

**Licensing Act 2003 –
Cumulative Impact & Saturation
Analysis of submissions in respect of the Shad Thames Area**

Appendix D2

Responses from licence holders

Name	Address	Support policy	Agree with proposed boundaries	Agree with proposed classes	Summary of Comment
Nigel Scandrett	Thames Luxury Charters Ltd, C/O The Mews, Putney Common, SW15	No			My company has the 6 vessels referred to in your note. I should point out that we do not arrange static events at the pier (Butlers Wharf) where alcohol is consumed. This takes place while cruising various Boroughs – we just happen to fall within the Shad Thames area due to our location. Looking at the stats pre-Licensing Act I would suggest that the number of licensed premises were less at that time. The development of the area is fairly recent. I believe that market forces will prevail and a saturation policy is not necessary.
S K Chowdhury (runs The Bengal Clipper)	Royal Parade, BR7	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
A M Chowdhury	Broadwalk, E18	Yes	Yes	Yes	None

(runs The Bengal Clipper)					
Nigel Guy	The Bridge Lounge and Dining Room, Tooley Street, SE1	No			I am unclear as to why a saturation policy is considered appropriate whilst the VAP figures show a substantial increase in % terms the absolute numbers are relatively low and over the comparative 05/06 and 06/07 year show a decrease. Other calls have diminished. My view would be that the Licensing Committee has adequate powers to amend, suspend or revoke a licence where a specific problem is identified – in particular a premises giving rise to 54 out of 85 noise complaints.
Mr Sudan Patel (runs an off-licence)	Shad Thames, SE1	Yes	No	Yes	I personally don't feel there should be any boundaries. I have an off-licence on Shad Thames, however, I do not ever come through any problems although there is a lot of noise with drunk people on the streets.
Ben Jones	All Bar One, Shad Thames, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Steve Novak (also local resident)	Kings Arms PH, Gulliver Street, Se1	No			None
Jeremy Veitch (Licensing Manager)	Greene King Retailing Ltd, Greene King Pub Partners, Abbot House, Westgate Brewery, Bury	No			We would like to respond as holders of premises licences within the proposed area. A special policy of this nature is obviously a serious measure and must be based on good evidence that crime and disorder are caused by the customers of licensed premises or that the risk of cumulative impact is imminent. We would purely respond in respect of the evidence provided which we feel is

	St Edmunds, Suffolk, IP33				<p>inadequate for such a policy. Firstly, the police themselves are not shown as supporters of the policy and secondly, the statistics provided are inconclusive. Incidents of violence against the person went down for the two six monthly periods following the Licensing Act although there was an increase in December – May 2007. Calls to police between 23.00 and 03.59 went down following the legislation despite more licensees trading later than had previously been the norm. The statistics would appear to show that later and staggered opening has in fact been a success. The ambulance pick-up statistic is not meaningful in terms of evidence. The noise complaint exercise shows that apart from the one outlet causing the majority of these complaints there were only 31 complaints over the past 5 years for all the other outlets combined. All of the above does not provide the evidence for a special cumulative impact policy which should be a measure of last resort and not a plea from local residents which may best be resolved by other means.</p>
Melissa Schmidt (said to represent local business)	Butlers Wharf Chop House, Shad Thames, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Responses from local residents					
Name	Address	Support policy	Agree with proposed	Agree with	Summary of Comment

