Reference: 2009/00612/01SPRN

Hearing: 21st May 2009

Application for Premises Licence

Premises Name:	New York New York	Application Date:	25th March 2009
Premises Address:	2 Queens Way Southampton SO14 3AZ	Application Received Date:	26th March 2009
		Application Valid Date:	26th March 2009



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Southampton City Council Licence No. 100019679 2007.

Representation From Responsible Authorities

Responsible Authority	Satisfactory?	Comments
Child Protection Services - Licensing	No response	
Hampshire Fire Service - Licensing	No response	

Environmental Health Service - Licensing	No	
Planning & Sustainability - Building Control - Licensing	No response	
Planning & Sustainability - Development Control - Licensing	Yes	
Police - Licensing	No	
Trading Standards - Licensing	Yes	

Other Representations

Name	Address	Contributor Type
Mr. John A. Baker	111 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Ms. D. Farragher	74 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Peter Devereux	74 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Simon Hooper	Flat 54 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Ms. Nadine Fry	24 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident

Linda & Michael Lawless	Flat 12 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Ms. Zoe Parker	Flat 30 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Gary Allen	268 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JP	Resident
Miss Virginie Deslandes & Mr S Russo	Flat 4 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. C. Griffiths	Flat 39 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. Jonathan Cantrell	Flat 49 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Katherine Bradbury	Flat 49 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mrs. K. Bingham	4 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Mr. C. Bingham	10 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Mr. Andrew Hales	267 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3JP	Resident

Miss. Bridget Newbury	55 Ocean Boulevard Briton Street, Southampton Hampshire.	Resident
Mr Paul & Mrs Ali Smith	245 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton Hampshire. SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Glen Harfield	184 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton Hampshire SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Colin Reynolds	21 Goldsmiths Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Denise Robinson	Flat 28 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Ms. Lorraine Barnett	22 Guild House Merchants Quarter Southampton SO14 3EY	Resident
N.B. Shacklock	Flat 26 Goldsmiths Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Miss Charlotte A. Bemand	9 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
Mr. Bruce Granger	99 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Frank Taggart	403 Imperial Apartments South Western House Canute Road Southampton SO14 3AL	Resident

Joao Assuncao	Flat 87 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Martin McAndrew	Flat 167 Oceana Boulevard Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HW	Resident
Dr. Jonathan Rust	Flat 160, Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Nickolas Hartshorn & Hannah Harwood	30 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
Miss Gillian Whyment	108 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Jeremy Weyman	211 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Nick Clegg	4 Talbot Court Queensway Southampton	Resident
Mr. Matthew Ellis	Flat 54, Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Adrian Ford	McKenzie's Furniture 49-53 Queensway Southampton SO14 3BL	Trader
Mr. L. Scott	Mack Southampton 49-50 High Street Southampton SO14 2NS	Trader

Dr. James Nixon	Flat 16 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. Steve Westhorpe	12 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
Rebecca Westhorpe	12 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
M. Piehto & N. Fiut	23 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Pasquale Lorusso	D. Young & Co Briton House Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EB	Trader
Mrs. Sarah Taggart	Flat 4 6 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ES	Resident
Mr. Joe Moore	13 Chandlers Court Merchants Quarter Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
D. Lydon	Flat 4 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Chris Richards	Flat 5 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Oliver Dormon	Flat 5 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident

Mr. Douglas Sutherland	Flat 10 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Dr. N Sambu	Flat 9 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Ian Warrington	89 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Rachel Rust	Flat 160 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Sarah Biddlecombe	133 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr. James Green	Flat 75 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Dr. Phillip Cheshire	42 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Aris Konstantopoulos	66 Oceana Boulevard Briton St SO14 3HU	Resident
Ms. Ellen McCarthy	Flat 10 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
F. List	Flat 17 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident

Ms. Jenny Mielczarek	8 Goldsmith Court 2 Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3ED	Resident
Mr. Andrew Boyne	76 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Gareth Shepherd	166 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Ms. Louise Haughton	122 Oceana Boulevard Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr. David McIntyre	Flat 35 Castle Place 117 High Street Southampton SO14 2EA	Resident
Simon Noyce	172 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO143JG	Resident
Melissa Guthrie	172 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO143JG	Resident
Mrs S McIntyre	Castle Place 117 High Street Southampton SO14 2EA	Resident
J.Rowsell	8 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HF	Resident

Mr. Ben Stanfield	Flat 36 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Lynette Bowen	73 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Rachael Livingstone	141 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr And Mrs Ni	64 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Miss Danielle Grover	Flat 131 Gate 7 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Simon & Meghann Andrew	Flat 86 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mrs. Yvette Newbury	116 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Ms. Kiren Bennett	9 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Ms. Charlotte Egan	188 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. James Read	26 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident

Mr. Darren Warner	163 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Clive & Charlotte Parry	Flat 115 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr. Richard Rombouts	Flat 51 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Dr. John Blythe	189 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Paul Jeans	Flat 18, Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hants.	Resident
Ms. Nora McGrath	4 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Magnus McKie	16 Chandlers Court Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Melvin Pugh	Flats 94,130 and 266 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton so14 3HU	Trader
Mr B.Sahota	1 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street, Southampton S014 3HF	Resident
Mr and Mrs Sangha	2 Oceana Boulevard Briton street	Trader

Rebecca Galbraith	47 Telephone House Southampton SO14 2NW	Resident
Mr. Alastair Vardy	31 Coopers Court 4 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
Ms. Lynn Flacco	Flat 62 Telephone House 70 High Street Southampton SO14 2NW	Resident
Mr. Clive Grace	Flat 62 Telephone House 70 High Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 2NW	Resident
Julian & Christine Aplin	Flat 8 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Labrousse Delphine	Flat 35 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Andrew Crowley	Select Education 10a Queensway Southampton SO14 3AZ	Trader
Ms. Vikki Upchurch	23 Goldsmiths Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Mr. Benjamin Rowe	Flat 23 Goldsmiths Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Salman Ansari	Flat 274 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JP	Resident

Mr. Mark Stevens	96 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hants SO14 3HU	Resident
Ms. Charlotte Sillars	132 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr. Mark Stevens	Flat 218 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Shaun Collins	200 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. David Robinson	2 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Briton Street SO14 3HL	Resident
Ms. Natalie Allen	Apartment 70 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Ms. Lesley McIvor	Flat 7 Goldsmith Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Ms. Angela Davies	Flat 22 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. Neal Rudkin	Flat 186 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk SO14 3JG	Resident
Mr. Lee Crudgington	Flat 20 Coopers Court 4 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident

Mr. Alan Patton	Flat 39 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Darren Baker	Flat 7, 6 Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3ES	Resident
Mr & Mrs T G Smith	The Cottage Dappers Lane Angmering West Sussex BN16 4EN	Resident
Bader Almutairi	Flat 30 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Nathalie Makin	Flat 38 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
C. Reece	Flat 6 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Ray Devine	Apartment 33 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
M Allen	45 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
C. Rae	44 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident

S. Butler	Flat 36 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
L Pillo	30 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Ben Cross	25 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
S. Butler	21 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Mark Smith	20 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Nick Lemon	19 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Paul Highett-Smith	18 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Ms. Caroline Palmer	Flat 46 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Ali Alshehri	Flat 16 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Ms. Sarah Daly	47 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident

Dr. Rutesh Patel	Flat 11 Goldsmiths Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Mr. Nick Richards	47 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
S. Broomfield	14 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. M. Madon	12 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Paul Griffiths	11 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
D. Searle	10 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Matt Graves	9 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Pam Heffelon	8 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
C. Sturman	No 1 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr And Mrs Robinson	Flat 2 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident

Mr. Dave McGeown	5 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr And Mrs Barnett	3 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
J. Fiddimore	7 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Barry Taylor	Interlink Express 8-10 Queensway Southampton SO16 0TD	Trader
Mr. Nigel Parker	58 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Jolanta Giel	Flat 38 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. Gary Taylor	9 Talbot Court Queensway Southampton SO14 3AZ	Resident
Ms. Jenny Baker	162 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Miss Laura J. Drummond	89 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Ms. Janet Marguerite Trevellyan	Flat 21 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HF	Resident

Mr. Paul Reece	6 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
C. Lydon	4 City Court 15 Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3HL	Resident
Mr. Satbire Singh Digwa	Trimwise Gym Briton Street Southampton	Trader
Mr. Richard Olney-Jones	81 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr And Mrs S.M. Jackson	Butcher's End Winchester Rd King's Somborne Stockbridge SO20 6NZ	Trader
		Resident
Mr. Callum Donnelly	104 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
PJ O'Maoil Mheana	Flat 30 No1 Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3JD	Resident
Miss Alison Cole	9 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Valerie And Michael Holloway	107 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident

Mr. Andrew Gardiner	101 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Glenn Baker	43 Oceania Boulevard Britton Street, Southampton	Resident
Ms. Claire Barker	168 Oceana Boulevard Orchard Place Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HW	Resident
Natalie Larsen And Nick Kemp	210 Oceana Boulevard Lower Canal Walk Southampton SO14 3JG	Resident
Martin & Doreen Curran	8 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Mr. Christopher Simmonds	72 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU	Resident
Mr. Richard Amundson	24 Goldsmiths Court 2 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3ED	Resident
Ms. Renata Mazik	163 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hampshire SO14 3HW	Resident
Mr R Wilks, Mrs A Wilks & Miss J. Wilks	59 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3 HU	Resident
Dr. Licheng Chang	Flat 59 Telephone House 70 High Street Southampton SO14 2NW	Resident

Chris Thickett	Flat 9 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
B. Painter	Flat 8 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
D.G. And B.J. Truphet	Flat 105 Oceana Boulevard Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Mrs. Nicky Sharrocks	165 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HW	Resident
Lucy Christopher And Neil Brooks	12 Chandlers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EZ	Resident
Mr. Gary Whitaker	25 Guild House 4a Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EY	Resident
Mr. R Sutherland & D Hayward	Nos 39,74 and 80 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton Hampshire	Trader
Miss Fiona D. Wright	14 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HF	Resident
A. Pilkinhton	Flat 2 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident
Mr. Clifford Gregory	Flat 1 Oceana Boulevard Briton Street Southampton	Resident

Dr. John Atkinson	28 Coopers Court Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident
Kelly Stewart	31 Coopers Court 4 Briton Street Southampton SO14 3EN	Resident

Legal Implications

1. The Licensing Act 2003 specifically restricts the grounds on which the Council, as Licensing Authority (LA), may refuse an application for a new Premises Licence, or impose conditions. Where relevant representations are made, the LA may refuse on the grounds that the licensing objectives are not met or the operating schedule is inadequate. Equally, conditions may be imposed where relevant and necessary. The LA may also refuse an application in part and thereby only permit some of the licensable activities sought.

2. The decision making committee, in considering an application, must have regard to the adopted Statement of Licensing Policy and any relevant representations made by those directly affected.

3. An applicant for a new Premises Licence whose application has been refused, or who is aggrieved by conditions imposed, may appeal against the decision to the Magistrates' Court.

4. In considering this application the committee will sit in a quasi-judicial capacity and is thus obliged to consider applications in accordance with both the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, and amending secondary legislation and the rules of natural justice. The practical effect of this is that the committee must makes its decision based on evidence submitted in accordance with the legislation and give adequate reasons for reaching its decision.

   The committee must also have regard to:-

5. *Crime and Disorder Act 1998*
   Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places the Council under a duty to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area.

6. *Human Rights Act 1998*
   The Act requires UK legislation to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the European Convention on Human Rights. It is unlawful for the Council to act in a way that is incompatible (or fail to act in a way that is compatible) with the rights protected by the Act. Any action undertaken by the Council that could have an effect upon another persons Human Rights must be taken having regard to the principle of Proportionality - the need to balance the rights of the individual with the rights of the community as a whole. Any action taken by the Council which affect another's rights must be no more onerous than is necessary in a democratic society. The matter set out in this report must be considered in light of the above obligations.

Application for a premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes at the end of the form.
If you are completing this form by hand please write legibly in block capitals. In all cases ensure that your answers are inside the boxes and written in black ink. Use additional sheets if necessary.
You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

We Nexum Leisure Limited
(Insert name(s) of applicant)
apply for a premises licence under section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the premises described in Part 1 below (the premises) and I/we are making this application to you as the relevant licensing authority in accordance with section 12 of the Licensing Act 2003

Part 1 – Premises Details

Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference or description New York New York 2 Queensway			
Post town	Southampton	**Post code**	SO14 3AZ

Telephone number at premises (if any)	Not yet known
Non-domestic rateable value of premises	£60,000.00

Part 2 - Applicant Details

Please state whether you are applying for a premises licence as

		Please tick yes	
a)	an individual or individuals *	☐	please complete section (A)
b)	a person other than an individual *		
	i. as a limited company	☑	please complete section (B)
	ii. as a partnership	☐	please complete section (B)
	iii. as an unincorporated association or	☐	please complete section (B)
	iv. other (for example a statutory corporation)	☐	please complete section (B)
c)	a recognised club	☐	please complete section (B)
d)	a charity	☐	please complete section (B)
e)	the proprietor of an educational establishment	☐	please complete section (B)
f)	a health service body	☐	please complete section (B)

g)	a person who is registered under Part 2 of the Care Standards Act 2000 (c14) in respect of an independent hospital	☐	please complete section (B)
h)	the chief officer of police of a police force in England and Wales	☐	please complete section (B)

* If you are applying as a person described in (a) or (b) please confirm:

	Please tick yes
• I am carrying on or proposing to carry on a business which involves the use of the premises for licensable activities; or	☑
• I am making the application pursuant to a	
○ statutory function or	☐
○ a function discharged by virtue of Her Majesty's prerogative	☐

(A) INDIVIDUAL APPLICANTS (fill in as applicable)

Mr ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Ms ☐		Other Title (for example, Rev)	
Surname		**First names**	
I am 18 years old or over		☐ Please tick yes	
Current postal address if different from premises address			
Post Town		**Postcode**	
Daytime contact telephone number			
E-mail address (optional)			

SECOND INDIVIDUAL APPLICANT (if applicable)

Mr ☐ Mrs ☐ Miss ☐ Ms ☐		Other Title (for example, Rev)	
Surname		**First names**	
I am 18 years old or over		☐ Please tick yes	
Current postal address if different from premises address			
Post Town		**Postcode**	
Daytime contact telephone number			
E-mail address (optional)			

(B) OTHER APPLICANTS

Please provide name and registered address of applicant in full. Where appropriate please give any registered number. In the case of a partnership or other joint venture (other than a body corporate), please give the name and address of each party concerned.

Name Nexum Leisure Limited
Address 2 Bank Court, Weldon Road, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 5RF
Registered number (where applicable) 04883781
Description of applicant (for example, partnership, company, unincorporated association etc.) Limited Company
Telephone number (if any)
E-mail address (optional)

Part 3 Operating Schedule

When do you want the premises licence to start?

Day	Month	Year	
A S	A P		

If you wish the licence to be valid only for a limited period, when do you want it to end?

Day	Month	Year	

A

Please give a general description of the premises (please read guidance note1) New York New York is located at 2 Queensway in Southampton. The premises have previously operated as a bar and nightclub.

If 5,000 or more people are expected to attend the premises at any one time, please state the number expected to attend.

n/a

What licensable activities do you intend to carry on from the premises?

(Please see sections 1 and 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 and Schedules 1 and 2 to the Licensing Act 2003)

Provision of regulated entertainment		**Please tick yes**
a)	plays (if ticking yes, fill in box A)	☐
b)	films (if ticking yes, fill in box B)	☑
c)	indoor sporting events (if ticking yes, fill in box C)	☐
d)	boxing or wrestling entertainment (if ticking yes, fill in box D)	☐
e)	live music (if ticking yes, fill in box E)	☑
f)	recorded music (if ticking yes, fill in box F)	☑
g)	performances of dance (if ticking yes, fill in box G)	☑
h)	anything of a similar description to that falling within (e), (f) or (g) (if ticking yes, fill in box H)	☑
Provision of entertainment facilities:		
i)	making music (if ticking yes, fill in box I)	☑
j)	dancing (if ticking yes, fill in box J)	☑
k)	entertainment of a similar description to that falling within (i) or (j) (if ticking yes, fill in box K)	☑
Provision of late night refreshment (if ticking yes, fill in box L)		☑
Supply of alcohol (if ticking yes, fill in box M)		☑

In all cases complete boxes N, O and P

A

Plays Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the performance of a play take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☐
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon			**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3)		
Tue					
Wed			**State any seasonal variations for performing plays** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur					
Fri			**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the performance of plays at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat					
Sun					

B

Films Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the exhibition of films take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) Music DVDs and videos.		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the exhibition of films** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the exhibition of films at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

C

Indoor sporting events Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Please give further details** (please read guidance note 3)
Day	Start	Finish	
Mon			
Tue			**State any seasonal variations for indoor sporting events** (please read guidance note 4)
Wed			
Thur			**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for indoor sporting events at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)
Fri			
Sat			
Sun			

D

Boxing or wrestling entertainments Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the boxing or wrestling entertainment take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☐
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon			**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3)		
Tue					
Wed			**State any seasonal variations for boxing or wrestling entertainment** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur					
Fri			**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for boxing or wrestling entertainment at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat					
Sun					

E

Live music Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the performance of live music take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) Provision of live entertainers – groups and solo performers		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the performance of live music** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the performance of live music at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

F

Recorded music Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the playing of recorded music take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) In house music system		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the playing of recorded music** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the playing of recorded music entertainment at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

G

Performances of dance Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the performance of dance take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) Topless dancing by performers and staff		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the performance of dance** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the performance of dance entertainment at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

H

Anything of a similar description to that falling within (e), (f) or (g) Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Please give a description of the type of entertainment you will be providing** There may be occasions when entertainment provided does not fall within the categories of (e) (f) or (g), for example, hypnotist/comedian/karaoke		
Day	Start	Finish	**Will this entertainment take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
Mon	00.00	24.00		Outdoors	☐
				Both	☐
Tue	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3)		
Wed	00.00	24.00			
Thur	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for entertainment of a similar description to that falling within (e), (f) or (g)** (please read guidance note 4)		
Fri	00.00	24.00			
Sat	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the entertainment of a similar description to that falling within (e), (f) or (g) at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sun	00.00	24.00			

I

Provision of facilities for making music Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Please give a description of the facilities for making music you will be providing** An in-house sound system, amplification controlled by management only.		
			Will the facilities for making music be indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y] (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☐
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) Amplified and unamplified music		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the provision of facilities for making music** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for provision of facilities for making music entertainment at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

J

Provision of facilities for dancing Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the facilities for dancing be indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (see guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
				Both	☐
Day	Start	Finish	**Please give a description of the facilities for dancing you will be providing** Provision of dance floor		
Mon	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3)		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for providing dancing facilities** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	00.00	24.00			
Fri	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the provision of facilities for dancing entertainment at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

K

Provision of facilities for entertainment of a similar description to that falling within i) or j) Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Please give a description of the type of entertainment facility you will be providing**		
Day	Start	Finish	**Will the entertainment facility be indoors or outdoors or both – please tick [Y]** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
Mon	00.00	24.00		Outdoors	☐
				Both	☐
Tue	00.00	24.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3)		
Wed	00.00	24.00			
Thur	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the provision of facilities for entertainment of a similar description to that falling within i or j** (please read guidance note 4)		
Fri	00.00	24.00			

Sat	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the provision of facilities for entertainment of a similar description to that falling within i or j at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)
Sun	00.00	24.00	

L

Late night refreshment Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the provision of late night refreshment take place indoors or outdoors or both – please tick** (please read guidance note 2)	Indoors	☑
				Outdoors	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	
Mon	23:00	05.00	**Please give further details here** (please read guidance note 3) Provision of hot food and drinks		
Tue	23:00	05.00			
Wed	23:00	05.00	**State any seasonal variations for the provision of late night refreshment** (please read guidance note 4)		
Thur	23:00	05.00			
Fri	23:00	05.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the provision of late night refreshment at different times, to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Sat	23:00	05.00			
Sun	23:00	05.00			

M

Supply of alcohol Standard days and timings (please read guidance note 6)			**Will the supply of alcohol be for consumption (Please tick box)** (please read guidance note 7)	On the premises	☐
				Off the premises	☐
Day	Start	Finish		Both	☑
Mon	00.00	24.00	**State any seasonal variations for the supply of alcohol** (please read guidance note 4)		
Tue	00.00	24.00			
Wed	00.00	24.00			
Thur	00.00	24.00	**Non standard timings. Where you intend to use the premises for the supply of alcohol at different times to those listed in the column on the left, please list** (please read guidance note 5)		
Fri	00.00	24.00			
Sat	00.00	24.00			
Sun	00.00	24.00			

State the name and details of the individual whom you wish to specify on the licence as premises supervisor

Name Ian Harries
Address

Personal Licence number (if known)
Issuing licensing authority (if known)

N

Please highlight any adult entertainment or services, activities, other entertainment or matters ancillary to the use of the premises that may give rise to concern in respect of children (please read guidance note 8)

No activity will occur at the premises or ancillary to the use of the premises which may give rise to concern in respect of children. Although topless dancing by performers and staff will take place, this activity will not give rise to concern in respect of children because at all times persons under the age of 18 will not be permitted entry to the premises

O

Hours premises are open to the public
Standard days and timings
(please read guidance note 6)

Day	Start	Finish
Mon	00.00	24.00
Tue	00.00	24.00
Wed	00.00	24.00
Thur	00.00	24.00
Fri	00.00	24.00
Sat	00.00	24.00
Sun	00.00	24.00

State any seasonal variations (please read guidance note 4)

Non standard timings. Where you intend the premises to be open to the public at different times from those listed in the column on the left, please list (please read guidance note 5)

P Describe the steps you intend to take to promote the four licensing objectives:

a) General – all four licensing objectives (b,c,d,e) (please read guidance note 9)

1. The premises are at risk assessed from time to time in accordance with existing legislation.

b) The prevention of crime and disorder

1. CCTV shall be installed at the premises. The number and locations of the cameras/monitors and recording equipment to be agreed with the police.
2. Recordings shall be stored in a safe environment for a period of time agreed with the Crime Prevention Officer and made available to an authorised officer of the licensing authority or police.
3. The system shall be maintained and images stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act and any other relevant legislation relating to the use of systems.
4. The requirement for door supervisors will be determined by a management risk assessment. Any door supervisor employed by the company will be licensed under the Private Security Industry Act 2001.
5. A register of door staff will be maintained indicating the number of door staff present on the premises, their identity and the times they are on duty.
6. A drugs policy will be agreed with the police and implemented.
7. Drinks promotions will not be permitted allowing unlimited supply of alcohol for a set price.
8. A representative of the premises licence holder will actively participate in the Pub Watch scheme
9. No person who appears to be drunk and/or disorderly will be allowed access to or be allowed to remain on the premises.
10. There will be full adherence to the local Check 21 Scheme criteria.

c) Public safety

1. Plan drawing numbers 100 and 200 submitted in support of the application incorporates the proposals in respect of the following public safety measures – means of escape, fire detection, fire fighting equipment and emergency lighting.
2. The applicant will ensure compliance with all building regulations prior to trading.
3. The applicant will comply with the reasonable requirements of the Fire Officer applicable at the time of completion of the works.

d) The prevention of public nuisance

1. To comply with the reasonable requirements of the Environmental Health Officer – to include matters relating to acoustic measures, noxious smells and refuse.
2. Notices asking patrons to leave quietly shall be displayed at the premises.

e) The protection of children from harm

1. Appropriate steps by management of the premises will be taken to ensure no under age sales will occur.
2. Persons under the age of 18 will not be permitted entry to the premises.

Please tick yes

- I have made or enclosed payment of the fee ☑
- I have enclosed the plan of the premises ☑
- I have sent copies of this application and the plan to responsible authorities and others where applicable ☑
- I have enclosed the consent form completed by the individual I wish to be premises supervisor, if applicable ☑
- I understand that I must now advertise my application ☑
- I understand that if I do not comply with the above requirements my application will be rejected ☑

IT IS AN OFFENCE, LIABLE ON CONVICTION TO A FINE UP TO LEVEL 5 ON THE STANDARD SCALE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003 TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS APPLICATION

Part 4 – Signatures (please read guidance note 10)

Signature of applicant or applicant's solicitor or other duly authorised agent (See guidance note 11). **If signing on behalf of the applicant please state in what capacity.**

Signature	
Date	25th March 2009
Capacity	Walker Morris - Solicitors for applicant

For joint applications signature of 2nd applicant or 2nd applicant's solicitor or other authorised agent. (please read guidance note 12). **If signing on behalf of the applicant please state in what capacity.**

Signature	
Date	
Capacity	

Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application (please read guidance note 13)
Carole Collingwood

il your e-mail address (optional)

FIRE KEY	
PB	Push Bar ironmongery
D	Detector Head (Smoke/Heat detection)
E	emergency light fitting
	Fire alarm call point
	Bell
E	Exit sign (3 hour maintained)
FD30s	30 minute fire resisting self closing door
FD60s	60 minute fire resisting self closing door
DP	Dry powder extinguisher (10lb or 20lb)
3 L	Multi extinguisher
CO2	CO2 extinguisher
F	Foam extinguisher
B	Fire blanket

Electrical Contractor To Install Emergency Lighting And Fire Alarm System In Strict Accordance With Bs 5266 And Bs 5839.
Niceic Certification To Be Supplied.

LICENSING KEY
AREA TO BE USED FOR THE SALE OF ALCOHOL THE PROVISION OF HOT FOOD AND DRINK AFTER 11PM AND THE PROVISION OF REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT.
THE LOCATION AND TYPE OF ANY FIRE SAFETY AND ANY OTHER SAFETY EQUIPMENT IS SHOWN AS AT PRESENT. THIS MAY BE VARIED AT TIME TO TIME WITH AGREEMENT OF THE FIRE OFFICER OR AFTER A FIRE RISK ASSESSMENT.



ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE BEFORE ANY WORK COMMENCES
ANY DISCREPANCIES TO BE REPORTED TO THE SUPERVISING OFFICER

GENERAL
1. All work to be carried out in strict accordance with the 'Building Regulations 1991 - Latest Amendments' and to the complete satisfaction of the Building Surveyor.

2. Contractors are responsible for complying with all relevant Building Regulations, C of Pa, BS etc., and check that Building Control and Environmental Health Departments are satisfied with the scope and content of all work on completion and obtain any necessary certificates.

3. Voids, roof spaces etc. to be protected with any necessary fire stops and cavity barrier to comply with requirements Part B Schedule 1 Building Regulations 1991, approved documents ADB 1, B2 and B3.

4. All brie-a-brac items to be securely fixed by Main Contractor unless otherwise stated and agreed in writing.

5. All Contractors direct or through Contract to be fully responsible for visiting Site and including for all work arising from Site Conditions and Site Details and dimensions are their full responsibility.

6. Drawings are not to be used as part or contributing to a "Schedule of Conditions" or a Structural Survey.

BUILDING
7. Structural Steelwork to conform to BSS 5950 and to be encased to afford 1 hour fire protection in accordance with schedule B/V10.

8. Pad Stones to be Min size 440 x 100 x 215 unless noted otherwise.

9. Minimum bearing for Structural Steel to be 100mm.

10. Reinforced Concrete to be in accordance with BS 8110.

11. Timber to be in accordance with BS 5268 Part 2.

12. Check that all ceilings/floors comply with Fire Resistance requirements and underdraw/protect allowing fully for all work and finishing required.

FIRE
13. Means of Escape in Case of Fire to Reg. B1 and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority and the Fire Prevention Officer.

14. Emergency Light Systems to be installed to BS 5266:Part 1.

15. Fire Alarm System to be installed to BS5839 Part 1 Latest Edition with Audible Alarms throughout the premises.

16. Upholstered furniture should satisfy as a minimum standard Ignition Source 0 (cigarette test) and Ignition Source 5 (blaze crib test) of BS 5852 1990.*

17. All curtains, drapes, hangings and blinds to be flame proof to BS 3119 1959 (test method in conjunction with BS 3120 1959) and in conjunction with BS 4530 1976 test and BS 5867 Part 2 1980 Type B test. D.O.E. P.S.A. specification 7 (using source 5). *

NB. Suppliers/Contractors to check and be responsible for meeting any Local or Particular requirements in excess of these standards.

18. All doors thus marked FD30s to have half hour fire resistance be with Britton c/fwood self closer. Door frames to have 25mm fire check rebate to BS 476. Complete with Smoke Seals and Intumescent Strips.

19. All fire exit signs with directional arrows as necessary to have green background with white letters, 125mm high to BS 5499.

20. Fire Doors to be marked 'FIRE DOOR KEEP SHUT'.

21. Fire safety related Signs and Notices are to conform to British Standard BS 5499 and Fire Exit Signs to the Health and Safety Safety Signs and Signals Regulations.

22. Wall and ceiling finishes to Drinking Areas to be Class 1. Wall and Ceiling finishes to Entrance Halls to be Class 1. Escape routes to be Class 0. Wall finishes to small rooms (Max 30m2) to be class 3. N.B. Main Contractor to be responsible for ensuring that any Specialist finish or material complies with rating required and obtain written evidence of compliance.

PLUMBING AND DRAINAGE:
23. All work to comply with latest legislation existing drains/plumbing to be checked and all remedial work to be included for and check the adequacy of gas and water supplies to meet all proposed requirements.

24. Prior to proceeding with drainage work, check invert levels and positions of existing drains, sewers and inspection chambers with Info and drawings.

25. Sanitary facilities to conform to BS 6465.

26. All traps to sinks, lav basins to have 75mm deep seal anti-syphon traps. Hot/cold water to be supplied to all sinks and lav basins.

27. All drainage/plumbing to be cleared and fully tested and left in good order on completion.

ELECTRICAL WORK
28. All new and existing installations to comply in full with Latest IEE Regulations, and any relevant P.S.A., of Local Authority requirements. Contractor must check/test existing and include fully for bringing all work to required standard.

29. All neon circuits to be cleared and agreed with Designer.

30. All cleaners to be slide (Kode or similar non cosmetic).

31. All neon to be protected/guarded as required by legislation by Supplier.

32. All lighting rigs, special effects fittings etc., to comply in full with IEE Regulations and any specified Local Authority, P.E.L. requirements and supplier to certify this work.

VENTILATION
33. Internal toilet jobbies are to be mechanically vented to allow 3 air changes per hour with 15 minute overrun.

34. Ventilation to comply in full with B Regs A3 F1 to all areas, check that all Bathrooms, Kitchens and ToDets have the required fans/ventilation even if they are existing rooms.

SOUND INSULATION
35. To be provided to B Reg E1.

Issue	Revision	Date

alan brown design

TEL: 07535 642589 E-MAIL: alanhbrown@hotmail.com

Project:
NYNY
Queensway
Southampton

Title:
Ground Floor Plan
Licensing

Client: Nexum Leisure

Date	Scale	Drawn By
jan 08	1:100	mf

Drawing No. 100 Rev.

FIRE KEY	
PB	Push Bar ironmongery
D	Detector Head (Smoke/Heat detection)
E	emergency light fitting
	Fire alarm call point
	Bell
E	Exit sign (3 hour maintained)
FD30s	30 minute fire resisting self closing door
FD60s	60 minute fire resisting self closing door
DP	Dry powder extinguisher (10lb or 20lb)
W	Water extinguisher
CO2	CO2 extinguisher
AFFF	Multi extinguisher AFFF
B	Fire blanket

Electrical Contractor To Install Emergency Lighting And Fire Alarm System In Strict Accordance With Bs 5266 And Bs 5839.
Niceic Certification To Be Supplied

LICENSING KEY
AREA TO BE USED FOR THE SALE OF ALCOHOL THE PROVISION OF HOT FOOD AND DRINK AFTER 11PM AND THE PROVISION OF REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT.
THE LOCATION AND TYPE OF ANY FIRE SAFETY AND ANY OTHER SAFETY EQUIPMENT IS SHOWN AS AT PRESENT. THIS MAY BE VARIED AT TIME TO TIME WITH AGREEMENT OF THE FIRE OFFICER OR AFTER A FIRE RISK ASSESSMENT.



ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE BEFORE ANY WORK COMMENCES
ANY DISCREPANCIES TO BE REPORTED TO THE SUPERVISING OFFICER

GENERAL
1. All work to be carried out in strict accordance with the "Building Regulations 1991 - Latest Amendments" and to the complete satisfaction of the Building Surveyor.

2. Contractors are responsible for complying with all relevant Building Regulations, C of Pa, BS etc., and check that Building Control and Environmental Health Departments are satisfied with the scope and content of all work on completion and obtain any necessary certificates.

3. Voids, roof spaces etc. to be protected with any necessary fire stops and cavity barrier to comply with requirements Part B Schedule 1 Building Regulations 1991, approved documents ADB 1, B2 and B3.

4. All brick-a-brac items to be securely fixed by Main Contractor unless otherwise stated and agreed in writing.

5. All Contractors direct or through Contract to be fully responsible for visiting Site and including for all work arising from Site Conditions and Site Details and dimensions are their full responsibility.

6. Drawings are not to be used as part or contributing to a "Schedule of Conditions" or a Structural Survey.

BUILDING
7. Structural Steelwork to conform to BSS 5950 and to be encased to afford 1 hour fire protection in accordance with schedule 8/10.

8. Pad Stones to be Min size 440 x 100 x 215 unless noted otherwise.

9. Minimum bearing for Structural Steel to be 100mm.

10. Reinforced Concrete to be in accordance with BS 8110.

11. Timber to be in accordance with BS 5268 Part 2.

12. Check that all ceilings/floors comply with Fire Resistance requirements and underdraw/protect allowing fully for all work and finishing required.

FIRE
13. Means of Escape in Case of Fire to Reg. B4 and to the satisfaction of the Local Authority and the Fire Prevention Officer.

14. Emergency Light Systems to be installed to BS 5266/Part 1.

15. Fire Alarm System to be installed to BS5839 Part 1 Latest Edition with Audible Alarm throughout the premises.

16. Upholstered furniture should satisfy as a minimum standard Ignition Source 0 (cigarette test) and Ignition Source 5 (timber crib test) of BS 5852 1990.

17. All curtains, drapes, foliage and blinds to be flame proof to BS 3119 1959 (test method) in conjunction with BS 3120 1959 and in conjunction with BS 4358 1976 test and BS 5867 Part 2 1980 Type B test. D.O.E. P.E.A. specification 7 using source 5. 4

N.B. Suppliers/Contractors to check and be responsible for meeting any Local or Particular requirements in excess of these standards.

18. All doors thus marked FD30s to have half hour fire resistance be with Britton c/fixed self closer. Door frames to have 25mm fire check rebate to BS 476. Complete with Smoke Seals and Intumescent Strips.

19. All fire exit signs with directional arrows as necessary to have green background with white letters, 125mm high to BS 5499.

20. Fire Doors to be marked "FIRE DOOR KEEP SHUT".

21. Fire safety related Signs and Notices are to conform to British Standard BS 5499 and Fire Exit Signs to the Health and Safety Safety Signs and Signals Regulations.

22. Wall and ceiling finishes to Drinking Areas to be Class 1. Wall and Ceiling finishes to Entrance Halls to be Class 1. Escape routes to be Class 0. Wall finishes to small rooms (Max 30m2) to be class 3. N.B. Main Contractor to be responsible for ensuring that any Specialist finish or material complies with rating required and obtain written evidence of compliance.

PLUMBING AND DRAINAGE
23. All work to comply with latest legislation existing drains/plumbing to be checked and all remedial work to be included for and check the adequacy of gas and water supplies to meet all proposed requirements.

24. Prior to proceeding with drainage work, check invert levels and positions of existing drains, sewers and inspection chambers with Info and drawings.

25. Sanitary facilities to conform to BS 5455.

26. All traps to sinks, lav basins to have 75mm deep seal anti-syphon traps. Hot/cold water to be supplied to all sinks and lav basins.

27. All drainage/plumbing to be cleansed and fully tested and left in good order on completion.

ELECTRICAL WORK
28. All new and existing installations to comply in full with Latest IEE Regulations, and any relevant PEL, of Local Authority requirements. Contractor must check/test existing and include fully for bringing all work to required standard.

29. All neon circuits to be dimmed and agreed with Designer.

30. All dimmers to be slide (Mode or similar non dimmtick).

31. All neon to be protected/guarded as required by legislation by Supplier.

32. All lighting rigs, special effects fittings etc., to comply in full with IEE Regulations and any specified Local Authority, P.E.L. requirements and supplier to certify this work.

VENTILATION
33. Internal toilet blocks are to be mechanically vented to allow 3 air changes per hour with 15 minute overrun.

34. Ventilation to comply in full with B Regs AD F1 to all areas, check that all Bathrooms, Kitchens and ToDats have the required fans/ventilation even if they are existing rooms.

SOUND INSULATION
35. To be provided to B Reg E1.

Issue	Revision	Date

alan brown design

TEL: 07595 642589 E-MAIL: alanhbrown@hotmail.com

Project:
NY NY
Queensway
Southampton

Title:
First Floor Plan
Licensing

Client: Nexum Leisure

Date	Scale	Drawn By
jan 08	1:100	mf

Drawing No. 200
Rev.

Part B – Application to vary a premises license under the licensing Act 2003, Section 34.

