cocktails and rising noise levels.

We understand that Chapter 72's licence permits them to have two tables outside on which four people can sit.

Even if there are only two tables outside, many more than four people usually congregate outside, standing, drinking and making noise. This noise is easily audible from our ground floor room, as well as our first floor living room and second floor bedroom which overlook the street.

In fact, during the good weather, the Chapter 72 staff increased the number of tables and placed them in front of our home-office window, and on one occasion right across our front door, so that we could not exit the premises. This was done without consultation with us and were removed once we complained. The staff appeared unaware that this was in breach of their licence.

We regularly open the door in the morning to see empty alcohol cups in front of our house. The café's billboard sign not infrequently blocks the opening of one of our front doors. Our eldest son has commented on the vomit in the street near our house and it saddens us that he is growing up thinking this is acceptable adult behaviour. This is not necessarily from

customers of Chapter 72 but is part of the “*new culture*” of Bermondsey Street fostered by the granting of alcohol licences seemingly to anyone who asks.

The lockdown period was particularly unpleasant. Before the lockdown restrictions were lifted so that customers were permitted to go inside the café, customers could be found urinating in the passageway and area behind our house.

The application for an extension of the licence has been made without consultation with us.

We are concerned that extending the opening hours will lead to even more public nuisances of the sort described above.

Permitting people to buy alcohol until midnight will mean even more noise disturbance to us as people congregate outside the premises until then and leave the premises at that time. The staff often play loud music around closing time which adds to the noise nuisance. This is particularly undesirable during the week as we need to be up at around 5.45 am as our eldest son has a long journey to school and needs to leave the house at 7.00 am.

There are already a large number of licensed premises very near to the property, many of which have sprung up in the last few years, drawing large crowds of “*destination*” drinkers to Bermondsey Street. What was at one time a vibrant local community of shops, businesses and local residents has rapidly turned into a party zone for groups of rowdy drinkers.

We had been told several years ago that “*saturation zone*” policies would be applied to Bermondsey Street, so that the number of establishments serving alcohol would be limited, but that does not appear to have occurred.

We have seen the representations provided by our neighbour [REDACTED] Bermondsey Street and agree with his reference to the Council’s own policy on licensing hours. Extending the licence for 72 Bermondsey Street appears contrary to this policy.

We therefore oppose the application to extend the hours on the licence. Any alternative (such as limiting the extension of hours just to those inside) will still cause substantial nuisance as people congregate outside to smoke and leave after midnight after a further hour’s drinking.

We are mindful of the fact that businesses such as Chapter 72 are suffering under Government Covid restrictions. That is not their fault – but nor is it ours. We have lived in this street for considerably longer than Chapter 72 has been in business. They came into the building knowing that it was in the centre of a residential section of the street and applied for an alcohol licence against the express objections of all of their residential neighbours.

Our view has not changed that the alcohol licence should not have been granted in the first place and the conversion of the street in general into a large scale drinking destination has been to the detriment of the previous balance of the area which made Bermondsey Street

so vibrant as a neighbourhood. There is a big difference between a thriving local community and Magaluf. The choice between the two is entirely down to the licensing authority. Extending the Chapter 72's licence will, in our view, be a further step in the wrong direction.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4th October 2020

Dear Sir or Madam

**Application for Extension of License of Chapter 72, 72 Bermondsey Street, London SE1 3UD  
(Application number 873212)**

We are writing to object to the extension of licensing hours for the premises noted above.

We live, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Our house has the bedrooms on the ground floor and living accommodation on the upper floors. As a result, we are affected by any noise created by the café, especially music played late in the evening. Only yesterday, at 10.20pm, we had to ask for the music to be turned down by the staff in the café. We have often heard music in the evening around this time.

We are particularly concerned that if a late license is granted, and music is being played at midnight, then this will make our lives intolerable and in particular, have a detrimental effect on our young children who need their sleep to be ready to learn.

[REDACTED] is a quiet mews off 72 Bermondsey Street. Since Chapter 72 reopened its doors after lockdown, we have seen an increase in both men and women seeking a place to urinate, as well as the number of arguments that take place late at night just outside our ground floor bedroom. In this past month, we had witnessed at least 2 loud arguments late at night. Only separated by an external wall from the arguments, [REDACTED] of what was happening. They asked if we should be calling the police. All of these activities under the influence of late-night alcohol consumption constitute a public nuisance, and are a cause of concern to us as a family, leaving us feeling threatened within our own home.

We acknowledge that Chapter 72 isn't responsible for the behaviour of individuals once they have left the premises. However, it seems likely that if the café were to be open until midnight, the incidence of this type of antisocial behaviour would increase significantly.

