

Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee

Wednesday, 23rd February 2022, 1.00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall and YouTube

Agenda

- | | | |
|----------|--|-------------------|
| 3 | Determination of Application for a Premises Licence- Old Camelot Site, Park Hall Road, Chorley, PR7 5LP | (Pages 133 - 134) |
|----------|--|-------------------|

Further information has been submitted for consideration.

Gary Hall
Chief Executive

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee Councillor Matthew Lynch (Chair), Councillor (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Margaret France and Christine Turner.

Electronic agendas sent to Licensing Act 2003 Sub-Committee reserves (Councillors) for information.

If you need this information in a different format, such as larger print or translation, please get in touch on 515151 or chorley.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

FAO: Mr. Nathan Howson
Enforcement Team Leader (Licensing)
Chorley Council

16th February 2022

Dear Nathan,

Application for Premises License for Camelot Site by One Digital Outdoor Ltd / Go to Live Ltd

Thank you for your letter and paperwork inviting me to the Sub-Committee Licencing Hearing on 23 February 2022.

Unfortunately, this clashes with an existing commitment and I will not be attending. However, I have taken the opportunity to speak with a representative of Go to Live (Jessica Webb 15/2/22, she was very helpful) and I hope to speak with Ryan Esson before 23/2/22.

However, as there is a deadline for my reply, I am taking the opportunity to write to you today (I do know you are on holiday) and within that timeframe. I would still like to lodge an objection and have this letter shared with the Sub-Committee at the hearing.

I would also like to extend my thanks to you as we have also had a long telephone conversation and I appreciated your time and the additional information you provided.

One aspect I feel I must question is on the process from the Council's perspective. There are aspects from my original letter of objection, and I have seen from other residents, where my comments have been redacted. In my case my reference to the already approved TENs applications.

In your letter of 7 February giving notice of the Hearing and the background to the application, including your report for the Sub-Committee you state (point 16) the event was discussed at the Council's Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG) on 16 February – I am assuming this was an error and it should read 16 January – where concerns were raised by emergency services but this was addressed at a site visit on 2 February. However, in the intervening period (19 – 24 January) an application was made under the TENs process and automatically approved within three working days.

Why the haste and given the implications of the proposal (the Company have been very explicit in its plans) why was no time given to elected local representatives to be informed and indeed local people?

By granting a TENs – I understand the process of TENs and the requirement to have less than 499 people in attendance – but why an 'emergency' TENs – and why was it granted before the Emergency Services had been satisfied all was correct?

Is this not something the Sub-Committee can read about in my letter when it is relevant to the whole process?

If the Council is only dealing with each application in isolation, then the bigger picture and outlook for residents is poor. I also note that a 'rave' was identified also on the same site, not part of 'Camelot Rises', and planned for the same opening night (4/2/22) but I understand it did not go ahead as the new business owner did not have a licence in their name – if they had what would have

been the consequences I wonder – two large and very different events with alcohol because they had been dealt with as separate applications?

I am not sure how much of my letter will actually reach the Sub-Committee – my wish would be for all of it. However, I will now make specific comments in respect of the application in hand:

- I wish to object to the above application on the grounds previously stated – the events will be detrimental to the peace and quiet of this semi-rural area and the enjoyment of my home if alcohol is permitted from 13.00 – 23.00 seven days a week.
- The two showings of films per week day and three showing on a weekend will see a turnover of cars, c300 per showing – c900 cars per day with potentially 5 occupants in each. On a weekend that could be 4,500 people a day on site with traffic on Park Hall Road severely impacted for local residents. Add alcohol into the mix and there is potential for even more disruption.
- I am particularly concerned that the clearing of cars from the site, especially for the late showings of the films, is scheduled for half an hour (as per the information in the Company Event Safety Plan). But if you come to the early events this is scheduled for an hour to clear the site. This does not add up. If alcohol and food is still being serviced up until 11pm the site will not clear by 11.30pm as per the application.
- This event is scheduled for a defined period with a potential to extend to the end of April when, within the documentation supplied by the Company, they will 'derig' the site. Why is the application for a license open ended? If a license is granted there will be no restrictions on what can be offered and that is a particular concern. This would mean 7 days per week without any respite for local residents.
- Additional amplified music is also planned for the site. This must be kept to within designated levels and monitored by the organisers carefully, especially the 'bass' levels – booming music late at night travels and is very intrusive.
- If the outcome is to grant a license, then can there be a caveat that it will be until 10.00pm and the site is cleared by 23.00pm rather than the existing proposal. Also, would it be possible to grant this license for the period identified within the organisers 'Event Safety Plan'? This would give some comfort to local resident that this is not an 'open door' approach that would make a mockery of the Council's own opening statement in the Licensing Policy.

I can appreciate the economic aspects of this proposal but I would request the Sub-Committee strike a balance between this and the four licensing objectives that local people feel very strongly about.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely,

Doreen Hounslea