Ref: 2009/00612/01SPRN
New York New York, 2 Queensway, Southampton

Applicants: **Nexus Leisure Ltd, 2 Bank Court, Weldon Road, Loughborough, Leicester, LE11 5RF.**

Proposed License Premises Supervisor: Mr Ian Harries

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES/ HOURS:

Exhibition of films	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Live Music:	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Recorded Music:	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Performance of dancing:	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00

Provision of facilities for making music	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Provision of facilities for dancing	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Provision of facilities for entertainment	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
Late night refreshment	Monday	23.00 – 05.00
	Tuesday	23.00 – 05.00
	Wednesday	23.00 – 05.00
	Thursday	23.00 – 05.00
	Friday	23.00 – 05.00
	Saturday	23.00 – 05.00
	Sunday	23.00 – 05.00
Supply of alcohol	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00
The opening hours of the premises	Monday	00.00 – 24.00
	Tuesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Wednesday	00.00 – 24.00
	Thursday	00.00 – 24.00
	Friday	00.00 – 24.00
	Saturday	00.00 – 24.00
	Sunday	00.00 – 24.00

Recommendation by Environmental Health (Food Safety Services):

Representation made to licensing services.

EHO Report by Polly Baker (Food safety Services)

The application was received by Environmental Health – Food Safety Service on the 26th March 2009. Consideration has been given, including a visual inspection of detailed plans submitted as part of the application. Site visit has been carried out to the premises but external observations only as premises are boarded up and not in use.

The site visit and plan reveals the following: All elevations shown.

Observations

- New York New York was formerly operated as a bar and nightclub located on corner of Queensway and Britons Street, which is on a main road which is predominantly a residential area, with hundreds of flats/apartments.
- The premises are an end-terrace situated between commercial premises.
- Directly opposite the premises are residential flats/ apartments, these are know as Occean Boulevard.
- The first floor of the premises is used for customers with two bars, a kitchen, office, female WC and stairs to the front of the building leading to the lower floor.
- The main customer entrance is a double set of doors which lead into a lobby area which has a further set of self closing double doors which lead into the main customer area.
- The ground floor consists of a dance floor and DJ area to the centre of the floor. There are two bars, toilets and cloakroom facilities.
- There are fire exits on Briton Street, Queensway and one to the rear of the building siding onto Orchard Place.
- To the front of the premises there are windows facing out on to Briton Street on the first floor.
- The rear of the premises which sides onto Orchard Place has a shared yard, usage not shown

Additional notes

- No acoustic report is available in support of the application specifying works covering sound attenuation at the premises, taking into account the proposal to hold live music and recorded music twenty four hours a day.

- The applicant has not identified any further risks in relation to part P (prevention of public nuisance) of the application, when quite clearly there are additional risks with the proposed live music and trading hours.

- There is no record of any sound limiting devices at the premises for restricting recorded music levels.

Complaints received, relating to noise since opening in 2004

- 4th May 2004, one complaint from Talbot Court of loud amplified music emanating from New York New York.
- 21st May 2004, one complaint from Talbot Court of loud amplified music emanating from New York New York.
- 28th May 2004, one complaint from Talbot Court of loud amplified music emanating from New York new York.
- Premises closed around July 2004

Objections raised on receipt of application to re-open

- A total of 25 residents living in the local vicinity of New York New York sent in objections with regard to public nuisance, in the form of either letters or signed petitions. The date for these objections was received between the 4th June 2005 – and 20th July 2005, copies of which are held on file.
- The application to issue a license was refused.

EHO concerns

- The potential for sound to breakout from the premises through the front double doors.
- Lack of an acoustic report and therefore, an assessment by the applicants of the controls needed to prevent noise outbreak from the premises as a whole.
- The history of alleged noise nuisance complaints from the premises is considered problematic. Allowing regulated entertainment in the form of “live music” gives us serious concern in terms of preventing public nuisance.
- The close proximity of residential housing and the proposal to hold live music leads us to believe there is potential for nuisance.
- The potential for dispersal noise from customers entering and exiting the building.

Conclusion

For the aforementioned reasons, I have serious concerns about the potential for noise nuisance from New York New York should the license be granted.

Recommendations

- To make a formal representation in relation to the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective.
- We object to the proposal under part E of the application, to have any live music at the premises, as live music is more difficult to control.
- To provide an acoustic report for regulated entertainment (Pre-recorded music).
- To review the opening hours of the premises.
- To provide a plan of preventive measures for dispersal noise from the customers entering and exiting the premises.

From: Chandler, Stewart
Sent: 24 April 2009 15:01
To: Burke, John
Subject: Police Objection - New York New York

Attachments: Under Age Issues at McCluskys & NY NY.doc; Analysts Report NY & McC Objection.doc; File Content - New York's.doc; G88 Police Objection NY 09.doc; Meetings and corres btwn Police and Management NY McC.doc; New Yorks Time Line Disorder.doc; NY NY Insp Bates.doc; NYNY report M Greening.doc; Significant Licensing Dates 1.doc

John

Quite a bit is duplicated on both files, but where there is a need to separate documents in relation to both premises I have done so.

Stewart

****
This electronic message contains information from Hampshire Constabulary which may be legally privileged and confidential. Any opinions expressed may be those of the individual and not necessarily the Hampshire Constabulary.

The information is intended to be for the use of the individual(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the [illegible] his electronic message in error, [illegible] n delete this email and destroy any copies of it.

All communications, including telephone calls and electronic messages to and from the Hampshire Constabulary may be subject to monitoring. Replies to this email may be seen by employees other than the intended recipient.
****

File Content – New York New York

1) Police Form G88 – Objection to Grant of Premises Licence at New York's

2) Timeline of Disorder at New York's - 1st January 2003 to 29th June 2004

3) Supporting documentation for timeline of disorder

4) Timeline of underage issues at New York's - 1st January 2003 to 29th June 2004

5) Supporting documentation for timeline of underage issues

6) Report from Police Inspector Phil Bates

7) Report from Chief Superintendent Matthew Greening

8) Report from Senior Police Analyst Holly Crane

9) Records of Meetings between Police and Management of New York's

10) Supporting documentation of meetings

11) Significant Licensing dates at New York's

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes on page 3.
Once completed please send your representation form to your local Licensing Authority.
You must keep a copy of the completed form for police records.

Hampshire Constabulary wish to make a representation(s) regarding the grant or variation of a Premises Licence or Club Premises Certificate issued under the Licensing Act 2003.
These representations must be made within 28 days

Postal address of premises or club premises:			
New York New York - 2 Queensway			
Post town:	Southampton	**Postcode:**	SO14 3AZ

Name of premises licence holder or club holding club premises certificate ***(if known)***
N/A

Police Details

Hampshire Constabulary is a responsible authority.

Name and address:
Police Sergeant Stewart Chandler 12-18 Hulse Road Southampton SO15 2JX

This application to object relates to the following licensing objective(s)

1)	**The prevention of crime and disorder**	☒
2)	**Public safety**	☐
3)	**The prevention of public nuisance**	☐
4)	**The protection of children from harm**	☒

Please select one or more boxes

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE
OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE
FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

State the ground(s) for representation *(please read guidance notes 1 & 2)*

The Chief Constable has delegated authority to all Operational Command Unit Commanders within Hampshire Constabulary in respect of his responsibilies under The Licensing Act 2003.
The OCU Commander, Chief Superintendent Greening has further delegated this responsibility to The Licensing Sergeant for Southampton.

Hampshire Police are objecting to the grant of new premises licences at both McClusky's and adjoining premises New York New York.

The grounds for objecting are based on evidence of crime and disorder that existed at both premises up until they closed in June 2004. This evidence will be produced as a timeline of disorder from 1st January 2003 until 29th June 2004 and is supported with documentation. There is also a timeline of under age issues associated with both premises from 1st January 2003 until 29th June 2004 and this too is supported with documentation.

The Police view is that the impact of granting premises licences at either one or both of these premises will undermine the following licensing objectives:

1) The Prevention of Crime & Disorder
2) The Protection of Children from Harm

The Police are also of the view that the granting of these licences will undermine the Prevention of Public Nuisance Licensing Objective however we are aware that a number of concerned residents will wish to make their own representations on that point.

The application is a significant and substantial one. If granted these two adjoining premises would have a combined capacity of nearly 1,400 persons. This would make these two establishments the second largest night time economy attraction in Southampton, the largest being Oceana which is located well away from any residential premises at Leisure World.

It is not only the size of these establishments that is of concern but the fact that the applicants are seeking to apply for premises licences that will authorise the sale of alcohol and the provision of entertainment 24 hours a day. If granted these premises would have the latest opening times for venues providing late night entertainment in Southampton. Generally in Southampton licensed premises of this size and nature have agreed to a terminal hour for the sale of alcohol to be set at 0300 hours and a closing time of between 30 minutes and one hour later. If these premises were granted licences beyond 0300 hours both venues would attract hundreds of revellers from other late night premises that closed at 0300 or earlier within the city. Many of these revellers will be well in drink if

**NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE
OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE
FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY**

not drunk and should the management refuse entry to these individuals this will inevitably lead to conflict at front doors with door staff and amongst themselves on the street.

Although The Police do not have any comparative data concerning other licensed premises in 2003/4 Inspector Phil Bates will provide evidence of his policing experiences regarding the crime and disorder associated with both McClusky's and New York New York at that time until they closed in June 2004.

The Police Licensing Sergeant then and now, Stewart Chandler will confirm that no other licensed premises within the Night Time Economy at that time attracted such levels of disorder, allegations of under age drinking and Police intervention with management.

Both applications are being made by the same company, Nexum Leisure Limited, the same company that previously operated these two premises back in 2004. Prior to these two night clubs closing in that year the extent of crime and disorder was such as to suggest poor and ineffective management as demonstrated by the enclosed Police documentation. If the premises were run this way now both would be in breach of one or more of the Licensing Objectives.
Looking at the proposed operating schedule for both premises there is very little change to the operating procedures that existed previously. The steps proposed are standard namely:

- CCTV installed in agreement with The Police
- Drugs Policy
- Door staff
- Check 21 Scheme

The only additional step in the operating schedule that did not exist before is an assurance by the applicant that they will not permit a drinks promotion that allows the unlimited supply of alcohol for a set price. The Police welcome this as in their view such all inclusive deals are wholly irresponsible and promote customers drinking to excess.

McClusky's and New Yorks were the only operators in Southampton at the time that decided to operate '£10 All Inclusive Deals' This effectively meant pay your £10.00 on the door and you can drink as much as you want during the night. The reality of such deals are that it encourages customers to drink more than they are comfortable with and Police and Hampshire Ambulance having to deal with the consequences .

At the time Police made representations to the club management regarding such irresponsible drinks promotions and eventually they were withdrawn (see copies of correspondence).

Back in 2003 / 2004 there was evidence of underage persons easily gaining access to both premises but more so McClusky's. As a result meetings were arranged between Police, management and company solicitors in order to discuss this issue and demand improvement (see copies of correspondence).

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

In order to address underage persons gaining access to either or both of these premises the proposed operating schedule refers to adopting a Check (Challenge) 21 Scheme. This is standard practice across the night time economy, what makes the difference is how well operators implement such schemes.

Within this application there is a variation on the previous licence that existed in 2004. The operators intend that Topless Dancing by performers and staff will take place. Even more reason to ensure Under 18's are not able to access the premises.

Another significant aspect to this application that warrants consideration is the impact the granting of these licences will have in undermining The Prevention of Public Nuisance Licensing Objective, this is an area that local residents will have a view on. The vicinity surrounding McClusky's and New York New York has changed significantly since the time these two clubs were operational. With the exception of an Indian Restaurant in Queensway the immediate vicinity is now predominantly residential.

Although both premises were still closed, in June 2005 Nexum Leisure Ltd applied to renew the annual Public Entertainment Licences for both McClusky's and New York NewYork. There were objections from residents to this application and the matter was considered by The Licensing Sub Committtee on 29th September 2005. The committee's decision was to refuse the application as 'in the absence of a clearly defined operation plan for the premises the sub committee was unable to assess the impact of the operation of the premises on the area and community and was not able to make an assessment of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder in the area given the concerns raised by objectors'

Nexum Leisure Limited appealed this decision to Southampton Magistrates Court however on 5th January 2006 Nexum Leisure Ltd withdrew the appeal. Without Public Entertainment Licences in place both premises would have reverted to just having Justices Licences permitting both to sell alcohol until 2300 hours and 2230 hours on a Sunday. Neither premises opted to convert their existing Justices Licences to premises licences in accordance with the then new Licensing Act 2003 (which took effect in November 2005) and as a consequence both premises became unlicensed.

At the time the residential objections were made McClusky's had a Public Entertainment Licence until 0200 hours and New York New York until 0300 hours. However both premises were only permitted to sell alcohol until 0200 hours.

Police are not just concerned about the actual management of these two premises and the likelihood of being deployed to this location to deal with crime and disorder but the overall impact on policing that these two venues will have on Southampton City Centre.

Chief Superintendent Greening will elaborate on this but essentially in order to provide adequate policing for the Night Time Economy in Southampton a significant number of police officers are drafted in at weekends to meet that demand, these officers are taken from Portswood, Bitterne and

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Shirley Police Staions often leaving these areas covered by minimum staffing levels. As it stands as many as 4 Sergeants, 25 Constables and an Inspector are currently required to police the Night Time Economy. Many of these officers will be involved in the arrests of persons for alcohol related disorder and it is not uncommon for custody space at Southampton Central to fill up by midnight and subsequent prisoners having to be transported to other custody centres across the county.

The location of these two premises in Queensway are out on a limb from the main proliferation of licensed premises in the City Centre and in order to provide the necessary policing cover for these two venues it would be at the expense of already strained resources.

The granting of premises licences at McClusky's and New Yorks will exacerbate this problem.

In Summary

(A) There are genuine police concerns about how these two establishments will operate, this is based on the below evidence:

(1) Timelines of disorder in relation to both McClusky's and New York's from 1st January 2003 – 29th June 2004. This evidence is supported by copies of print outs from Police Control Room

(2) Timelines of underage issues at both McClusky's and New York from 1st January 2003 – 29th June 2004. This evidence is supported by statements, internal Police e-mails and print outs from Police Control Room

(Evidence (1) & (2) to be presented by officers from The Police Licensing Unit)

(3) Report from Inspector Phil Bates regarding his experiences of policing McClusky's and New Yorks in 2003/4

(B) The impact the granting of these two licences will have on existing police rersources, this is based on the below evidence:

(1) Report from Chief Superintendent Matthew Greening

(2) Extract from the Southampton Strategic Assessment October 2007 – September 2008 produced by Senior Police Analyst Holly Crane

State any conditions that the Police seek to negate the need for a hearing

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE
OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE
FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

The Police position is that the granting of these two licences should be refused.

IT IS AN OFFENCE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003 TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS REPRESENTATION

Part 3 – Signatures *(please read guidance note 3)*

Recommendation of Police Officer

To oppose applications for the grant of premises licences at both McClusky's and New York

Signature of Police Officer Completing

Signature: Sgt 609 Stewart Chandler

Date: 23/04/2009

Recommendation of Police Sergeant

To oppose applications for the grant of premises licences at both McClusky's and New York

Signature of Police Sergeant

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

NEW GRANT OR VARIATION OF PREMISES LICENCE
OR CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE
FORM FOR REPRESENTATIONS FROM HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Signature: Sgt 609 Stewart Chandler

Date: 23/04/2009

Decision of Police Licensing Inspector

To oppose applications for the grant of premises licences at both McClusky's and New York

Signature of Police Licensing Inspector

Signature: Inspector 325 Lisa Stevens

Date: 24/04/2009

NOTES FOR GUIDANCE

1. The ground(s) for representation must be based on one of the licensing objectives.
2. Please list any additional information or details, for example dates of problems which are included in the grounds for representation if available.
3. The representation form must be signed.

New Yorks New Yorks – Crime and Disorder Timeline
1st January 2003 until 29th June 2004

No.	Date & Time	Location	Incident or Occurrence	Reference
	29/06/2004		**PREMISES CEASED TRADING**	
1	26/06/2004 @ 2330	New York's	Offender met female aggrieved inside club, showed her a tablet which she refused. Offender believed to have spiked her drink who then collapsed – taken to hospital	Inc No 04062700264
2	12/06/2004 @ 0055	New York's	Fight amongst males known to each other. No injuries	Inc No 04061200197
3	11/06/2004 @ 0020	New York's	Staff reporting male being violent towards door staff. Male detained	Inc No 04061100027
4	10/06/2004 @ 2315	New York's	Female drinking alcohol outside. Requested to hand over the bottle, refused and hit male in the eye. Subsequently charged	RMS 44040016183
5	30/05/2004 @ 2300	New York's	Phone left on bar area. Phone used to ring numbers within address book to make rude and threatening calls	Inc No 04053100219
6	29/05/2004 @ 0100	New York's	Bag left unattended and stolen by persons unknown	RMS 44040569761
7	09/05/2004 @ 2350	New York's	Female had mobile phone stolen from shoulder bag whilst she was wearing it	RMS 44041147205
8	25/04/2004 @ 0100	New York's	Male detained by door staff for assaulting staff. Police requested however male got away.	Inc No 04042500089
9	24/04/2004 @ 0001	New York's	Door staff attempts to remove two females one of whom was attacking the other with a bottle. In the process member of door staff is injured	RMS 44040065065
10	21/04/2004 @ 0150	New York's	Aggrieved parked outside entrance to night club. Friends got in whereupon a group of males started punching and kicking the car causing damage. Driver injured as a result	Inc No 04042100064
11	04/04/2004 @ 0200	New York's	Theft of phone from handbag whilst inside premises	RMS 44040825978
12	20/03/2004 @ 0001	New York's	Ejected female alleging assault by door staff and theft of jacket and bag	Inc No 04032000239
13	29/02/2004 @ 0001	New York's	Offender approached male inside and sprayed him with pepper spray	RMS 44040737226
14	19/02/2004 @ 2200	New York's	Mobile phone taken from hand bag	RMS 44040389328
15	15/02/2004 @ 2230	New York's	Unattended handbag stolen by persons unknown	RMS 44040552852
16	14/02/2004 @ 0115	New York's	Ejected male claiming assault by door staff for no reason	Inc No 04021400145
17	24/01/2004 @ 0135	New York's	Female had mobile phone stolen from shoulder bag whilst she was wearing it	RMS 44041108468

18	23/01/2004 @ 0016	New York's	Complaint from Sgt Clawson re unhelpful attitude of door staff following serious incident involving male waving a spade at someone. See separate report from Sgt Clawson	Inc No 04012300010
19	18/01/2004 @ 0300	New York's	Male claims he was assaulted by door staff	Inc No 04011800198
20	04/01/2004 @ 0146	New York's	Group 'squaring up ' to each other	Inc No 04010400113
21	03/01/2004 @ 0040	New York's	Unknown person threw glass within night club which hit a female customer causing cuts to her face	Inc No 04010300063
22	01/01/2004 @ 0120	New York's	Male punched in the face by unknown male outside premises	RMS 44041235490
23	20/12/2003 @ 0232	New York's	From CCTV – Large fight with weapons, two detained	Inc No 03122000227
24	07/12/2003 @ 0126	New York's	Disabled male alleging assault by door staff on his ejection	Inc No 03120700166
25	22/11/2003 @ 0219	New York's	From CCTV – Large fight taking place. All quiet on police arrival. Further call from CCTV fight now taking place on a bus	Inc No 03112200169
26	01/11/2003 @ 0301	New York's	Females fighting outside, one received a cut head	Inc No 03110100272
27	01/11/2003 @ 0102	New York's	Caller alleging assault by door staff	Inc No 03110100119
28	26/10/2003 @ 0154	New York's	Off duty Police Officer requesting police attendance for disturbance outside. All quiet on arrival	Inc No. 03102600146
29	03/10/2003 @ 0052	New York's	Two underage males alleging assault by door staff	Inc No 03100300041
30	29/09/2003 @ 0051	New York's	Male left club, refused re-entry. Male alleging pushed over by door staff causing grazes	Inc No 03092900031
31	28/09/2003 @ 0200	New York's	Male left nightclub, approached by 4-5 males, one of whom smashed bottle over aggrieved head causing cuts to ear. Male fell to ground, kicked by another whilst first male scraped broken bottle across his neck	RMS 44030894887
32	13/09/2003 @ 0008	New York's	From CCTV – Group fighting outside. Dispersed, no complaints	Inc No 03091300026
33	12/09/2003 @ 0340	New York's	Manager contacts Police – male assaulted inside club with facial injuries. Gone prior to police arrival	Inc No 03091200231
34	07/09/2003 @ 0117	New York's	Male removed keys from another male who was going to drink & drive. Got beaten up ambulance attended – no complaint	Inc No 03090700130
35	25/08/2003 @ 0159	New York's	Police attend to deal with male detained by door staff. On arrival detained male spat in the face of officer Charged Assault Police	RMS 4403031118
36	17/08/2003 @ 0214	New York's	Call from manager – 3 males detained for assaults at the premises	Inc No 03081700244
37	17/08/2003 @ 0200	New York's	Male hit over the head causing injury - Charged	RMS 44030630567
38	17/08/2003 @ 0110	New York's	Caller reporting three onto one assault. Police and ambulance attend	Inc No 03081700149

39	04/08/2003 @ 0027	New York's	From manager – Three females ejected, one threw a brick through neon sign	Inc No 03080400043
40	03/08/2003 @ 0234	New York's	From CCTV – Fight outside. Police attend group dispersed	Inc No 03080300272
41	19/07/2003 @ 0228	New York's	From CCTV – Fight at NY. Door staff trying to restrain persons. Later described as a running fight in the street. Male with head injury to hospital	Inc No 03071900292
42	18/07/2003 @ 0149	New York's	From CCTV – Male 'kicking off' with iron bar and road signs. Door of club damaged. Female has head injury from an assault	Inc No 03071800094
43	17/07/2003 @ 0106	New York's	From CCTV – males intimidating door staff. Males moved on by Police and monitored by CCTV	Inc No 03071700072
44	05/07/2003 @ 0156	New York's	Police reporting fight outside – persons seen and moved on	Inc No 03070500215
45	29/06/2003 @ 0029	New York's	Report of group fighting, windscreen of car smashed. All parties gone on police arrival	Inc No 03062900059
46	21/06/2003 @ 0141	New York's	Male at entrance causing trouble with door staff, moved on by police	Inc No 03062100213
47	20/06/2003 @ 0043	New York's	Male alleging assault by door staff – injured the back of his head	Inc No 03062000043
48	14/06/2003 @ 0159	New York's	Female reporting that both her and her boyfriend assaulted by door staff	Inc No 03061400240
49	07/06/2003 @ 0104	New York's	Caller reporting persons fighting outside with bits of wood. Police attend, one injured – 2 detained	Inc No 03060700118
50	18/05/2003 @ 0213	New York's	Female reporting being assaulted by two women, drink thrown in her face and kicked between the legs	Inc No 03051800204
51	10/05/2003 @ 0112	New York's	From ambulance – male very drunk and abusive, initially reported as unconscious. Taken to hospital	Inc No 03051000134
52	02/03/2003 @ 0159	New York's	From CCTV – Fight in door way of club, window damaged	Inc No 03030200188
53	21/02/2003 @ 2343	New York's	Caller stating males fighting outside. Some with shirts off and covered in blood. Aggrieved refusing to assist police – no complaint	Inc No 03022101632
54	09/02/2003 @ 0235	New York's	Call from Police officer – Fight outside, further assistance required. All parties moved on	Inc No 03020900177
55	01/01/2003 @ 0210	New York's	Call from manager – 5 Asian men trying to force entry, causing damage to door	Inc No 03010100321

INCIDENT: 04062700264 DATE/TIME : 27/06/2004 03:46 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : DRUINC DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8514

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : STAFF NURSE[redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : SOUTHAMPTON GENERAL ACC & EMERGENCY

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
27/06/2004				
03:46:00	TTCAD4168	8183	ENTRY	
03:46:55	TTCAD4168	8183	CHNG	Details Entered;
03:52:10	TTCAD4129	174	MISC	SN06 ADVISED
03:52:17	TTCAD4129	174	MISC	SC72 WILL ATTEND SHORTLY
03:59:41	TTCAD4128	8514	DSP	SC72 (SECT) O/3720
03:59:41	TTCAD4128	8514	ENR	SC72 (SECT) O/3720
04:18:13	TTCAD4129	174	SUPP	
04:21:42	TTCAD4132	11446	MISC	SY1X AWARE - WILL RING SY72 ON MOBILE.
04:23:55	TTCAD4129	174	ONS	SC72
04:24:05	TTCAD4129	174	CLOC	SC72[SGH A AND E]
04:32:00	TTCAD4129	174	SUPP	
04:34:19	TTCAD4165	2687	MISC	TWUN SGT WAKEFORD NOTED
04:42:06	TTCAD4117	8991	SUPP	
05:05:01	TTCAD4132	11446	SUPP	
06:23:52	TTCAD4129	174	CLEAR	SC72
06:23:52	TTCAD4129	174	CLOSURE	
06:24:54	TTCAD4128	8514	SUPP	
06:25:14	TTCAD4129	174	SUPP	
06:28:11	TTCAD4128	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10,C91);
06:28:11	TTCAD4128	8514	CLOSE	
06:28:11	TTCAD4128	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC

C+D
N.Y.1

06:48:13	TTCAD4129	174	SUPP	
06:50:01	TTCAD4130	11366	SUPP	
06:52:26	TTCAD4130	11366	SUPP	
06:53:07	TTCAD4130	11366	SUPP	
06:57:34	TTCAD4129	240	SUPP	
10:47:11	TTCAD4066	8972	PRINT	Sent to TTSOCO
10:51:48	TTCAD4066	8972	SUPP	

27062004/03:46:00 8183 TTCAD4168

WE HAVE A FEMALE HERE CALLED [redacted] WHO HAS BEEN BROUGHT IN BY HER MOTHER AND COUSIN. SHE AND COUSIN WERE IN NEW YORK AND AN INDIAN MALE WITH A SMILEY FACE WEARING A WHITE LONG SLEEVED TOP WITH YELLOW AND GREEN ON IT OFFERED HER DRUGS WHICH SHE REFUSED. IT IS BELIEVED THAT HE THEN SWAPPED DRINKS WITH HER AND THAT THE DRINK WAS SPIKED.

REQUEST FOR POLICE TO ATTEND A & E AND ALSO TO CHECK THE CLUB FOR THE MALE.

COUSIN IS WITNESS AND WILL MAKE A STATEMENT. FEMALE [redacted] IS QUITE BAD. [redacted]

.

27062004/03:46:55 8183 TTCAD4168

MALE IS APPROX 5' 6".

.

27062004/04:18:13 174 TTCAD4129

SC72 THIS APPEARS GENUINE REPORT OF DRINK SPIKED

REQST POLICE SURGEON TO TAKE BLOOD SAMPLE

27062004/04:32:00 174 TTCAD4129

POLICE SURGEON ARRANGED TO ATTEND
LOG [redacted]

.

27062004/04:42:06 8991 TTCAD4117

SY1X DC BRUNSDEN ADVISED AND WON'T BE ATTENDING AT THIS STAGE

SOC ADVISED AND ALSO ATTENDING WDC FEWSTER

27062004/05:05:01 11446 TTCAD4132

INCIDENT: 04061200197 DATE/TIME : 12/06/2004 01:59 SOURCE : T GRADE : 4 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] ,SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0770[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
12/06/2004				
01:59:21	TTCAD4122	11412	ENTRY	
03:00:57	TTCAD4129	8547	SUPP	
03:01:25	TTCAD4129	8547	INCMSG	W/OHFEC035, ACR REQ NO OIC
03:06:24	TTCAD4129	8547	CHNG	Grade: 3 ==> 4;
05:09:40	OHFEC035	6297	SUPP	
05:10:22	TTCAD4129	8547	SUPP	
05:10:30	TTCAD4129	8547	CHNG	Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> SACR;
05:10:43	TTCAD4129	8547	PRINT	Sent to ST
14/06/2004				
10:19:48	SC075	10403	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: SACR ==> SDIV;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
10:19:48	SC075	10403	CLOSE	
10:19:50	SC075	10403	PRINT	Sent to SC

12062004/01:59:21 11412 TTCAD4122

CALLER REPORTING THAT HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY THREE DOORMAN AND TWO EX-DOORMAN OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK. HE DOES NOT REQUIRE AN AMBULANCE. HE SAID THAT THE EX-DOORMAN WHO HAS PUNCHED HIM TONIGHT WAS THE ONE WHO HAS KICKED HIM OUT BEFORE AND HE DID LODGE A COMPLAINT BEFORE, BUT NOTHING WAS DONE. HE BELIEVES THAT HE HAS SOMETHING AGAINST HIM.

HE WANTS TO WAIT AT NEW YORK, NEW YORK TO SEE AN OFFICER.

12062004/03:00:57 8547 TTCAD4129

CALL BACK TO INFMT HE WILL BE AT GIRLFRIENDS HOUSE ALL DAY TOMMORROW AND WOULD LIKE CALL ON THERE

2.42 C+D

ADDRESS IS [redacted]

12062004/05:09:40 6297 OHFEC035

***
[redacted]
**

12062004/05:10:22 8547 TTCAD4129
*[redacted] STATION TO CALL ON [redacted] TO TAKE ASSAULT REPORT PLSE**

14062004/10:19:48 10403 SC075

RESULT

[redacted]
OIC - 2695 DYSON FOR ALLOCATION

INCIDENT: 04061100027 DATE/TIME : 11/06/2004 00:20 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : DISOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8514

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 02380[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
11/06/2004				
00:20:46	TTCAD4135	11586	ENTRY	
00:22:18	TTCAD4128	8514	DSP	SD90 (CCTV) O/20568,2404
00:22:18	TTCAD4128	8514	ENR	SD90 (CCTV) O/20568,2404
00:22:37	TTCAD4128	8514	ONS	SD90
00:29:11	TTCAD4128	8514	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/20322,20695
00:29:11	TTCAD4128	8514	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/20322,20695
00:29:31	TTCAD4128	8514	DSP	SC72 (SECT) O/20129,20730
00:29:31	TTCAD4128	8514	ENR	SC72 (SECT) O/20129,20730
00:30:05	TTCAD4128	8514	MISC	FM SD90 HAVE ONE DETAINED AT THIS TIME REQ ANOTHR UNIT TO THE AREA PSE
00:32:31	TTCAD4128	8514	ONS	SC72
00:39:05	TTCAD4129	174	CLEAR	SC97
00:42:08	TTCAD4128	8514	CLEAR	SC72 SD90
00:42:08	TTCAD4128	8514	CLOSURE	
00:42:24	TTCAD4128	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R18);
00:42:24	TTCAD4128	8514	CLOSE	
00:42:25	TTCAD4128	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC

11062004/00:20:46 11586 TTCAD4135

INFT REPORTING MALE BEING VIOLENT TOWARDS THE DOORMEN AT THE CLUB

CAN HEAR MALE IN THE BACKGROUND SHOUTING ABUSE

C+D 2.4.3

NFDATT

11062004/00:42:24 8514 TTCAD4128

RESULT

ONE DETAINED TO SC

CD
N.44

Occurrence summary (CPS)

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:07 by 8076

Report no.: 44040016183

Date/Time: between....10/06/2004 23:15 and 10/06/2004 23:15

Reported time: 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT) 11/06/2004 02:02

Place of offence: 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT)

Classification: 8/6/VIOLENCE: Assault occasioning actual bodily harm

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: Female was drinking alcohol outside of the nightclub when asked to handover the bottle she refused. a struggle started and the female hit the aggrieved in the eye.

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

1) T0900646498 [Init rpt - New] Due: 17/04/2009 18:52 #8076 FUSCO, P. ->#20568 PASSFIELD, D. [Low] 44040016183 @11/06/2004 02:02 (2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sect

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Charged] [redacted] (31) F [redacted] E United Kingdom (OCU: 6 WESTERN, District: E EASTLEIGH, Sector: EE EASTLEIGH, Beat: 6EE01 EASTLEIGH CENTRAL)), Id #:145454
2) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (31) M [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted] England (OCU: 6 WESTERN, District: E EASTLEIGH, Sector: EH HEDGE END, Beat: 6EH00 HEDGE END) (Land line) 02380 [redacted]
3) [Suspect] [redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom SO14 3AZ (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #20568 PASSFIELD, D. (Reporting officer)
2) #20568 PASSFIELD, D. (Officer in case)
3) #2590 MORTON, P. (Submitting officer)
4) #20568 PASSFIELD, D. (Charging officer/unit)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Working Sheet

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:07 by 807

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 12:31 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040469369 Assault @11/06/2004 02:02**

Date/Time: between.... 10/06/2004 23:15 and 10/06/2004 23:15

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s):

1) [Aggrieved] [redacted]8 (31) M [redacted], HAMPSHIRE [redacted] CENTRAL, Neighbourhood: [redacted], Sector: [redacted]
2) [Charged] [redacted] (31) F [redacted] HAMPSHIRE ([redacted] HAMPSHIRE, [redacted], Sector: [redacted] Beat: [redacted]
3) [Suspect] [redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] NY2 NIGHTCLUB, QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):

1) #2590 MORTON, P. (Submitting officer)
2) #20568 PASSFIELD, D. (Officer in case; Reporting officer; Charging officer/unit)

Flag(s):

1) Type: Expiry date:

Remarks: [redacted]

Summary: Female was drinking alcohol outside of the nightclub when asked to handover the bottle she refused. a struggle started and the female hit the aggrieved in the eye.

Remarks:

INCIDENT: 04053100219 DATE/TIME : 31/05/2004 04:21 SOURCE : T GRADE : 4 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : THEOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 6425

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MR[redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 02380[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
01/06/2004				
17:50:52	SC104	6628	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: SACR ==> SDIV;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C59);
17:50:52	SC104	6628	CLOSE	
17:50:54	SC104	6628	PRINT	Sent to SC
31/05/2004				
04:21:24	OHFEC036	10682	ENTRY	
04:21:48	OHFEC036	10682	CHNG	Type: PUBOTHER ==> THEOTHER;TypeDescr: Public Order Other Incident ==> Theft Other Incident;
04:29:04	TTCAD4130	760	CHNG	Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> WSTH;
04:35:20	TTCAD4132	11130	DSP	WH50 (AREA) O/1511,20369
04:35:20	TTCAD4132	11130	ENR	WH50 (AREA) O/1511,20369
04:35:33	TTCAD4165	6958	SUPP	
04:36:36	TTCAD4131	6425	DSP	WH1E (FOOT) O/3778
04:36:36	TTCAD4131	6425	ENR	WH1E (FOOT) O/3778
04:40:28	TTCAD4132	11130	CLEAR	WH50
04:40:47	TTCAD4132	11130	SUPP	
04:45:05	TTCAD4132	11130	SUPP	
04:45:46	TTCAD4132	11130	CHNG	Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: WSTH ==> SDIV;
04:45:52	TTCAD4132	11130	CLEAR	WH1E
04:45:52	TTCAD4132	11130	CLOSURE	
04:49:48	TTCAD4130	760	ROPEN	FOR ACR & DEPLOYMENT
04:50:20	TTCAD4130	760	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ NO OIC SLOW TIME DEPLOYMENT

C+D
N.45

04:50:41	TTCAD4130	760	CHNG	Grade: 3 ==> 4;
04:55:19	OHFEC036	10682	SUPP	
04:57:32	TTCAD4130	760	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> SACR;
04:57:46	TTCAD4130	760	PRINT	Sent to SC

31052004/04:21:24 10682 OHFEC036

INFT HAD HIS PHONE STOLEN FROM HIM TONIGHT. IT WAS ON THE BAR AND A MALE TOOK IT.

HE HAS CALLED THE PHONE TEL NO - 0796[redacted]

THE MALE ANSWERED IT AND STATED THAT HE WANTED INFT TO MEET HIM AT SC TRAIN STN WITH #100.00 TO GET THE PHONE BACK.

HE THREATENED INFT WITH A GUN OVER HIS SHOULDER IF HE DIDN'T PLAY BY HIS RULES AND SOMEONE WOULD GET HIM AND TO WATCH HIS BACK.

INFT TOLD MALE WHERE TO GO AND THEN THE MALE SAID THAT HE WOULD GET HIS SISTER - SISTERS ADDRESS WAS ON PHONE.

INFT IS MAINLY CALLING BECAUSE OF THE THEATS TO HIS SISTER.

THE THEFT IS ON CCTV AT CLUB

CAN SOMEONE CONTACT INFT TONIGHT - HE IS SAT BY THE PHONE WAITING AND VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE THREATS TO HIS SISTER. HE IS NOT GOING TO MEET THIS MALE BECAUSE OF THE MENTION OF A GUN

31052004/04:35:33 6958 TTCAD4165

NOTED

UNIT TO ATTEND INF'S ADDRESS TO TAKE DETAILS OF THEFT

NO GUN SEEN

AWAITING UPDATE ON INFO RE: THREAT ASSESSMENT

.

31052004/04:40:47 11130 TTCAD4132

WH1E - CONTACTING THE INF VIA PHONE

31052004/04:45:05 11130 TTCAD4132

WH1E - HAVE SPOKEN TO THE INF WHO IS WELL IN DRINK AND RAMBLING WHEN SPOKEN TO

MALE DOES NOT KNOW HIS SISTERS ADDRESS OR SURNAME OR TELEPHONE NUMBER

INF DOES NOT KNOW THE LOCATION OF THE MALE WHO HAS TAKEN HIS PHONE

MOBILE NUMBER TRIED AND NO REPLY

31052004/04:55:19 10682 OHFEC036

[redacted]

31052004/04:57:32 760 TTCAD4130

==========

FOR STATION DEPLOYMENT - SLOW TIME CALL PLEASE.