			boundaries	proposed classes	
Lyndsay Gough	Anise Court, Shad Thames, Se1	Yes	Yes	Yes	I live in Shad Thames and have suffered increasingly in maintaining a quiet home life and restful sleep as the number of night time visitors to the area has gone up dramatically in the six years that I have lived here. The main problem is the late night noise, often by large groups of drunken people leaving the riverside area for the Jamaica Road. There is loud shouting, often abusive, exacerbated by the narrow street and tall buildings. This sometimes continues until the early hours. There is often vomit and empty cans outside our building and taxis and coaches parked on double-yellow lines with their engines running while awaiting groups of late night revellers add to the blight. My husband and I, professionals in our late 40s, often fear for our safety when returning from restaurants in the area. It s not fellow residents who alarm us, but visitors whose yobbish behaviour and lack of self-control is all the evident.
Anna Bengo	Cinnamon Wharf, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	I believe there should be a saturation policy in Shad Thames due to the current levels of public nuisance, already caused by licensed premises in the area... On talking to some of my neighbours I have found that a number of us are disturbed by dispersal noise, and morning deliveries or waste collection ... Shad Thames has narrow streets with tall buildings and that environment together with the archway of the Design Museum and the river, create an acoustic where sound penetrates. The conversations of groups leaving bars are

					clearly heard. Residents are disturbed by singing, shouting, talking and the noise of cabs arriving or leaving the area... However, not many complain about public nuisance even though people are frequently disturbed by it. One of the reasons is a lack of faith in the Council because they seem ill-equipped to deal with the problem.. Ignorance and uncertainty are another factor. (Full detailed submission available at www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing)
Michael Place	Caraway Apartments, Cayenne Court, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	I consider it is necessary and appropriate to introduce a saturation policy for Shad Thames because of the existing levels of nuisance which needs to be largely eliminated before granting any additional licences. There are two key features of Shad Thames that are particularly relevant when considering if a nuisance is being, or might be, caused. 1. Shad Thames is largely a conservation area, which implies a general respect for all the physical aspects of the area. 2. Shad Thames is largely a residential area which implies a general respect for the rights of residents to enjoy a peaceful nights sleep. To ignore these constitutes a nuisance. (Full detailed submission available at www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing)
Jonathon Baldrey (Chair Butlers Wharf Building RA)	Butlers Wharf Building, Shad Thames, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	We feel the evidence provided does not provide a complete picture for Shad Thames and does not reflect the reduction of the living and working amenity & environment of residents. Shad Thames is densely populated with flats in predominantly old buildings, many listed, attractive visually, but poorly insulated and subject

					to sound echoing between them as well as being reflected off the flat surface of the river. This loss of amenity is due to repeated transient disturbances and interference with sleep caused by noisy patrons leaving licensed premises along the cobbled walkways and by cars and cabs which turn and wait predominantly under the bedroom windows of apartment blocks adjacent to Curlew Street. (Full detailed submission available at www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing)
Antonia C H Gravin	The Cooperage, Gainsford Street, SE1	Yes	No	Yes	The boundaries for the special policy should include Potter's Field and be applicable to events held thereat as well.
Sophie Vokes-Dudgeon	The Cooperage, Gainsford Street, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Jilly Frisch, Secretary Shad Thames RA	C/O The Cooperage, Gainsford Street, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	We believe there should be a saturation policy in Shad Thames as we feel that the evidence as presented does not adequately reflect the level of public nuisance and disturbance experienced by residents... Dispersal noise is a major factor which licence conditions address only weakly ... In Shad Thames the built environment and river accentuate sound and there are multiple transient disturbances as groups of people leave the area on foot or in cars which wait and are forced to turn in the dead end of Curlew Street. Residents' sleep is disrupted as is the peaceful enjoyment of their homes and this source of nuisance is virtually impossible to control due to it's transient nature and unpredictability as well as very limited enforcement options...Residents naturally would

					like to improve the current situation but at the very least to maintain the status quo and not suffer an increase in public nuisance and erosion of their human rights. (Full detailed submission available at www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing)
Fazicat Aftab	The Cooperage, Gainsford Street, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Patricia Varney	Butlers Wharf, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	A saturation policy should apply as the evidence presented does not reflect the persistent but low level nuisance and loss of amenity suffered by local residents... Noise pollution is transient and unpredictable & although sufficient to disturb residents sleep often repeatedly would be unlikely to attract police attention... Residents are realistic and strive to contain the current situation and feel that this is precisely what a saturation policy would do.... (In relation to Qs 2&3) Perhaps stores with off sales could be exempt but residents would not want to encourage binge drinking in public areas which are accessible 2 hours a day such as river walkway and Potters Field. The densest concentration of licensed premises is currently along Shad Thames parallel to the river and along the east side of Tower Bridge Road so a policy could be limited to this area but although residents here suffer the greatest disturbance and anti-social behaviour is often a little distant from the licensed premises . (Full detailed submission available at www.southwark.gov.uk/businesscentre/licensing)
Sandy	Butlers Wharf,	Yes	No	Yes	I am happy with the boundaries suggested but would add