What Chapter 72 is responsible for is ensuring that they operate their business inside their existing licensing conditions. They have manifestly failed to do this in regard to the tables outside the café. For example, on 24th July this year, we saw as we walked along Bermondsey Street that the café had placed tables not only in front of Number 72 but also in front of the next two premises (Numbers 74 and 76). We spoke to one of the proprietors of the café at the time to raise our concerns. It was clear that she was either unaware of the license conditions or had deliberately ignored them. If the opening hours are extended, then the opportunity for the café to cause public nuisance could only be increased.

We are aware that Chapter 72 has, like all hospitality businesses, suffered under the Covid-19 lockdown, and wishes to extend opening hours to make up for the lost trade. We are, in general sympathetic, but we don't see why their profits should come at such a cost to us, and our



[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
4 October 2020

**Re Licensing Application No. 873212 – Chapter 72, 72, Bermondsey Street**

I am writing in order to make representations about the application that has been made to vary the premises licence in respect of Chapter 72 at 72, Bermondsey Street.

I will begin by explaining the relative locations of the premises and my home. My property is [REDACTED] the premises. My house projects slightly forward of the street line and I have windows to both my living room and main bedroom which look directly down at the entrance to 72, Bermondsey Street. Customers seated outside the premises are only a few feet away. Even when talking at a normal volume, they are audible inside my home. The main door to the premises is also only a few feet away from these windows and if noisy music is being played inside then it, too is audible.

The basis for my objection is that I am concerned that granting an extension of hours will have an adverse effect on the licensing objectives – in particular the prevention of public nuisance.

As already explained, conversations taking place in the street outside the premises – especially if voices are raised – a common circumstances when people have been drinking – is clearly audible from my sitting room and main bedroom. If this application were allowed, it is likely that disturbance from the noise of people leaving will occur at around midnight. This is too late to be regarded as something which residents can reasonably be expected to tolerate.

Also, there is a regular habit of staff from the premises putting on loud music whilst they clear up the premises after closing. This is also clearly audible from my home when the front door is open.

Far more concerning to me, though, is the possibility of having customers sitting outside the premises until midnight. Licence condition 343 on the current licence permits 4 people to be seated outside and drinking. The application is silent about external customers, so I assume that it is intended to extend the hours for these customers too.

In my experience this condition is barely sufficient at present to keep nuisance at bay and, indeed, if my experience of recent weeks is to continue, then a review application by me is likely.

To begin with, this condition is often not properly complied with. There are often more than the 4 permitted customers sitting outside drinking. This is not just a recent phenomenon. For instance, on 30 June 2018 at 9.15pm there were 12 customers outside, 6 of whom were standing, and who were being noisy. On that occasion I spoke to a member of staff at 9.20pm. They were not aware of the licensing condition and took no action.

More recently, I have often counted 6 to 8 people sitting outside. These customers often make sufficient noise not only for it to be audible inside but is so significant that we have to turn up the sound on the television. I have on several occasions spoken to customers seated outside and pointed out to them that their conversations are clearly audible to me in my house.

During lockdown, things were even worse, with considerable groups of people standing outside drinking. On one occasion when I approached the staff about this it was simply denied that there was a noise being caused.

To extend this degree of interference in my home life until midnight would not be acceptable.

I would, therefore, ask for this application to be refused. If, despite these arguments, it is decided that an extension should be granted, I would ask for a condition to be imposed which makes it clear that any such extension does not apply to the use of the tables outside the premises.

I would like to conclude my representation by making some references to the Council's own licensing policy. Firstly, I understand that there may be good commercial reasons why the applicant is making this application. However, the promotion of commercial interests is not a licensing objective.

I note from paragraph 122 of the policy that applicants should not simply try to replicate later opening hours even if there are other premises nearby that currently operate longer. I am aware that there are some venues locally that may have later licences. However, they are not all in such very close proximity to residential premises.

I am aware that the premises falls within the area covered by the Borough and Bankside Cumulative Impact Policy ("CIP"). Those of us who live on Bermondsey Street have in recent years had to put up with growing levels of disturbance along the street caused by customers leaving licensed premises. Granting this application would only add to that disturbance. Given the CIP, there is a presumption against the granting of this application. Paragraph 152 of the policy makes it clear that the Council should only grant it if it is satisfied that doing so will not impact further on the relevant licensing objectives. My argument is that it is clear that granting the application will indeed have such an impact.

I would also draw your attention to the Council's policy on licensing hours. Paragraph 168 sets out a table of suggested closing times. The suggested time for closing for premises such as these in a residential area is 23.00. Paragraph 169 identifies three areas, which include Bermondsey Street, and the policy says at para 170 "*It is recognised that these areas, although of mixed use, have a high residential usage and consideration for the later hours beyond those recommended for a residential area should be accompanied by evidence that the proposal is intended to enhance the provision of arts, culture and tourism in the area*". I am not aware that any such evidence has been provided by the applicant. In fact, the application form says very little other than setting out the proposed new hours. That being so I would argue that the usual residential policy of closing at 23.00 should apply.