==========

01062004/17:50:52 6628 SC104

RESULT

[redacted]

OIC PS PARTRIDGE

C+D
N.46

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:28 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040569761 Theft @29/05/2004 02:44**

Date/Time: between.... 29/05/2004 01:00 and 29/05/2004 01:00

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved][redacted] (25) F[redacted]L [redacted] (Voice) (02380[redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #10900 BARTON, J. (Reporting officer; Supervising officer)
2) #4013 CRIME DESK, S. (Officer in case)
3) #8076 FUSCO, P. (Submitting officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Bag left unattended in night club. between times stated bag has been taken by means and persons unknown.

Remarks:

C+D
N.97

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:32 by 8076

Occurrence: **44041147205 Theft @09/05/2004 23:50**

Date/Time: between.... 08/05/2004 22:00 and 08/05/2004 23:30

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved][redacted] (28) F[redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK, NEW YORK, 2 QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #8976 DEWEY, P. (Reporting officer; Supervising officer)
2) #4013 CRIME DESK, S. (Officer in case)
3) #11714 DYER, V. (Submitting officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Aggrieved reporting that she was in new york, new york and had her bag zipped up on her shoulder. when she next checked the bag, which was still on her shoulder, the zip had been unzipped and her mobile phone had been taken by person/s unknown.

Remarks:

INCIDENT: 04042500089 DATE/TIME : 25/04/2004 01:00 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PERDET DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 6564

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] DOORSTAFF CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
25/04/2004				
01:00:21	TTCAD4124	10920	ENTRY	
01:02:42	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/3720,9198
01:02:42	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/3720,9198
01:03:54	TTCAD4130	11164	XREF	#HC04042500092, SAME INC
01:03:54	TTCAD4130	11164	DUP	Duplicates Incident #HC04042500092, SAME INC
01:04:08	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	XR2A (FOOT) O/21005,3016
01:04:08	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	XR2A (FOOT) O/21005,3016
01:04:21	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SC74 (SECT) O/20399,9250
01:04:21	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SC74 (SECT) O/20399,9250
01:04:25	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SP78 (SECT) O/2827
01:04:25	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SP78 (SECT) O/2827
01:05:54	TTCAD4129	6564	ONS	XR2A
01:06:15	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SC73 (SECT) O/20001,9150
01:06:15	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SC73 (SECT) O/20001,9150
01:06:37	TTCAD4130	11164	MISC	SC73,THERE WAS A FIGHT - ALL HAVE LEFT IN TAXI'S - NO OTHER UNITS
01:06:40	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	SP78
01:06:43	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	SC74
01:06:51	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	SC73
01:08:33	TTCAD4130	11164	MISC	XR2A,MALE DETAINED BY DOORSTAFF - NO BIG FIGHT
01:12:13	TTCAD4129	6564	CLEAR	SC98
01:13:07	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	XR2A

C+D
N.48

01:13:07	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSURE	
01:15:32	TTCAD4130	11164	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R18);
01:15:32	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSE	
01:15:33	TTCAD4130	11164	PRINT	Sent to SC

25042004/01:00:21 10920 TTCAD4124

A MALE IS BEING DETAINED FOR ASSAULTING DOOR STAFF. HE IS CAUSING TROUBLE AND POLICE REQD ASAP. I COULD HEAR THE MALE SHOUTING IN THE BACKGROUND.

25042004/01:15:32 11164 TTCAD4130

********** RESULT **********

MALE AT LARGE - GOT AWAY WITH THOSE INVOLVED IN FIGHT WHO LEFT AREA IN TAXI
NO AGG

C+D
N.49

Occurrence summary (CPS)

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:08 by 8076

Report no.: 44040065065

Date/Time: between....24/04/2004 00:00 and 24/04/2004 00:40

Reported time: 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT) 24/04/2004 00:40

Place of offence: 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT)

Classification: 8/6/VIOLENCE: Assault occasioning actual bodily harm

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: Door staff became aware of physical altercation between 2 females in club, both females in drink, one female attempts to strike other female with drink bottle and believed accidently assaults the member of doorstaff instead who was attempting to eject females from the club

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Aggrieved][redacted], [redacted] (28) M[redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT) (Land line) 07791433402),
2) [Suspect][redacted], [redacted] (23) F[redacted], HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom [redacted](OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON,[redacted] (Land line) 02380[redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] 2 QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE United Kingdom SO14 3AZ (NEW YORK NEW YORK) (OCU: 5 SOUTHAMPTON, District: S CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON, Sector: SW CENTRAL SOUTHAMPTON WEST, Beat: 5SW02 WATERFRONT)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #3043 CLAWSON, T. (Reporting officer)
2) #3797 PATIENT, A. (Officer in case)
3) #2619 TOMBLESON, S. (Submitting officer)
4) #3043 CLAWSON, T. (Supervising officer)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Hampshire Constab

INCIDENT: 04042100064 DATE/TIME : 21/04/2004 01:51 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : DAMINPROG DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 6676

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 0777[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
21/04/2004				
01:51:36	TTCAD4126	11073	ENTRY	
01:52:01	TTCAD4129	8186	XREF	#HC04042100062
01:52:56	TTCAD4114	8949	APND	LocCmt: O/S NEW YORKS;Caller: [redacted];Address: [redacted] Phone: ;Phone: ;Type: ASSREP;
01:53:09	TTCAD4130	6676	DSP	SY50 (AREA) O/20229,2319
01:53:09	TTCAD4130	6676	ENR	SY50 (AREA) O/20229,2319
01:53:33	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SL05 ADVISED..
01:54:36	TTCAD4129	8186	DSP	SY99 (VAN) O/20343
01:54:36	TTCAD4129	8186	ENR	SY99 (VAN) O/20343
01:54:38	TTCAD4114	8949	SUPP	
01:55:36	TTCAD4129	8186	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ OIC 2319
01:56:20	TTCAD4130	6676	CLEAR	SY99
01:56:30	TTCAD4130	6676	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20528,3893
01:56:30	TTCAD4130	6676	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20528,3893
01:57:11	TTCAD4130	6676	ONS	SY50
01:58:36	OHFEC036	10682	SUPP	
01:58:52	TTCAD4130	6676	ONS	SC99
01:58:59	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SY50 - AIO..
01:59:14	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SN05 - VEH AHS BEEN DAMAGED & LADY HAS BEEN ASSAULTED...
01:59:29	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SN05 - GRIOUP DISPERSED TWDS ST MARYS AREA..
01:59:31	TTCAD4130	6676	DSP	SN05 (PSGT)
01:59:31	TTCAD4130	6676	ENR	SN05 (PSGT)

C+D
N.Y 10

01:59:43	TTCAD4130	6676	CLOC	SY50[AREA SEARCH]
02:08:14	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SC99 - SEVERAL MALES INVOLVED...
02:08:36	TTCAD4130	6676	SUPP	
02:09:44	TTCAD4130	6676	SUPP	
02:16:41	TTCAD4130	6676	SUPP	
02:18:45	TTCAD4130	6676	ONS	SN05
02:30:54	TTCAD4130	6676	CLEAR	SY50
02:33:55	TTCAD4130	6676	CLEAR	SN05
02:34:03	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	SC99 - TAKING STATEMENTS AT SC...
02:37:48	TTCAD4130	6676	MISC	3893 - MALE REFUSED TO GO TO HOSPITAL - CAN HAS ATTEND..FRONT OFFICE AT SC..
02:39:57	TTCAD4130	6676	CLEAR	SC99
02:39:57	TTCAD4130	6676	CLOSURE	
02:40:11	TTCAD4129	8186	SUPP	
02:49:59	TTCAD4130	6676	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C60);
02:49:59	TTCAD4130	6676	CLOSE	
02:50:00	TTCAD4130	6676	PRINT	Sent to SC
04:37:56	TTCAD4129	689	PRINT	Sent to SC

21042004/01:51:36 11073 TTCAD4126

A GROUP OF MALES HAVE BEEN EJECTED FROM THE CLUB AND ARE NOW ATTACKING A CAR PARJKED OUTSIDE.

DESC: 6 OR 7 ASIAN MALES IN THEIR EARLY 20S

VEHICLE BEING DAMAGED IS A SMALL BLUE RENAULT

NO FURTHER DETTAILS AT THIS TIME

21042004/01:52:56 8949 TTCAD4114

CALLER IN BLUE FIESTA PARKED OUTSIDE NEW YORK
THEY WERE SET UPON BY GROUP OF ABOUT 10 YOUTHS (NOW GONE - NO DESCS OR DIRECTION OF TRAVEL)
BOYFRIEND BEATEN UP, HE IS BLEEDING FROM A CUT BY HIS EYE
.... THEY ARE LOCKING THEMSELVES IN THE CAR UNTIL POLICE ARRIVE
CALLER VERY SCARED, FRIGHTENED YOUTHS WILL COME BACK (HENCE GRADE 2)
CALLING H.A.S.

21042004/01:54:38 8949 TTCAD4114

H.A.S. INFORMED & ATTENDING REF : 26

21042004/01:58:36 10682 OHFEC036

[redacted]

21042004/02:08:36 6676 TTCAD4130

SC99 - MAIN OFFENDER IS BELIEVED TO BE IC3 - WEQARING RED TOP - DRIVING BLACK BMW - [redacted]

.

21042004/02:09:44 6676 TTCAD4130

SY50 - ASNT FOR IC3 GROUP

.

21042004/02:16:41 6676 TTCAD4130

SN05 - GROUP WALKING OFF TWDS MCCLUSKYS - CAN CCTV MONITER?

.

T1 - VS CHECKING.ASNT..

.

21042004/02:40:11 8186 TTCAD4129

AMB ATTENDING FRONT OFFICE AT SC - REF 36

****

21042004/02:49:59 6676 TTCAD4130

****RESULT***

.

DETAILS OBTAINED

FURTHER ENQS

ASNT FOR OFFENDERS

[redacted]

.

C+D
V.Y 11

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:31 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040825978 Theft @04/04/2004 03:40**

Date/Time: between.... 04/04/2004 02:00 and 04/04/2004 02:00

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (28) F [redacted], HAMPSHIRE), [redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, 2 QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #10825 BREWSTER, N. (Reporting officer)
2) #3859 MARCHMENT, I. (Officer in case)
3) #2074 WESTERN, J. (Submitting officer)
4) #5012 BATES, P. (Supervising officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Agg initially reporting that her mobile phone had been stolen out of her bag whilst she was in new yorks. then went on to say that earlier on in the evening unknown offender/s also stole her purse from her handbag in kellys pub in bedford place

Remarks:

INCIDENT: 04032000239 DATE/TIME : 20/03/2004 02:52 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : LEANNE [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NFA

CALLER PHONE: 0796[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
20/03/2004				
02:52:43	TTCAD4125	10920	ENTRY	
02:56:40	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
03:09:19	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
03:42:27	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/140,20129,2935,3610
03:42:27	TTCAD4129	689	ONS	SC97 (VAN) O/140,20129,2935,3610
03:42:30	TTCAD4129	689	CLEAR	SC97
03:42:30	TTCAD4129	689	CLOSURE	
03:44:22	TTCAD4129	689	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ NO OIC SLOW TIME CALL
03:46:38	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
03:51:38	OHFEC036	10762	SUPP	
04:20:29	TTCAD4130	760	PRINT	Sent to SC
04:20:43	TTCAD4130	760	CHNG	Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> SACR;
25/03/2004				
11:33:18	SC075	10403	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: SACR ==> SDIV;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
11:33:18	SC075	10403	CLOSE	
11:33:19	SC075	10403	PRINT	Sent to SC

20032004/02:52:43 10920 TTCAD4125

INF REPORTING SHE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY A BOUNCER WHO HAS THROWN HER OUT OF THE CLUB. SHE DOES NOT REQUIRE AN AMB. SHE HAS ALSO HAD HER #200 HENRY LLOYD COAT STOLEN FROM THE CLOAKROOM, AND HER HANDBAG CONTAINING #347. HER HANDBAG HAS BEEN FOUND BY THE BUST STOP OUTSIDE MCCLUSKYS

CTD 2.9.12

EMPTY. INF WANTS TO SEE POLICE. SHE DOES NOT WANT TO WALK UP TO SC. SHE WILL WAIT OUTSIDE NEW YORKS AND MAKE HERSELF KNOWN TO POLICE.

20032004/02:56:40 689 TTCAD4129

TWUN

TRIED TO CALL INF BACK TO ADVISE RE DELAY AS NO UNITS AND MOBILE RINGS THEN GOES TO VOICEMAII

20032004/03:09:19 689 TTCAD4129

TWUN

STILL UNABLE TO GET HOLD OF THE FEMALE AS MOBILE RINGS AND GOES TO VOICE MAIL

20032004/03:46:38 689 TTCAD4129

****

PASSED TO STN FOR ATTENTION OF BEAT OFFICER TO MAKE CONTACT WITH THE FEMALE

SHE WAS NOT AT THE LOCATION GIVEN AND WOULD NOT ANSWER THE MOBILE

****

20032004/03:51:38 10762 OHFEC036

********** [redacted] **********

25032004/11:33:18 10403 SC075

RESULT

[redacted]

OIC - 1023 KITCHER

C+D
N.Y 13

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:30 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040737226 Assault @29/02/2004 05:45**

Date/Time: between.... 29/02/2004 00:00 and 29/02/2004 01:05

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (29) M[redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #20397 WESTON, J. (Officer in case; Reporting officer)
2) #1538 CLARK, G. (Submitting officer)
3) #2743 RAWDON-SMITH, A. (Supervising officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Ofender approached aggrieved inside ny2 and sprays him with pepper spray. (10 minutes later no injuries)

Remarks:

C+D
N.Y 14

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:26 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040389328 Theft @20/02/2004 12:45**

Date/Time: between.... 19/02/2004 22:00 and 20/02/2004 01:00

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (34) F [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted] (Voice) ([redacted]), [redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s): 1) #6196 TILLYER, P. (Officer in case; Reporting officer)
2) #1066 BOYLES, R. (Submitting officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Aggrieved states whilst in nightclub person unknown has taken mobile phone from handbag - handbag in possession all evening

Remarks:

C+D
N.Y IS

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:28 by 8076

Occurrence: **44040552852 Theft @20/02/2004 13:25**

Date/Time: between.... 15/02/2004 22:30 and 15/02/2004 23:00

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (25) F [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, (Voice) (02380[redacted]), [redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #11372 COATES, V. (Reporting officer)
2) #4013 CRIME DESK, S. (Officer in case)
3) #8425 PLANTE, G. (Submitting officer)
4) #10736 BAKER, P. (Supervising officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Handbag left unnatended on table behind agg'd. bag and contents taken by person/s unseen by victim.

Remarks:

INCIDENT: 04021400145 DATE/TIME : 14/02/2004 01:38 SOURCE : T GRADE : 4 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted]

CALLER ADDR : [redacted], SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 077[redacted]

CONTACT : Y

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
14/02/2004				
01:38:36	TTCAD4105	8964	ENTRY	
01:40:55	TTCAD4140	187	APND	LocCmt: ;Caller: [redacted];Address: [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON;Phone: ;Phone: ;Type: ASSREP;
01:50:41	TTCAD4129	426	MISC	CANNOT GET BACK TO INFT
01:54:39	TTCAD4129	426	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ NO OIC
01:57:18	TTCAD4129	426	CHNG	Details Entered;Grade: 3 ==> 4;
02:33:18	TTCAD4130	11164	MISC	ALL NIGHTS OFFICERS ARE OUT IN VANS AT #188 #187 - NUA
02:44:37	OHFEC035	10827	SUPP	
03:39:56	TTCAD4130	11164	CHNG	Details Entered;
03:40:01	TTCAD4130	11164	CHNG	Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> SACR;
16/02/2004				
14:24:42	SC075	10403	PRINT	Sent to SCCMU
14:26:10	SC075	10403	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: SACR ==> SDIV;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
14:26:10	SC075	10403	CLOSE	
14:26:12	SC075	10403	PRINT	Sent to SC

14022004/01:38:36 8964 TTCAD4105

INF SAYS HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY A BOUNCER WHO CHUCKED HIM OUT THE CLUB FOR NO REASON AND ASSAULTED HIM...IT COST HIM #3 TO GET IN
INF STATES HE WANTS TO MAKE STATEMENT AND WANTS POLICE THERE NOW
HE DOENT NEED AMB.
AFTER A LONG AND LENGTHY DISCUSSION I TOLD HIM SOMEONE WOULD ATTEND WHEN SOMEONE WAS FREE AND HE MAY HAVE TO WAIT
HE DIDNT LIKE THAT

C+D
N.416

HE PAYS HIS TAXES AND IS A RESIDENT OF SOUTHAMPTON AND WILL REPORT ME.
HE HAS HAD 5 OR SO PINTS HE STATES.
TOLD HIM TO ATTEND ST TOMORROW BUT HE WANTSE POLICE AT THE NIGHTCLUB TO ARREST THE BOUNCER
IA MA SURE HE WILL RING BACK.

14022004/01:40:55 187 TTCAD4140

INFT REPORTING THAT HE AND HIS BROTHER HAVE BEEN ASSAULTED BY A DOORMAN AT NEW YORK NEW YORK SOUTHAMPTON - HE STATES FOR NO REASON WHAT SO EVER - ADMITS HE AS BEEN DRINKING- DOES NOT REQUIRE AMBULANCE OR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.
INFT AGGRESSIVE.

14022004/01:57:18 426 TTCAD4129

CANNOT GET BACK TO THE INFT AS PHONE GOES STRAIGHT TO ANSWER-PHONE. NO FREE UNITS AT THIS TIME. MALE IS HEAVILY IN DRINK. TO BE SENT TO STATION FOR AN OFFICER TO CONTACT THE INFT IN THE MORNING TO ASCERTAIN FURTHER DETAILS.

14022004/02:44:37 10827 OHFEC035

[redacted]

14022004/03:39:56 11164 TTCAD4130

********** TO STATION **********

[redacted]

16022004/14:26:10 10403 SC075

RESULT

[redacted]
OIC - CRIME DESK

C+D
N.Y 17

Occurrence summary

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 07/04/2009 19:31 by 8076

Occurrence: **44041108468 Theft @24/01/2004 14:30**

Date/Time: between.... 24/01/2004 01:35 and 24/01/2004 01:45

Clearance status: Filed

Involved person(s): 1) [Aggrieved][redacted](24) F[redacted]
SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (Voice) (02380[redacted]

Involved address(es): 1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, 2 QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved officer(s):
1) #10976 MCNULTY, T. (Reporting officer)
2) #4013 CRIME DESK, S. (Officer in case)
3) #10403 PAXFORD, P. (Submitting officer)
4) #8395 LYONS, A. (Supervising officer)

Flag(s):

Summary: Theft of mobile phone between 0135-0145 hrs from location. phone was removed from handbag held by agg'd - the handbag was closed but someone opened the zip and removed the phone without her noticing.

Remarks:

INCIDENT: 04012300010 DATE/TIME : 23/01/2004 00:16 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : BURREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 10907

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : ROBERT [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted], SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0779[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
23/01/2004				
00:16:10	TTCAD4146	10927	ENTRY	
00:19:15	TTCAD4130	240	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20000 SN05 (PSGT) O/3043
00:19:15	TTCAD4130	240	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/20000 SN05 (PSGT) O/3043
00:20:27	TTCAD4130	240	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR NO PLEASE - OIC 3043
00:20:31	TTCAD4129	10907	XREF	#HC04012300013, .
00:20:31	TTCAD4129	10907	DUP	Duplicates Incident #HC04012300013, .
00:25:20	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,ONE MALE BEEN ATTACKED
00:25:37	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,OFFENDER WEARING BLACK JACKET >>>>DEBENHAMS
00:25:41	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/20475,2681
00:25:41	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/20475,2681
00:26:39	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,UP QUEENS WAY ON ORCHARD LANE EST
00:26:49	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,GOING BACK TO THE AGRIVED
00:27:22	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,2 OFFNDERS ONE WEARING BLACK JACKET WHITE T SHIRT LAST SEEN ORCHARD LANE EST
00:27:45	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,HAS PLEASE - MALE CON AND BREATH - AGED 20'S
00:28:03	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOC	SP52[ORCHARD LANE EST]
00:28:28	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SP52,ONE MALE STOOD QUEENSWAY/EAST STREET
00:28:37	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SP76 (SECT) O/20792,3242
00:28:37	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SP76 (SECT) O/20792,3242
00:28:41	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SC98
00:28:41	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SN05
00:28:41	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SP52

C+D
N.Y 18

00:28:41	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SP76
00:28:52	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOC	SP76[QUEENS WAY/EAST STREET]
00:29:43	TTCAD4130	240	MISC	HAS ATTENDING - INC 7
00:33:14	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	SC98,THE AGRIVED HAS A CREAM JUMPER AND DARK TROUSERS
00:36:08	TTCAD4130	240	SUPP	
00:37:43	TTCAD4129	10907	MISC	DOOR STAFF AT NEW YORKS ARE NOT CO OPERATING ALL
00:38:03	TTCAD4135	11366	SUPP	
00:39:29	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SP76
00:48:12	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SP52
00:58:55	TTCAD4129	10907	SUPP	
01:00:18	TTCAD4129	10907	OK	SC98 SN05 [TIMER CLEARED]
01:07:47	TTCAD4129	10907	SUPP	
01:08:02	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SC98 SN05
01:08:02	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOSURE	
01:09:13	OHFEC036	10889	SUPP	
01:12:44	TTCAD4129	10907	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
01:12:44	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOSE	
01:12:44	TTCAD4129	10907	PRINT	Sent to SC
05:01:01	TTCAD4110	8828	SUPP	
05:01:37	TTCAD4110	8828	ROPEN	FURTHER CALL FROM INFMT REPORTING DAMAGE
05:01:46	TTCAD4110	8828	CHNG	Grade: 2 ==> 3;
05:12:57	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20000
05:12:57	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/20000
05:20:21	TTCAD4128	426	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ FOR ATTEMPT BREAK OIC 20000
05:26:01	TTCAD4128	426	SUPP	
05:26:15	TTCAD4128	426	PRINT	Sent to SHSOCO
05:28:26	OHFEC036	10889	SUPP	
05:29:26	OHFEC036	10889	SUPP	
05:36:32	TTCAD4128	426	ONS	SC98
05:59:45	TTCAD4128	426	CLEAR	SC98
05:59:45	TTCAD4128	426	CLOSURE	
06:18:38	TTCAD4128	426	CHNG	Details Entered;All results: (C10) ==> (C10,C39);
06:18:38	TTCAD4128	426	CLOSE	

06:18:38 TTCAD4128 426 PRINT Sent to SC

23012004/00:16:10 10927 TTCAD4146

I HAVE JUST WITNESSED MALE BREAK INTO B S S SEA FARERS AND HE HAS STOLEN A SPADE. HE IS NOW OUTSIDE NEW YORK NEW YORK AND IS WAVING IT AROUND. HE IS WITH A GROUP OF 10 OTHERS.

MALE DESC AS WHITE - SHORT HAIR - JUMPER KICKERS CREAM - AGED 20 YRS

(CALLER [redacted]

23012004/00:36:08 240 TTCAD4130

FROM CCTV - THERE WAS AN EARLIER SCUFFLE IN THE ENTRANCE TO NEW YORK'S WITH MALES FITTING THE DESC OF THE OFFENDER

BOTH IC1 MALES:
1 WEARING A DK JACKET AND WHITE T SHIRT, BEIGE TROUSERS
1 WEARING A CREAM JUMPER AND DK TROUSERS

.THE WALKED OFF UP BRITTON ST - TOWARDS THE HIGH ST

.

23012004/00:38:03 11366 TTCAD4135

AMB WERE UNABLE TO FIND POLICE, HAVE ADVISED THEM THE MALE IS OUTSIDE HERTZ.

23012004/00:58:55 10907 TTCAD4129

.
SN05 - WE THOUGHT WE WERE CALLED TO A BREAK AT NEW YORKS AND THE INFT [redacted] - ON ARRIVAL WE FOUND A MALE WHO HAD BEEN ASSULTED THAT IS WHAT THIS LOG RELATES TO - HOWEVER THE AGRIEVED IS MAKING NO COMPLAINT AND REFUSING ALL DETAISL - IT IS BELIEVED HE KNOWS WHO ASSULTED HIM - HE HAS NOW GONE OFF IN SEARCH OF A CAB - IT IS THE OPINION OF THE AMBULANCE THAT HE IS EXTREMLY HIGH IN DRUGS - NO COMPLAINT FROM THE AGRIEVED AND ASNT FOR THE OFFENDERS - DETAILS HAVE BEEN TAKEN FOR ACR -
,
WE ARE NOW GOING TO CHECK SEA FARERS - NO SPADE HAS BEEN SEEN.
.

23012004/01:07:47 10907 TTCAD4129

. ********** R E S U L T **********
SPEAKING TO [redacted] - THE AGRIEVED FROM THE ASSULT WAS THE ONE THROWING THE SPADE AROUND ! - THERE HAS BEEN NO BREAK IN HERE.
.
THE ACR RELATING TO THIS LOG SHOULD BE MADE FOR AN ASSULT NOT A BURGLARY AS ONLY AN ASSULT HAS HAPPENED HERE [BUT THERE IS NO COMPLAINT FROM THE AGRIEVED].
.

Chandler, Stewart

From: Clawson, Terry
Sent: 23 January 2004 01:21
To: Chandler, Stewart
Subject: NEW YORKS

Stu,

I attended an incident in BRITON STREET at 0025 today (23/1/04). A male had been assaulted by 2 offenders who had kicked him in the head. The incident was preceded by an altercation outside NEW YORKS where a male had been waiving a garden spade at someone.

Very credible witnesses state that the male with the spade was threatening people with the spade and waiving it around his head. They also state door staff at NEW YORKS were 'goading' him on and seemed to be encouraging him. They were amazed at the attitide of the staff. This all happened right outside their door.

CCTV contacted TWUN and advised that the aggrieved had been ejected along with at least one other male from the club. I therefore spoke to the door staff and asked them about the assault that had just taken place in BRITON STREET which would have been clearly in view of their door. They looked at me completely blankly. I asked what the situation was concerning the males who had been ejected 10 minutes ago and received the reply "There's been loads of people coming out of here mate."

They were completely obstructive and unhelpful. I then told them that CCTV had filmed people being ejected and they suddenly remembered that 2 males had been ejected for violence inside the club.

This is yet another example of the unprofessional and obstructive nature of the staff at NEW YORKS. Please would you add this to the long list of incidents?

Thanks

Terry Clawson
PS3043 Southampton Central

INCIDENT: 04011800198 DATE/TIME : 18/01/2004 03:00 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 5 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MR DANIEL [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 07745[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
18/01/2004				
03:00:36	TTCAD4147	11351	ENTRY	
03:00:53	TTCAD4147	11351	PRINT	Sent to SC
03:09:46	TTCAD4130	8111	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ NO OIC
03:11:38	OHFEC036	10889	SUPP	
03:12:35	TTCAD4130	8111	CHNG	Details Entered;
03:12:45	TTCAD4130	8111	PRINT	Sent to SC
03:12:50	TTCAD4130	8111	CHNG	Beat: SC03 ==> <empty>;CUR DG: SDIV ==> SACR;
20/01/2004				
13:50:32	SC075	10403	CHNG	Details Entered;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;CUR DG: SACR ==> SDIV;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
13:50:32	SC075	10403	CLOSE	
13:50:33	SC075	10403	PRINT	Sent to SC

18012004/03:00:36 11351 TTCAD4147

MALE REPORTING THAT HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY ONE OF THE STAFF OUTSIDE THE CLUB HE SAYS THE MALE WAS WEARING A WHITE SHIRT. ASSAULT OCCURRED 15 MINS AGO.

INFT SAYS THE MALE MAY HAVE BEEN THE MANAGER HE SAYS HE WAS PINNED DOWN BY THE MALE AND PUNCHED HE HAS A BRUISED EYE , AN ACHING JAW AND A BRUISED HAND.

HE SAYS HE WAS ALSO SLAPPED BY A BOUNCER FROM THE CLUB.

MALE ADVISED TO GO TO CIVIC CENTRE POLICE STATION AS HE WAS WALKING THROUGH TOWN TO MAYBUSH.

C+D
N.419

INCIDENT: 04010400113 DATE/TIME : 04/01/2004 01:46 SOURCE : O GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 11089

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : XR4A CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
04/01/2004				
01:46:58	TTCAD4129	11089	ENTRY	
01:47:09	TTCAD4129	11089	DSP	XR4A (FOOT) O/20191,21360
01:47:09	TTCAD4129	11089	ONS	XR4A (FOOT) O/20191,21360
01:47:12	TTCAD4129	11089	DSP	XR96 (VAN) O/1657,20416,5012
01:47:12	TTCAD4129	11089	ENR	XR96 (VAN) O/1657,20416,5012
01:47:15	TTCAD4165	778	MISC	checked
01:54:40	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	XR96
02:21:47	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	XR4A
02:21:47	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSURE	
02:22:21	TTCAD4129	11089	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ OIC 20191
02:29:37	OHFEC036	10995	SUPP	
02:31:58	TTCAD4130	11164	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R10);
02:31:58	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSE	
02:31:59	TTCAD4130	11164	PRINT	Sent to SC
19/01/2004				
17:17:27	TTCAD4095	8394	PRINT	Sent to CRSU
20/01/2004				
10:08:32	TTCAD4072	5924	PRINT	Sent to CRSU

CTD 2.4.20

04012004/01:46:58 11089 TTCAD4129

VAN TOWARDS PLS, FEW SQUARING UP

04012004/02:29:37 10995 OHFEC036

** [redacted] *

[redacted]

04012004/02:31:58 11164 TTCAD4130

******** RESULT *********

NO OFFENCES
GROUPS WENT SEPERATE WAYS

INCIDENT: 04010300063 DATE/TIME : 03/01/2004 00:45 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8111

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3A2

CALLER NAME : HAS CONTACT : Y
CALLER ADDR :
CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
03/01/2004				
00:45:23	TTCAD4139	187	ENTRY	
00:45:47	TTCAD4139	187	SUPP	
00:49:59	TTCAD4129	8111	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20397,3606
00:49:59	TTCAD4129	8111	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20397,3606
00:54:06	TTCAD4129	8111	DSP	XR3A (FOOT) O/20171,3056
00:54:06	TTCAD4129	8111	ENR	XR3A (FOOT) O/20171,3056
00:54:10	TTCAD4129	8111	PREMP	SC99
01:04:28	TTCAD4129	8111	ONS	XR3A
01:18:31	TTCAD4129	8111	CHNG	Details Entered;
01:19:03	TTCAD4129	8111	INCMSG	W/OHFEC036, ACR REQ OIC 20171
01:20:35	TTCAD4129	8111	CLEAR	XR3A
01:20:35	TTCAD4129	8111	CLOSURE	
01:20:50	OHFEC036	8976	SUPP	
01:39:31	TTCAD4129	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10);
01:39:31	TTCAD4129	8514	CLOSE	
01:39:32	TTCAD4129	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC

03012004/00:45:23 187 TTCAD4139

FEMALE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED AND HAS INJURIES TO FACE. SHE IS CONSCIOUS AND BREATHING.
A MR [redacted] WHO CALLED AMB [redacted] HAS THE PERSON WHO ASSAULTED HER ON CCTV.

CTV
N421

03012004/00:45:47 187 TTCAD4139
HAS REF NO. 10

03012004/01:18:31 8111 TTCAD4129

FEMALE HAS BEEN TAKEN TO THE SGH, THERE MAY BE CCTV FOOTAGE. WE WILL RESUME AND CONTINUE ENQ LATER

03012004/01:20:50 8976 OHFEC036

[redacted]

03012004/01:39:31 8514 TTCAD4129

RESULT

FOLLOW UP ENQS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY OIC

C+D
N.Y22

Occurrence summary

ampshire Constabulary

nted: 07/04/2009 19:32 by 8076

ccurrence: **44041235490 Assault @01/01/2004 01:29**

ate/Time: between.... 01/01/2004 01:20 and 01/01/2004 01:20

---

earance status: Filed

volved person(s):
1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (26) M [redacted]
2) [Person reporting] [redacted] F [redacted], SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (Voice) (077[redacted])[redacted]

volved address(es):
1) [Occurrence address] O/S NEW YORK NEW YORK, 2 QUEENS WAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE SO14 3AZ (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

volved vehicle(s):

volved officer(s):
1) #20229 GWYER, A. (Officer in case; Reporting officer)
2) #683 STOKES, R. (Submitting officer)
3) #6297 HOTCHKISS (Supervising officer)

ag(s):

mmary: Agg'd was punched in the face by u/k male.

marks:

INCIDENT: 03122000227 DATE/TIME : 20/12/2003 02:32 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : DISPATCHER : 11089

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y
CALLER ADDR :
CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
20/12/2003				
02:32:00	TTCAD4129	6075	LOCOVR	DspGrp: ->SDIV
02:32:00	TTCAD4129	6075	ENTRY	
02:32:14	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC73 (SECT) O/3244,3610
02:32:14	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC73 (SECT) O/3244,3610
02:32:22	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	VS - TRYING TO PICK UP CHUNKS TIMBER
02:32:54	TTCAD4130	1982	SUPP	
02:33:17	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC72 (SECT) O/20397,21368
02:33:17	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC72 (SECT) O/20397,21368
02:33:22	TTCAD4130	1982	MISC	LARGE FIGHT JUST DOWN FROM NEW YORKS
02:33:33	TTCAD4130	1982	ONS	SC73
02:34:22	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	SC73,2 DETAINED FIGHTING - CUFFED - PINNED DOWN
02:35:18	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20322,20381
02:35:18	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20322,20381
02:35:37	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	SC73,ASSAULT - HAS NO OTHER DETAILS
02:36:39	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1544,1790
02:36:39	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1544,1790
02:37:04	TTCAD4130	1982	CHNG	Details Entered;Location: NEW YORKS ==> NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ ;Atom: <empty> ==> SC03;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;LOC DG: <empty> ==> SDIV;
02:38:02	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SY99 (VAN) O/20014
02:38:02	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SY99 (VAN) O/20014
02:38:14	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SQ03A (PINS) O/5511

C+D N.423

02:38:14	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SQ03A (PINS) O/5511
02:38:30	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SQ03A
02:38:33	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SC51
02:40:49	TTCAD4130	1982	SUPP	
02:46:02	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SY99
02:46:09	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SC72
02:46:15	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SC99
02:47:18	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SC73
02:48:09	TTCAD4130	11089	DSP	SC73 (SECT) O/3244,3610
02:48:09	TTCAD4130	11089	ONS	SC73 (SECT) O/3244,3610
02:48:24	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,FACIAL AND HEAD INJS, WITH THE AMB NOW
02:48:38	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,THE MALE ISN'T REALLY BEING HELPFUL
02:48:52	TTCAD4130	11089	CLEAR	SC73
02:50:46	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,CAN WE CHASE AMB UP PLS
02:51:32	TTCAD4128	11412	MISC	SC51,MALE WITH FACIAL INJURIES
02:52:30	TTCAD4128	11412	SUPP	
02:57:21	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,2 HAVE BEEN DETAINED, JUST WAITING FOR THE AME
03:00:28	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,AMB HAS ARRIVED
03:00:33	TTCAD4130	11089	CLEAR	SQ03A
03:06:49	TTCAD4130	11089	MISC	SC51,MALE OFF TO SGH NOW
03:06:51	TTCAD4130	11089	CLEAR	SC51 SC72
03:06:51	TTCAD4130	11089	CLOSURE	
03:10:29	TTCAD4128	11412	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R18);
03:10:29	TTCAD4128	11412	CLOSE	
03:10:31	TTCAD4128	11412	PRINT	Sent to SC

20122003/02:32:54 1982 TTCAD4130

FROM CCTV.....PERSONS APPEAR TO BE TRYING TO ARM THEMSELVES WITH OBJECTS....

20122003/02:37:04 1982 TTCAD4130

AMBULANCE ATTENDING REF....RNA

20122003/02:40:49 1982 TTCAD4130

SC51 - VAN PSE, BUT ALL IN ORDER AT PRESENT

20122003/02:52:30 11412 TTCAD4128

FROM HAS - 10 MINUTE ETA AS IS COMING FROM WINCHESTER

20122003/03:10:29 11412 TTCAD4128

****RESULT****

TWO DETAINED.

INCIDENT: 03120700166 DATE/TIME : 07/12/2003 01:26 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8719

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MR [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] ,SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0776[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
07/12/2003				
01:26:37	TTCAD4123	10870	ENTRY	
01:27:32	TTCAD4130	8719	MISC	VS CHECKING OS CLUB
01:28:18	TTCAD4130	8719	DSP	TRD5 (ARV.) O/1417,2933
01:28:18	TTCAD4130	8719	ENR	TRD5 (ARV.) O/1417,2933
01:28:20	TTCAD4130	8719	ONS	TRD5
01:34:14	TTCAD4130	8719	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/1125,1206,3244,3610,3798
01:34:14	TTCAD4130	8719	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/1125,1206,3244,3610,3798
01:34:16	TTCAD4130	8719	ONS	SC97
01:34:26	TTCAD4130	8719	CLEAR	SC97 ,INFORMANT ABUSIVE AND REFUSED TO ASSIST
01:34:29	TTCAD4130	8719	CLEAR	TRD5
01:34:29	TTCAD4130	8719	CLOSURE	
01:35:11	TTCAD4128	1339	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D11);
01:35:11	TTCAD4128	1339	CLOSE	
01:35:12	TTCAD4128	1339	PRINT	Sent to SC
01:51:34	TTCAD4130	8719	SUPP	
01:52:22	TTCAD4130	8719	CHNG	Details Entered;All results: (D11) ==> (D11,N15,C10);
01:52:54	TTCAD4130	8719	PRINT	Sent to SC

07122003/01:26:37 10870 TTCAD4123

CALLER STATES DOORMAN HAVE HIT HIM AND CHUCKED HIM OUT OF CLUB , SAYS HE US DISABLED HAS ONE LEG.