Gumm	Shad Thames, SE1				Potters Field, to the west of Tower Bridge Road, in addition. In considering the appropriateness of the saturation policy in this area, I feel that it is very important to take into account the extent of residential use in the area. The mix between licensed premises, businesses and residents in the area feels broadly right, but further skewing of use to licensed premises would, I Believe, be detrimental to the area.
Ms B J Kelly	The Cooperage, Gainsford Street, SE1	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Eugene J Dugan Brause	Oxley Close, SE1	No			The market will determine the viability of businesses
Mrs Rosemary Hartley (of St James & St Anne's Churches)	Thorburn Square, SE15	Yes	No	Yes	It may not be relevant to this enquiry but I feel a saturation policy is necessary in Bermondsey around the Blue – Southwark Park Road / St James Street. There are too many venues serving alcohol here.
Leslie Smith (states represents local residents - of Tooley Street T&RA)	St Olave's Estate, Druid Street, SE1	Yes	No	Yes	Such policies should cover all of Southwark, as restricting any control measures within a bounded area will only shift ASBO activities outside the bounded areas. Law and order issues should apply to all areas not just selected areas.
Jean Attridge (of Longfield)	Ash House, Longfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	None

T&RA)	Estate, SE1				
Colin Oakley	Queen Elisabeth Street, SE1	Yes			This is a topic about which I feel very strongly indeed as a resident of the area concerned for twenty years. For many years now the increase in licensed premises has been troublesome for local residents and I believe the statistics are merely the tip of the ice-berg. Many incidents go unreported including a whole lot I have witnessed. I have lost tenants because of alcohol induced anti-social behaviour and in my home I have had to spend tens of thousands of pounds to install secondary double-glazing to guarantee a good nights sleep. Incidents often occur on Queen Elisabeth Street very late where people park and then gather after visiting local bars etc. Noise, litter, urinating in the streets etc, often follows. It can be quite an intimidating environment and one feels quite powerless. Similarly, having spoken with the community police, it seems their patrols end hours before the bars close and so they are not around when they are most needed. Residents concerns have been voiced before and it really is time that some action is taken to make conditions more tolerable. A saturation policy sounds a good place to start although it does seem rather a lightweight measure.
Annie Lynn	St Saviours, Shad Thames, SE1	Yes	No		A saturation policy for Shad Thames is much needed. Where I live is not too near the restaurants and bars along the waterfront so their immediate noise and disruption is not my personal concern and will, I am sure, be dealt with by others. The problem for our part of Shad Thames is the aftermath. "Worse for wear" people on

					<p>their homeward journey. We suffer from noise, the ringing of doorbells as they pass and, worst of all, men peeing in the entrance ways to garages. I am dreading the first time I drive home late and, on turning into the garage, find someone using the entrance as a toilet. There are times when walking round this area in the morning is quite unpleasant until the porters of the various blocks have had a chance to clean up. This must be a health and safety issue. There is only one pub which causes a nuisance to our block, we overlook St Saviour's Dock and the noise from the lazy Bar (which is at Dockhead, Jamaica Road and is outside the area immediately under consideration but which should be included) echoes down the Dock late at night.</p>
Florence Essien	Wendover, Thurlow Street, SE17	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>It's about time something is done to reduce the crime in these areas. (Note: Ms Essien does not live in the area but always uses the routes either for shopping or visiting friends)</p>