Paragraph 236 of the Council policy draws attention to the consideration of disturbance caused by patrons on departure and notes that this is particularly important between 23.00 and 08.00. In this case customers will be leaving up until at least midnight.

With regard to the customers seated outside the premises, I also refer to paragraph 243 of the policy. This suggests controls on the operation of licensed external areas and suggests that in residential areas a closing time for such areas is no later than 22.00.

Finally, I would refer to paragraph 14 of the Council's policy. This sets out the five core principles to be applied. The first of these is "*treating residents as if they were a valued member of our own family*". I would argue that no valued family member should be asked to tolerate the likely nuisance that granting this application would cause.

██████████

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 01, 2020 2:33 PM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
**Subject:** Objection to licence application 873212

Dear Licensing Team,

I would like to submit my objection to the licence application Ref 873212 (Chapter 72, Bermondsey Street).

In particular, I object to the proposed extension of opening hours to midnight. I live in the area, which has already been significantly affected in the past months by an increased presence at night, with relative noise and disturbance to residents. An extension of hours to midnight will only add to the issue, which we keep reporting regularly, rather than resolving it.

Best regards

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 01, 2020 12:35 PM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Reference 873212

This is regarding an application made by chapter 72 to extend the alcohol serving hours.

The council should seriously think about residents living on Bermondsey street and the surrounding roads. We have constant noise and disturbance after the bars and restaurants shut. We have put up with drunken people throwing up, peeing in the corners and smoking weed . The bars do not clear people from the streets just their venue where they sit on pavements and drink outside.

Its not that the council clean up the streets the next day or have to listen to the constant noise 7 days a week. Its not upto the residents to monitor the noise level and check on closing hours and make sure the bars/ restaurants are complying with regulations.

Please think of the residents who live on the street.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2020 9:42 AM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
**Subject:** RE application 873212.

RE: Application 873212 to extend licensing hours for Chapter 72 Ltd, 72 Bermondsey Street  
– Premises licence 860426

Hello

We live at [REDACTED], close to Chapter 72 & object to the possible extension of this license.

The noise of people congregating and drinking on the street is already intrusive to us and the other residents that live nearby, but we tolerate this with a reasonable cut off time.

Since we live on the actual road, we are used to noises during normal hours and accept them but any extension to this time would make this intolerable.

We therefore strongly object to this application.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2020.

Dear Southwark Council,

**RE: Objection to Application: 873212 (Chapter 72 Ltd) to extend licensing hours both inside and outside premises.**

As residents of [REDACTED], and as parents of a young toddler, living in close proximity to Chapter 72, we object to the proposed extension to licensing hours both inside and outside, on the grounds of this creating greater public nuisance.

There is an exceedingly small and narrow pavement outside of the premises in question which residential properties (including our own) open directly onto. The pavement is certainly too small for the application proposed. We are concerned a midnight close will only serve to increase and extend the noise outside our house, where people are already loitering and creating a loud commotion. Extending the closing hours even inside, both increases and exacerbates the same nuisance when people exit the premises and continue to loiter outside before leaving the area.

We bought our family home here under the understanding that Chapter 72 was a coffee house open during the day and not a bar or establishment that sold alcohol into the evenings. Our young son's sleep is already disturbed several times a night from what, in truth, is generally good intentioned people, however, when lubricated with alcohol – they add an element of inevitable noise pollution. In this respect, it could also be argued that this extension to licensing hours is also potentially harmful to young children, likes ours, living close by.

We are genuinely concerned that if this application goes ahead, not only will these problems continue and worsen but a dangerous precedent is set for any future owners who might have even more extreme plans and public nuisance would be even greater. We urge you to reject this application.

Many thanks for considering this objection.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Senders Email Address: [REDACTED]  
Message:

Licence Application 860426

I am writing as a near neighbour of the premises, which are, as you will appreciate, is a live/work area. Indeed the most immediate neighbours are all homes rather than business premises.

I understand the challenges faced by the applicant in the light of COVID 19 but equally there is an actual and potential nuisance from an extension of the hours proposed as bedrooms about the interior, and exterior noise will affect others trying to sleep as they too have to work.

[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 12, 2020 2:18 PM  
**To:** Regen, Licensing  
**Subject:** Licence application 873212

Dear Sir,

I am writing to object to the extension of hours application for Chapter 72, 72 Bermondsey Street, London SE1 3UD.

I am objecting on the grounds that this will encourage more noise and anti-social behaviour on a residential street already suffering with increased noise at night. Bermondsey Street is primarily a residential street with a few businesses that are restaurants and bars. At night residents are finding it increasingly difficult to sleep due to increased noise after 11pm from people leaving bars and restaurants. These businesses do nothing to stop the noise.

My address is [REDACTED]

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]