C+D
N.124

IS WAITING AT THE CLUB FOR OFFICER TO ATTEND.

07122003/01:35:11 1339 . TTCAD4128

.
******
RESULT
******
.
MALE LOCATED AND SPOKEN TO - NO OFFENCES DISCLOSED. SUITABLY ADVISED AND SENT ON WAY.
.

07122003/01:51:34 8719 TTCAD4130

**********FOR DEPLOYMENT BY DAYS SC**********
OFFICER TO CONTACT AGGREIVED RE ASSUALT REPORT
****
.

07122003/01:52:22 8719 TTCAD4130

****RESULT*****
TO STN FOR DEPLOYMENT RE ASSUALT

INCIDENT: 03112200169 DATE/TIME : 22/11/2003 02:19 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y
CALLER ADDR :
CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
22/11/2003				
02:19:13	TTCAD4128	689	ENTRY	
02:19:25	TTCAD4128	689	SUPP	
02:19:55	TTCAD4129	8719	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/2764
02:19:55	TTCAD4129	8719	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/2764
02:20:07	TTCAD4129	8719	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/2681,3043,3806
02:20:07	TTCAD4129	8719	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/2681,3043,3806
02:20:14	TTCAD4129	8719	ONS	SC97
02:20:36	TTCAD4128	689	SUPP	
02:20:51	TTCAD4128	689	CLEAR	SC97
02:20:53	TTCAD4128	689	CLEAR	SP52
02:20:53	TTCAD4128	689	CLOSURE	
02:21:13	TTCAD4128	689	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10);
02:21:13	TTCAD4128	689	CLOSE	
02:21:14	TTCAD4128	689	PRINT	Sent to SC
02:26:35	TTCAD4128	689	ROPEN	FURTHER CALL
02:26:49	TTCAD4128	689	SUPP	
02:26:57	TTCAD4129	8719	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/2681,3043,3806
02:26:57	TTCAD4129	8719	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/2681,3043,3806
02:27:00	TTCAD4129	8719	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/2764
02:27:00	TTCAD4129	8719	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/2764
02:27:06	TTCAD4128	689	DSP	WD30 (DOG) O/1787

C+D
N425

02:27:06	TTCAD4128	689	ENR	WD30 (DOG) O/1787
02:28:34	TTCAD4128	689	ONS	WD30
02:28:44	TTCAD4128	689	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/2559
02:28:44	TTCAD4128	689	ONS	SC51 (AREA) O/2559
02:29:15	TTCAD4129	8719	ONS	SC97
02:32:18	TTCAD4129	8719	CLEAR	SP52
02:35:37	TTCAD4129	8719	CLEAR	SC51
02:35:39	TTCAD4129	8719	CLEAR	SC97
02:35:41	TTCAD4129	8719	CLEAR	WD30
02:35:41	TTCAD4129	8719	CLOSURE	
02:36:13	TTCAD4129	8719	CHNG	Details Entered;
02:36:13	TTCAD4129	8719	CLOSE	
02:36:14	TTCAD4129	8719	PRINT	Sent to SC

22112003/02:19:25 689 TTCAD4128

FROM CCTV LARGE FIGHT GOING ON

22112003/02:20:36 689 TTCAD4128

SC97 THERE ARE A GROUP WAITING FOR A BUS AND A GROUP THAT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN ARGUING

22112003/02:21:13 689 TTCAD4128
****** RESULT********

ALL IN ORDER NO FIGHT AND NO ONE WANTED TO SPEAK TO POLICE

22112003/02:26:49 689 TTCAD4128

FROM CCTV THERE IS A FIGHT GOING ON ON THE BUS NOW

22112003/02:36:13 8719 TTCAD4129
****RESULT******
NOTHING OBVIOUS ON ARRIVAL

INCIDENT: 03110100272 DATE/TIME : 01/11/2003 03:01 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 11164

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted]
CALLER ADDR :
CALLER PHONE:

CONTACT : Y

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
01/11/2003				
03:01:14	TTCAD4125	10481	ENTRY	
03:04:36	TTCAD4130	11164	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/3443
03:04:36	TTCAD4130	11164	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/3443
03:06:02	TTCAD4130	11164	ONS	SP52
03:06:05	TTCAD4125	10481	SUPP	
03:09:45	TTCAD4130	11164	MISC	SP52,HAS REQ. PREGNANT LADY BEEN IN A SCUFFAL WITH A CUT HEAD
03:19:18	TTCAD4130	11164	CLEAR	SP52
03:19:18	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSURE	
03:26:53	TTCAD4130	11164	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10B);
03:26:53	TTCAD4130	11164	CLOSE	
03:26:54	TTCAD4130	11164	PRINT	Sent to SC

01112003/03:01:14 10481 TTCAD4125

INF REPORTING GIRLS FIGHTING.

ONE FEMALE IS 8 MTHS PREGNANT.

ANOTHER FEMALE IS 5 MTHS PREGANT.

TWO OTHER FEMALES ARE HITTING THE 8 MTH PREGNANT GIRL. THE 5 MTH PREGANT GIRL IS FRIENDS WITH THE OTHER PREGANT GIRL.

INF STATES HAS NOT REQ'D BUT I HAVE CALLED THEM AS A PRECAUTION.

ALOT OF SHOUTING CAN BE HEARD IN THE BACKGROUND.

CTD N.426

01112003/03:06:05 10481 TTCAD4125

HAS REF 89

01112003/03:26:53 11164 TTCAD4130

********** RESULT **********

ONE TAKEN IN H.AS. TO SGH

INCIDENT: 03110100119 DATE/TIME : 01/11/2003 01:02 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0779[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
01/11/2003				
01:02:13	TTCAD4136	11367	ENTRY	
02:43:20	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	CALL TO INFMT - NO REPLY
04:12:37	TTCAD4129	11089	MISC	SGT 3286 SN05 AWARE OF INCD
04:16:43	TTCAD4129	11089	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B,N15A);
04:16:43	TTCAD4129	11089	CLOSE	
04:16:43	TTCAD4129	11089	PRINT	Sent to SC

01112003/01:02:13 11367 TTCAD4136

CALLER SAYS HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY THE BOUNCERS AT LOCATION.

HE SAYS HE HAS BEEN THROWN AGAINST A POST AND BANGED HIS HEAD.

HE SAID HE WANTS POLICE TO ATTEND.

HAVE ADVISED HIM THAT IF HE HAS BEEN DRINKING WE WILL BE UNABLE TO TAKE A STATMENT.

HE SAID HE HASNT HAD MUCH TO DRINK.

01112003/04:16:43 11089 TTCAD4129

RESULT

NO FREE UNIT TO SPEAK TO MALE AT TIME OF CALL.
MALE IN DRINK AND ADVISED UNIT COUDN'T TAKE STATEMENT TIL THE MORNING.

DAY TURN TO MAKE CONTACT WITH AGG'D DURING THE DAY PLS.

CTD N.427

INCIDENT: 03102600146 DATE/TIME : 26/10/2003 01:54 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 10907

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : OFF DUTY PC [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE: 0781[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
26/10/2003				
01:11:06	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SC51
01:11:06	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOSURE	
01:13:25	TTCAD4130	10358	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10B);
01:13:25	TTCAD4130	10358	CLOSE	
01:13:25	TTCAD4130	10358	PRINT	Sent to SC
01:54:49	TTCAD4108	240	ENTRY	
01:55:41	TTCAD4108	240	CHNG	Details Entered;
01:56:03	TTCAD4108	240	CHNG	CallerPhone: <empty> ==> 07816 89030;CallerPhone2: <empty> ==> 02380 909064;
01:56:47	TTCAD4130	10358	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1281,3644
01:56:47	TTCAD4130	10358	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1281,3644
01:57:08	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SC51
01:57:08	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOSURE	
01:57:13	TTCAD4129	10907	CLSRX	Dispatch to event in closure mode
01:57:13	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1281,3644
01:57:13	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1281,3644
01:57:34	TTCAD4130	10358	MISC	FROM VS - ALL QUIET O/S
01:58:01	TTCAD4130	10358	ONS	SC51
01:58:15	TTCAD4130	10358	MISC	SC51,CONFIRM EVERYTHING Q

26102003/01:55:41 240 TTCAD4108

INFT STATES THERE IS A DISTURBANCE O/S THE ABOVE LOCATION

CTD N.Y 28

HE SOUNDS IN DRINK AND JUST SAID 'GET HERE QUICK' NO FURTHER DETAILS

26102003/01:13:25 10358 TTCAD4130

********** RESULT **********

ALL QUIET

INCIDENT: 03100300041 DATE/TIME : 03/10/2003 00:52 SOURCE : T GRADE : 5 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : SAM [redacted] - 16YRS

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER PHONE: 077[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
03/10/2003				
00:52:52	TTCAD4137	8547	ENTRY	
01:00:21	TTCAD4128	6958	CHNG	Details Entered;Grade: 3 ==> 5;CallerName: SAM [redacted] ==> SAM [redacted]- 16YRS;CallerLocation: NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ [redacted]
01:00:53	TTCAD4128	6958	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B);
01:00:53	TTCAD4128	6958	CLOSE	
01:00:54	TTCAD4128	6958	PRINT	Sent to SC

03102003/00:52:52 8547 TTCAD4137

ME AND MY FRIEND HAVE BEEN BEATEN UP BY THE BOUNCERS
LOTS OF SWEARING AND SHOUTING ON THE PHONE

03102003/01:00:21 6958 TTCAD4128

INF STATES HE HAS BEEN DRINKING ABOUT 3 PINTS. (SOUNDS LIKE HE IS A LOT MORE DRUNK)

HE STATES HE IS BLEEDING FROM THE ARM AND ELBOW (AMBULANCE DECLINED)

ALSO STATES HIS FRIEND DAN [redacted], 17YRS, [redacted] HAS ALSO BEEN ASSAULTED (CUT HEAD)

SPOKE WITH DAN (AMBULANCE DECLINED)

THEY WILL BOTH WALK UP TO THE CIVIC POLICE STN TO MAKE A COMPLAINT OF ASSAULT.

I HAVE ADVISED THEM THAT AS THEY HAVE BEEN DRINKING THEY MAY NOT BE ABLE TO MAKE A FULL STATEMENT BUT THEY WILL ATTEND IN THE FIRST INSTANCE TO GIVE FIRST ACCOUNT DETAILS OF WHAT HAS OCCURRED.

CTD N.429

03102003/01:00:53 6958 TTCAD4128

** RESULT **

INF (AND FRIEND) WALKING UP TO SC TO MAKE COMPLAINT

INCIDENT: 03092900031 DATE/TIME : 29/09/2003 00:51 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8514

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : ADRIAN [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted], SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0777[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
29/09/2003				
00:51:03	TTCAD4139	11354	ENTRY	
00:55:42	TTCAD4129	8514	DSP	SC71 (SECT) O/3244,3798
00:55:42	TTCAD4129	8514	ENR	SC71 (SECT) O/3244,3798
01:00:26	TTCAD4129	8514	ONS	SC71
01:02:31	TTCAD4129	8514	SUPP	
01:02:37	TTCAD4129	8514	CLEAR	SC71
01:02:37	TTCAD4129	8514	CLOSURE	
01:02:48	TTCAD4129	8514	CHNG	Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
01:02:48	TTCAD4129	8514	CLOSE	
01:02:49	TTCAD4129	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC

29092003/00:51:03 11354 TTCAD4139

CALLER STATES HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY A BOUNCER. CALLER WENT OUSIDE THE CLUB, AND THEN WANTED TO GO BACK IN AND THE BOUNCER PUSHED THE CALLER OVER SEVERAL TIMES WHEN CALLER WAS TRYING TO TALK TO HIM

CALLER HAS GRAZED KNEES AND ELBOWS

CALLER STATES THERE ARE UNDERAGED DRINKERS IN THE CLUB

29092003/01:02:31 8514 TTCAD4129

MALE NOT MAKING HIMSELF KNOWN TO OFFICERS NOR ANSWERING HIS PHONE....

RESULT

N.430 (+1)

CLOSED PENDING FURTHER CONTACT

C+D
N.431

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:22 by 6628

Report no.: 44030894887 Assault

Date/Time: between....28/09/2003 02:00 and 28/09/2003 02:30

Reported time: OUTSIDE NEW YORK NEW YORK NIGHT CLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE) 28/09/2003 02:40

Place of offence: OUTSIDE NEW YORK NEW YORK NIGHT CLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Classification: 8/6/VIOLENCE: Assault occasioning actual bodily harm

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: By suspect approaching witness and smashing a glass bottle across victim's head in an unprovoked attack.

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Aggrieved] [redacted], [redacted] (28) M [redacted]
   Id #:421446
2) [Suspect] , [redacted]
3) [Suspect] M, Id #:1915994

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] OUTSIDE NEW YORK NEW YORK NIGHT CLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #20528 BLACKALL, L. (Reporting officer)
2) #1303 BARNETT, K. (Officer in case)
3) #3043 CLAWSON, T. (Submitting officer)
4) #6044 BOULTON, A. (Supervising officer)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Working Sheet

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:22 by 6628

Occurrence: **44030894887 Assault @28/09/2003 02:40**

Author: *Report time:* 28/09/2003 13:52

Entered by: *Entered time:* 28/09/2003 13:52

Remarks: Working sheet text (1.1) 28/09/2003

Details noted. Male in custody b

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:22 by 6628

Occurrence: **44030894887 Assault @28/09/2003 02:40**

Author: *Report time:* 29/09/2003 12:58

Entered by: *Entered time:* 29/09/2003 12:58

Remarks: Working sheet text (3.1) 29/09/2003

20528 280903 Apparently the aggrieved attended New York Nightclub in company with a friend [redacted]. Upon leaving at around 0200am the aggrieved engaged in a conversation with a female o/s the venue. The female then left and the aggrieved was approached by 4-5 light skinned 1C3 males. No words were spoken. One of the males who was wearing a blueheaded top then smashed a glass bottle over the head of the aggrieved, striking him behind the left ear causing bleeding and swelling. As the aggrieved fell he was then kicked to the back of the neck by a second male. The first male then scrapped the bottle across the aggrieved's neck region causing it to bleed. The suspect then casually walked off towards the Tesco garage. Police were flagged down in the Queenaway and the aggrieved pointed out the male who was detained by ST51 in Orchard hare [redacted]. Aggrieved attended SGH - exact injuries unknown at this stage, possible broken nose.

INCIDENT: 03091300026 DATE/TIME : 13/09/2003 00:08 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8111

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
13/09/2003				
00:08:40	TTCAD4128	8184	ENTRY	
00:10:01	TTCAD4128	8184	CHNG	Details Entered;Grade: 1 ==> 5;
00:10:34	TTCAD4128	8184	XREF	#HC03091300031, SAME CALL
00:10:34	TTCAD4128	8184	DUP	Duplicates Incident #HC03091300031, SAME CALL
00:12:34	TTCAD4128	8184	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> Y;All results: () ==> (D10B,X10);
00:12:34	TTCAD4128	8184	CLOSE	
00:12:35	TTCAD4128	8184	PRINT	Sent to SC
00:14:28	TTCAD4128	8184	ROPEN	.
00:14:47	TTCAD4128	8184	CHNG	Details Entered;Grade: 5 ==> 2;
00:19:30	TTCAD4129	8111	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/1303,1637,3043,3209,3742
00:19:30	TTCAD4129	8111	ONS	SC98 (VAN) O/1303,1637,3043,3209,3742
00:19:34	OHFEC040	10889	SUPP	
00:21:12	TTCAD4129	8111	MISC	SC98,APPEARS AIO
00:25:25	TTCAD4129	8111	CLEAR	SC98
00:25:25	TTCAD4129	8111	CLOSURE	
00:35:07	TTCAD4129	8111	CHNG	Details Entered;
00:35:07	TTCAD4129	8111	CLOSE	
00:35:08	TTCAD4129	8111	PRINT	Sent to SC

13092003/00:08:40 8184 TTCAD4128

GROUP FIGHTING OUTSIDE NEW YORKS

C+D

N.Y 32

STILL MONITORING ON CAMERA....BUT CALMED DOWN SLIGHTLY

13092003/00:10:01 8184 TTCAD4128

GROUP ON CAMERA, NO LONGER FIGHTING
DISPERSING
RE-GRADED 5 PENDING ANY FURTHER CALLS OR COMPLAINTS

13092003/00:12:34 8184 TTCAD4128

RESULT
****
GROUP DISPERSED
CLOSED PENDING FURTHER CALLS
.

13092003/00:14:47 8184 TTCAD4128

GROUP STILL MILLING AROUND

13092003/00:19:34 10889 OHFEC040

****

FURTHER CALL FROM CCTV - THE GROUP HAS NOW SPLIT - PART HAS GONE DOWN TOWARDS NEW YORKS & INFT CANNOT SEE THEM ANY LONGER - THEY HAVE GONE PAST THE CLUB & INFT DOES NOT KNOW IF THEY WENT LEFT OR RIGHT.

THE 2 GIRLS WHO STARTED IT - BOTH APPROX 5FT 8 - BOTH WEARING WHOITE MINI SKIRTS & BLACK BOOB TUBES - 1 HAD BLACK BOOTS & DARK HAIR (LONG) THE OTHER WHITE BOOTS & BLOND HAIR.

****

13092003/00:35:07 8111 TTCAD4129

RESULT

GROUP HAS NOW DISPERSED, ALL IN ORDER

INCIDENT: 03091200231 DATE/TIME : 12/09/2003 03:40 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 077[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
12/09/2003				
03:40:30	TTCAD4128	1982	RETROSP	
03:40:31	TTCAD4128	1982	PRINT	Sent to SC
03:40:50	TTCAD4128	1982	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B);
03:42:10	TTCAD4128	1982	DSP	SC99
03:42:10	TTCAD4128	1982	ENR	SC99
03:42:10	TTCAD4128	1982	CLEAR	SC99
03:42:10	TTCAD4128	1982	CLOSURE	SC99
03:42:22	TTCAD4128	1982	PRINT	Sent to SC

12092003/03:40:00 1982 TTCAD4128

ASSAULTED BY A MALE IN NEW YORK,NEW YORK. (NO DESC). INFT HAS FACIAL INJURIES. WAS ADVISED BY DOOR STAFF THAT HE WAS OK AND TO GO HOME. STATES HE CAN'T SEE OUT OF ONE EYE.

12092003/03:40:50 1982 TTCAD4128

RESULT
****

A.S.N.T. FOR THE MALE

12092003/03:42:10 1982 TTCAD4128

C+D N.Y 33

00:34 - INFT STATED HE WAS WALKING HOME THEN SOUNDS OF OTHER PERSONS WITH MALE AND LINE CLEARED. TRIED NUMBER, BUT GOES TO VOICEMAIL. NOT KNOWN WHERE INFT IS AT THIS TIME, POSSIBLY > ITCHEN BRIDGE, AS STATED, WAS WALKING HOME. BELIEVED OFFENDER STILL IN CLUB, HENCE GRADED 2

INCIDENT: 03090700130 DATE/TIME : 07/09/2003 01:17 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT :

ATOM : SECTOR : DISPATCHER : 6075

LOCATION : NEW YORKS

CALLER NAME : SC99 CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
07/09/2003				
01:17:06	TTCAD4129	6075	LOCOVR	DspGrp: ->SDIV
01:17:06	TTCAD4129	6075	ENTRY	
01:17:12	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/3173
01:17:12	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/3173
01:17:17	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20129,3301,3443
01:17:17	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/20129,3301,3443
01:19:04	TTCAD4133	11170	SUPP	
01:19:59	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SC99
01:20:02	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SC98
01:24:41	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	WD30 (DOG) O/1787
01:24:41	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	WD30 (DOG) O/1787
01:24:44	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20129,3301,3443
01:24:44	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/20129,3301,3443
01:25:00	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SP77 (SECT) O/3601
01:25:00	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SP77 (SECT) O/3601
01:25:42	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SC98
01:26:15	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	LICENSING UNIT STATE 6 ALSO
01:26:45	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	ST51 - NEW YORKS HAS PLEASE - CONSCIOUS MALE CUT TO EYE
01:27:13	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	LAST WAS FROM SC98
01:27:33	TTCAD4158	206	MISC	FROM AMB THEY ARE ATTENDING...THIER REF 40
01:28:50	TTCAD4130	11164	MISC	HAS ALREADY AWARE REF 40

C+D
N.434

01:29:34	TTCAD4129	6075	MISC	SC98,ONE MALE WITH CUT ABOVE HIS EYE, REFUSED TO TALK TO POLICE, NO DESCRIPTIONS
01:31:20	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SP77
01:39:31	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SC99
01:41:51	TTCAD4133	8169	OK	WD30, TIMER CLEARED
01:45:51	TTCAD4130	8547	CLEAR	SC98
02:03:27	TTCAD4121	11167	CLEAR	WD30
02:03:27	TTCAD4121	11167	CLOSURE	
02:04:10	TTCAD4129	6075	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> Y;All results: () ==> (D10B);
02:04:10	TTCAD4129	6075	CLOSE	

07092003/01:17:06 6075 TTCAD4129

INCIDENT

07092003/01:19:04 11170 TTCAD4133

FURTHER CALL FROM STUART [redacted] - 0779[redacted]

HE STATES HE HAS A MALES KEYS FOR HIS VEH [redacted] - AS HE HAS BEEN DRINKING AND WAS GOING TO DRIVE - STATES PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO BEAT HIM UP NOW BECAUSE OF THIS.

07092003/02:04:10 6075 TTCAD4129

RESULT
****

NO OFFENCES, MALE DIDN'T WANT TO REPORT INCIDENT TO POLICE

C+D
N.Y 35

Hampshire Consta...,

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:21 by 6628

Report no.: 44030316118 Assault

Date/Time: between....25/08/2003 01:59 and 25/08/2003 02:01

Reported time: NEW YORKS, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE) 25/08/2003 02:20

Place of offence: NEW YORKS, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Classification: 104/23/VIOLENCE: Assault on constable (police act 1996)

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: In a van and attended new york, new york where a male had been detained by door staff on the ground. i approached the male who was lying on his side and went to roll him onto his back. as soon as he saw him he spat at me from 2-3 feet hitting me directly in the face. reply to caution was "go fuck yourself". continued to be verbally and physically aggressive and was eventually handcuffed in the van.

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (35) M (SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, CIVIC CENTRE SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (Voice) [redacted]
2) [Charged] [redacted] (22) M [redacted] HAMPSHIRE), [redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORKS, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #3043 CLAWSON, T. (Submitting officer)
2) #3209 MABEY (Officer in case; Reporting officer; Charging officer/unit)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Working Sheet

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:21 by 6628

Occurrence: **44030316118 Assault @25/08/2003 02:20**

Author: *Report time:* 27/08/2003 13:51

Entered by: *Entered time:* 27/08/2003 13:51

Remarks: Working sheet text (1.1) 27/08/2003

3209 MABY 25 ...sted
S 5 at NYNY ... of 3 ...C.

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:35 by 6628

Report no.: 44031173967 Public order

Date/Time: between....25/08/2003 02:18 and 25/08/2003 02:25

Reported time: NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE) 25/08/2003 02:20

Place of offence: NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Classification: 125/12/VIOLENCE: Harassment, alarm or distress

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: Upon escorting balthazar into custody he said to me "i'm going o fuck your mother" and "your grandads dead" in the holding cell. prior to this he had also been verbally abusive calling me and other officers "cunts" "pices of shite" etc. after saying this to me he was wraned section 5 and continued to be confrontational and aggressive as well as calling myself and other officers various expletives he was arrested at 02.22 hrs for section 5.

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Aggrieved] [redacted] (35) M (SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, HAVELOCK ROAD SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE [redacted]
2) [Charged] [redacted] (22) M [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORK NEW YORK, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC03 WATERFRONT/DOCKS/OCEAN VILLAGE)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #3043 CLAWSON, T. (Submitting officer)
2) #3209 MABEY (Officer in case; Reporting officer; Charging officer/unit; Supervising officer)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Working Sheet

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:35 by 6628

Occurrence: **44031173967 Public order @25/08/2003 02:20**

Author: *Report time:* 27/08/2003 14:20

Entered by: *Entered time:* 27/08/2003 14:20

Remarks: Work

INCIDENT: 03081700244 DATE/TIME : 17/08/2003 02:14 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PERDET DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 760

LOCATION : 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ (NEW YORK NEW YORK)

CALLER NAME : TONY CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 02380[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
17/08/2003				
02:14:05	TTCAD4125	10920	ENTRY	
02:15:49	TTCAD4129	6063	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1327,3745
02:15:49	TTCAD4129	6063	ONS	SC51 (AREA) O/1327,3745
02:20:06	TTCAD4129	6063	MISC	SC51,VAN PLSE
02:20:07	TTCAD4129	6063	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/1790,20177,3173,3601
02:20:07	TTCAD4129	6063	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/1790,20177,3173,3601
02:25:15	TTCAD4129	6063	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
02:25:15	TTCAD4129	6063	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
02:25:33	TTCAD4128	760	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/1281,1648
02:25:33	TTCAD4128	760	ONS	SP52 (AREA) O/1281,1648
02:26:26	TTCAD4128	760	MISC	SC98: MALE VERY LIVELY..... SC99 HURRY UP PLEASE.
02:32:31	TTCAD4129	6063	AUTPRE	SC99
02:39:17	TTCAD4129	6063	CLEAR	SP52
02:41:36	TTCAD4129	6063	SUPP	
02:41:40	TTCAD4129	6063	AUTPRE	SC51
02:41:43	TTCAD4129	6063	CLEAR	SC98
02:41:43	TTCAD4129	6063	CLOSURE	
03:14:33	TTCAD4130	689	CHNG	Details Entered;Location: 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ ==> 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ (NEW YORK NEW YORK);Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R18);
03:14:33	TTCAD4130	689	CLOSE	
03:14:34	TTCAD4130	689	PRINT	Sent to SC

CtD N.436

17082003/02:14:05 10920 TTCAD4125

INF REPORTING A MALE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED INSIDE NEW YORKS. HE DOES NOT REQUIRE AN AMB. THEY HAVE THE OFFENDER DETAINED INSIDE BY THE STAIRS. HE IS NOT BEING ANY TROUBLE AT THE MOMENT.

17082003/02:41:36 6063 TTCAD4129

SC51 =- 2 DETAINED - ONE FOR THE ORIGINAL JOB, THEN ONE FROM A SEPERATE ASSAULTE

17082003/03:14:33 689 TTCAD4130

***** RESULT********

3 DETAINED TWO FOR ORIGINAL JOB AND ONE FOR ANOTHER JOB

C+D
N.Y 37

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:17 by 6628

Report no.: 44030630567 Assault

Date/Time: between....17/08/2003 02:00 and 17/08/2003 02:00

Reported time: NEW YORKS NIGHTCLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC04 POLYGON) 17/08/2003 02:15

Place of offence: NEW YORKS NIGHTCLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (BCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Section: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC04 POLYGON)

Classification: 8/6/VIOLENCE: Assault occasioning actual bodily harm

Attempt: No

Clearance status: Filed

Occurrence summary: Male hit on head by another causinf injury.

Remarks:

Associated tasks:

Associated occurrence(s):

Involved person(s) (aggrieved, witness, suspect, other):

1) [Aggrieved][redacted] (30) M [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON, [redacted]
2) [Charged][redacted] (27) M, [redacted]
3) [Suspect][redacted]

Involved address(es):

1) [Occurrence address] NEW YORKS NIGHTCLUB, QUEENSWAY SOUTHAMPTON, HAMPSHIRE (OCU: S SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, District: SC SOUTHAMPTON CENTRAL, Sector: CENTRAL, Beat: SC04 POLYGON)

Involved comm address(es):

Involved vehicle(s):

Involved police:

1) #20129 SLOCOMBE, D. (Officer in case)
2) #3443 BARKER, M. (Submitting officer)
3) #1399 MCGONIGLE, J. (Supervising officer)
4) #1327 SMITH, C. (Reporting officer; Charging officer/unit)

Involved property:

Modus operandi:

Enquire details:

Working Sheet

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:17 by 6628

Occurrence: **44030630567 Assault @17/08/2003 02:15**

Author: *Report time:* 26/08/2003 22:57

Entered by: *Entered time:* 26/08/2003 22:57

Remarks: Working sheet text (3.1) 26/08/2003

This crime has b e
file.

Hampshire Constabulary

Printed: 08/04/2009 15:17 by 6628

Occurrence: **44030630567 Assault @17/08/2003 02:15**

Author: *Report time:* 17/08/2003 13:10

Entered by: *Entered time:* 17/08/2003 13:10

Remarks: Working sheet text (1.1) 17/08/2003

[redacted] has been charged with common assault and possession of an offensive weapon. Detection sheet has been submitted same time as crime report. Pc 20129 Slocombe

INCIDENT: 03081700149 DATE/TIME : 17/08/2003 01:10 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : PAUL [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0778[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
10/09/2003				
16:14:34	TTCAD4075	40267	PRINT	Sent to CRSU
17/08/2003				
01:10:15	TTCAD4154	10894	ENTRY	
01:11:10	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/3173,3601
01:11:10	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/3173,3601
01:11:24	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SP93 (IPV) O/3683,3859
01:11:24	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SP93 (IPV) O/3683,3859
01:11:37	TTCAD4130	689	CLEAR	SP93
01:11:40	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SC72 (SECT) O/3363
01:11:40	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SC72 (SECT) O/3363
01:11:59	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
01:11:59	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
01:13:49	TTCAD4130	689	ONS	SC98
01:14:49	TTCAD4130	689	CLEAR	SC98
01:15:21	TTCAD4130	689	CLEAR	SC72
01:15:30	TTCAD4130	689	PREMP	SC99
01:16:23	TTCAD4128	760	SUPP	
01:17:15	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
01:17:15	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/20008,3499
01:17:56	TTCAD4130	689	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/1790,20177,3173,3601
01:17:56	TTCAD4130	689	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/1790,20177,3173,3601

CTD 2438

01:18:02	TTCAD4130	689	ONS	SC98
01:18:45	TTCAD4130	689	SUPP	
01:20:02	TTCAD4130	689	XREF	#HC03081700153
01:23:02	TTCAD4128	760	MISC	AMBULANCE ADVISED AND ATTENDING.....REF 45
01:25:43	TTCAD4130	689	SUPP	
01:36:59	TTCAD4128	760	MISC	AMBULANCE RECONTACTED..... NO UNIT AVAILABLE.
01:43:44	TTCAD4128	760	SUPP	
01:46:30	TTCAD4128	760	CLEAR	SC99
01:52:42	TTCAD4128	760	MISC	SC98:MALE JUST LOST CONSCIOUSNESS.
01:54:10	TTCAD4129	6063	SUPP	
01:54:47	TTCAD4128	760	MISC	AMBULANCE ADVISED....ETA:ASAP
02:07:16	TTCAD4129	6063	SUPP	
02:10:32	TTCAD4129	6063	CLEAR	SC98
02:10:32	TTCAD4129	6063	CLOSURE	
02:11:19	TTCAD4129	6063	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10B);
02:11:19	TTCAD4129	6063	CLOSE	
02:11:19	TTCAD4129	6063	PRINT	Sent to SC

19/08/2003

16:43:51	OHFEC026	10831	SUPP	
16:44:16	OHFEC026	10831	PRINT	Sent to SC

25/10/2003

03:27:46	OHFEC033	10678	SUPP	
03:27:54	OHFEC033	10678	PRINT	Sent to OHFEC

17082003/01:10:15 10894 TTCAD4154

INFMT STATES HE HAS JUST BEEN JUMPED BY THREE MALES OUTSIDE LOCATION
HE HAS PUT TWO OUT ON THE FLOOR ONE OF WHOM HAS JUST GOT BACK UP AND IS BEING HELD BACK BY THE THIRD. HE REQUESTS POLICE BEFORE ANYTHING ELSE HAPPENS

17082003/01:16:23 760 TTCAD4128

RECONTACTED INFORMANT.....ADVISED TO FLAG UNIT DOWN (IN SIGHT) STATED MALES JUST RETURNED AND GIVEN HIM A GOOD KICKING.

17082003/01:18:45 689 TTCAD4130

SC98 CAN WE HAVE AN AMB HE HAS RIB INJURIES AND BRUSING AND IS INHIS MID 30'S

ALSO A FEMALE AHVING AN ASTHMA ATTACK

17082003/01:25:43 689 TTCAD4130

SC98 THE DESC IS 3 IC1 MALES 19/20 TWO WILL BE BLEEDING FROM THE FIGHT

17082003/01:43:44 760 TTCAD4128

SC98: AUTHORISATION TO PROVIDE TRANSPORT TO SGH SOUGHT.....
FCR INSP: NOT AUTHORISED EXCEPT LIFE OR DEATH SITUATION.
INJURED PARTY EITHER WAITS FOR AMBULANCE OR CONSIDERS TAXI.
AMBULANCE ADVISE ETA 20 MINS.
SC98 ADVISED - WILL WAIT WITH INJURED PARTY.

17082003/01:54:10 6063 TTCAD4129

SC98 - MALE HAS NOW GONE UNCONSCIOUS - PLSE UPDATE INSPECTOR

17082003/02:07:16 6063 TTCAD4129

SC98 - AMB HAVE ARRIVED

17082003/02:11:19 6063 TTCAD4129

RESULT
****

NO OFFENCES AT THIS TIME
MALE BEING CHECKED OVER BY AMB

19082003/16:43:51 10831 OHFEC026

PAUL [redacted] HAS CALLED IN AND HAS ASKED IF THE OIC COULD PLEASE CONTACT HIM ON HIS MOBILE NUMBER - [redacted]

MANY THANKS

INCIDENT: 03080400043 DATE/TIME : 04/08/2003 00:27 SOURCE : T GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : CRIMDAM DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : TONY CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 023 80[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
04/08/2003				
00:27:43	TTCAD4114	8393	ENTRY	
00:36:01	TTCAD4130	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C60);
00:36:01	TTCAD4130	8514	CLOSE	
00:36:01	TTCAD4130	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC
14/08/2003				
15:28:12	OHFEC042	10678	SUPP	
15:28:25	OHFEC042	10678	PRINT	Sent to SC

04082003/00:27:43 8393 TTCAD4114

JUST EJECT 2 FEMALES AND 1 FEMALE - JUST THROWN A BRICK THROUGH ONE OF NEON LIGHTS
MEMBER OF STAFF OUT TRYING TO LOCATE THEM

04082003/00:36:01 8514 TTCAD4130

.
ARESULT
.
ACR AT SC
.
SEE XREF'S ALSO

14082003/15:28:12 10678 OHFEC042

CALL RECEIVED FROM TONY [redacted] - 02380 [redacted] - DEPUTY MANAGER OF NEW YORKS - PLEASE CAN HE BE CONTACTED WITH A CRIME REFERENCE NUMBER.

****

C+D
N.Y39

INCIDENT: 03080300272 DATE/TIME : 03/08/2003 02:34 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8514

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
03/08/2003				
02:34:49	TTCAD4129	8118	ENTRY	
02:34:54	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20083,20094,20322,3235,3443,3842
02:34:54	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC98 (VAN) O/20083,20094,20322,3235,3443,3842
02:34:57	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/1790,20177
02:34:57	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/1790,20177
02:36:20	TTCAD4128	8514	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1837,3940
02:36:20	TTCAD4128	8514	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1837,3940
02:36:24	TTCAD4128	8514	ONS	SC51
02:36:28	TTCAD4128	8514	CLEAR	SP52
02:58:40	TTCAD4128	8514	CLEAR	SC51 SC98
02:58:40	TTCAD4128	8514	CLOSURE	
02:59:10	TTCAD4128	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
02:59:10	TTCAD4128	8514	CLOSE	
02:59:11	TTCAD4128	8514	PRINT	Sent to SC

03082003/02:34:49 8118 TTCAD4129

FIGHT O.SIDE

03082003/02:59:10 8514 TTCAD4128

.

RESULT

.

