

Resident - Royal Parade

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing with regard to the application by 131 The Promenade to extend the opening hours of their bar at the back until 3 am. As a resident living in very close proximity to 131, particularly to the bar at the back, I strongly object to this application. As it is myself and the residents in the area are much disturbed by the perpetual music they put on on occasions, by the revellers who come out having drunk far too much and make a lot of noise. This is a residential area which is slowly losing its residential status and becoming a purely entertainment area, by the number of bars and restaurants, the lack of shops needed by the residents, by the broken glass left by the drunk people all over the roads in Montpellier, as well as in the M Gardens.

I think the emphasis should be cutting down on the revelries and not extending their licensing hours, which will surely create a precedent to the other bars in the area. I strongly object extending the licensing hours to 131 The Promenade.

Resident

I would like to oppose the extension of the license to 3 am from 12pm the premises in question is very close to my flat (queens circus)

I do not think this extension will be good for the local area and I am concerned about the noise

Which it will cause late at night.

Resident

Dear licensing,

We live at Fauconberg Road, GL50 3AU.

We strongly object to 131's application for extension to 3am on the grounds of noise and nuisance. Certainly it is very difficult to sleep in the past when they have been allowed to remain open late and in hot weather impossible to sleep without closing all the windows which then also makes it difficult. Then they were only doing it on an occasional basis. To allow them to do it for most of the week will be intolerable.

Although we have no direct evidence the nuisance aspect is from 131 it seems to match 131 opening times where people continue their party on the church lawns next to us.

Resident

We write to object to the pending licence request for the 131 bar to be extended to 3am.

We live on the Broadwalk and are concerned about the noise issue.

Resident

Dear Sir,

I live at Summerfield House on the corner of Bayshill and Fauconberg roads, within 150m of No 131.

I wish to object to No 131's application to extend their opening hours till 3am.

I have four concerns:

Noise Levels

No 131 is adjacent to residential accommodation and the area to the back of the building is used as an outdoor venue. A fairly powerful sound system plays modern music on a continuous basis and with little respite

This noise is intrusive and is audible in the local area (from mid afternoon through till 11pm). It is completely unreasonable to ask the local residents to put up with intrusive noise levels till the early hours.

Furthermore, the noise levels generated by vehicles in Bayshill Road will remain high till much later than is currently the case (if the application succeeds) as many of the establishment's clients use the road for parking.

Behaviour

Revellers using the many local hostelries are sometimes boisterous when departing the area and the behaviour of a few leaves much to be desired.

Extending drinking hours at No 131 will only exacerbate the problem, with predictable consequences for the residents and, potentially, the police.

The Ambiance of Montpellier

Montpellier is an important part of Cheltenham's Regency heritage and much effort has been expended over the years to ensure it's ambiance and balance remain intact.

The extension of drinking hours at an outdoor music venue in the centre of the area will do nothing to advance that cause.

Unintended Consequences

If this application is approved it will create a precedent for other bars and nightclubs to apply for extensions to their drinking hours.

This would compound the problem. I would suggest this application is refused.

Resident

Good Evening,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed extension to licensing at 131 The Promenade.

As a resident of Summerfield House, I would be directly impacted by:

- a) the increase in noise level in the night from music and customers seated in the outside terraces,
- b) the increase in customers coming and going throughout the early hours of the morning.

Montpellier is not a nightclub area.

I strongly object to this area being converted to such purpose and the proposal for such a major change to the area should have been better communicated by the council.

Resident

Dear Sirs,

I feel I must express my objection to the above proposal for extending the license for 131 The Promenade, for Thursdays through Sundays.

As I'm sure you appreciate, the Montpellier area of Cheltenham is justifiably considered the showpiece area of the town, for its architectural elegance and prime location for high-end shops. It is also a most desirable place to live, near to the parks and yet free from the noise and bustle of the town centre.

