

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2016 4:47 PM  
To: Regen, Licensing  
Subject: Objection to license for premises reference 856737 no 75 Enid Street

[REDACTED]  
Chairperson Neckinger Estate TRA  
[REDACTED]  
London  
SE16 3QH.

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

I am Chairperson of Neckinger Estate Tenants and Residents Association. As Chair over the last two years I have had many complaints regarding Brew by Numbers and the premises 79 Enid Street so was concerned when I heard of this second licence for 75 Enid Street.

I would like to point out that Neckinger Estate Residents were never informed of the original licence for 79 Enid Street so we're never given an opportunity to object and again no notice has been given to neighbours for the new licence.

On Tuesday 13th December 2016 we held our AGM and Brew by Numbers new licence for 75 Enid Street was discussed. The meeting concluded that a second premises would only add to our problems the reasons being as follows:-

1. Crime and disorder. Antisocial behaviour and urinating in a public place are both crimes.
2. Nuisance, the customers are not supervised in any way, there is very limited internal space, so they use the road, the pavement and wall of our Estate to the point where the road is completely blocked at times. They employ one security guard who is mostly ineffective and unable to control some people. We have even had people run into tenants gardens when it has started to rain to shelter under the balconies. We feel that another premises would just make it worse.

They only have 2 mobile toilets outside and no hand wash facilities and our Estate is used as a toilet, mostly men use our bin houses as a toilet and some don't even hide they just use a spare wall with no concern that anyone can see them.

Noise is a real problem, again because of a lack of interior space most customers are outside and the noise level can get very high especially when they start singing. Friday night events are particularly noisy lasting till midnight or later again a second premises will just make the problem worse.

Cars parked in Enid Street are used to sit on put drinks on etc and Tenant complained of damage having being done to their vehicle.

3. Safety, it is an accident waiting to happen, most customers are in the road, even mother's with babies in prams and buggies. The traffic flows both ways and cars find it difficult to pass safely when customers are wandering around stepping backwards not looking using the road as a pedestrian area.

Some customers can be quite aggressive towards cars especially when they are drunk or tipsy. This is also true of walking down the street entering and leaving our Estate.

4. The protection of children from harm. The two area's opposite this premises have a large number of children living and playing there. On a Saturday especially the children play outside or on their balconies and because of lack of toilets as previously mentioned some men urinate in full view of the children, this is very unpleasant and against the law. During the summer months it is particularly bad not happening just once in the day but 5 to 10 times possibly even more.

For all the above reasons we feel that this license should not be allowed and would ask you to take into consideration all of our points. Thanking you in anticipation.

Sincerely,



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

Objection to license for premises reference 856737 No. 75 Enid Street

As a resident living opposite 75 Enid Street I am very concerned about the new license application for Brew by Number. Our lives are already very disturbed by this Companies other premises 79 Enid Street on Friday and Saturdays especially.

1. Crime and disorder. Antisocial behaviour and urinating in a public place are both crimes.

2. Nuisance, the customers are not supervised in any way, there is very limited internal space, so they use the road, the pavement and wall of our Estate to the point where the road is completely blocked at times. They employ one security guard who is mostly ineffective and unable to control some people. We have even had people run into tenants gardens when it has started to rain to shelter under the balconies. We feel that another premises would just make it worse.

They only have 2 mobile toilets outside and no hand wash facilities and our Estate is used as a toilet, mostly men use our bin houses as a toilet and some don't even hide they just use a spare wall with no concern that anyone can see them.

Noise is a real problem, again because of a lack of interior space most customers are outside and the noise level can get very high especially when they start singing. Friday night events are particularly noisy lasting till midnight or later again a second premises will just make the problem worse.

Cars parked in Enid Street are used to sit on put drinks on etc and Tenant complained of damage having being done to their vehicle.

3. Safety, it is an accident waiting to happen, most customers are in the road, even mother's with babies in prams and buggies. The traffic flows both ways and cars find it difficult to pass safely when customers are wandering around stepping backwards not looking using the road as a pedestrian area.

Some customers can be quite aggressive towards cars especially when they are drunk or tipsy. This is also true of walking down the street entering and leaving our Estate.