C+D
N.Y 40

DISPERSED

INCIDENT: 03071900292 DATE/TIME : 19/07/2003 02:28 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT :

ATOM : SECTOR : DISPATCHER : 8118

LOCATION : NEW YORKS NEW YORKS

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
19/07/2003				
02:28:55	TTCAD4130	6827	LOCOVR	DspGrp: ->SDIV
02:28:55	TTCAD4130	6827	ENTRY	
02:29:04	TTCAD4130	6827	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/1810,20163,2724
02:29:04	TTCAD4130	6827	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/1810,20163,2724
02:29:12	TTCAD4130	6827	DSP	SC60 (CID) O/20528
02:29:12	TTCAD4130	6827	ENR	SC60 (CID) O/20528
02:30:01	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:31:23	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:32:30	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC98
02:32:34	TTCAD4130	6827	ONS	SC60
02:32:44	TTCAD4130	6827	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/20119,3286,3828
02:32:44	TTCAD4130	6827	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/20119,3286,3828
02:35:40	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:37:06	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:37:45	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
02:37:53	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
02:38:35	TTCAD4130	6827	XREF	#HC03071900299
02:39:29	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/20322,2620
02:39:29	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/20322,2620
02:39:36	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:39:44	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SP93 (IPV) O/3235,3668

174

02:39:44	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SP93 (IPV) O/3235,3668
02:39:49	TTCAD4167	136	MISC	NOTED FCR INSP WEEKS
02:40:00	TTCAD4130	6827	CLEAR	SP93
02:40:04	TTCAD4130	6827	DSP	SP93 (IPV) O/3235,3668 ,FOR AREA SEARCH.
02:40:04	TTCAD4130	6827	ENR	SP93 (IPV) O/3235,3668 ,FOR AREA SEARCH.
02:40:36	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
02:41:04	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:41:22	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC97
02:41:26	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:41:36	TTCAD4156	8184	CHNG	Details Entered;
02:41:39	TTCAD4164	2604	MISC	TWUN SGT NOTED
02:42:17	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/20129,3301
02:42:17	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC99 (VAN) O/20129,3301
02:43:37	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SP93
02:44:49	TTCAD4130	6827	SUPP	
02:45:58	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SN06 (PSGT) O/1125
02:45:58	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SN06 (PSGT) O/1125
02:50:27	TTCAD4164	2604	SUPP	
02:53:11	TTCAD4130	6827	CLEAR	SC97
02:54:04	TTCAD4130	6827	CLEAR	SP93
02:56:03	TTCAD4130	6827	CLEAR	SC51
02:58:09	TTCAD4129	8514	CLEAR	SC99
03:06:31	TTCAD4129	8514	CLEAR	SC60 SC98 SN06
03:06:31	TTCAD4129	8514	CLOSURE	
03:07:03	TTCAD4129	8514	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
03:07:03	TTCAD4129	8514	CLOSE	

19072003/02:28:55 6827 TTCAD4130
CCTV SHOWS FIGHT AT NYNY....

19072003/02:30:01 6827 TTCAD4130
CCTV SHOWS A SMALL SCUFFLE

19072003/02:31:23 6827 TTCAD4130
CCTV - SHOWS FIGHT TAKING PLACE - DOOR STAFF TRYING TO RESTRAIN.
.

19072003/02:35:40 6827 TTCAD4130
CCTV - SHOWS RUNING FIGHT FROM BERNARD ST...
.

19072003/02:37:06 6827 TTCAD4130
CCTV - ONE MALE ONE THE FLOOR
YT1 - HAS EN ROUTE.
.

19072003/02:37:45 8118 TTCAD4129
SC60 - AMBULANCE PLEASE

19072003/02:37:53 8118 TTCAD4129
SC60 - MALE UNCONCIOUS

19072003/02:39:36 6827 TTCAD4130
T1 - HAS REF 66.

19072003/02:40:36 8118 TTCAD4129
SN06 - HAS AGAIN PLEASE ANOTHER MALE WITH HEAD INJ

19072003/02:41:04 6827 TTCAD4130
SN05 - OPP BERNARD HOUSE. MALE WITH HEAD INJS. HAS ON RO9UTE.
.

19072003/02:41:26 6827 TTCAD4130
** T1 - CONFIRMS TWO HAS VEHS REQUESTED **
.

19072003/02:41:36 8184 TTCAD4156
CCTV - DESC OFFENDER - IC1, 18-22YRS, SHORT CROPPED HAIR, WHITE SHIRT WITH LARGE BLUE SQUARES/LINES ON IT & JEANS, LOOKED ABOUT F510
.
INCIDENT IS ON LIVE RECORD

.
HE WENT OFF DOWN TWDS BERNARD HOUSE...OUT OF CAMERA RANGE

19072003/02:44:49 6827 TTCAD4130
T1 - DESC OF OFFENDER GIVEN IS THE ONE WHO ASSAULTED THE MALE NOW LYING BY THE TICKET MACHINE.
.

19072003/02:50:27 2604 TTCAD4164

TWUN SGT - INSP WOODFORD AWARE & MONITORING

19072003/03:07:03 8514 TTCAD4129
.
RESULT
.
1 TO SGH WITH HEAD INJ.. UNSURE IF ASSAULT OR FALL.. FURTHER ENQS VIA STN
.

INCIDENT: 03071800094 DATE/TIME : 18/07/2003 01:49 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : WEAPON DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 2226

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y
CALLER ADDR :
CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
18/07/2003				
01:49:52	TTCAD4168	8931	ENTRY	
01:50:38	TTCAD4130	2226	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/1281,20171
01:50:38	TTCAD4130	2226	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/1281,20171
01:50:42	TTCAD4130	2226	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/3642,3858
01:50:42	TTCAD4130	2226	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/3642,3858
01:50:50	TTCAD4130	2226	DSP	SP76 (SECT) O/1113
01:50:50	TTCAD4130	2226	ENR	SP76 (SECT) O/1113
01:51:24	TTCAD4130	2226	DSP	SP77 (SECT) O/3363,3859
01:51:24	TTCAD4130	2226	ENR	SP77 (SECT) O/3363,3859
01:51:35	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
01:52:12	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
01:53:31	TTCAD4130	2226	MISC	SP52,FEAMLE WITH A HEAd wound has pls
01:54:03	TTCAD4130	2226	ONS	SP52
01:54:15	TTCAD4168	8931	SUPP	
01:54:31	TTCAD4129	8118	SUPP	
01:55:25	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC99
01:55:30	TTCAD4130	2226	ONS	SP77
02:03:56	TTCAD4130	2226	SUPP	
02:07:31	TTCAD4130	2226	MISC	SP77,DETAILS TAKEN
02:08:28	TTCAD4130	2226	CLEAR	SC99
02:12:22	TTCAD4130	2226	MISC	SP52,NO COMPLAINTS

CTD
N.742

02:12:46	TTCAD4130	2226	CLEAR	SP77
02:12:59	TTCAD4130	2226	CLEAR	SP76
02:15:04	TTCAD4130	2226	CLEAR	SP52
02:15:04	TTCAD4130	2226	CLOSURE	
02:15:34	TTCAD4130	2226	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> Y;All results: () ==> (C10B);
02:15:35	TTCAD4130	2226	CLOSE	
02:15:54	TTCAD4130	2226	PRINT	Sent to SC
13:30:13	TTCAD4133	11170	PRINT	Sent to SY

18072003/01:49:52 8931 TTCAD4168

MALE KICKING OFF WITH IRON BAR - NEED URGENT ASSISTANCE

18072003/01:51:35 8118 TTCAD4129

CCTV- THEY ARE USING ANYTHING THEY CAN LAY THEIR HANDS ON ROAD SIGNS ETC

18072003/01:52:12 8118 TTCAD4129

CCTV- THERE IS A DOOR DAMAGED AT THE CLUB

18072003/01:54:15 8931 TTCAD4168

CCTV - FEMALE WITH RED STRAPPY TOP ON - MALE TUBBY WITH WHITE OPEN SHIRT - GONE DOWN BRINTON ST TWDS HIGH ST

18072003/01:54:31 8118 TTCAD4129

HAS ATTENDING REF 36

18072003/02:03:56 2226 TTCAD4130

**
SP52 M, MALE WAS BANGING HIS HEAD AGAINST THE DOORS WHILST THE STAFF WERE HOLDING IT SHUT
FEMALE HAS A HEAD INJURY FROM AND ASSAULT

***

18072003/02:15:34 2226 TTCAD4130

RESULT
=========

NO COMPLAINTS

FEMALE TREATED AT THE SCENE

INCIDENT: 03071700072 DATE/TIME : 17/07/2003 01:09 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 3 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8719

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : SARAH [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted], SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
17/07/2003				
01:09:29	TTCAD4154	207	ENTRY	
01:10:17	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
01:11:53	TTCAD4128	8719	STKDSP	SY50 (AREA) O/3651,892
01:12:10	TTCAD4129	689	AUTPRE	SY50
01:12:11	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1646,3859
01:12:11	TTCAD4129	689	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1646,3859
01:12:37	TTCAD4128	8719	DSP	SY50 (AREA) O/3651,892
01:12:37	TTCAD4128	8719	ENR	SY50 (AREA) O/3651,892
01:12:51	TTCAD4128	8719	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/20008
01:12:51	TTCAD4128	8719	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/20008
01:13:25	TTCAD4128	8719	ONS	SC98
01:14:02	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
01:14:14	TTCAD4128	8719	ONS	SC51
01:15:36	TTCAD4128	8719	DSP	SD90 (CCTV) O/3499
01:15:36	TTCAD4128	8719	ENR	SD90 (CCTV) O/3499
01:15:43	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
01:17:06	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
01:19:50	TTCAD4128	8719	CLEAR	SY50
01:22:48	TTCAD4128	8719	CLEAR	SC51
01:22:52	TTCAD4128	8719	CLEAR	SC98
01:29:47	TTCAD4129	689	CLEAR	SD90

CTD NY 43

01:29:47	TTCAD4129	689	CLOSURE	
01:31:10	TTCAD4129	689	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
01:31:10	TTCAD4129	689	CLOSE	
01:31:11	TTCAD4129	689	PRINT	Sent to SC

17072003/01:09:29 207 TTCAD4154

WE ARE IN THE CLUB AND HAVE BEEN HAVING TROUBLE WITH A SMALL IC3 MALE WEARING A BLACK SHIRT.HE IS STANDING OUTSIDE THE FRONT OF THE CLUB NOW WITI TWO LARGE IC3 MALES AND WE ARE SCARED TO LEAVE,CAN POLICE ATTEND.

17072003/01:10:17 689 TTCAD4129

CCTV MONITORING AND SAYING THE SAME

17072003/01:14:02 689 TTCAD4129

FROM CCTV A IC3 MALE WITHHIS DARK SHIRT OPEN KEEPS FLYING INTO THE DOORWAY OF THE CLUB

HE IS WITH A SHORTER MALE WITH A TRACKSUIT TOP ON WITH A WHITE BIT ON TEH TOP PART OF HIS JACKET

IC3 MALE WITH THE SHIRT HALF OFF KEEPS COMING BACK TOWARDS THE CLUB

17072003/01:15:43 689 TTCAD4129

SD90 THE GROUP HAVE MOVE OFF TOWARDS BRITON ST AND THE HIGH ST

17072003/01:17:06 689 TTCAD4129

SC98 TWO LARGE IC3'S WANT TO FIGHT THE DOOR STAFF THEY HAVE WALKED OFF AND THEY MAY COME BACK

SD90 THE YOUTHS ARE WALKING UPTOWARDS JUNES RESTAUANT

17072003/01:31:10 689 TTCAD4129

****** RESULT*******

MALES MOVED ON AND BEEN MONITIRED BY CCTV

NO OFFENCES AT THIS TIME

INCIDENT: 03070500215 DATE/TIME : 05/07/2003 01:56 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 141

LOCATION : NEW YORKS

CALLER NAME : SP52 CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
05/07/2003				
01:56:56	TTCAD4129	6075	LOCOVR	Beat: ->SC03 DspGrp: ->SDIV
01:56:56	TTCAD4129	6075	ENTRY	
01:57:04	TTCAD4129	6075	DSP	SP52 (AREA) O/20163,2559
01:57:04	TTCAD4129	6075	ENR	SP52 (AREA) O/20163,2559
01:57:15	TTCAD4129	6075	ONS	SP52
01:58:29	TTCAD4128	141	DSP	SP77 (SECT) O/20119
01:58:29	TTCAD4128	141	ONS	SP77 (SECT) O/20119
02:00:19	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SP52
02:00:57	TTCAD4129	6075	CLEAR	SP77
02:00:57	TTCAD4129	6075	CLOSURE	
02:02:13	TTCAD4128	141	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10B);
02:02:13	TTCAD4128	141	CLOSE	
02:02:13	TTCAD4128	141	PRINT	Sent to SC

05072003/01:56:56 6075 TTCAD4129

FIGHT

05072003/02:02:13 141 TTCAD4128

.

*** RESULT ***

==========

PERSONS SEEN AND MOVED ON

.

N 444

INCIDENT: 03062900059 DATE/TIME : 29/06/2003 00:29 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSINPRO DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 10907

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : JEMMA CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
29/06/2003				
00:29:09	TTCAD4134	496	ENTRY	
00:29:57	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/140,20113,3058,3842,981
00:29:57	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/140,20113,3058,3842,981
00:31:46	TTCAD4130	2489	SUPP	
00:36:20	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SN05 (PSGT) O/2743
00:36:20	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SN05 (PSGT) O/2743
00:36:45	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SN05
00:36:47	TTCAD4129	10907	CLEAR	SC97 SN05
00:36:47	TTCAD4129	10907	CLOSURE	
00:36:56	TTCAD4129	10907	CLSRX	Dispatch to event in closure mode
00:36:56	TTCAD4129	10907	DSP	SN05 (PSGT) O/2743
00:36:56	TTCAD4129	10907	ENR	SN05 (PSGT) O/2743
00:36:58	TTCAD4129	10907	ONS	SN05
00:46:47	TTCAD4130	2489	SUPP	
00:46:56	TTCAD4130	2489	CLEAR	SN05
00:46:56	TTCAD4130	2489	CLOSURE	
00:48:16	TTCAD4130	2489	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10A,C60,R13);
00:48:16	TTCAD4130	2489	CLOSE	
00:48:17	TTCAD4130	2489	PRINT	Sent to SC

C+D 2449

29062003/00:29:09 496 TTCAD4134

THERE IS A FIGHT OUTSIDE THE CLUB, A WINDSCREEN HAS JUST GONE THROUGH ON A BMW OUTSIDE THE CLUB, THERE ARE 8 PEOPLE FIGHTING ONE MALE. THE BOUNCERS HAVE GOT INVOLVED AND THE GROUP ARE WALKING OFF, THE OFFENDER WHO DID THE WINDSCREEN IS WEARING A BLUE ENGLAND SHIRT.

29062003/00:31:46 2489 TTCAD4130

FROM CCTV CALL CAME IN IN PUB WATCH 5 MINS AGO ALL QUIET NOW
OFFENDERS GONE OFF TOWARDS HIGH ST
MALE WHO SMASHED WINDOW IS WEARING ENGLAND SHIRT
CCTV LOOKING FOR HIM

29062003/00:46:47 2489 TTCAD4130

FROM SN06
OFFENDERS HAD LEFT
WINDSREEN OF BMW SMASHED
WHILST DEALING WITH ANOTHER MATTER
BMW HAS GONE

29062003/00:48:16 2489 TTCAD4130

RESULT

ALL QUIET ON ARRIVAL
WINDSCREEN OF BMW SMASHED
VEH AND OWNER DROVE OFF BEFORE POLICE COULD TAKE A REPORT

INCIDENT: 03062100213 DATE/TIME : 21/06/2003 01:41 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 6419

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MARK [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 0790[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
21/06/2003				
01:41:05	TTCAD4127	10927	ENTRY	
01:41:36	TTCAD4128	6419	DSP	SC71 (SECT) O/3209
01:41:36	TTCAD4128	6419	ONS	SC71 (SECT) O/3209
01:41:48	TTCAD4128	6419	MISC	SC71,ONE FURTHER UNIT PLEASE
01:41:55	TTCAD4130	240	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/2264,2619
01:41:55	TTCAD4130	240	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/2264,2619
01:42:07	TTCAD4128	6419	DSP	SD90 (CCTV) O/3499,3683
01:42:07	TTCAD4128	6419	ENR	SD90 (CCTV) O/3499,3683
01:46:58	TTCAD4130	240	CLEAR	SC51 SC71 SD90
01:46:58	TTCAD4130	240	CLOSURE	
01:49:23	TTCAD4130	240	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
01:49:23	TTCAD4130	240	CLOSE	
01:49:25	TTCAD4130	240	PRINT	Sent to SC

21062003/01:41:05 10927 TTCAD4127

MALE AT FRONT OF NEW YORKS GIVING BOUNCERS TROUBLE.

MALE DESC
WHITE
SKIN HEAD
BLUE SHIRT
BLUE JEANS.

CTD
N.Y 46

CALLER BELIEVES SITUATION GETTING VERY HEATED.

21062003/01:49:23 240 TTCAD4130

**********RESULT**********

ONE MALE SPOKEN TO - [redacted] - VERY MUCH IN DRINK

NO COMPLAINTS

MALE LEFT ON REQUEST

****

INCIDENT: 03062000043 DATE/TIME : 20/06/2003 00:43 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 5 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MR DANIEL [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
20/06/2003				
00:43:10	TTCAD4122	8461	ADVD	
00:43:10	TTCAD4122	8461	ENTRY	
00:43:11	TTCAD4122	8461	PRINT	Sent to SC
00:43:22	TTCAD4122	8461	CHNG	Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B);

20062003/00:43:10 8461 TTCAD4122

INFT STATES HE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY THE BOUNCER AT NEW YORK NEW YORK, IT HAPPENED BECAUSE ANOTHER MALE ASSAULTED INFT , THEN THE BOUNCER CAMI OVER AND ALSO HIT HIM. INFT DOESNT WANT TO MAKE A COMPLAINT ABOUT THE FIRST ASSAULT BECAUSE HE DOESNT KNOW WHO THE MALE INVOLVED IS. INFT STATES HE HAS HURT THE BACK OF HIS HEAD BUT DOESNT WANT HOSPITAL TREATMENT. INFTS SPEECH SOUNDS SLURRED BUT HE STATES HE ISNT DRUNK.

** RESULT **

AGG'D MAKING A REPORT AT LOCAL STATION TOMORROW

C+D N 447

INCIDENT: 03061400240 DATE/TIME : 14/06/2003 01:59 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 5 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
14/06/2003				
01:59:08	TTCAD4141	10920	ADVD	
01:59:08	TTCAD4141	10920	ENTRY	
01:59:22	TTCAD4141	10920	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B);
01:59:22	TTCAD4141	10920	CLSRQST	
01:59:32	TTCAD4141	10920	PRINT	Sent to SC
02:35:10	TTCAD4129	760	CLOSE	
02:35:11	TTCAD4129	760	PRINT	Sent to SC

14062003/01:59:08 10920 TTCAD4141

INF REPORTING SHE AND HER FRIEND DARREN [redacted] OF [redacted] HAVE BEEN ASSAULTED BY THE BOUNCERS IN NEW YORKS. DARREN HAS A CUT HAND. HE DOES NOT REQUIRE AN AMB. INF IS WITH A TAXI DRIVER WHO IS A WITNESS. ADV INF TO GO TO SC, WHICH SHE WILL DO NOW. INF AND HER FRIEND HAVE BOTH BEEN DRINKING. ADV HER WE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO TAKE A STATEMENT.

14062003/01:59:22 10920 TTCAD4141

RESULT

INF ATTENDING SC NOW

CTD N.748

INCIDENT: 03060700118 DATE/TIME : 07/06/2003 01:04 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : MR [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : PASSER BY

CALLER PHONE: 0771[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
07/06/2003				
01:04:43	TTCAD4138	8936	ENTRY	
01:05:22	TTCAD4128	689	DSP	SC71 (SECT) O/20140,3642
01:05:22	TTCAD4128	689	ENR	SC71 (SECT) O/20140,3642
01:05:34	TTCAD4165	5731	MISC	NOTED TWUN SGT
01:06:00	TTCAD4128	689	DSP	SP77 (SECT) O/3683
01:06:00	TTCAD4128	689	ENR	SP77 (SECT) O/3683
01:07:01	TTCAD4128	689	DSP	X3606 (PCON) O/3606
01:07:01	TTCAD4128	689	ENR	X3606 (PCON) O/3606
01:09:14	TTCAD4138	8936	SUPP	
01:09:39	TTCAD4128	689	ONS	X3606
01:09:40	TTCAD4130	8719	ONS	X3606
01:09:47	TTCAD4130	8719	MISC	X3606 - ALL IN ORDER ON ARRIVAL
01:10:00	TTCAD4128	689	CLEAR	SC71
01:10:07	TTCAD4128	689	CLEAR	SP77
01:10:24	TTCAD4130	8719	MISC	SP77 - HAS - ONE MALE WITH SERIUOS INJS - HE IS CONSCIOUS AND BREATHING
01:10:29	TTCAD4130	8719	MISC	SP77 - MAY HAVE TWO DETAINED FOR ASSUALT
01:11:42	TTCAD4130	8719	SUPP	
01:18:47	TTCAD4128	689	CLEAR	X3606
01:18:47	TTCAD4128	689	CLOSURE	
01:22:24	TTCAD4128	689	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (R10);
01:22:24	TTCAD4128	689	CLOSE	

CTD N.479

01:22:24 TTCAD4128 689 PRINT Sent to SC

07062003/01:04:43 8936 TTCAD4138

APPROX 15 PEOPLE ABOUT TO START A FIGHT O/S THE ABOVE CLUB
THEY ARE ALL EGGING EACH OTHER ON

07062003/01:09:14 8936 TTCAD4138

FURTHER 999 FROM SAME MALE SAYING THEY HAVE BROKEN PALLETTS UP AND ARE FIGHTING WITH STICKS NOW

.

07062003/01:11:42 8719 TTCAD4130

8719 - AMBULANCE ONROUTE = THEIR REF 31

.

07062003/01:22:24 689 TTCAD4128

**** RESULT*********

NO FIGHT AND ASNT ALL QUIET

LOCAL NIT WILL STAY AND MONITOR

INCIDENT: 03051800204 DATE/TIME : 18/05/2003 02:13 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 5 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : ASSREP DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CARLY [redacted]

CALLER ADDR : [redacted] SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]

CALLER PHONE: 079[redacted]

CONTACT : Y

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
18/05/2003				
02:13:16	TTCAD4138	10920	ADVD	
02:13:16	TTCAD4138	10920	ENTRY	
02:13:35	TTCAD4138	10920	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C10B);
02:13:35	TTCAD4138	10920	CLSRQST	
02:13:49	TTCAD4138	10920	PRINT	Sent to ST
02:13:54	TTCAD4138	10920	PRINT	Sent to SC
02:20:42	TTCAD4164	2385	CLOSE	
02:20:43	TTCAD4164	2385	PRINT	Sent to SC

18052003/02:13:16 10920 TTCAD4138

INF REPORTING SHE HAS BEEN ASSAULTED BY CARLA [redacted] AND JO [redacted] INSIDE THE CLUB. SHE HAS HAD A DRINK THROWN IN HER EYES AND HAS BEEN KICKED BETWEEN THE LEGS 10 TIMES. SHE DOES NOT REQUIRE AN AMB. INF HAS BEEN DRINKING TONIGHT AND IS HAPPY TO ATTEND ST IN THE MORNING TO MAKE A STATEMENT. ADV HER TO CALL AMB IF SHE FEELS ILL LATER ON.

18052003/02:13:35 10920 TTCAD4138

**RESULT **

INF WILL ATTEND ST IN THE MORNING TO MAKE A STATEMENT

C+D
N.YSO

INCIDENT: 03051000134 DATE/TIME : 10/05/2003 01:12 SOURCE : T GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBDRUNK DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER :

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : HAS CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : INC REF 28

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
10/05/2003				
01:12:17	TTCAD4127	2303	ENTRY	
01:17:09	TTCAD4127	2303	SUPP	
01:20:04	TTCAD4117	8256	SUPP	
01:21:25	TTCAD4130	6526	MISC	SC99 - RESUMING SHORTLY
01:22:31	TTCAD4130	6526	CHNG	Grade: 3 ==> 2;
01:24:42	TTCAD4143	10927	SUPP	
01:29:29	TTCAD4130	6526	XREF	#HC03051000148
01:30:04	TTCAD4130	6526	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> Y;All results: () ==> (D20,X10);
01:30:04	TTCAD4130	6526	CLOSE	
01:30:05	TTCAD4130	6526	PRINT	Sent to SC

10052003/01:12:17 2303 TTCAD4127

AMB ON SCENE WITH MALE WHO WAS REPORTED AS UNCONSCIOUS BUT HE IS NOT UNCONSCIOUS BUT VERY DRUNK AND ABUSIVI

10052003/01:17:09 2303 TTCAD4127

AMB ADVISED THAT IF MALE INCAPABLE CUSODY SGT WOULD INSIST ON HOSPITAL. AMB CREW STATE THE MALE IS VERY MUCH AWAKE BUT V DRUNK. ADVISED THAT IF NO CONCERN FOR WELFARE IT WAS NOT NECESARY FOR AMB TO AWAIT POLICE ATTENDANCE

10052003/01:20:04 8256 TTCAD4117

FROM HAS - POLICE ATTENDANCE RQD ASAP AS PATIENT BECOMING AGGRESSIVE

N.Y.S.I. C+D

10052003/01:24:42 10927 TTCAD4143

AMBULANCE SAY STAND DOWN - THEY HAVE TAKEN MALE OFF IN AMBULANCE.

10052003/01:30:04 6526 TTCAD4130

RESULT
****

HAS TAKEN MALE OFF - UNIT ATTENDING AREA TO SEE WHAT HAS OCCURRED ON CROSS REF#

INCIDENT: 03030200188 DATE/TIME : 02/03/2003 01:59 SOURCE : C GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : CCTV CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
02/03/2003				
01:59:40	TTCAD4119	166	LOCOVR	DspGrp: ->SDIV
01:59:40	TTCAD4119	166	ENTRY	
02:00:11	TTCAD4122	689	DSP	SP93 (IPV) O/140,20083
02:00:11	TTCAD4122	689	ENR	SP93 (IPV) O/140,20083
02:00:18	TTCAD4122	689	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1464,981
02:00:18	TTCAD4122	689	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1464,981
02:00:28	TTCAD4122	689	CHNG	Location: NEWYORK NEWYORK ==> NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ ;Atom: <empty> ==> SC03;Beat: <empty> ==> SC03;LOC DG: <empty> ==> SDIV;
02:01:08	TTCAD4122	689	SUPP	
02:08:03	TTCAD4122	689	ONS	SP93
02:08:03	TTCAD4122	689	ONS	SC51
02:11:02	TTCAD4122	689	SUPP	
02:22:56	TTCAD4122	689	AUTPRE	SC51
02:27:51	TTCAD4122	689	CLEAR	SP93
02:27:51	TTCAD4122	689	CLOSURE	
02:28:27	TTCAD4122	689	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (C60);
02:28:27	TTCAD4122	689	CLOSE	
02:28:29	TTCAD4122	689	PRINT	Sent to SC

02032003/01:59:40 166 TTCAD4119

FIGHT IN THE DOORWAY NO OTHER DETAILS

CTD
NYS2

02032003/02:01:08 689 TTCAD4122

TWUN

MALE ON CAMERA WAVING HIS ARMS AROUND IS WEARING LIGHT BLUE SHIRT AND WHITE TROUSERS

02032003/02:11:02 689 TTCAD4122

SC51 THE MALE HAS BEEN DRAGGED OFF BY HIS MATES AIO AT THIS TIME

02032003/02:28:27 689 TTCAD4122

***** RESULT**********

MALE HAD PUT IN A WINDOW AT NEW YORKS

ASNT FRO THE MALE

INCIDENT: 03022101632 DATE/TIME : 21/02/2003 23:43 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 689

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : ROGER CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE: 0775[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
21/02/2003				
23:43:52	TTCAD4152	1773	ENTRY	
23:44:38	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/1113,3499
23:44:38	TTCAD4129	689	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/1113,3499
23:44:59	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/1538,1544,3606,3747
23:44:59	TTCAD4129	689	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/1538,1544,3606,3747
23:45:38	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1837,2766
23:45:38	TTCAD4129	689	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1837,2766
23:45:49	TTCAD4129	689	DSP	SC3A (FOOT) O/1023,3016,3940
23:45:49	TTCAD4129	689	ENR	SC3A (FOOT) O/1023,3016,3940
23:46:09	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
23:46:44	TTCAD4129	689	SUPP	
23:46:47	TTCAD4129	689	CLEAR	SC98
23:46:53	TTCAD4129	689	CLEAR	SC51
23:46:59	TTCAD4129	689	CLEAR	SC3A
23:47:35	TTCAD4130	731	CLEAR	SC99
23:47:35	TTCAD4130	731	CLOSURE	
23:48:25	TTCAD4130	731	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> Y;All results: () ==> (C10B);
23:48:25	TTCAD4130	731	CLOSE	
23:48:26	TTCAD4130	731	PRINT	Sent to SC
25/02/2003				
10:19:15	TTCAD4158	624	PRINT	Sent to SC

C+D
N.Y S3

21022003/23:43:52 1773 TTCAD4152

MALES FIGHTING OUTSIDE. SOMOE HAVE THEIR SHIRTS OFF AND THEY ARE COVERED IN BLOOD

21022003/23:46:09 689 TTCAD4129

TWUN

ONE MALE SEEN ON CAMERA RUNNING FROM THE SCENE IN BLACK TOP AND BLUE JEANS

HE RAN OFF INTO BERNARD STREET

21022003/23:46:44 689 TTCAD4129

SC99 STAND DOWN ANY OTHER DETALS MALE IS REFUSING ALL HELP

21022003/23:48:25 731 TTCAD4130

RESULT
****

AGG REFUSING DETAILS
ADVISED TO ATTEND STN IN MORNING WHEN SOBER IF HE WISHED TO PROCEED WITH A REPORT

INCIDENT: 03020900177 DATE/TIME : 09/02/2003 02:35 SOURCE : T GRADE : 1 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBFIGHT DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 8813

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : SC72 CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR :

CALLER PHONE:

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
09/02/2003				
02:35:16	TTCAD4129	8118	ENTRY	
02:35:27	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC72 (SECT) O/3550,9057
02:35:27	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SC72 (SECT) O/3550,9057
02:35:29	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC72
02:35:39	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC51 (AREA) O/1774,1790
02:35:39	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SC51 (AREA) O/1774,1790
02:35:42	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SP93 (IPV) O/423
02:35:42	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SP93 (IPV) O/423
02:36:14	TTCAD4129	8118	MISC	SC72,AIO MORE UNITS STILL TOWARDS
02:36:25	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC98 (VAN) O/140,3301,3572,3893
02:36:25	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	SC98 (VAN) O/140,3301,3572,3893
02:36:28	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SP93
02:36:38	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC51
02:36:42	TTCAD4128	8813	ONS	SC51
02:37:03	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	WD34X (DOG) O/2708
02:37:03	TTCAD4129	8118	ENR	WD34X (DOG) O/2708
02:37:06	TTCAD4128	8813	CLEAR	WD34X
02:37:13	TTCAD4129	8118	DSP	SC71 (SECT) O/3439,3805
02:37:13	TTCAD4129	8118	ONS	SC71 (SECT) O/3439,3805
02:37:16	TTCAD4128	8813	DSP	WD34X (DOG) O/2708
02:37:16	TTCAD4128	8813	ENR	WD34X (DOG) O/2708

N.Y.S.P. CTD

02:37:37	TTCAD4129	8118	MISC	SC51,STILL HEATED BUT SEEM TO BE DISPERSING
02:38:04	TTCAD4129	8118	MISC	SC51,STAND ALL UNITS SDOWN UNL;ESS 95'D
02:38:18	TTCAD4128	8813	CLEAR	SC98
02:41:51	TTCAD4129	8118	CLEAR	SC51
02:43:43	TTCAD4129	8118	CLEAR	WD34X
02:47:51	TTCAD4128	8813	CLEAR	SP93
02:47:57	TTCAD4128	8813	CLEAR	SC71
03:01:37	TTCAD4129	8118	CLEAR	SC72
03:01:37	TTCAD4129	8118	CLOSURE	
03:02:04	TTCAD4129	8118	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D10B);
03:02:04	TTCAD4129	8118	CLOSE	
03:02:05	TTCAD4129	8118	PRINT	Sent to SC
10/02/2003				
20:08:52	TTCAD4167	136	SUPP	
20:08:57	TTCAD4167	136	PRINT	Sent to SHMIR
15/02/2003				
12:05:39	TTCAD4165	778	PRINT	Sent to SHMIR
27/02/2003				
13:37:24	TTCAD4095	8392	PRINT	Sent to CRSU

09022003/02:35:16 8118 TTCAD4129
FIGHT - ASSISTANCE PLEASE

09022003/03:02:04 8118 TTCAD4129
**********RESULT*********

NO COMPLAINTS
ALL MOVED ON

10022003/20:08:52 136 TTCAD4167
********** FOR ATTENTION OF DS BOWEN **********

INCIDENT: 03010100321 DATE/TIME : 01/01/2003 02:10 SOURCE : 9 GRADE : 2 STATUS : CLS

TYPE : PUBOTHER DISPATCH GROUP : SDIV BEAT : SC03

ATOM : SC03 SECTOR : SC03 DISPATCHER : 6564

LOCATION : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER NAME : [redacted] CONTACT : Y

CALLER ADDR : NEW YORK NEW YORK @ 2 QUEENSWAY ST ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ

CALLER PHONE: 02380[redacted]

DATE/TIME	WORKSTATION	PERSONNEL	ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
01/01/2003				
02:10:46	TTCAD4146	11089	ENTRY	
02:13:19	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SC99 (VAN) O/1062,5421
02:13:19	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SC99 (VAN) O/1062,5421
02:13:36	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SC97 (VAN) O/2559,3910
02:13:36	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SC97 (VAN) O/2559,3910
02:15:11	TTCAD4129	6564	DSP	SP77 (SECT) O/3125,3786
02:15:11	TTCAD4129	6564	ENR	SP77 (SECT) O/3125,3786
02:15:50	TTCAD4129	6564	CLEAR	SP77
02:16:28	TTCAD4128	6526	ONS	SC97
03:09:25	TTCAD4129	8547	CLEAR	SC99
03:12:11	TTCAD4129	8547	CLEAR	SC97
03:12:11	TTCAD4129	8547	CLOSURE	
03:13:02	TTCAD4129	8547	CHNG	Details Entered;Contact Result: <empty> ==> N;All results: () ==> (D2A);
03:13:02	TTCAD4129	8547	CLOSE	
03:13:03	TTCAD4129	8547	PRINT	Sent to SC
04:18:53	TTCAD4129	8547	PRINT	Sent to SC

01012003/02:10:46 11089 TTCAD4146

THERE ARE 5 ASIAN MALES OUTSIDE THE NIGHTCLUB TRYING TO FORCE ENTRY. THE CLUB ARE HAVING PROBLEMS LETTING CUSTOMERS OUT, AS AS THEY DO, THEY TRY TO GET IN. THEY ARE ACUSING DAMAGE TO THE DOOR.
INFT STATES ONE OF THEM IS ON HIS MOBILE, INFT THINKS HE MAYBE CONTACTING MORE FRINED TO COME DOWN.

C+D
N.YSS

01012003/03:13:02 8547 TTCAD4129

RESULT
****
ASSISTANCE GIVEN

Under Age Issues at McClusky's and New York New York Night Clubs
From October 2003 – April 2004

Number	Location	Date	Information	How Documented
1	McClusky's	17-04-2004	From Sgt Bates – complaint from door staff at McClusky's that their management were preventing them from checking ID	Internal Police report from Sgt Bates to Police Licensing
2	McClusky's	20-02-2004	Statement from PC Rippon that his partners daughter 'Rachel' had been celebrating her 15th Birthday inside McClusky's	Statement from PC Rippon
3	McClusky's	18-01-2004	Internal Police E–Mail from PC O'Grady to Licensing Unit that 2 x 16 year old boys arrested for damage to a taxi having had a 'skin full' in McClusky's	Internal Police E-Mail from PC O'Grady
4	McClusky's	09-01-2004	Call from 'Laura' to Police Control Room stating there are a lot of teenagers under the age of 18 in McClusky's	Copy of Police Control Room Record
5	McClusky's	02-12-2003	Statement from 16 yr old 'Angeline' regarding being in McClusky's with friends	Statement from Angeline
6	McClusky's	31-12-2003	Complaint from mother 'Anita' of 15 year old 'Leah' (below) regarding having had to collect her 15 year old daughter from McClusky's	Copy of Police Control Room Record
7	McClusky's	31-12-2003	Information from 15 year old 'Leah' regarding being allowed entry to Mcclusky's unchallenged	Statement from Leah
8	McClusky's	16-12-2003	Internal Police E-Mail from PC Tait to her Licensing Unit colleagues that call received from 'Matthew' concerned that his 14 year old brother admitted drinking alcohol in McClusky's	Internal Police E-Mail from PC Tait
9	McClusky's & New York	05-10-2003	Statement from 17 year old Christopher regarding being served alcohol in Both McClusky's and New York New York	Statement from Christopher
10	New York	04-10-2003	Statement from 17 year old Lauren regarding being served alcohol inside New York New York	Statement from Lauren

M 'CLUSKYS
UNDERAGE
1

Chandler, Stewart

From: Bates, Phillip
Sent: 17 April 2004 07:33
To: S DIV LICENSING Mailbox
Subject: McCluskys New Yorks

Doorstaff at McCluskys are not happy with thte management as management were stopping the door staff checking ID on people and just letting them in when they appeared to be underage. One 16 yr old arrested from there last night. Also story of one being ejected from McCluskys and being walked by management from McCluskys into NYs.
I am on again tonight and will do a fuller report by end of weekend. This needs sorting.

Phil

UNDER AGE
2

MG11(T)

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Statement of: C
Age if under 18: 018 (if over 18 insert 'over18') Occupation: PC 1047

This statement (consisting of 1 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: Date: 20/02/04

During the weekend of 13th / 14th December 2003, it was brought to my attention that [redacted] Rachel had been celebrating her 15th birthday in McCluskies.

When spoken to re this issue she claimed that she had been using this place for many months and she was one of many people in there underage.

I asked her what checks they had made re her age when she used the premises. They initially asked her age, which she obviously lied about, then when she was recognised then no further questions were asked.

To be fair to the door staff, I have to say that when Rachel is dressed up, make up etc she can easily pass for a female in her early 20's.