I believe that to extend the drinking (and possibly music) license until early hours of the morning would have a devastating effect on Montpellier residents and property values. It could be argued that it would also change the whole character of the area, attracting a section of the public to the area who perhaps, after late night drinking, could cause all sorts of unwanted social activities.

I understand from the police, that most anti-social behaviour occurs in the hours after midnight, and dread to think of the possibilities if this extended license is granted.

Finally, already we have already had considerable - and to me unacceptable - noise from the continuous music 131 plays during some summer weekends when there is a festival on. It has meant that on these occasions we have had to think twice using our terrace because of the constant intrusive noise.

I sincerely hope that the proposed license is rejected.

Resident

Reference the proposed extension to 131 The promenade

I understand that an application has been submitted to extend the licence from Thursdays through until Sundays.

To 1.00 a.m. at the front and 3.00 a.m at the back of the complex.

I am sure you know there are a lot of private residences within a short distance of 131 several of whom I know are unsettled by the noise which emanates from the place. As a Street Pastor who patrols that part of town on a Saturday night I think it already produces more decibels than any other place in or around Montpellier in the evening.

Personally I am disturbed by the noise in my house and there are many who live nearer to 131 than me.

I only found out about the application recently and suggest many residents won't have spotted the notice. I would suggest if the locals were made aware they would take a similar view of the matter as me.

Moreover it would seem to set a precedent for all bars at our end of town to ask for similar extensions.

From my 9 years experience of pastoring in the middle of town , where there are few residences, I know that it's after midnight that the majority of anti social behaviour happens. The police would bear this out. Where locals are trying to carry on normal lives it seems to me unfair to embroil them in typical late night behaviour

I really do hope that you will reject the application

Resident

I am writing to you to formally object to the proposed extension to licensing at 131 The Promenade.

We are a family of four including two children aged 3 and 5 who live at Royal Parade. Our house fronts onto Bayshill Road and at the rear onto Royal Parade Mews. As the crow flies, we have direct sight of the rear garden of 131 The Promenade from the back of our house over a distance of less than 100m.

I understand that the proposal put forward by 131 The Promenade is an extension to licensing hours Thursday to Sunday until 3am in their rear garden. I would like to object to this on two grounds, noise and precedent.

Noise:

My children's bedrooms are on the rear of our house and they are currently already disrupted way past their usual bedtimes during the summer months due to the noise generated by 131 The Promenade. This has been most noticeable since the removal of the wall that used to surround Crazy Eights to extend into the property next door. There is now absolutely no buffer of general people noise and this carries very easily and clearly straight into my children's bedrooms causing them both lack of sleep and general upset at the shouting and excitement going on. I had raised this with environmental health last summer and I believe they were going to write to the proprietor to address the issue, but unfortunately the issue has been worse this year. 131 The Promenade need to find a way to mitigate their current noise levels for surrounding residents before considering extending their offerings. I understand that the vines they are attempting to grow may in many years assist with this but they are 18 months in and are not growing very well.

Precedent:

Montpellier has always been an area people have come to enjoy a drink or dinner during the evening before moving into town to continue their fun into the early hours. I have concerns that should these extended hours be granted that this will set off a chain of bars in Montpellier applying for extended hours. This would really change the whole feel and vibe of this part of town which is most certainly not late-night partying and would not wish to be associated with that.

To summarise, my children's wellbeing will be further compromised by loud noise into the early hours and local residents would not wish the feel of this area to be in jeopardy should it become a late-night partying location.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries, I look forward to hearing from you.

Local business

REPRESENTATION TO AN APPLICATION BY 131 PROMENADE LIMITED FOR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE
131 PROMENADE CHELTENHAM GLOUCESTERSHIRE
LICENSING ACT 2003

I am the General Manager of the Queens Hotel, The Promenade, Cheltenham and wish to make a representation to the above application on behalf of the hotel.

The Queens Hotel is adjacent to the applicant premises. A number of the 84 bedrooms in my hotel face towards, and overlook, No. 131.