4. The protection of children from harm. The two area's opposite this premises have a large number of children living and playing there. On a Saturday especially the children play outside or on their balconies and because of lack of toilets as previously mentioned some men urinate in full view of the children, this is very unpleasant and against the law. During the summer months it is particularly bad not happening just once in the day but 5 to 10 times possibly even more.

For all the above reasons I feel that this license should not be allowed and would ask you to take into consideration all of our points. Thanking you in anticipation.

If you require any photographic evidence of the problems we have plenty we can provide.

Sincerely,





11<sup>th</sup> December 2016

**RE: Objection to licence application**

**Licence number:** 856737  
Brew By Numbers  
**Trading name and address:** 75 Railway Arch Enid Street  
SE16 3RA  
**Ward:** Grange

To whom it may concern

I wish to object to the above licence application on the basis of the prevention of nuisance and public safety.

The application is lodged by the current owners of the arch at 79 Enid which already has a licence. This establishment attracts very noisy and boisterous customers who stand outside the premises, spilling out onto the road. The loud noise of their boisterous shouting, including singing, can last well into the evening causing noise nuisance to the local residents in the Neckinger Estate. This noise would be increased with a further licence.

Along with the noise, the current licensed premises at Arch 79 sees many customers over spilling into the road. This causes a danger to public safety by narrowing a busy street. With the main purpose of the business being the selling of strong alcohol, the customers standing in the way are by definition of reduced judgement due to alcohol intake (a rather polite way of putting it, as the premises is marketed as part of the 'Bermondsey Beer Mile' – a ridiculous euphemism for attracting those wishing to take part in a middle class pub crawl) and so often move/sway unaware into the path of traffic causing them to swerve. This will only intensify should a further licence be granted four arches away. In an attempt to block off patrons from milling onto the road the owner places pallets on the highway. I am totally unsure what highway regulation allows them to do so and I would have thought this is a breach of highway regulations and takes up valuable parking space – noting that the premises are located in controlled parking zone. These pallets are then used by customers for sitting on – raising questions as to whether they are street furniture and therefore eligible for a street furniture licence? On one occasion in the summer a very large

marquee was erected blocking over half the highway. I remonstrated with the owner over this and he finally relented and moved it back slightly so it only blocked a third of the

highway. As I pointed out to him at the time the fact it was only moved on complaint did not portray a responsible licensee.

Critically the premises at Arch 79 nor at the proposed licence Arch 75 have inside toilet facilities for customers. This has resulted in the owner placing two portable toilets cubicles on the pavement outside its premises. They sit there all week as a noxious health hazard to the local community. On occasions they have been left unlocked – a safety hazard for children and pets. Should the licence be granted for Arch 75 then I presume more toilets will be placed. They are a blight on the local area. The toilets are so basic, undesirable and insufficient that on almost every weekend the customers of the establishment use the rubbish chutes and boundary wall of the Neckinger Estate to urinate and vomit on. In the summer this can be in full view of children playing in the estate. Due to the intake of alcohol, remonstrating with people in the act of urinating can result in verbal assaults. The response of the licensee has been to have a single agency security guard on duty, but their patrolling is futile and lackadaisical. They often appear more interested in sitting with the operators of the various food stalls that seem to accompany the business (licensed or unlicensed?) than actually managing the customers noise or behaviour.

Additionally, due the nature of the business the owner sees fit to install a burglar alarm. This alarm has regularly gone off through the night (evidenced by calls to the Southwark Noise and Nuisance team). Increased use of Arch 75 should the licence be granted will lead to more setting of the alarm and further nuisance for residents. The owner's attitude towards this alarm nuisance is ambivalent at best. Once activated it goes off for twenty minute on off intervals through the night. It is often activated on being set around closing time.

A further licence granted at Arch 75 will only exacerbate all the problems mentioned above. Licence premises this close to the Neckinger Estate are a noise nuisance and provide no benefit to the local area. A large number of pubs once existed in the surrounding streets. They all closed as there was not demand. The premises at Arch 75, like Arch 79 will not be serving local customers – I would defy them to get a petition of more than 10 customers from the estate supporting their application, but instead provides demand for people travelling from outside the are. These people do not provide any cost benefit to the local area. The business does not employ local people nor is demanded by local people.

I urge the licensing committee not to let the nuisance to the local residents intensify and not grant the licence in respect of 75 Enid Street.

Yours sincerely



Picture of pallets and bins blocking highway – very quiet December day. (Portaloos on right)