Signed : _____ Signature witnessed by : _____

UNDER AGE
3

Tait, Susan

From: S DIV LICENSING Mailbox
Sent: 18 January 2004 17:34
To: O'Grady, Hayley
Cc: Tait, Susan; Chandler, Stewart
Subject: RE: McClusky's

Hayley

Many thanks for this I am seeing the licensee's this week.

Sue - Can you add these details to the file - yet more!!

Regards

Jon Snook - Inspector
Southampton City Sector & Licensing

-----Original Message-----
From: O'Grady, Hayley
Sent: 18 January 2004 15:45
To: S DIV LICENSING Mailbox
Subject: McClusky's

Hello licensing Unit,
Just to let you know, CIS log entered in relation to the above premises. This follows the arrest of 2 x 16 yr olds for criminal Damage to a taxi, having just left McCluskys, after a skin full.
Both boys say they have been allowed in there a number of times before and no ID has been requested. Always get served.
Thanks,
Hayley.

UNDER AGE
(4)


```
+-------------------------+
| INCIDENT HISTORY RECORDS |
+-------------------------+

Incident#: HC04011600426        Entry: 16-Jan-2004/11:49:55

     Type: OTHINC        - Other Incident
    Grade: 4   Src: T   Resp Code: 1FSVM   Level: 1

 Location: 4 QUEENSWAY SQ ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ (FOUR TO SIX)
 Loc Info: MCCLUSKIES
           Dispatch Group: SDIV   Beat: SC03

   Caller: LAURA [redacted]
  Address: [redacted],SOUTHAMPTON ^SO19 8NZ
  Phone 1: 07766[redacted] /        2:                    3:
           07749[redacted]
```

REMARKS

Date/Time	Remarks
16-Jan-2004 11:49:55	INFT STATES THAT ON FRIDAY 09/01/04 SHE WAS IN THE CLUB AND NOTICED THAT THERE WERE A LOT OF TEENAGERS UNDER THE AGE OF 18 IN THE CLUB INFT ADVISED THE BOUNCER ON THE DOOR WHO TOLD HER TO BE QUIET OR SHE WOULD BE BARRED

INCIDENT SUMMARY

Status	Status Date	By	At
WAI	16-Jan-2004/11:49:55	10890	OHFEC042

INCIDENT CHRONOLOGY

Date/Time	Action	Description	[Wks/Pers]
16-Jan-2004			
11:49:55	ENTRY		[OHFEC042/10890]
11:49:55	LOCOVR	DspGrp: SDIV->TELS	[OHFEC042/10890]
11:50:48	PRINT	Sent to SC	[TCM02/TCMOP2]

ALTARIS MESSAGE CLEARANCE		
ACR Ref		NCRS DECISION MADE/CLEAR
Other crime related incident (EXPLANATION BELOW)		Sgt/No Date.
T1 Ref		
PMS Ref		Decision Validated/Audited by:
...censing Register	Y/N	Ch/Insp/Supt
...ctim Informed	Y/N	
...ssed to CBO	Y/N	
...rmation Only	Y/N	
...EAST ONE OF THE		

COPIES TO: -
CBO BT 3
LICENSING SH.

UNDER AGE 5

MG11

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Statement of: ANGELINA E [redacted]

Age if under 18: 16 (if over 18 insert 'over 18')

This statement (consisting of 3 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated anything in it, which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: Date: 2/12/03

On Saturday 22nd November 2003 I was at home in the evening getting ready to go out to McCluskeys. I go there every so often with a group of friends. On this Saturday I was going out with two of my friends Hannah [redacted] and Rachel, but I don't know her surname. They arrived at about 7pm and ~~[illegible]~~ AC we went to ~~getting~~ AC ready to go out. Sometime soon after Stephanie [redacted] arrived. I only knew Stephanie was coming about five minutes before she arrived because Hannah had invited her. No-one had been drinking at this stage but when we were all together we started drinking some alcohol. Stephanie had brought her own drink in a small coke bottle. It was vodka and coke but looked to be mostly vodka. We were all joking to her that she couldn't handle her drink. The more ~~of~~ she has to drink the

Signed : re witnessed by : [redacted]

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

MG11C

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Continuation of Statement of : A. [redacted]

louder she gets. We stayed at my house chatting, drinking and getting ready. I ordered the taxi to take us to McCluskey and it arrived at about 9.30pm. We all pay towards the cab fare. We got to McCluskey at about 9.45pm and it dropped us right outside the door. We went straight in and the doorman looked at Stephanie and then said to me that he would only let her in if I kept an eye on her and he told me to make sure she only drank water. This was because when we were at the door she was really loud and slurring her words. We went straight up to the ladies toilets and on the way up there Stephanie was bumping into Hannah almost knocking her over, Hannah said something to her and then in the toilets Stephanie shouted at Hannah asking what she had said, she was shouting alot and others in the toilets were asking her to calm down. Then a large doorman stood in the doorway and said "Come on Steph" Steph laughed and said "alright". The doorman took her downstairs and to the door area but I didnt see her then and I dont know if she was shown out. Hannah was wound up so we went to the bar and bought a drink. Then we were dancing and Steph came up and asked all of us where Charlene was, (her sister). The same doorman was still with her. We all said we hadnt seen her sister and the doorman took her off. Soon after the DJ put a call out over the microphone for her sister and I never saw Stephanie again that night. The last time I saw Steph must have been some time just after 10pm not later than 10.15pm. When we left at about 10.45pm to go to New Yorks I spoke to the doorman who had been with her he was on the door, and I asked him where Steph was but he didnt know. I asked which way she had gone, but again he didnt know. I havnt seen or heard from her since I have had this statement read to me and made any alterations

Signed : A[redacted] Signature witnessed by : A[redacted]

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

MG11C

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Page No. : 7

Continuation of Statement of : A [redacted]

necessary. I am willing to attend Court and give evidence if necessary. [redacted]

Signed : A[redacted]

Signature witnessed by : [redacted]

UNDER AGE
NY (6)

3 hours.

```
+---------------------------+
| INCIDENT HISTORY RECORDS  |
+---------------------------+
```

Incident#: HC03123101339 Entry: 31-Dec-2003/23:35:43

Type: OTHINC - Other Incident
Grade: 4 Src: T Resp Code: 1FSVM Level: 1

Location: 4-8 QUEENSWAY SQ ,SOUTHAMPTON ^SO14 3AZ (FOUR TO SIX)
Loc Info: **MCCLUSKIE'S NIGHT CLUB**
Dispatch Group: SDIV Beat: SC03

- OFF MONDAYS.

Caller: ANITA [redacted]
Address: [redacted] ,SOUTHAMPTON [redacted]
Phone 1: 07748[redacted] 2: 3: [redacted] RD.
(DAUGHTERS NO.) 07969 - [redacted]

R IARKS

Date/Time	Remarks
31-Dec-2003 23:35:43	CALLER REPORTING THAT SHE HAS JUST REMOVED HER 15 YEAR OLD DAUGHTER, LEAH [redacted] FROM MCCLUSKIE'S NIGHT CLUB. HER FRIENDS, ALSO AGED 15 YEARS, ARE STILL IN THERE. CALLER HAD BELIEVED THAT LEAH WAS ON A SLEEPOVER WITH HER FRIEND [redacted], WHO LIVES IN THE WOOLSTON AREA, CALLER RANG [redacted] PARENTS TO SPEAK WITH LEAH, AND WAS TOLD BY THEM THAT BOTH GIRLS HAD GONE TO MCCLUSKIES. CALLER HAS ASKED LEAH IF SHE WAS ASKED FOR ANY ID, AND WAS TOLD THAT THIS HAD NOT BEEN REQUESTED. CALLER IS ANGRY THAT LEAH WAS ALLOWED ACCESS TO A NIGHTCLUB FOR OVER 21'S, AND HAS REQUESTED THAT POLICE ATTEND THE CLUB IN RESPECT OF THE OTHER 15 YEAR OLDS WHO ARE STILL INSIDE. SHE WOULD LIKE TO BE UDPATED ON THE RESULT PLEASE
23:40:50	8719 - ADVISED LICENSING UNIT - ATTENDING TO SPEAK TO LICENSEE AND MAKE FURTHER ENQUIRIES
23:41:04	**********COPY FAO LICENSING UNIT********** **********
23:41:30	*****RESULT***** LICENSING UNIT AWARE AND ATTENDING TO SPEAK TO LICENSEE AND MAKE FURTHER ENQUIRIES

Copy to Licensing

UNDER AGE 7

MG11

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Statement of: Leah [redacted]

Age if under 18: 15 yrs. (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: [redacted]

This statement (consisting of 3 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated anything in it, which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [redacted] (MOTHER) Date: 6th January '04

Approximately 4 pm on Wednesday 31st December 2003, I met my friend Kelly [redacted]. It was our intention to go into Southampton and then go back to Kelly's house where I would stay overnight. Approximately 7 pm, Kelly spoke to a friend on her mobile telephone. During the course of the conversation, her friend asked what we were doing during the evening. Kelly told her we were staying at home whereupon her friend, who is 18, suggested we went to McCLUSKIES. Kelly was eager to go but I just went to keep Kelly company.

Kelly and I left home about 8.30 pm and arrived about 9.30 pm. When we arrived there was no queue. I saw 3

Signed: [redacted] Signature witnessed by: [redacted]

MG11C

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Continuation of Statement of : Leah - [redacted]

'bouncers' standing by the door. One of them said "Hello" and we walked straight in, unchallenged. No one else entered with us.

Inside the club it was quiet and quite well-lit. Kelly and I went to the toilet and chattered to a group of about 5 girls. We didn't know the girls but 3 were under 18.

We went downstairs and went to the bar. Kelly ordered a WKD or something similar. I didn't want anything to drink. The people serving behind the bar didn't ask how old Kelly was and served her the WKD. We spoke to a couple of girls from the toilets and danced. Kelly bought another WKD. Some of the girls we met had drinks. I think one was a 'Vodka Ice'. I don't know how old the girl was who had the Vodka.

At no time were we approached by anyone whilst in the club.

Kelly received a phone call from her mum stating my mum had contacted her. I ~~then~~ left the club with Kelly and I went to a nearby phone box. Kelly went back inside the club.

When I went to M^c CLUSKIES I was wearing a black sleeveless dress which I wore with one side slightly off the shoulder. The dress was approx. 4 cms from the knee and was loose fitting. My legs were bare and I wore black snow boots which came just below the

Signed : [redacted] Signature witnessed by : [redacted]

MG11C

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Continuation of Statement of : Leah - [redacted]

knee. I carried a black, white and red bag. I also wore a black knee-length coat. My hair is dark and is just below shoulder length. I did not dress it up. My make up was subtle. I wore 'light' perfume. I think I did look slightly older than my years. Having said that on the bus journey to the club I was charged 'child' prices without being asked my age. Usually when I am not dressed up I am charged adult prices.

I would describe myself as 5'7", slim build, long dark wavy hair.

Kelly and I have not been to McCHUSKIES before but I know boys who do. The youngest is about 16. [redacted]

Signed : ___ Signature witnessed by : _____

UNDER AGE
8

Dawson, Ian A

From: Tait, Susan
Sent: 16 December 2003 17:58
To: Snook, Jonathan; Chandler, Stewart; Dawson, Ian A
Subject: Mc Cluskies

Gents,

Call received 1745 hours, 16th December 2003 from Mr. Mathew [redacted]

Tel. no. S[redacted]

He is concerned that his 14 years old brother has admitted drinking alcohol in Mc CLUSKIES. He has visited approx. 2200 hrs on two Friday nights recently with a group of friends.He has not been approached for id. Mr [redacted] is of the opinion his brother does not look 18 .
Details of brother declined.

For your information.
Sue

No reply - 18/12/03 1700hrs.

Contacted - 20/12/03 1730hrs. Mr [redacted] will speak with his father about trying to get a statement from his younger brother. Will be calling us back. - did not call back.

Re-contacted - 21/12/03 - 1620hrs - No reply.

— " — 7/1/04 - 0955hr. Message left. S. Tait WPC 357

— " — 8/1/04 - 1820hrs - " " S. Tait WPC 357

— " — 1840hrs - No reply. S. Tait WPC 357

— " — 10/1/04 - 1455hrs - No reply S. Tait WPC 357

— " — 15/1/04 -

UNDER AGE

MG11(T)

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Statement of: Christopher [redacted]
Age if under 18: 17 (if over 18 insert 'over18') Occupation:

This statement (consisting of 2 page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [redacted] Date: 5/10/03

During the evening of Saturday 4th October 2003 I went out with a group of my friends into Southampton drinking. I went to McCluskys and then onto New Yorks in Queensway, Southampton. I had drunk about 8 pints of lager. I came out of the club about 0130 on the Sunday morning as my friends, Gerald [redacted] and Kirk [redacted] were outside. We waited for our other friends to come out. Just after 0200 the club closed and our friends Gary [redacted] Khan and Michael [redacted] came and joined us. We were all stood by the bus shelter opposite McCluskys. We were talking amongst each other. 2 men then approached us. The first man I will refer to as male 1 was about 6'1", big build, short black hair, wearing jeans and a dark shirt. Male 2 was a bit smaller, I cannot remember anything else about him. Male 1 came up to me and said 'Whats your problem?' About this time I became aware my friend [redacted] Khan, had been hit and was laid out on the ground by me. I did not have time to react and male 1 just hit on the left side of my face with a clenched fist, I stumbled back, male 1 continued towards me and was swinging more punches towards me but I managed to avoid them. Male 1 then ran off as 2 police officers approached. I have never seen male 1 or 2 before. No one had permission to assault me and I am not aware of anything I had done to warrant such action by anyone. I certainly was not a threat to any one. I do not think I would recognise the men again. I did not see who assaulted [redacted], I just remember the fact that he was laid on the ground. After a while at the request of one of the police officers I got into the police van and was taken to Southampton Central police Station for this statement to be obtained. Whilst at the police station I examined my face in a mirror and could see swelling just under my left eye and that the swelling had a small cut on it about 1 cm long, the swelling was

Signed : [redacted] Signature witnessed by :

MG11A(T)(cont.)

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

WITNESS STATEMENT

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

Continuation of Statement of : Christopher [redacted]

pulling the cut open. My face hurts. At the time I was hit it hurt a lot and it stunned me. I recall as male 1 was trying to hit me again a girl, chubby build, 5'7", blonde hair, came over and tried to get the man to stop

1. [redacted]

Signed : _____ Signature witnessed by : _____

UNDER AGE 10

[redacted]

MG11(T)
5/03

HERTFORDSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Witness Statement

(CJ Act 1967 s.9; MC Act 1980 ss.5A, (3) (a) and 5B, MC Rules 1981 r.70)

URN

Statement of Lauren[redacted]

Age if under 18 (if over 18 insert "over 18") **Occupation**

This statement (consisting of 2 pages each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature Date

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded ☐ *(supply witness details on rear)*

I am the above named person and live at the address overleaf.

On the 4th of October 2003, I attended the New York New York night Club in Queensway Southhamton. I was 17 years of age at the time and with a group of friends of about 15 to 20, on entering the nightclub I wasn't asked for identification of age by any member of staff.

I only went to the bar once, where I ask for a WKD, which is an alcoholic drink. I was able to buy this drink and was not ask for identification of age.

After a while in the club a member of my group of friends spoke to Richard, a member of the group, and I and said that they were leaving and were we coming. Richard said "no we were going to stay a little longer"; also staying in the club was two other members of the group, Andrew and Sam.

Andrew and Sam were on the stage dancing, a bouncer went over to Andrew and I heard him ask him to get down off the stage, as only four people were allowed on the stage at any one time. Sam said he would get down instead, but the bouncers said "no we want him down", I took this to mean Andrew. Andrew then said" I don't see why I should, there is only three of us up here now, which is less than there should be"

The bouncers then replied "we don't want have to look at you" Andrew then said "Why what's wrong with me" the bouncers reply was "we don't want blacks in here".

The next thing I knew there were more bouncers around us and two of the bouncers pulled Andrew by his hand and dragged him off the stage. They then pushed him over

Signature **Signature witnessed by**

Continuation of State

to the fire exit, and made a human barrier, with Richard and I on one side and Sam and Andrew on the other.

All of a sudden four to five bouncers jumped on top of Richard, forcing him to the floor face down. I saw that as Richard lying on his stomach with his head to the side, one of the bouncers had his thumb on the side of Richards's throat and his knee in his back. I could see he was going red, he looked as if he was finding it hard to breathe. I said to the bouncer who had hold of him "he can't breathe", to my amazement the bouncers reply was "Good" I kept on shouting for him stop say that Richard couldn't breathe, then one of the other bouncers hit me in my throat winding me.

After a few minutes the bouncers all went back into the club, leaving us outside.

Signature **Signature witnessed by**

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Station : **Southampton Central** OCU : **5 Southampton**

Department : **SNT** Date : **07 April 2009**

Subject : **Premise Licence Applications for New York New York and McClusky's**

Licensing

I am Inspector 5012 Phil Bates. My present role is the Safer Neighbourhood Inspector (SNT) for Southampton Central West Sector. This is one of 7 Sectors that cover Southampton. Within this sector are the major retail area and the Night time economy area. I have responsibility for policing these issues.

I have a long association with Southampton Central. I was a Police Constable here from 1982 to 1995. I returned as a Sergeant in 1999, leaving on promotion in 2004. In 2006 I returned to Southampton as a Duty Inspector responsible for day to day incidents across the city, this included policing the night time economy. In September 2008 I returned to Southampton Central as the SNT Inspector.

During my different roles at Southampton Central I recall New York New York Nightclub and later McClusky's. Initially New York New York was considered to be on the of the better late night venues within the city. Sadly this did not last long. For a number of years it was a source of calls to the police and required officers to be in attendance. I recall attending fights involving up to 10 people just outside of the venue. There were other times when I attended as a result of fights inside the venue but had finished by the time I arrived but I could see the injuries to persons and the broken glass.

There were a number of reports of door staff using excessive force and of them taking people out of the rear fire escape to avoid cameras.

In my perception as an experienced patrol Sergeant McClusky's became the worst place for trouble in the city. At weekends we constantly needed to keep police officers in the area to try and prevent fights. At closing time officers from other parts of the city centre would be directed to McClusky's to see the club out and often there would be fights. A lot of the people involved were under 18 years of age and in drink. A number of police officers were assaulted in Queensway as a result of fights with patrons from both of these premises.

I recall door staff from McClusky's complained to me at one time as they were wanting to turn certain customers away but the management were instructing them to let them in. The door staff felt this contributed to the troubles.

Since these premises have been shut the nature of the area has changed from a business area to a residential area. What used to be an office block and car park opposite the site is now a development of residential flats and apartments. There are more residential properties close by in Briton Street.

Presently the night time economy is spread over a distance of about 2 kilometres along the main spine of the city, High Street, Above Bar Street and London Road, in places it spreads East and West of this spine but only up to 200 metres. There are satellite sites at Leisure World, and Bevois Valley/St Marys area. Logistically all of this is very difficult to police and resources are stretched along this 2 km spine and at the satellite locations. The main population of licensed premises are in the London Road/Bedford Place area at the north of the city centre. Then it is Above Bar Street in the middle. Therefore the concentrations of officers are to the middle and north of the city. The operation to police weekend evenings is resourced by officers from all the other police stations in Southampton, specialist units from across Southampton and Force wide resources.

A police analyst reported in 2008 that 25% of all of the Violence against person offences for the whole of Southampton occur on a Friday and Saturday night **WITHIN MY SECTOR,** i.e. a quarter of the offences occur in just 2 nights in just one of the seven Sectors across the city.

New York New York and McClusky's are in the south of the Sector. Officers are already stretched to cope with demand at weekends. With the history of these premises, the proximity of residential areas and from the detail on the schedule I consider there will be an increased demand for police resources and I need to consider how this will be achieved. However it is achieved it will be at the cost of policing in another area.

Insp 5012 Phil Bates

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Station : **Southampton Central** OCU : **Southampton**

Department : Date : **22 April 2009**

Subject : **Licensed Premises Applications for sites known as 'New York New York' and McCluksy's Queensway Southampton**

To whom it may concern,

I am Chief Superintendent Matthew Greening and I am the Operational Police Commander for Southampton Police. I have worked as a Police Officer in the City on and off since 1985. I have performed many different roles. As a Constable my work included policing the alcohol related disorder especially at weekends and regularly including Queensway area. As a Sergeant I led a team out of Southampton Central Police Station. I was a Custody Sergeant dealing with people arrested in the City and I spent a period as the licensing sergeant for the City working with the City Council on the policing of licensed premises. I am now responsible for the delivery of all front line operational policing services for the people of Southampton.

In every role I have performed in the city I have always been acutely aware of the impact of alcohol and the proliferation of licensed premises, especially those with late night closing times. Every weekend (but also at other times) Police Officers in the City deal with violence, disorder and other criminality, such as damage, created by excessive drinking. Alcohol consumption is a significant factor in offending behaviour but also in the risk victims are exposed to. There is a strong link between victims of sexual offences and rape in the City centre and the consumption of alcohol. Wider members of the public face the noise, litter, intimidation and violence caused by those who use the city centre to drink to excess.

The change in drinking hours has led to these negative outcomes occurring later into the night and the early morning. There has been no reduction in violence and disorder but it is now spread out across a longer period. The impact on policing is that I now have to commit 0.5 million pounds of policing service every year just to the city centre on 2 nights of the week. That figure covers only the on street uniform policing and doesn't include the cost of the custody provision, investigations the following day, management time and many other support costs such as criminal justice functions. The total cost could be 3 or 4 times that amount. That is public money being used to police the several thousands of people in the city every weekend too many of whom drink to excess and so pose a risk to themselves and others.

To provide the amount of officers needed through until 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning I have to take those officers away from the earlier duties which means that I can not provide as many staff during the busy day time as I would wish to. Also officers come into the city centre from Shirley, Portswood and Bitterne stations to support the late night operation. Those officers are not replaced at those stations, therefore, those communities do not get the level of policing I could provide if it wasn't for the huge demand created by city centre alcohol related disorder and crime.

Southampton is already seen as the late night drinking centre of the South Coast. I have no doubt that despite the current economic climate any additional drinking venues in the City will increase the potential volume of people coming into the city and will further spread out the areas of the City where crime and disorder occurs as a direct result of excessive drinking. Therefore, as the Police Commander responsible to the people of Southampton for the service we provide I have to state my firm objection to the grant of premises licences at these two venues.

Matthew Greening
Chief Superintendent

Extract from Southampton Strategic Assessment
Oct 2007 – Sept 2008
Produced by Holly Crane – Senior Police Analyst

4.24 ALCOHOL MISUSE

The vast majority of people enjoy alcohol without causing harm to themselves or to others. But for others, alcohol misuse is a significant problem, and one which carries a huge economic and social cost. In 2004, the government indicated that damage to health, crime and disorder, and loss of work productivity costs around £20 billion per year in England and Wales.

Common harms identified as caused by alcohol include:

- health harms to the individual;
- close links to crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour;
- links to crime types such as domestic and sexual violence and drink driving;
- social harms, including problems within families, young people and communities[1]

Southampton has a thriving night-time economy which, despite being generally safe, links with increased levels of violence and other crime and disorder.

The rate of violent crime in Southampton is one of the highest in England. Smoking and binge drinking rates are estimated to be high compared to national levels[2], and this has several implications for the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

The harm to the city from alcohol misuse can be difficult to quantify, however, the JSNA (Southampton's first joint strategic needs assessment 2008-2011) identified in their key findings from consultation that alcohol related harm is a significant problem in Southampton. Research by the North West Public Health Observatory[3] shows that the city performs significantly worse in the following areas:

- Alcohol-specific mortality – males
- Alcohol-specific hospital admissions – under 18
- Alcohol-specific hospital admissions – males
- Alcohol related recorded crimes
- Alcohol related violent crimes
- Alcohol related sexual offences
- Claimants of incapacity benefit – working age
- Binge drinking
- Southampton PCT recorded 946 people admitted for liver disease in 2007. 90% of these were due to alcohol related liver disease; of these 49 people died.

This is supported by the Local Alcohol Profiles for England research (LAPE) which found that Southampton was significantly worse for:

- Alcohol specific related mortality in males, 302nd out of 354 authorities
- Alcohol related specific hospital admissions under 18, 300th out of 354 authorities
- Alcohol related violent crime,352nd out of 354 authorities
- Alcohol related sexual offences, 350th out of 354

[1] http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/operational-policing/crime-disorder/alcohol-misuse
[2] Southampton City Health Profile 2008, Department of Health
[3] 'Engaging Communities in Fighting Crime' Review by Louise Casey June 2008

Assessment of offenders managed by probation in Southampton indicates that 53% of offenders showed a link between violent behaviour and alcohol misuse (550). 37% (385 offenders) required an alcohol education approach to address their drinking problems, with 26% (378) referred for an alcohol intervention via an Alcohol Treatment Requirement, indicating a high level of need.

Since January 2008, there have been 51 drug and alcohol related hospital admissions for young people aged 12-16 from Southampton. The most common age is 14. The largest proportions were for alcohol misuse (90%) with 11 (21%) presenting for drug misuse, often in combination with alcohol[4].

Prison data indicates that around 90% of all prisoners have a diagnosable mental health problem (personality disorder), substance misuse or both[5].

4.25 KEY ISSUES

Alcohol misuse by young people

Areas subject to Anti-social behaviour and criminal damage have been linked to the misuse of alcohol by underage youths (cf. Pg 9), and the propensity to use alcohol underage affects a proportion of the city's youth population.

- Underage drinking and the congregation of youth groups on Friday/Saturday evenings outside local shops and open park areas. Rowdy and inconsiderate reports are frequently of youth groups, and in some areas evidence of alcohol/drug misuse has been found when the areas are patrolled. This links with areas reporting graffiti, arson and vehicle damage[6].

A survey in July 2008 by the Southampton youth service 'No Limits' of 465 young people in the city found that[7]:

- 30% (140) of young people surveyed said they used drugs and alcohol regularly, or that they couldn't do without drugs and alcohol. These have been classed as having problematic drug and alcohol use. The peak age for this is 14-16 years.

Of these 'problematic users':

- 61% (86) reported problems with alcohol;
- 14% (19) reported problems with drugs
- 25% (35) reported young people had problems with both drugs and alcohol

The national Ofsted 'Tell Us 3' survey in Spring 2008 found that in Southampton[8]:

- 5% of youths reported being drunk 3 times or more in the past 4 weeks (compared to 6% reported nationally).
- 15% reported being drunk, but only once or twice and not recently (compared to 17% reported nationally.
- 37% reported never having been drunk and 27% had never had an alcoholic drink.

This supports the findings from No Limits that a proportion of youths in are vulnerable to alcohol consumption and the harm that results from this.

Night Time Economy

Excessive alcohol consumption and drug misuse in a vibrant night-time economy in the city continues to contribute to a significant proportion of crime, including violence,

---

[4] SUHT data – Young People's Substance Related Admissions (Angelina) September 2008

[5] Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2008-2011

6 Neighbourhood Profiles, ASB Quarterly Updates 1/1/08-31/03/008. Kathryn Hague

[7] No Limits (Southampton) 'Having Their Say' survey. July 2008. Carol James and Vicki Orba

[8] Tell Us 3 Ofsted Local Authority Report, Southampton, September 2008

sexual offences, criminal damage and ASB reports. The impact of excessive alcohol consumption impacts on all services across the City every weekend.

- 25% of all Violence against the Person offences committed in a public place in Southampton occur in the city centre area on Friday and Saturday evenings, and other areas of the city also record 'hotspots' for night-time economy related violence[9].
- Links have been made between rape and serious sexual offences and alcohol consumption in the night-time economy, with the city centre the main area affected although offences also reported in dwellings and other areas of the city[10].
- The city parks are identified as a vulnerable location for violence offences linked to the night time economy, in particular for robbery and sexual violence offences including rape where the aggrieved is more vulnerable through alcohol consumption.
- Excessive drinking in the night-time economy is also linked with criminal damage and ASB, with an increase in damage offences around routes out of the city centre (Polygon area, Shirley High Street) and other stretches with many licensed premises[11] (cf ASB, Pg 12)
- 20% of all Hate Crime is recorded in the city centre and these offences are primarily alcohol-fuelled racially aggravated harassment offences against door staff, taxi drivers, and staff working in late-night food outlets[12]. (cf. pg 38)
- The city centre continues to record a high number of drug related arrests on Friday and Saturday evenings related to the night time economy. Stimulant drugs (cocaine and amphetamine) are most prevalent in seizures, which are believed to fuel violent crime in the area due to their use alongside alcohol. Assault offences have occurred in close proximity to these premises[13]
- Cocaine use and dealing in Southampton public houses outside of the city centre has remained evident during the period, particularly in Bitterne and Shirley.
- Strain on Emergency Department and ambulance services by alcohol related injuries caused by accidents and/or violence.

4.26 KEY PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITY – Current and Future

The partnership aims to reduce presentation to Accident and Emergency between the hours of 18:00-09:00. Admissions for assault recorded by the Emergency Department have remained consistent over the past 2 years, with an average 122 assaults per month in 2007/08 compared to 120 in 2006/07.

Alcohol also has long-term health issues which impact on resources in the city. Southampton Primary Care Trust have recorded similar levels of alcohol related admissions that require treatment in 2007/08 to the previous year, with approximately 2,500 per year[14].

The Trading Standards department have completed test purchase operations in areas vulnerable to underage drinking, which have resulted in a 20% sale rate. From 68 attempts made to buy alcohol, 14 resulted in a sale. For the previous year, there were 99 attempts made, with 28 sales (28% sale rate).

[9] Violence Against Person offences, Southampton April-Jun 2008 Holly Crane
[10] Problem Profile, Rape Offences in Southampton, September 2008. Amy Luxton
[11] Neighbourhood Profiles, ASB Quarterly Updates 1/1/08-31/03/008. Kathryn Hague
[12] Southampton OCU PPU Report: DV and Hate Crime October 2008. Amy Luxton
[13] Class A Drugs Strategic Assessment Southampton OCU September 2008 F.Anderson
[14] Alcohol related admissions data, PCT

The Partnership has chosen tackling alcohol to be the overarching priority in its partnership plan. Current initiatives involve:

- Work within the Night Time Economy on new initiatives to reduce crime and disorder and improve public safety such as the Street Pastor Scheme and the Triage Jumbulance
- A bid has been submitted to GOSE for funding for a brief Interventions scheme to work with young people between 11 and 17yrs who are at risk due to their alcohol abuse.
- The use of the DPPO is intelligence led and targeted at key areas.
- A DVD is being produced for use in schools and with young people which will have hard hitting themes around alcohol misuse.

The proportion of violent crime attributable to night-time economy has remained stable over the last 3 years, which shows that the current policing strategy is containing the number of offences but not having an impact on reducing crime in this area.

- There is a dedicated police resource in city centre on Friday and Saturday nights
- Southampton Police currently commit between 17-25 officers every Friday and Saturday night as a high visibility presence during the NTE. This is resourced from across the OCU and includes where possible Specials.
- The officers are spread out in the 4 main geographical locations of the NTE within the city.
- When possible the local officers are supplemented by the Force Support Unit, however these additional resources are never guaranteed unless funding is specifically provided for this purpose.
- On a busy evening the resources are depleted by the need to travel with detained persons to cell blocks across the county as the cell space in Southampton City is not sufficient to cope with the demand.
- Police numbers may not always be sustainable and the high visibility approach, whilst containing the issues, are not reducing them therefore other ways of containing the violence and drunkenness related to the NTE need to be assessed and implemented.

In June 2008, a consultation was carried out by No Limits information, advice, counselling and support service with young people aged 11-25, regarding their views on how substance misuse treatment services (Tier 3) should be designed and delivered in Southampton, with the aim of informing the commissioning of new services for children and young people who have problems with drugs and alcohol[15].

An assessment of cumulative impact from the nature and combined effect of licensed premises found that 3 defined areas of Southampton are disproportionately affected by offending linked to the night-time economy[16]. These areas are: Bedford Place/London Road, the Above Bar area and Bevois Valley. All three locations record increased levels of violence and criminal damage offending. Links with alcohol misuse were evidenced by times of offending and intoxication of victim/offender. As a result, a Cumulative Impact Policy (Licensing Act, 2003) has been pursued in these areas as a tool to control violent crime and alcohol related offending.

[15] No Limits (Southampton) 'Having Their Say' survey. July 2008. Carol James and Vicki Orba
[16]

Record of Meetings and correspondence between Police & Management of New York's and McClusky's

	Date			Outcome
1	10th March 2004	Meeting at Hulse Road Police Station with John Boardman, Rodney Shires (solicitors) and licensees. Inspector Snook and Sgt Chandler	Follow Up Meeting from 21/01/04	G34B Internal Police Report summarising the outcome of the meeting. Copy on file
2	21st January 2004	Meeting at Hulse Road Police Station with Mr Boardman and Licensees. Also present Inspector Snook and Sgt Chandler	Meeting called to discuss increasing reports of underage issues at both McCluskys and New York Night Clubs. Insp Snook commented that over the past few months the Police had noticed a deterioration at both premises regarding underage issues and that should further information materialise Police would consider prosecution and revocation proceedings	Copy of minutes available.
3	28th October 2003	Reply from Inspector Snook to BRM Solicitors re drinks promotion policy		Copy on file
4	27th October 2003	Letter from Solicitors BRM acting for McClusky's seeking clarification regarding Police policy on drinks promotions		Copy on file
5	11th May 2003	Inspector Snook challenged the licensee regarding the proposed All Inclusive £10 Deals on Friday Nights	The Police view was that this was an irresponsible approach to licensing	Company withdrew the promotion. Copies of Police Licensing register available
6	10th May 2003	Flyer for All Inclusive £10 Deal		Copy of Flyer available
7	30th April 2003	Letter from Inspector Snook to licensee thanking him for the efforts he had made in reducing crime and disorder at New York New York since December 2002		Copy of letter available

CORRES.
(1)

HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

MINUTE SHEET (No. 1)

H.Q. Ref. No. Div. Ref. No.

16/3/04 – SUE FOR FILING.

Meeting 10/3/04

Meeting held at Hulse Road, present were the area manager John Boardman, Solicitor Rodney Shires and Licensee's [redacted] and [redacted] Police were represented by Insp Snook and PS Chandler.

Insp Snook commenced the meeting stating that there had been a significant improvement in terms of a reduced number of calls to New York's and McCluskies. Insp Snook read through the schedule that had been prepared by PC Tait with particular reference to the incidents that had taken place since the last meeting on 21/1/04. PS Chandler described an incident that had occurred on 5/3/04 where there was disorder outside of the premises and that he had found the head Door Supervisor rude and uninterested in making any response to questions from the Police. John Boardman was present when the incident occurred and agreed with Sgt Chandler's comments and that he would address the matter with the Door Supervisor.

The new licensee [redacted] then described that the units were attempting to go a little more up market and were encouraging guests to star on particular nights.

John Boardman asked whether the Police would be prepared to take calls from the Solicitors in order that the situation at the clubs could be monitored and feedback given to the area management. This was agreed with the expectation that Mr Shires would either contact Insp Snook or Sgt Chandler for feedback.

The issue of CCTV was raised by Insp Snook concerning a letter that was sent by Insp Snook at closure of the Prime on 30/4/03. The Police had not received any feedback in relation to the letter that recommended that CCTV should be upgraded within the premises. The new licensee [redacted] confirmed that the club had now obtained 5 Infra red internal CCTV cameras (2 black and white, 3 colour) multiplex and two time lapse VCR's. Insp Snook offered the assistance of the Police in positioning these cameras within the premises.

The issue of drinks promotions was raised by Insp Snook and concern was expressed by the officer with regard to some of the offers concerning "All drinks for £1". The management explained that the offers applied to some not all drinks, which is contrary to the flyers in circulation. The management were reminded about their obligations to promote safe drinking and the guidance of Southampton Police licensing on such promotions with potentially any irresponsible promotions leaving the club open to more formal action.

CORRES. (2)

McCluskys and New York New York Nightclubs

Meeting with Mr Boardman, Mr [redacted] and Mr [redacted]
11.00 hrs Wednesday 21st January 2004

Also present Inspector Snook and PS Chandler

Insp Snook explained the meeting had been called to discuss the increasing reports of underage issues at the above premises.

Insp Snook then proceeded to go through individual accounts from a schedule. At the conclusion he stated how concerned he was that persons under 18 and as young as 14 were able to get into these premises and obtain alcohol.

Mr Boardman questioned the validity of the information on the schedule whereupon Insp Snook explained that a number of the reports were as a result of intelligence information received and others were backed up by witness statements.

[redacted] indicated that a possible reason for increased reports of underage drinking could be as a result of malicious calls, these persons having been refused entry themselves.

Insp Snook stated that aside there is still clearly underage issues that can be evidenced.

Insp Snook then asked why was this happening. There was an initial acceptance that there is a problem with underage issues however Mr Boardman then asked Mr [redacted] to refer to his incident book. Mr [redacted] referred to 4/5 recent dates where it was recorded that his staff had turned away between 40-60 individuals on any one night as they did not have acceptable ID.

Mr Boardman then at the defence of Mr [redacted] stated that he was an experienced licensee who does care about these issues. The management team was disappointed firstly that no follow up meeting took place after the one some 13 months ago and secondly that they were not made aware of these issues when they arose in the first place.

Insp Snook agreed that regular meetings could take place in the future and that the underage issues have only really come to notice since September 2003. Police have gathered information since that time in order to establish a clear picture of the problem and this meeting has been called now to address it.