Although the applicant is not obliged to consult with local residents and businesses before lodging the application, I am disappointed that I was not approached by No. 131 in advance of the application being lodged. The precise nature of the changes sought could have been explained to me together with details of any steps that they proposed to take to mitigate against any issues that this may cause for the residents and patrons of my hotel. Had they done so then I may not have put in a position where I felt the need to make this representation.

The basis of my representation is as follows:

1. Non-compliance with The Licensing Act 2003 (Premises Licences and Club Premises Certificates) Regulations 2005

(a) A copy of the site notice that is currently displayed on the premises is attached.

I am advised that the above regulations require that the site notice shall be "of a pale blue colour" The clear intention of this is to distinguish notices/applications made under the Licensing Act 2003 from any other public notice that may be displayed on the premises (planning applications for example) which usually displayed on white paper.

The applicant has failed to comply with this requirement under the regulations.

It is my view that this omission amounts to more than an administrative error in the application process and as such the application should be deemed defective and either withdrawn or dismissed with the applicant being invited to resubmit a further application (b) Notwithstanding the fact that the notice is defective for failure to comply with the above, the notice itself provides insufficient detail as to the nature of the variation being sought, so as to inform members of the local community and enable them to make an informed decision about the application. This is a further breach of the regulations.

In the circumstances, and as a consequence of the combination of the above, the application is defective.

As stated above, the applicant should either be invited to withdraw the application and restart the consultation process to ensure compliance with the regulations.

If the applicant is unwilling to withdraw the application then this should be dismissed for reasons of noncompliance.

2. Licensing Objectives

Given the limited information provide on the public notice I am unable to make a proper assessment of what is being applied for.

If it is the applicants intention to extend the hours for the sale of alcohol, and the provision of late night refreshment, the precise extent to which this extension is sought, is unclear from the public notice.

The Queens Hotel already suffers from noise and nuisance disturbance caused by 131 Promenade.

It is my view that any further extension, or variation, of the permitted hours would do nothing to improve this situation.

In the circumstances, give the limited information available, the application does not promote the licensing objectives in so far as they relate to:

- (a) Crime and disorder
- (b) Public safety
- (c) Public nuisance

3. Designated area of concern

The premises fall with the an area identified within the Cheltenham Borough Council policy as being a “designated area of concern”.

The Council’s own policy states that “it has identified the town centre as being an area of concern in that it is susceptible to alcohol related crime, alcohol hospital admissions and nuisance arising from or caused by customers of licensed premises”.

Any change to the licensing hours at the applicant premises will do nothing to address the concerns expressed in the Councils own policy.

4. Change of name of applicant company

The licence holder, and name in which the application for variation is made, is 131 Promenade Limited.

On the 3 February 2020, 131 The Promenade Limited changed its name to The Lucky Onion Group Limited. A copy of this notification lodged at Companies House is attached.

I am advised that s.33 of the Licensing Act requires the holder of a premises licence to notice the relevant licensing authority of any change in name “as soon as reasonably practicable” I am unaware that an such notification has been made to the authority.

Given the limited information available to us at this stage should the matter proceed to a hearing, I reserve the right to expand on any of the above in the event that the application is pursued.

I would be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of this email and confirm that it is deemed as a relevant representation. Should it be determined that the application is not defective for reasons set out above, and should the applicant decide to pursue this matter, I look forward to receiving conformation as to when the matter will be considered by the Licensing Committee.

Resident

*
REF:- 20/00977/PRMV
131 THE PROMENADE.

2 Summerfield Meads
Fauconberg Road
GL50 3AU

1-9-2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object
most strongly to the extended licence
to the above address.*

It is already very,
very, noisy and anti-social at
week-ends at the moment! There
are cars and taxis and drunk
people outside our house at
the end of night. I can not
go to bed to sleep until
every one has gone!

The other problem
is that we have people
(mainly men) using our garden
wall and St. Andrew garden
as a toilet!!!

Yours faithfully. A. Copaldi (MRS)