Insp Snook commented that it is fair to say that following the last meeting improvements had been brought about and it is only over the past few months that police had observed a deterioration.

PS Chandler explained that he has a general overview of what is happening licensing wise across Southampton and it has become apparent to him that McClusky's is the venue that keeps cropping up as a premises where underage custpmers can get in.

[redacted] stated he would now deal with this problem and ID everybody, Mr Boardman clarified that this would not be necessary obviously older customers would not be challenged.

Mr [redacted] was asked what ID he would accept - photo driving licence and passport. It was agreed a photocopy of a passport would not be acceptable.

Mr Boardman queried whether there had been a change of policy regarding extra police outside his venues. Insp Snook clarified there has been no change in policy, the police are intelligence led and if a certain location is experiencing problems then the police would respond.

Insp Snook explained that he would be recording the fact that he was formally warning the management today regarding underage issues and should further information materialise then he would consider prosecution and revocation proceedings.

A further meeting is planned for 10th March 2004 at 1400 hrs.

CORRES. (3)

HAMPSHIRE Constabulary

Chief Constable Paul R. Kernaghan QPM LL.B MA DPM MCIPD

Our Ref. :
Your Ref. :

he Licensing Department
12-18 Hulse Road
Southampton
Hampshire
SO15 2JX

Di

E-mail:

28 October 2003

Mr Rodney Shires
BRM Solicitors
Gray Court
99 Saltergate
Chesterfield

Dear Sir

Re: McClusky's and New York New York Southampton.

Thank you for you letter dated 27th October 2003 regarding drinks promotions within the Southampton licensing area. I am aware that the licensing trade is a very competitive industry and Licensee's actively advertise their premises by way of drinks promotions. The overriding principle that I apply in Southampton is that these promotions need to be responsible, not promote unhealthy competition between premises and not promote excessive drunkenness.

In May this year I was made aware of a drinks promotion at Mclusky's which in my opinion was highly irresponsible and did not promote the premises as a safe drinking venue. The picture on the flyer showed a male with a swimming hat and goggles swimming out of a pint of lager, on the rear of the flyer was an offer to pay £10 for entrance and this would include all you can drink. I duly contacted the Licensee [redacted] and informed him of my concerns and he agreed to withdraw the promotion. I am aware that subsequent to the promotion that both New York New York and McClusky's have run drinks promotions including 'two for the price of one' and I have not objected to them.

With regard to drinks promotions in other premises Mr [redacted] is aware that the Licensing Team will look into each promotion on its merits and as a result of information from Licensee's other drinks promotions have recently been withdrawn. I will however not get drawn into commenting on the promotions that other clubs are running but I assure that these are dealt with in a firm, fair and consistent manner.

Mr [redacted] has been informed that he can contact this office at any time to seek our advice on promotional offers that I am aware are costly. I would urge him to attend the next Licensing Link meeting to be held on Wednesday 19th November 2003 where amongst other agenda items I want to discuss drinks promotions and negotiate some future guidelines for link premises.

HAMPSHIRE Constabulary

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can assist further.

Yours faithfully

Jon Snook
Licensing Inspector

Jeremy C Rice
Michael MacDonald
Rodney A Shiers
Peter J McGowan
Neil A Brown
Russell S Thompson
Adrian J Sheehan

Associate:
Paul Berresford

CORRES. (4)

BRM solicitors

Gray Court 99 Saltergate
Chesterfield S40 1LD

Inspector Snook
Hampshire Constabulary
Licensing Unit
12-18 Hulse House
Southampton
SO15 2JX

Our Ref.
RS/Springwood plc/S1143026
Your Ref.

27 October 2003

Dear Inspector

On behalf of my clients Springwood Leisure, I have been instructed to write to ask for clarification as to your policy for drinks inclusive deals. My clients operate McClusky's and New York New York in Southampton. Earlier this year, my clients were competing with Jumpin Jaks with an inclusive deal and you contacted them on the 11th May to suggest they immediately stop the deal. My client agreed to this.

We are instructed that at the present time Jumpin Jaks is again promoting an all in deal namely "Pay £3.00 and drink vodka kick free between 8pm and 10pm on Mondays". This has been going on since September. We understand that this has been drawn to your attention and we would welcome your confirmation as to whether our clients can run a similar promotion or if not what is being done to stop the promotion at Jumpin Jaks.

At the moment my clients are down £16,000 in revenue as a result of what they consider unfair competitiveness from Jumpin Jaks have over them. We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully

CORRES. (5)

SUE
PLEASE PLACE IN McCUSKY'S FILE
Thank you

RECORD OF POLICE ENTRY TO PREMISES

Date	Time	Officer(s)	Remarks (All irregularities to be brought to the notice of O.C.D.)
15/10/02	0200	3683 BASSETT 3261 HEYDARI	Statement taking ref Crime report
			SC/23838/02
27/10/02	0100	PC3745 King	Assault ACR/026033/02
1.2.03	2108	CHANDLER WESTERN	LICENSING DOOR STAFF CHECK AND
22.2.03	0222	PC 1774 SANDERSON	PUBLIC ORDER ACR SC/5228/03
19/3/03	2100	PS 2495	Routine check - AND
1/3/03	0005	2264 Mead	Assault ACR/6002/03
15/3/03	2230	Licensing	ION TRACK operation
11/4/03	2320	PC3242 Percy	PUBLIC ORDER ACR/010737/03
8/5/03	2300	2495	Routine Visit AND
11/5/03	1750	Insp SPOOK	Spoke with licence Mr [redacted] regarding his Friday night promotion of all you can drink for £10 and free entrance, informed that I did not consider that this demonstrated a responsible approach to licensing and that I did not support the promotion and if problems arose I would consider position re. licence. Mr [redacted] spoke with area manager and later contacted me stating he would withdraw the "All Inclusive" night

G.1A

CORRES. (6)


fridaynightsallinclusive
£10onthedoor
paynomore
includes
entry | drinks
music
party | chart | cheese
McCLUSKY'S
4-6 Queensway | Southampton | T: 023 8039 9889


McCLUSKY'S
ALL INCLUSIVE
FRIDAY NIGHTS

CORRES. (7)

HAMPSHIRE Constabulary

Chief Constable Paul R. Kernaghan QPM LL.B MA DPM MCIPD

Our Ref. : Prime SC/01/03
Your Ref. :

The Licensing Department
12-18 Hulse Road
Southampton
Hampshire
SO15 2JX

Tel: 0845 045 45 45

Email:

10/3/04

Mr [redacted]
New York New York Nightclub
Queensway
Southampton
Hampshire

INTERNAL
PRESENT - RECEPTION NYNY
OBTAINED 5 INTERNAL AND INTERNAL
CCTV CAMS.
2 Black + White
3 Colour.
MULTI-PLEX.
TWO TIME LAPSE VCR'S.

30 April 2003

Dear Mr [redacted]

I am writing to you concerning the partnership work between the Southampton Licensing Team and your venue. As you will be aware this work was commenced in December 2002 following a Police review on the levels of incidents at New York New York. Since the commencement of the project there has been a dramatic improvement regarding the number of recorded instances at the club, this is extremely encouraging from the Police perspective.

It is the view of the Police that your premises would greatly benefit from the introduction of internal CCTV covering in particular the bar areas, dance floor and exits. You may be aware that it is now a requirement of Southampton City Council that all new premises that apply for a Public Entertainment Licence have adequate CCTV covering both the inside and outside of the venue. It would be extremely encouraging for your venue to install internal CCTV prior to the annual PEL renewal in June 2003.

I would like to take the opportunity to personally thank you and your area management for the open and honest manner that you approached this project. It is clear that there have been many benefits to this partnership approach, in not only examining your premises, but also licensing issues across the city. I would also like to thank you for your assistance, support and practical application of the drug testing machine in March 2003, we look forward to visiting your premises in the future.

In the case that you would like to discuss the above or any other issues please feel free to contact me on the above direct dial number. I have copied this letter to your area management.

Yours sincerely

Jon Snook
Licensing Inspector

Significant Licensing Dates – McClusky's and New York New York

No.	Date			Outcome
1	25th March 2009	Application for two new premises licences in relation to McCluskys and New Yorks New Yorks		
2	5th January 2006	Applicants withdrew from the appeal to Magistrates Court to overturn Licensing Panel's decision not to renew Public Entertainment Licence		As no conversion of existing licences ever took place under the Licensing Act 2003 both premises became unlicensed Copy of letter available
3	23rd November 2005	Applicants appealed the decision made by the Licensing Panel	Full hearing set for Southampton Magistrates Court on 25th January 2006.	
4	29th September 2005	Panel Hearing took place to hear the objections to the renewal of the Public Entertainment Licence.	Licensing Panel refused the application	Reason given: No clear operating plan to show how the premises would prevent crime and disorder Copy of decision available
5	30th June 2005	Premises still closed however owners apply to renew Public Entertainment Licence	No Police objection however objections received from local residents.	The tone of the objections were based on the fact that since these premises ceased trading the vicinity had become more residential and residents did not wish for all the noise and disorder that would be associated with these premises
6	30th June 2004	Public Entertainment Licence	Renewed	No Police or residential objections
7	29th June 2004	Both premises close and cease trading		

SLD (2)

Jeremy C Rice
Michael MacDonald
Rodney A Shiers
Peter J McGowan
Neil A Brown
Russell S Thompson
Adrian J Sheehan

Associates:
Paul Berresford
Jason C Skelton

BRM solicitors

Gray Court 99 Saltergate
Chesterfield S40 1LD

Legal & Democratic Services
Southampton City Council
Southbrook Rise
4-8 Millbrook Road East
Southampton
SO15 1YG

Our Ref.
RS/Nexum Leisure Limited/N1312036
Your Ref.

18 January 2005

RECEIVED
2 JAN 2005
COUNCIL

Dear Sirs

McClusky's and New York New York
Appeal against refusal to grant Public Entertainment Licence

Thank you for your letter of the 16th January. As indicated in our letter to your chief officer of the licensing team on the 5th January, we have withdrawn the appeal and notified the court. We have also now received instructions from our client that the Premises Licence is not now required and we have accordingly written to the licensing department to inform them of this.

Yours faithfully

SLD (4)

LEGAL & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES
MARK HEATH, LLB Solicitor, Dip. LG
Solicitor to the Council

Southampton City Council
Southbrook Rise,
4-8 Millbrook Road East
Southampton SO15 1WQ
Direct dial:
Our ref:

Please address all correspondence to:
Licensing – Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344, Southampton SO15 1WQ

SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

Your ref:

Messrs. BRM
Solicitors
MDX 12358
Chesterfield

3rd October 2005

Dear Sirs,

Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982
Applications for Renewal of Public Music and Dancing Licences
McClusky's, 8 Queensway, and New York, New York , 2 Queensway, Southampton

I refer to the applications for the renewal of the public music and dancing licences for the above premises made by Anthony David Ashman and James Alexander Cameron on 20th May 2005 and the subsequent application made by Julian William Stones on 24th June 2005 for transfer of the licences.

Consideration was given to the applications and the objections to them by the City Council's Licensing (General) Sub-Committee on 29th September 2005.

Mr. Shiers of your firm represented the applicants and called Mr. Stones on behalf of Nexum Leisure Ltd. The Sub-Committee also heard objections from Dr. Atkinson and had written objections before them from Dr Atkinson, Mr. Westhorpe, Mr Baker, and Mr. Taylor.

The Sub Committee resolved that the applications for the renewal of a public music and dancing licences in respect of McClusky's, at 8 Queensway and New York, New York, at 2 Queensway, be refused.

In announcing the Sub Committee's decisions, the Chair, Councillor Smith, said that in the absence of a clearly defined operation plan for the premises, the Sub-Committee was unable to assess the impact of the operation of the premises on the area and community and was not able to make an assessment of the prevention of crime and disorder in the area, given the concerns raised by objectors.

The Sub-Committee recommended the applicant to reapply when a clearly defined operation plan for the premises has been formulated.

Your clients have a right of appeal to the Southampton Magistrates' Court, if they are aggrieved at the Sub-Committee's decisions, and I will take the "relevant date" for the purposes of paragraph 17(2) of schedule 1 to the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 to be the date on which this letter is received by you.

I would appreciate notification of any intended appeal, given the additional complication of the conversion applications under the Licensing Act 2003.

Yours faithfully,

John Burke
Licensing Officer
for Solicitor to the Council

jb100301.doc

Please send all correspondence to: Licensing – Southampton City Council, PO Box 1344, Southampton SO15 1WQ
Switchboard 023 8022 3855 Fax 023 8083 4061 Minicom 023 8083 2798 DX 115710 Southampton 17
E-mail: licensing@southampton.gov.uk Web: http://www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 13:50
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Martin McAndrew has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 13:49:3[illegible]
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Martin McAndrew
Address:
Flat 167 Oceana Boulivard
Southampton
Hamsphire
Postcode:
so143hw
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
A night club right next to newly built flats is not only going to increase noise disturbances, it is going to increase crime. This location is not sutable for this purpose any more.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 16:01
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Sarah Daly has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 16:01:04 from

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Sarah Daly

Address:
47 Oceana Boulevard
Briton St.
Southampton
Postcode:
SO143HU

Phone Number:
Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
My flat is opposite this proposed site in Oceana Boulevard overlooking Briton St. and Queens Way. I object to this licencing application as the noise associated with a venue such as this coupled with the increased crime and damage to the area makes this application totally unacceptable.
In recent years a number of housing developments have been erected in the immediate area around Briton Street, the Bargate and the bottom of Queens way. In light of this - the area is now residential and therefore is not an appropriate site for a late night bar and club.
I agree that this proposed site should be redeveloped - but to reopen it as a club and bar is not the solution.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Sarah Daly
Sent: 15 April 2009 15:54
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: Re: New York New York - 2009/0612/01SPRN

Hayley,

In relation to the email below and the application for licence for New York New York on the corner of Briton Street / Queens Street Southampton could the following be added to my application.

Do I need to put this in writing or can you add this to my original electronic submission on 26/03/09?

Please let me know

Kind Regards

Sarah Daly
Owner - 47 Ocean Boulevard.

I am an owner of a property in the Oceana Boulevard development situated on Briton Street. My flat windows look directly over Briton Street and
Queens Way approximately 20 metres away from this site. The flat was
bought several years ago, and at that time, we were reassured by Barretts who built Oceana Boulevard that New York New York had been shut down and would not be reopening as a nightclub / bar venue due to the residential developments being built in the Briton Street area. (eg. Oceana Boulevard, Telephone House etc)

If the proposed licence were to be granted, it would have a direct impact due to noise and public disturbances around my property, Oceana Boulevard and the immediate residential developments .

In terms of noise, as I have stated, the windows of the living room and bedroom are on Briton Street. Having a nightclub / bar venue so close to my premise would mean the windows and balcony doors could not be opened due to the noise from the clubs/bar in terms of music and people leaving the nightclub at all hours of the night seven days a week. (There are only windows on the Briton St side of the property so I do not have an alternative). This would be unbearable in the summer. There are roughly 50-60 properties in the Oceana Boulevard development with windows facing out on to Briton Street who would be affected in a similar way not to mention the properties facing a similar direction in the other developments.

There will also be disturbances created with people leaving the premises whilst they wait for taxi's or 'hang around' the club at various stages throughout the night. As I said - my windows are only 20 metres away from the New York New York site. The disturbances created by the public leaving are highly likely to compromise the safety of people leaving the Oceana Boulevard building - particularly as a female, which is again something that I was exceptionally conscious about when I bought the property. As an owner, I do not expect safety to be compromised entering and exiting the flat at certain times of the evening.

The crime and disturbances associated with alcohol is certain to rise in the area if a late licence is granted which is likely to cause problems outside of my property, which not only would cause a nuisance around the immediate area in terms of noise, litter, fighting but would almost certainly impact on the outside of the buildings in terms of damage to flower beds / walls and electronic gates. The area around Oceana Boulevard has been redeveloped significantly over the last couple of years, and as a result looks a very smart city residential area, The maintenance costs associated with the Oceana Block have risen over the last couple of years and would rise further if repairs had to be carried out to the

outside of the buildings which would impact on me directly and have no bearing on the owners of New York New York.

I am exceptionally conscious that whilst I do not have children, the impact on growing up 'next door' to a night club would not be something I would wish families who live in the Oceana block to have to put up with again in terms of the noise and compromised safety around the premises.
This is a private development and whilst I have chosen to buy a flat in a City centre location, I would not have bought it if it was 'next door' to a Club, and I doubt that may others would have either.

I hope that those reviewing the licence application will take the above comments into consideration whilst making their decision. The area around Briton St. Queens Way, Queens Terrace and the lower High St is now largely residential. Whilst restaurants, convenience stores and surgery have been welcomed as the opening hours and nature of the businesses does not cause too much disturbance, a nightclub is in a completely different league and would not be welcomed.

Kind Regards

Sarah Daly

"Clowes, Hayley"
26/03/2009 16:26

cc

Subject
New York New York

Dear Ms Daly,

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your representation about the above premises. Please be advised that only representations which relate to at least one of the four licensing objectives can be considered. The licensing objectives are:
The prevention of crime and disorder
Public Safety
The prevention of public nuisance
The protection of children from harm

As you referred to noise nuisance and crime in your representation we have accepted your representation as being valid, however, you may wish to strengthen your representation by more clearly setting out the likely effects the grant

of the licence would have on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives above. Please follow the link below to our website which contains information and guidance on representations if you wish to provide more information for your representation.

http://www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing/alcohol-licences/representations.asp

Yours Faithfully,

Hayley Clowes
Licensing Assistant
Legal & Democratic Services
Southampton City Council

E-mail: hayley.clowes@southampton.gov.uk This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you are not the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies, please ignore it, delete it and notify us. SCC does not make legally binding agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. E-mails may be monitored.

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 16:22
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

JAMES GREEN has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 16:22:09 from

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
JAMES GREEN
Address:
FLAT 75 OCEANAN BOULEVARD
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
Postcode:
SO14 3HU
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I AM WRITING THIS AS I FEEL THIS APPLICATION WILL BE DETRIMENTAL TO BOTH MY LIFE AND THAT OF THE HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS THAT I LIVE WITH IN OCEANA BOULEVARD,FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

THE NOISE CAUSED BY LOUD MUSIC AND SHOUTING FROM CLUB PATRONS WILL BE AN EXTREME NUISANCE UNTIL GONE 5 AM.

VANDALISM CAUSED BY THESE SAME DRUNK CLUB PATRONS TO CARS PARKED ON BRITON STREET, QUEENSWAY AND ESPECIALLY TO OCEANA BOULEVARD PROPERTY WILL BE TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.

THE INCREASED LITTER CAUSED BY SMOKERS,BROKEN BOTTLES AND VOMITTING ON THE PAVEMENT.

TOTALLY UNDERMINES THE TENS OF THOUSANDS OF POUNDS THAT TAX PAYERS HAVE PAID TO INCREASE THE BEAUTIFICATION OF BRITON STREET,WHICH IS CURRENTLY STILL ONGOING.

INCREASED DIFFICULTY IN SELLING OR LEASING MY PROPERTY IN THE FUTURE.

THE LOWERING OF PROPERTY PRICES IN THIS AREA DUE TO THIS CLUB REOPENING.

PLEASE READ THESE POINTS AND USE YOUR COMMON SENSE THAT THIS APPLICATION IS NOTHING BUT A BAD IDEA.

REGARDS
JAMES GREEN

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 16:40
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Christopher Simmonds has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 16:39:58 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer: Customer Details

Name:
Christopher Simmonds
Address:
72 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3HU
Email:
Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing ObjectivesComments:
I object very much to a licence being granted. I live over the road and my life would be ruined if I had to listern to loads of drunk people outside, the Nightclub. all the extra cars driving by and taxis dropping of and picking

up. The risk of trouble and litter and vandelism. It would make our properties worseless. It would ruin many residents lives. I would have to give my flat away and move somewhere else.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 17:27
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Phillip Cheshire has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on
a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case
Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 17:27:06 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Phillip Cheshire
Address:
42 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3HL
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Comments:
As the local area has become primarily residential since these clubs closed down,
it is not appropriate to have a nightclub with or without a late liscence in the
immediate area. This will cause noise pollution as well as resident complaints and

a loss in property value for all residents.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 26 March 2009 18:55
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)Ian Warrington has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 26/03/2009 18:54:48 from
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Ian Warrington
Address:
89 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO143HU
Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:

I strongly object to this application in view of the following reasons; noise coming from the venue / patrons outside the proposed club increase in litter caused by smokers / broken bottles / vomit which are all associated with areas around clubs undermines the recent work the council have taken in the local area eg paving / beautification work already are enough clubs within the southampton city centre locality e.g. Leisure World / Bedford Place / London Road / Oceans & Collins etc lowers property values for surrounding areas. When buyers bought properties within Oceana Blvd / Telephone House / French Qtr there was no talk of a night club within the area. Now all properties are occupied its disappointing this application has been submitted in view of the current government comments re binge drinking and alcohol abuse surely the city council should not be entertaining another licence application to encourage these activities

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 27 March 2009 09:00
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Charlotte Sillars has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 27/03/2009 09:00:20 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Charlotte Sillars
Address:
132 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton
Hampshire
Postcode:
SO14 3HW
Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard and i am wholy against this licence.
Please see the following reasons:
1. When these premises previously had alcohol licenses, this was not a residential area. The demographics of the area have changed, and therefore, nightclubs should not be a part of the area.
2. Noise problems for all residents on the Briton Street side of the building caused by loud music, loud shouting, etc. (Prevention of Public Nuisance) 3. Vandalism issues caused by club-goers to cars parked on Briton & Queen St. as well as vandalism to the Oceana Boulevard building. (Prevention of Crime & Disorder) 4. Difficulty to sell or lease our property.
5. Lower property values.
6. Increase in litter caused by smokers, broken bottles, vomit, etc. on the pavement.
7. Undermines the "beautification work" that the Council has undertaken to Briton Street.
Regards

Charlotte Sillars
PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

Flat 86 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hampshire
SO14 3HU
26th March, 2009

Mr. I. McGuiness
The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RE: Premises Licence for McCluskey's International (2009/00580/01SPRN) and New York New York (2009/0612/01SPRN)

Dear Mr. McGuiness,

My husband and I are writing to petition against the granting of licences for both McCluskey's and New York New York nightclubs at the corner of Queensway and Briton Street.

As we own a flat in Oceana Boulevard, just across the street from the aforementioned properties, we feel that the reopening of these clubs would be detrimental to the residents and property owners of Briton Street for several reasons.

First, because our flat faces Briton Street, we already hear street noise from passing buses and people after a night out. If these clubs were to reopen, we would have extreme levels of noise from inebriated patrons of the clubs, as well as loud music until the early hours of the morning. Sleeping on weekend nights would be impossible.

Second, we are concerned with the rise in vandalism that the reopening of these venues would bring. Cars parked on both Queensway and Briton Street would be at greater risk of theft and vandalism, as well as the Oceana Boulevard property. We have recently had various cases of theft and vandalism in our building, and are working closely with the Hampshire Constabulary to find ways to alleviate this problem, not add to it.

Third, we would expect an increase in litter on pavements including cigarette butts, broken glass, vomit, urine, etc. Our street is currently very clean, and we would hate for that to change. This would create more work for the Council.

Fourth, the reopening of these clubs would undermine the beautification work that the Council has undertaken for the last three months. The Council has decided to give this area a "facelift" by installing new wider pavements with trees. The addition of two nightclubs would be a blight on the new image for this area of the city.

Finally, we are concerned that if you grant these licences, we will not be able to sell or let our property, and our property values will decrease. No one wants to live next to a nightclub. If these applications are passed, the residents of Oceana Boulevard and properties further down Briton Street will have a very difficult time enticing future buyers or lessees with our flats. They will be extremely difficult to sell, and everyone will lose a great deal on their investments, even more than the cause of the recession.

We like that the nightclub area is in Bedford Place because it is easily accessible for us to walk to, and there are so many different options in one area. We hope you will deny the application for these two nightclubs on Queensway, so that we can keep our residence clean, safe, free of nuisance, and a stable investment.

Kind regards,

Simon & Meghann Andrew

From: Licensing
Sent: 27 March 2009 10:18
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mark Stevens has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 27/03/2009 10:18:02 from
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Mark Stevens
Address:
96 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants
Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to this application as it WILL be extremely detrimental to myself and all the other residents not just in Oceana Boulevard but the whole of Briton Street, as they will be a lot of noise every nite til 5am which would be unexceptable, vandalism to cars and property, litter, vomit, broken bottles which would ruin the beautification work which has cost a lot a money, it WILL also lower property values.
Briton Street is a lovely place to live and people have spent alot of money to live there and granting a license of any kind of license would make Briton Street a very undesirable place to live.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

116 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton
SO14 3HW

26 March 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO BOX 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Dear Sirs

RE: LICENCE FOR NIGHTCLUB ON BRITON STREET
(former New York, New York/McClusky's)

I am shocked to hear that a licence has been applied to reopen the nightclub on Briton Street.

When the nightclub was last in operation this area was non-residential and I believe that the opening of Oceana Boulevard, Telephone House etc has now altered the nature of the area, making a nightclub in such close vicinity to this building out of the question.

I believe that any new licence would have an adverse impact on :

1) crime and disorder in the vicinity
2) public safety, particularly late at night/early hours of the morning
3) public nuisance, and
4) acceptable noise levels from the club itself due to the club being on the opposite side to Oceana Boulevard

I can also envisage problems with traffic late at night due to the road junction, noisy late night revellers leaving the club and no parking available within the club premises. As it is we have the noise of the vegetable market ongoing during the early hours and during the day, so this disruption at night will make it unbearable.

I was informed that as the licence has already expired it would be unlikely that any new application would succeed given the high occupany rate at Oceana Boulevard and in this area. In addition I believe there are already enough nightclubs in Southampton to warrant a refusal to the granting of this licence.

I also questioned Barratt's about this former nightclub when purchasing my property and was told that it was going to be demolished and new flats built there.

I would therefore like to voice my objection to any licence to be granted to this nightclub and, in addition, for the buildings use to be redesignated to something more appropriate for a residential area.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Yvette Newbury

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Kiren Bennett
9 Chandlers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EZ

26th March 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Kiren Bennett

RECEIVED
27 MAR 2009

From: Danielle Grover
Sent: 27 March 2009 10:32
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: RE: Forceful objections to the Nexum license
Dear Hayley Clowes

Apologies for not including my address. It is
Flat 131
Gate 7
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
SO143HW

I'd be grateful if you could now register my objections.
Thank you
Danielle Grover (Miss)

--- On **Fri, 27/3/09, Clowes, Hayley <*Hayley.Clowes@southampton.gov.uk*>** wrote:

From: Clowes, Hayley <Hayley.Clowes@southampton.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Forceful objections to the Nexum license

Date: Friday, 27 March, 2009, 9:12 AM

Dear Ms Grover,

Although you have addressed the licensing objectives when making your representation we are currently unable to accept your representation as you have not stated your address. This means we are unable to confirm whether you are within the vicinity of the premises you are objecting to. Please provide your address so I am able to validate your representation. For your information further details about representations and what happens after one has been validated can be found via the link below:

http://www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing/alcohol-licences/representations.asp

Yours Faithfully,

Hayley Clowes
Licensing Assistant
Legal & Democratic Services
Southampton City Council

E-mail:

This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you are not the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies, please ignore it, delete it and notify us. SCC does not make legally binding agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. E-mails may be monitored.

From: Danielle Grover
Sent: 26 March 2009 16:28
To: Licensing
Subject: Forceful objections to the Nexum license

RE: the application by Nexum (owner of McCluskys/New Yorks Nightclub) for a new alcohol license

To whom it may concern

Appalled is not the word. I have been absolutely disgusted to learn that Nexam have applied for a new alcohol license for New Yorks nightclub on the edge of Briton street . As a flat owner at Oceana Boulevard opposite, this selfish scheme would have disasterous consequences for residents on this street. I would like to forcefully outline my objections (listed below) and express my fury at this scheme.

With the numerous pubs on the high street, this area is already exceptionally noisy at night-time and the new license would make the noise one hundred times worse. Is it not bad enough that we have to tolerate the noise of continuous road works on Briton street and the council bin collection, which wakes the whole complex up at 6am every Thursday morning, loutish behaviour, constant drunken shouting, vandalism in our carpark in a city that is supposed to pride itself on a low crime rate? Aren't there enough pubs/nightclubs in Southampton already?!! Now we have to contend with the strong possibility of more crime, more noise pollution, more vandalism and drunken behaviour. How would that make you feel??

An extended licence for a neighbouring night club would make living here intolerable. And what tenant would chose to live opposite a nightclub? How is that fair on those of us trying to sell our flats in this difficult climate? The scheme gives no consideration whatsoever to residents and flat owners. My other objections are outlined below and shared by many fellow residents at Oceana Boulevard ; many of who are absolutely appalled by this new proposal. I shall think extremely badly of Southampton city council if you allow this preposterous scheme to go ahead. I will also be complaining to the Bargate councillor.

My other objections are:

1. When these premises previously had alcohol licenses, this was not a residential area. The demographics of the area have changed, and therefore, nightclubs should not be a part of the area.

2. Noise problems would counteract the Prevention of Public Nuisance act

3. Vandalism issues caused by club-goers to cars parked on Briton & Queen St. as well as vandalism to the Oceana Boulevard building. (Prevention of Crime & Disorder)

4. Difficulty to sell or lease our property.

5. Lower property values.

6. Increase in litter caused by smokers, broken bottles, vomit, etc. on the pavement.

7. The scheme undermines the "beautification work" that the Council has undertaken to Briton Street .

If you need me to express this in the form of a letter, please let me know.

I sincerely hope this scheme is rejected

Thanks

Danielle Grover

From: Charlotte Egan
Sent: 27 March 2009 12:50
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: Licensing Team at Southampton City Council

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

To whom this may concern

I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, Living in Gate 10 which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question where to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. I live on the ground floor, on Briton Street, with an entrance door to MY BEDROOM, which is accessible from street level. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

To speak to me more about this please contact me on

Charlotte Egan 188 Oceana Boulevard, Lower Canal Walk, Southampton, SO14 3JG

Charlotte Egan

Marketing Coordinator

Sent: 27 March 2009 13:15
To: Licensing
Subject: Application Appeal

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern

I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, Living in Gate 3 which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

To speak to me more about this please contact me on

James Read 26 Oceana Boulevard, Briton Street, Southampton, SO14 3HU

From: Darren Warner
Sent: 27 March 2009 14:41
To: Licensing
Subject: Objection

D.Warner
163 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HW

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street.

This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don’t really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Thanks Darren

From: Clive Parry [
Sent: 27 March 2009 15:27
To: Licensing
Subject: Objections to Application Nos 2009/00612/01 SPRN 2009/00580/01 SPRN

Charlotte Parry

Flat 115 Oceana Boulevard

Orchard Place

Southampton

Hampshire

SO14 3HW

26th March 2009

Dear Sir/Madam

New York, New York Application No: 2009/00612/01 SPRN

McCluskys Application No: 2009/00580/01 SPRN

Applications for licensing

I wish to lodge a formal and firm complaint to the recent applications by the above named on Briton Street for a Licence.

Historically, when the above named had an establishment in this area, there were no residential dwellings within the vicinity. Obviously since the building of Oceana Boulevard directly opposite and Telephone House to name but a few, the demographic of the area has changed.

I strongly believe that there are other more suitable venues for this type of establishment other than this. As you will be aware it is densely populated and the subsequent problems that arise with this type of venue will have a negative impact on various issues.

There would be large amounts of people congregating outside very late into the night when residents are sleeping. There would be the inevitable alcohol fuelled fights and associated noise with increased traffic from taxis and cars. It would also make the area very intimidating for residents and in effect it would be

impossible for us to feel safe during the evening and early morning. There would be an increase in the requirement of a police presence, however, because it is so far away from other clubs and pubs I feel that this will place unnecessary pressure on the police force to be able to respond to the amount of problems that occur over a weekend.

Other newly established outlets in the area have very strict rules, one of which is that they cannot operate past 11pm. This is due to the close proximity of residential dwellings and these rules are in place to ensure that residents are not disturbed.

There are numerous other locations for a nightclub and therefore the application is most strenuously opposed and should NEVER be allowed to go through. A residential area is NOT the place for this establishment any more. I strongly agree that this should not even be a pub. With the no smoking policy in force, the pavement would be full of people smoking and causing noise and litter and general anti social behaviour.

There must be consideration made to all the residents in this area including the increase in public order offences, increase in crime and vandalism that this type of establishment will bring as well as the noise and anti social behaviour.

DO NOT GRANT THIS LICENCE EVER- the demographic in this area has changed and no longer supports this type of business. I believe that after refusing this licence a note should be put on the property that it can never be used for this purpose due to the residential nature of the area.

The council has taken the time and spent valuable taxpayers money making this area more attractive. How long do you think the lovely trees will last when club goers vomit and urinate on them or just pull them out ‘for fun’. Our insurance premiums will rise due to the increase in problems in this area. The inevitable vandalism that will occur. The reasons are too numerous and far too important to be ignored or cast aside.

I believe that Southampton has enough themed pubs and clubs without causing so much distress by granting this licence. It is far too far away from the rest of the entertainment area of town. All of the clubs are located at the cinema complex or in the main part of town, where the associated problems do not affect residents therefore there is no need for this application to be accepted

All of the residents in this area were assured that the nightclub would not be re-opened when we purchased our properties. If we had been told that this was even a possibility we would never have moved here. We chose the area because it was close enough to the town centre and all its amenities but far enough away from the associated problems that go with it. This area, thanks in part to the council's efforts to regenerate it is beautiful and quiet which is ideal for all the families and young professionals that now live here. There is not place for a nightclub which will disturb our peace and affect our ability to feel secure in our own homes.

I thank you for taking the time to read this objection and I only hope you act upon this letter and all the other ones you will inevitably receive.

Yours faithfully

Charlotte and Clive Parry

From: Andy Hales
Sent: 27 March 2009 20:22
To: Licensing
Subject: Objection

Andrew Hales
267 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3JP

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

I would like to object to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

I live in Oceana Boulevard which is opposite the premises mentioned above where a license has been applied for. I DO NOT want two late night drinking venues yards from my front window.

When the premises McCluskys/ New Yorks was previously trading this area of town did not have much residential accommodation. I believe that the demographic has changed dramatically since and now many young families and young professionals live in this area.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be made into a car park or more flats. I don't think I would have bought a property here if I had known that two clubs would be opening on my doorstep, especially considering the high price I paid for my property.

I feel very strongly that two late night venues of this kind will be a nuisance and will ruin the quality of life I enjoy here at the moment, not to mention the decrease in value my property is bound to have.

It is for this reason and the following reasons that I make this objection.

• The prevention of crime and disorder
Alcohol consumption inevitably leads to crime and vandalism. People leaving these venues late at night will be very noisy and will no doubt hang around causing trouble late at night. In my previous residence at Bedford Place my car was vandalized more than once by drunk people late at night, and this was part of the reason I moved. I DO NOT wish for this to happen again as I have to park on the street at night. Briton Street is also currently undergoing 'beautification' work paid for by the council using our tax payers money, I do not wish to see vandalism of the tree's or benches being installed or vomit and broken glass everywhere. These clubs are also out of reach of the main drinking areas in Southampton, I don't see how they can be policed efficiently.
• Public Safety
As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

• The prevention of public nuisance
The obvious noise and disruption that a club would cause, especially at kick out time, will cause public nuisance. There are bound to be fights and people making noise into the early hours. I do not want to feel that I have to shout out my window for people to keep the noise down so I can sleep, I already put up with noise living in the city center without the added noise these clubs would cause.

• The protection of children from harm
Young families live in my building and I do not want these children as they grow up to have to contend with drunks.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Sincerely,
Andrew Hales

Windows Live Messenger just got better. Find out more!

From: bridget newbury
Sent: 28 March 2009 12:06
To: Licensing
Subject: McCluskys /New Yorks
55 Oceana Boulevard

Dear Sirs

I am absolutely stunned ,to see that you are even contemplating giving them a licence. My apartment is directly opposite the so called nightclubs,and it stands to reason that me and even other residents will be woken up when people are coming out of the clubs at all times of the night,in a drunken stupour.

Before I moved here, there was always something in the papers about the trouble there was here ,but I decided to move here when the club was closed,and Barratts sales team told me that the building was going to be knocked down and flats built.I was also under the impression that POSH and the car hire place was also going in time,but it does not look as if that is going to happen now.

I think there are enough clubs around here,without opening more,in a residential area. There are times know when they close at whatever time,and people stagger home shouting, walking in the miiddle of the road,knocking down bollards pulling plants out of the planters we have here,and generally making a nuisance of themselves.

The Council are in the middle of making up the pavements around here, and planting trees , the area is beginning to look a lot nicer now ,I can only imagine what it would be like if clubs were allowed to open,drunks rolling out ,fighting in the street,trees being pulled up, and residents around being woken up .

As you can tell I am absolutely against a licence being granted,and would ask you to think seriously about it.

Yours faithfully

Miss B. Newbury

245 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3JG

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

Ali & Paul Smith
Flat 245 Oceana Boulevard

From: glen harfield
Sent: 29 March 2009 15:33
To: Licensing
Subject: McClusky's and New York's alcohol license application

Mr Glen Harfield

Flat 184 Oceana Boulevard

Lower Canal Walk

Southampton

SO14 3JG

Application References 2009/00612/01SPRN, trading as New York New York and 2009/00580/01SPRN, trading as McClusky's

Dear Sir/Madam,

I live in a ground floor flat in the apartment block Oceana Boulevard, opposite New York's and McClusky's. I strongly object to the proposal to re-open the premises as a bar/nightclub, as I fear that drunken persons will cause a public nuisance. Persons would no doubt use the wall outside mine and my neighbour's windows as 'convenient' places to relieve themselves, and create noise, keeping myself and my neighbours awake until sometime after the premises closed. I also fear for mine and my neighbour's safety, as drunken violence will no doubt occur in the street outside the apartment block, I fear windows would be broken, and persons will undoubtedly try to enter the block and cause a nuisance and possible damage. When we bought our flat, we were told by Barratt homes that the premises would probably be turned to flats, and not re-open as a bar/club. I would definitely have reconsidered buying my flat if I knew there was a possibility of the bar/club re-opening, as I feel this will de-value it. We enjoy living in this relatively quiet and safe end of town, which will be spoilt if the premises re-opened. We plan to start a family in the next couple of years, but would need to move to a more suitable location, away from the noise and disruption the bar would cause. Suffice to say, I would greatly appreciate if the license was not granted.

Yours sincerely,

Glen Harfield

From: Licensing
Sent: 29 March 2009 20:23
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Rachel Rust has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 29/03/2009 20:23:06 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Rachel Rust
Address:
Flat 160 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3HW
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Comments:
As a local resident, living just around the corner from these premises,I feel the

need to strongly object to the application of having New Yorks re-opened and having an alchohol liscence until 5am.
Firstly, when I purchased my property at Oceana Boulevard I was informed that the intention was that the premises of New Yorks was for it to be made into residential flats. This seemed a rational plan, as the this is now a residential area and any club/pub would be detremental and an inconvienece for local residents. Secondly, we already experience a level of noise and vandalism from people coming out of pubs along Oxford Street, who have urinated in to people's ground floor balconies and thrown their rubbish into balconies late at night as they make their way home. I have no doubt that this type of behaviour would increase dramatically if a club was re-opened so close to our residential building. Thirdly, although New Yorks used to be open in this area - at the time the area surrounding it was NOT a residential area and a re-opening would have a severe impact on the local community.

I am certain that the re-opening would also have detremental effects on the area, which the council are spending so much money on in order to make it a more appealing place for visitors and people residing in Southampton. Finally, the re-opening of this club, would most certainly have a negative impact on the value of the properties in the area. The credit-crunch has already had a huge impact on the prices of our properties at Oceana Boulevard and this would make the situation even worse.
I hope that my comments will be considered very seriously, as this will have a massive impact on my life in Southampton.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 29 March 2009 22:39
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Sarah Biddlecombe has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 29/03/2009 22:38:52 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Sarah Biddlecombe

Address:
133 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HW

Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I object to the proposed new alcohol licence being awarded to this applicant for use on the respective property to be used as a new nightclub/venue for alcohol consumption. As a resident of Oceana Boulevard I am concerned that we will see an increase in: Noise pollution (music, traffic and people), Vandallism/ Criminal Damage associated with alcohol consumption. This venue is now in a residential area and unsuitable for the proposed use.I feel it will have a negative effect not only on local residents enjoyment of their homes but also on the value of our properties.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 March 2009 11:18
To: Licensing
Subject: Objection to Licence Numbers:2009/00612/01SPRN & 2009/00580/01SPRN

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

[redacted]

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours faithfully

Windows Live Hotmail just got better. Find out more!

From: Licensing
Sent: 30 March 2009 11:59
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Jeremy Weyman has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 30/03/2009 11:59:16 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Jeremy Weyman
Address:
211 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Postcode:
SO14 3JG
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I am objecting to this licence as I can see allot of noise and disruption until early

in the morning 7 nights a week. I am also concerned about Vandalism to Car's and Property and my own personal Safety when coming home late at night.
When I brought my property I was told that the old night clubs were going to be knocked down.
I can also see the price of my property devaluing if a night club opens opposite
PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Thompson, Leon
Sent: 30 March 2009 12:11
To: Licensing
Subject: New York and McKlusky's Night Clubs

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red
To Whom this may concern:

I wish to register my unconditional objection to the license application filed for the New York and Mcklusky's night clubs on Queens Way/Briton Street.
I live in Goldsmith Quarter, Briton Street and feel that our quality of life will be detrimentally affected. I understand that we live in a town centre and often the weekend will be quite noisy, however since their is no secure parking the risk to our vehicles will increase massively. I have already had my car vandalised once outside my flat which cost me £550 in insurance excess. With the lack of parking provided in the area I often park outside the redundant night clubs, which is a bad enough risk as it is! With the night clubs re-opening you can almost guarantee at least 1 car being vandalised each week.

May I take this opportunity to state that we pay a ridiculous amount of council tax to the tune of £145 per month, we pay this extortionate rate because we pay for a good quality of life. If this license was to be agreed you will be ruining the standards which we and probably 1000 others along the street are paying for. It is clearly unethical to agree this license and it will be clear that you are only doing so to line your own pockets further.

Your response will be greatly appreciated.

Your Faithfully,

Leon Thompson
8 Goldsmith Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3ED

****

Vinci PLC Group of Companies

Opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the individual not the company, unless specifically indicated to that effect.

This e-mail together with any files attached is confidential and intended for the addressee only.

If you have received this in error, please delete it from your PC and inform our IT Department on 01923 470407 or itsupport@vinci.plc.uk.

From: Mielczarek, Jenny |
Sent: 30 March 2009 13:05
To: Licensing
Subject: FW: New York and McKlusky's night club

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

To Whom this may concern:

I wish to register my unconditional objection to the license application filed for the New York and Mcklusky's night clubs on Queens Way/Briton Street.

I live in Goldsmith Quarter, Briton Street and have done for the past 2 and a half years. I am very concerned that our quality of life will be detrimentally affected if the plans you are putting forward go ahead. I understand that we live in a town centre and often the weekend will be quite noisy, however since their is no secure parking the risk to our vehicles will increase massively. My partners car has already been vandalised once outside the flat which cost £550 in insurance excess. With the lack of parking provided in the area myself or my partner I often park outside the redundant night clubs, which is a bad enough risk as it is! With the night clubs re-opening you can almost guarantee at least 1 car being vandalised each week, if not more.

May I take this opportunity to state that we pay a ridiculous amount of council tax to the tune of £145 per month, we pay this extortionate rate because we pay for a good quality of life. If this license was to be agreed you will be ruining the standards which we and probably 1000 others along the street are paying for. It is clearly unethical to agree this license and it will be clear that you are only doing so to line your own pockets further.

On speaking with other residents we are all very unhappy about this and all I can do is hope that the other residents have expressed their concern about this also.

Your response will be greatly appreciated.

Your Faithfully,

Jenny Mielczarek

8 Goldsmith Court

2 Briton Street

Southampton

SO14 3ED

166 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton
SO14 3HW

29th March 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO BOX 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Dear Sirs

RE: LICENCE FOR NIGHTCLUB ON BRITON STREET
(former New York, New York/McClusky's)

I am shocked to hear that a licence has been applied to reopen the nightclub on Briton Street.

When the nightclub was last in operation this area was non-residential and I believe that the opening of Oceana Boulevard, Telephone House etc has now altered the nature of the area, making a nightclub in such close vicinity to this building out of the question.

I believe that any new licence would have an adverse impact on:

1) crime and disorder in the vicinity
2) public safety, particularly late at night/early hours of the morning
3) public nuisance, and
4) acceptable noise levels from the club itself due to the club being on the opposite side to Oceana Boulevard

I can also envisage problems with traffic late at night due to the road junction, noisy late night revellers leaving the club and no parking available within the club premises. As it is we have the noise of the vegetable market ongoing during the early hours and during the day, so this disruption at night will make it unbearable.

I was informed that as the licence has already expired it would be unlikely that any new application would succeed given the high occupancy rate at Oceana Boulevard and in this area. In addition I believe there are already enough nightclubs in Southampton to warrant a refusal to the granting of this licence.

I also questioned Barratt's about this former nightclub when purchasing my property and was told that it was going to be demolished and new flats built there.

I would therefore like to voice my objection to any licence to be granted to this nightclub and, in addition, for the buildings use to be redesignated to something more appropriate for a residential area.

Yours faithfully

Mr Gareth Shepherd

From: Andy Boyne
Sent: 30 March 2009 15:17
To: McGuiness, Ian
Subject: RE: Licensing for 2009/00612/01SPRN and 2009/00580/01SPR (New York New York / McClusky's)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

76 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HU

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

March 30th 2009

RE: Licensing for 2009/00612/01SPRN and 2009/00580/01SPR

Dear Mr McGuiness,

Please read this document as my formal objection to the alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton (ref **2009/00612/01SPRN and 2009/00580/01SPR)**. I tried to submit this objection online but the service appeared unavailable. Could you please acknowledge whether this email is a valid objection to both applications referenced above. I obtained your details from the public access site for licensing applications.

I am a resident and homeowner at Oceana Boulevard, opposite the premises in question and have grave concerns following the licensing application. I understand in the past the premises *were* a licensed nightclub and bar, but at that time it was not within a residential area, and certainly not in an area that had been subject to regeneration. There are over 1000 new residents, including young familes and the retired along Briton Street and Orchard Place that would certainly have their lives made a misery through noise nuisance, public disorder, criminal damage and the inevitable untidiness that a late licensed bar and nightclub would bring.

Residents purchasing properties in the area were made aware that the premises were to be knocked down, maybe deceitfully as a sales tactic, but common sense would suggest one would be less likely to invest in a property so close to such an establishment.

It is for the points above and the following that I make this objection. I have marked in 'bold' the criteria stipulated to have a valid objection.

- **The prevention of crime and disorder**

Alcohol can be a contributing factor to crime and public nuisance. At Oceana Boulevard we are already covering the cost of vandalism from people in drink returning home from other venues. Having a late licensed establishment in the middle of a densely populated residential area can only increase crime. Currently, the police resources in

Southampton at night are spread between several key 'nightlife hotspots'. If another is allowed to be introduced, the resource will be spread even thinner – the obvious outcome in this case is increased crime and disorder.

- **Public Safety**

In such a densely populated residential area, it will be difficult to police and control the late night revellers. Local residents may live in fear of going out during 'opening hours' for fear of being harassed. Many clubs in an around the city have actually lost their licenses due to being unable to control violence/drugs, so it just doesn't make sense to allow another to open as it is the same people that caused the other clubs to close that will attend the new ones.

In addition to this, it is likely some revellers will 'want to explore' neighbouring buildings, further putting people's property *and* public property at risk. We have had incidents in the past where non-resident-drunk people have been found wandering the communal areas of our private buildings.

Also, there are several main (and somewhat busy) roads that are often frequented by large HGV vehicles related to activity at the docks. None of the roads leading away from the premises have been pedestrianised, unlike the other late night hotspots in the city, so there are public safety issues for those likely to attend the venue. Not to mention the negative effects of 'binge drinking' that such an establishment encourages – the owners are famous for their 'happy hours' and drinks promotions.

- **The prevention of public nuisance**

Noise pollution from the venue will be most distressing to those residents living closest to the venue. Additional noise pollution is likely to arise from the continuous stream of taxis picking up late night revellers. In addition to this, there will be the obvious 'pub shouting and singing' of revellers leaving (and arriving) at the venue.
The area has undergone recent regeneration and 'beautification' that will be negated by littering/vomit etc.

- **The protection of children from harm**

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Close to the venue is park, along Orchard Place, that is often used by children (and adults) as an area to play and relax. This park is likely to become a target for litter and broken glass which could injure anyone using the park.

I trust the licensing team will use their best judgement in dealing with this application – the area really is no longer suitable for such a venue.

Kind Regards,

Andrew Boyne

From: Licensing
Sent: 30 March 2009 21:54
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Aris Konstantopoulos has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 30/03/2009 21:53:33 from
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Aris Konstantopoulos
Address:
66 Oceana Boulevard
Briton St
Postcode:
SO14 3HU
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Comments:
Dear sir/madam

I would like to voice my strong objection to this application. Briton St has become a friendly residential area and a noisy nightclub has no place opposite large residential developments such as Oceana Boulevard and Telephone House.Many of us residents have bedrooms facing Briton St and it is often noisy enough when drunk people are walking home on a weekend night.

Crime, already an issue in the area with many of our cars vandalised and broken into, is of particular concern to me and my family. Many of the residents in the Briton St flats have children and spend their spring and summer evenings strolling along Briton and Oxford St enjoying the sea breeze and continental atmosphere. Yes, there are pubs and restaurants in the region, but these are neither noisy nor crime inviting.

The coucil has spent thousands (if not millions) of pounds improving the pavements and furniture so that residents of this region can enjoy the atmosphere provided by Southampton. I would be a pity to undermine, and potentially destroy, all this for a nightclub. This would offer nothing to the residents of the region nor of Southampton, as nightclubs are well placed where there are no residential concerns, such as the Oceana nightclubs in town.

In summary I feel that a nightclub has no place on Briton St. I and other residents of Briton St will be taking any action that is required to stop this going ahead.

Yours sincerely

Dr A Konstantopoulos

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

RECEIVED
30 MAR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

122 Oceana Boulevard
Oceana Boulevard
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HW

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Haughton

From: Jonny Rust
Sent: 01 April 2009 11:36
To: McGuiness, Ian
Subject: Re: FW: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Dear Mr McGuiness,

Thank you for confirming, it was unintentional not to include my name on my representation.

It is Dr Jonathan Rust, and it is in relation to my representation objecting to New York New York.

Many thanks

Jonathan Rust

On 01/04/2009, McGuiness, Ian <Ian.McGuiness@southampton.gov.uk> wrote:
> Good Morning,
>
> I am writing to ask if you could please confirm your name as this is
> missing from this representation submitted and although I am aware you
> have submitted a representation with your name for another premises, I
> am required to have this confirmed to validate this objection.
>
> Many thanks,
>
> Ian McGuiness
> Licensing Assistant
> Legal & Democratic Services
> Southampton City Council
>

> E-mail
> Web: www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing
> Post: Licensing - Southampton City Council
> PO Box 1344, Southampton. SO15 1WQ
>
> Please Note: - This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed

> under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act
> 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you are not
> the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies, please ignore
> it, delete it and notify us. SCC does not make legally binding
> agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. E-mails may be monitored.
> Application Summary
> ----------
> Application Number:
> 2009/00612/01SPRN
>
> Address:
> 2 Queens Way
> Southampton
> SO14 3AZ
>
> Licence Description:
>
>
> Case Officer:
>
>
> Customer Details
> ----------
> Name:
> An anonymous user
>
> Address:
> Flat 160 Oceana Boulevard,
> Orchard Place,
> Southampton
>
> Postcode:
> SO14 3HW
>
> Email:
>
>
> Phone Number:
>
>
> Comments
> --------
> Representation Type:

> Resident
>
> Objection Type:
>
>
> Comments:
> Dear Sir/Madam,
>
> I am writing to lodge an objection to the application for the licence
> for New York New York on Queens Way, Southampton.
>
> I am writing from the position of being a resident at Oceana
> Boulevard, situated on Briton street and directly opposite the
> premises in question. The premises have been closed for a number of
> years, and during that time the immediate neighbourhood has undergone
> substantial change. It is now a densely residential area, currently
> enjoying a large amount of investment by the council with regards to
> the pavements and street furniture.
>
> I strongly believe the reopening of New York New York would be a
> backward step in the rejuvenation of the area, and lead to
> considerable problems between night club attendees and local residents.
>
> Although the Applicant may argue that jobs will follow the reopening,
> and a 'smartening' of the building - this will be a small benefit in
> comparison with the substantial detrimental effects listed below.
>
> 1. (in relation to The prevention of crime and disorder) Southampton
> has been recently listed as the third most violent city in the
> country. A reopening of one of the clubs which had a bad reputation
> when it was last open is unlikely to help this situation. Drunk venue
> users are likely to cause damage to parked cars and local buildings as
> they leave the venue. This venue is further out from the main night
> club venues, meaning that police resources will be further stretched
> to attend incidents which are extremely likely to occur. The secure
> car park for Oceana Boulevard is directly opposite the entrance to
> said premises. It is likely opportunistic theft will be more likely
> as people waiting outside the venue become aware of the car park
> opening for short periods as resident enter and leave at night.
>
> 2. (In relation to Public Safety)
> Alcohol fuelled unprovoked violence is a well documented phenomenon,
> and so to allow a night club venue in the centre of a residential area

> is highly likely to lead to incidents between night club attendees and
> innocent residents.
>
> 3. (In relation to the prevention of public nuisance) I am a busy
> junior doctor, and so work long hours and need uninterrupted sleep to
> provide a good service at the NHS. I have grave reservations
> regarding the likely level of noise from this venue opening. This is
> partially due to the night club itself, which play loud music, but
> also and more importantly the club goers. The attendees of the night
> club are highly likely to be drunk as they leave the premises, and
> cause considerable noise.
>
> In conclusion, if I had known that this premises was likely to be
> reopening, I would not have invested in the area as I have done. I
> fear by allowing a small investment by the nightclub, you will drive
> away a section of the local residential population. If the club does
> indeed open, I shall have to very carefully consider if I can carry on
> living in the area, or if I will need to move. This is in spite of
> the fact that the value of my property will have dropped considerably
> if this night club opens.
>
> Please take heed of my objections to the giving of this licence.
>
>
>
> PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.
>

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Lorraine Barnett
22 Guild House
Merchants Qtr
Southampton
SO15 3EY

30th March 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Lorraine Barnett

RECEIVED
- 1 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

RECEIVED
- 1 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Flat 26 Goldsmiths Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3ED

30 Mar 09

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

NEW YORK NIGHT CLUB & McCLUSKY's APPLICATION FOR 24 HOUR LICENSE

I have been informed that an application has been made to reopen the above night club on Queensway together with a 24 hour drinking license.

As residents of Goldsmiths Court we already suffer from inebriated youth of both sexes screaming, shouting abuse, vomiting and dropping litter as they return up the High Street from the Town Quay bars from about 0100 until 0330 nightly.

However, access to the Queensway site from the West (High Street) and beyond will be via Oriental Terrace which passes through the centre of Merchants Quarter. Unlike the High Street which is cleaned daily, Oriental Terrace and the communal areas of Merchants Quarter including the car parks rely on private weekly contract cleaners.

Should the application be approved the residents of Merchants Quarter will be subjected to living in a squalid litter compound exacerbated by an increased rat population attracted by the inevitable discarded fast food cartons and their contents which will lie in the open for up to seven days. Damage to private cars is highly likely.

I wish to record my very strong objection to the above application and ask that the attention of your rodent control team be drawn to the environmental health impact of this application.

Yours faithfully,

NB Shacklock

From: Licensing
Sent: 31 March 2009 20:31
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Julian & Christine Aplin has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 31/03/2009 20:30:47 from
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Julian & Christine Aplin
Address: Flat 8 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3HL
Email:

Phone Number:
Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
We live opposite this venue and the granting of this licence will be a local nuisance as it will cause increased noise late at night and vandalism to our

properties and cars (we have already recently had the door to the flats smashed by a late night drinker).
This area is currently used as a access route for late night drinkers going to and from the local casinos and other bars and as such we are regularly awoken by their raucous behaviour. There are several new blocks of flats in this area and the re-opening of this premises with the extended licence will not be acceptable.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 01 April 2009 10:35
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Ian Chesterman has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 01/04/2009 10:34:50 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Ian Chesterman

Address:
Flat 20, Goldsmiths Court
Briton Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3ED
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I would like to make a representation with regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York nightclub, 2 Queensway, Southampton,SO14 3AZ.
I live in a residential block on Briton Street, which is a quiet,mainly residential street and I am concerned that two licensed premises opening in this area would attract
a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.
Section 4(2)of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives,two of which are:
The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.
With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.
There is a public footpath called Oriental Terrace which goes through Merchants Quarter and is in very close proximity to five residential buildings, from this footpath there is also easy access to private garages and cars parked in allocated spaces. This footpath runs from the High Street to Queensway ending opposite McClusky's Bar, next door to New York New York. I am concerned that granting a premises licence especially
with very late hours would increase the number of people using this path and lead to crime and disorder in relation to parked cars and noise nuisance from rowdy people late at night.As a resident on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would
have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers going to or coming from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on thestreet, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

RECEIVED
02 APR 2009

Flat 11, Goldsmiths Court,
Briton Street,
Southampton,
SO14 3ED.

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO BOX 1344,
Southampton,
SO15 1WQ.

30/03/2009

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for **New York New York night club**, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet, mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.
Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives two of which are:
The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and encouraging large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.
Currently, the residents of our block are already subjected to excessive noises and vandalism from passers-by on the High Street. The addition of a social venue on the other side of our flats, will no doubt increase the levels of noise and disturbance.
With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

There is a public footpath called Oriental Walk which goes through and is in very close proximity to five residential buildings, from this footpath there is also easy access to private garages and cars parked in allocated spaces. This footpath runs from the High Street to Queensway. I am concerned that granting a premises licence especially with very late hours would increase the number of people using this path and lead to crime and disorder in relation to parked cars and noise nuisance from rowdy people late at night.
My NEW car sits alongside this footpath and in the space of 4 months, I have had my driver-side windscreen wiper arm snapped off by drunken individuals. I have had the boot lid burnt from a cigarette haplessly thrown on it from a passer-by. This has

happened when there is no pub/club/drinking venue on the other side. I genuinely feel uneasy and worried about the concept of a licensed premises on the other side of this path and can't afford to fix parts of my car each time a drunk individual(s) chooses to let loose. It is not only my car affected, but I have also witness other vehicles mindlessly vandalised.
After discussion with the local council and the police about alcohol fuelled crime around this area, the best that could be done with current resources was a slight increase in police ground patrols in the evenings. A licensed premises here will without a doubt increase these levels of crime and disorder and will cause a major public nuisance.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. I can already hear the expletives shouted out by these customers through double glazed windows, this would be especially worse during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

At present, you do get the odd high decibel swearing and vandalism. This is generally kept to a minimum by the lack of drinking/social venues around this area. The addition of another venue with a drinking licence here would tip the balance completely, especially if a path connecting the High Street and these bars/clubs runs directly through our private car park.
When this venue was last an area of drinking and socialising, this part of town was not very residential and I know the levels of disorder that emanated from this area secondary to alcohol. (I was a student here and witnessed many things). So you can understand my concern for reinventing this establishment in light of the recent surge in people living in this area.
I'm not trying to over dramatise the situation, but if a licensed bar/club were to open in such close proximity to our residential area, I would feel as though relocation is my only option. I do feel concerned for those that have young children within our block of flats.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr Rutesh Patel

Flat 5, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME:

CHRIS RICHARDS

SIGNED:

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

30 March 2009

Ref License application
2009/00612/01SPRN New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN – McCluskys

Dear Sirs

We would like to object most strongly to the granting of premises licenses to the above night clubs. When these buildings were licensed previously, it was almost impossible for residents in Briton Street to sleep at night because of the rowdy behaviour, foul language and fighting, (sometimes of a serious nature) which happened on several nights of the week, Friday and Saturday being the most unpleasant. In addition, considerable damage to communal property was not unusual.

Now that Briton Street has become a largely residential area with a programme of improvements by the Council to create new pavements, seating areas, trees etc, the behaviour as described above would surely be hugely detrimental.

Yours faithfully

Nadine Fry
24 Coopers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3 EN

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

From: hooper s.j. (sjh2g08
Sent: 02 April 2009 20:20
To: Licensing
Subject: Application 2009/00612/01STRN - NEW YORK NEW YORK

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a tenant in a flat in the Ocena Boulevard Residence, Briton Street. It has recently come to my attention that the nightclub (New York New York) opposite has applied for a license to re-open, which includes a license to sell alcohol/remain open until 5AM. I object fully to this application for a number of reasons. Firstly the pollution associated with the areas surrounding nightclubs will become a problem. This relates to a number of issues - noise late at night, litter, vomit. On top of these issues the area around the nightclub will become a more dangerous area from violence. This danger is not just against humans but also against the surrounding buildings where graffiti and damage will not become uncommon. Further, the proximity of the nightclub to the flats will make quiet nights in/sleeping at night nigh on impossible. Lastly and perhaps most importantly the impact to any children living in the flats will be felt most with people smoking outside the club and setting a poor eample with drunken antics.

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the application.

Yours Sincerely,

Simon Hooper
Flat 54 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SO14 3HU

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

LINDA LAWLESS

MICHAEL LAWLESS

Flat number 12
Oceana Boulevard

Flat 30
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

ZOE PARKER

Flat number 30
Oceana Boulevard

268 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3JP

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Regards,

Mr Gary Allen

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

ED
03 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

Miss Virginie Deslandes & Mr Salvatore Russo.

Flat number 4
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Dear Resident

If you wish to, but have not yet objected to the application of an alcohol license for McCluskys/New York New York, please print and sign your name and add your flat number to this letter and return to the Licensing Team at the address on the letter as soon as possible. For further information see the posters around the building or email your objection to licensing@southampton.gov.uk citing the issues contained in the letter.

Mr C Griffiths
Flat 39
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

2 April 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

Flat number 39.
Oceana Boulevard

From: Licensing
Sent: 03 April 2009 20:28
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Jonathan Cantrell has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 03/04/2009 20:27:51 from IP 192.168.50.31.

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Jonathan Cantrell
Address:
49 Oceana Boulevard, Briton street, Southampton
Postcode:
so14 3hu

Comments
Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am a tenant within oceana boullevard, the building opposite to the above proposed establishment. I wish to object to the re-opening of New York New York for the following reasons.
1- prevention of crime and disorder: The re-opening of this establishment which would allow late night drinking would be extremley likley to bring crime to the local area. When this establishment previously existed this area was not a residential area so there was less oppourtunity for people to comit crimes, cause vandalism to people's property and cause disorder. I am extremley worried about the prospect of an increase in crime in this area. The underground carpark has been entered by non-residents sneaking in after cars (the garage doors remain up for several seconds

after a car passes through) several times and crimes have been commited in this car park which the police can testify to. I am concerned that this risk would increase with an the large increase of people who would be likley to be drunk and hanging around at night after leaving New York New York. This would also allow people easy access to our building (which can be accessed from the carpark) and would make vandalism and crime within the building more likley. There is also the fruit and vegetable unit over the road to cosider which quietly operates throughout the night. It is extremley likley that this buisness and the workers would be hassled or worse by drunk people leaving the above establishment.

2. Public safety: Being a residential area there are naturally many people about enjoying there homes and the surrounding area (streets and local park nearby). These people should not be put at risk by the opening of a club in there area and the increase in crime-in particular violent crimes which are associated with such places. Clubs like this should be in one place, such as the leisure world complex, these places are easier to police and have lots of bounces because it is known that these places would otherwise cause harm to people. A residential is much harder to police and extra police resources would be needed to attend to this area. This area does not otherwise require much of a police presence as it has no other bars or clubs which are linked with risks to public safety so extra police resources would need to be identified. Why should we as residents put up with an increase in risk of harm to ourselves and our children? I and many others moved into this area because it was a quiet residential area with a low crime rate. I find it appauling that this should be allowed to change.

3. Public nuisance- the loud noise that this club would cause is clearly not suitable for a residential area where people are trying to sleep and the fact that this club wants a license to be open till 5am would mean a major nuisance and disruption to the lives of local residents. Noise from taxis, police and potential ambulances would add to this problem. As a council tax payer i find this completley unacceptable.

4. Protection of children from harm: Young children are living locally within this residential area, it is not okay for them to be put at risk from either drunken crimes or broken glass that is likley to occur around this establishment. It is not acceptable to put our children at risk.

I hope that you will consider these issues and NOT grant this license. This area has improved in recent years and is becoming an afluent area with a good reputation. It would be a big shame for people to be forced to move out of this area because of the above stated probelms which will be caused if this club is re-opened. Also this area will find it much harder to replace tenants who move out as the area will be much less safe, peaceful and a less attractive for potential tenants. This will result in a loss of value of the property- in the current economic climate do you really want this kind of thing to happen?
Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license and the re-opening of New York New York.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 03 April 2009 20:11
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

katherine bradbury has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 03/04/2009 20:10:52 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
katherine bradbury

Address:
49 oceana boullevard, briton street, southampton
Postcode:
so14 3hu

Comments
Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am a tenant within oceana boullevard, the building opposite to the above proposed establishment. I wish to object to the re-opening of New York New York for the following reasons.
1- prevention of crime and disorder: The re-opening of this establishment which would allow late night drinking would be extremley likley to bring crime to the local area. When this establishment previously existed this area was not a residential area

so there was less oppourtunity for people to comit crimes, cause vandalism to people's property and cause disorder. I am extremley worried about the prospect of an increase in crime in this area. The underground carpark has been entered by non-residents sneaking in after cars (the garage doors remain up for several seconds after a car passes through) several times and crimes have been commited in this car park which the police can testify to. I am concerned that this risk would increase with an the large increase of people who would be likley to be drunk and hanging around at night after leaving New York New Yorks. This would also allow people easy access to our building (which can be accessed from the carpark) and would make vandalism and crime within the building more likley. There is also the fruit and vegetable unit over the road to cosider which quietly operates throughout the night. It is extremley likley that this buisness and the workers would be hassled or worse by drunk people leaving the above establishment.

2. Public safety: Being a residential area there are naturally many people about enjoying there homes and the surrounding area (streets and local park nearby). These people should not be put at risk by the opening of a club in there area and the increase in crime-in particular violent crimes which are associated with such places. Clubs like this should be in one place, such as the leisure world complex, there places are easier to police and have lots of bounces because it is known that these places would otherwise cause harm to people. A residential is much harder to police and extra police resources would be needed to attend to this area. This area does not otherwise require much of a police presence as it has no other bars or clubs which are linked with risks to public safety so extra police resources would need to be identified. Why should we as residents put up with an increase in risk of harm to ourselves and our children? I and many others moved into this area because it was a quiet residential area with a low crime rate. I find it appauling that this should be allowed to change.

3. Public nuisance- the loud noise that this club would cause is clearly not suitable for a residential area where people are trying to sleep and the fact that this club wants a license to be open till 5am would mean a major nuisance and disruption to the lives of local residents. Noise from taxis, police and potential ambulances would add to this problem. As a council tax payer i find this completley unacceptable.

4. Protection of children from harm: Young children are living locally within this residential area, it is not okay for them to be put at risk from either drunken crimes or broken glass that is likley to occur around this establishment. It is not acceptable to put our children at risk.

I hope that you will consider these issues and NOT grant this license. This area has improved in recent years and is becoming an afluent area with a good reputation. It would be a big shame for people to be forced to move out of this area because of the above stated probelms which will be caused if this club is re-opened. Also this area will find it much harder to replace tenants who move out as the area will be much less safe, peaceful and a less attractive for potential tenants. This will result in a loss of value of the property- in the current economic climate do you really want this kind of thing to happen?
Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license and the re-opening of new york new yorks.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

FLAT 49.
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

K. BRADBURY.

Oceana Boulevard

4 Chandlers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EZ

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

31st March 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would

be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs K. Bingham

10 Chandlers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EZ

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
03 APR 2009

31st March 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would

be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Christopher Bingham

168 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HW

4.4.2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please take this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol Licence for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern, I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street.
It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol licence for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that leads to crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence and therefore another call on already stretched police resources.
Opening a night club within a residential area would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime to property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per the above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Potential vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone can see the potential danger and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol licence.

Regards

C BARKER

Sent: 05 April 2009 15:28
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr David Mcintyre has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 05/04/2009 15:27:56 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Mr David Mcintyre

Address:
Flat 35 Castle Place
117 High street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 2EA

Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
This has now become a residential area and we do not require another late night establishment.
There is enough late night/ early morning disturbance and noise passing along the high street out side our residence at present.
A lot of money is being spent making Briton street and surrounding areas very smart.
Do not spoil it by allowing this and the license for New York New York, and the possibility of these facilities and our homes being damaged and vandalised

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Natalie Larsen
Sent: 06 April 2009 11:04
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: RE: Briton Street Nightclub Proposal

Hi Hayley

Thank you for letting me know.

I am objecting to both of them:
2008/00580/01SPRN – McClusky's
2008/00612/01SPRN – New York New York

Thank You

Natalie

Subject: RE: Briton Street Nightclub Proposal
Date: Mon, 6 Apr 2009 10:55:34 +0100
From: Hayley.Clowes@southampton.gov.uk
To:

Dear Ms Larsen,

We are currently unable to accept your representation as valid as you have not specifically stated which application you are objecting to. Please confirm by return which application (s) you are objecting to so I can able to validate your representation:

2008/00580/01SPRN – McClusky's
2008/00612/01SPRN – New York New York

Yours Faithfully,
Hayley Clowes
Licensing Assistant
Legal & Democratic Services
Southampton City Council

This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. If you are not the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies, please ignore it, delete it and notify us. SCC does not make legally binding agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. E-mails may be monitored.

From: Natalie Larsen [mailto:

Sent: 06 April 2009 10:07

Subject: Briton Street Nightclub Proposal

RE: Re-opening of Nightclub on Briton Street, Southampton

To start with first of all, I need to say that myself and my partner are two young individuals, age 25, who regularly frequent the clubs and bars of Southampton and neighboring cities. We are not the usual demographic of people you would expect to see complaining about a night club opening, but this is something I feel very passionate about.

If you type in “Briton Street” into Google, the first few pages that come up all contain web pages associated with real estate; all websites advertising the property of the area. I think this goes some way to prove the residential nature of this section of Southampton.

Myself and my partner have lived at Oceana Boulevard, Briton Street for a little over 6 months. We both moved from separate homes in quite rural areas (my self from Hedge End and my partner from Romsey). Getting used to living in a city would be different we realized, but so far, it has been comfortable, calm, undisturbed and relatively quiet. We obviously want it to remain like that, however, with the proposal of this new nightclub on Briton Street, right outside our front door, all of that will disappear.

There are several reasons, both personal and communal, why we think this nightclub should definitely not be re-opened, and why, you as the Council, should not allow a liquor license for these premises. As an authority looking to grant or reject such a license, I know that you must satisfy the Licensing Act of 2003, thus this is what we base our objectives on. The reasons are listed below:

1. / The prevention of Crime and Disorder; The Crime and Disorder Act of 1998 stated that there should be specific steps taken in the prevention and punishment of Anti-Social behavior. In re-opening a nightclub in Briton Street or a similar area, crime and public disorder is guaranteed to sky-rocket. All of the problems you can expect to see with this kind of amenity will certainly follow within a few weeks of its’ opening. I’m specifically talking about the obvious issues like binge-drinking, drug-taking, noise level complaints, vandalism, problems that inevitably lead from drinking excessively and drug-taking such as brawls and fights, etc etc.

We are extremely proud of our neighborhood and of the up market part of Southampton that I consider to live in. We are close to Ocean Village and opposite Town Quay here. It is a very prosperous and sought-after location in terms of real estate and also because it is a quiet area, at the moment. The crime and disorder that will inevitably follow will bring this part of town right

down in terms of value, desirability and reputation. The main issues will certainly be the vandalism to our buildings and our vehicles as well. Many of us, myself included, have no parking space access at our apartment (most of the apartments do not come with parking spaces), and because you cannot get a Council permit to park in this area (as I have been told it is too new), a lot of us are forced to park our cars on the streets (the max 2 hour pay-and-display bays) and surrounding small car parks. I for one, regularly park my car on Briton Street itself; a luxury that I'm sure is soon to be taken from me if this nightclub was to re-open as I am sure there will be no access to park on Briton Street. This forces us to park our cars further from our homes, thus increasing the risk of thefts and vandalism, especially with the drunken club-goers around to smash our windows, steal our stereos and generally disrespect our property. There will be a massive increase in these kinds of petty vandalisms, thefts and general public disorder, not only in the hours that the nightclub is open but undoubtedly at other periods too. It will simply bring a different kind of people and trouble to this neighborhood. On the extreme side of things, the worst kind of crime it could bring is obvious; assault, sexual assault, and drug dealing; these are major problems.

Having listed some of the obvious issues above, the ones I am most concerned over are the binge-drinking problems (this relates strongly to Public Safety (2./) issues) and the potential drug issues it will bring to this neighborhood. Wherever clubs and bars open, these problems are sure to follow. The two are linked. I am concerned with the fact that this area is very heavily residential. In my opinion, this area is completely inadequate for a nightclub or bar of any sort; it mainly contains small businesses and apartment buildings. The nearest area that contains other bars is Oxford Street, but even then, Oxford Street does not have nightclubs; it contains licensed restaurants mainly and a couple of small pubs. Briton Street is an odd location for a nightclub; there was a clear reason why it did not work the first time round when it was New York’s New York’s and McCluskys. If you take a look at the nightclubs and bars in Southampton generally, they are all situated in areas where there is little threat to personal and communal security and safety. For example, Oceana Nightclub is out on its’ own piece of land at Leisure World, Oceans and Collins Nightclub is at the back of Above Bar tucked away from any housing, the clubs and bars of Bedford Place are generally segregated from apartments and tucked away in back alleys, the bars and clubs on Above Bar street are again all away from any body’s homes. These nightclubs and bars are just a few in Southampton but are all in locations and environments that make sense and that'fit’ for that area. Briton Street, and any surrounding street in the Town Quay area of Southampton will not and cannot accommodate a nightclub or late-night bar at all. There are simply too many flats and too many people living in that area.. I think you’ll find a higher concentration of flats and apartments in that area of Southampton than any other part that is inner city. Just because we live inner city does not justify ruining our environment and causing such high risk to public safety. There are simply too many residents, children and pedestrians in this area at any given time on these roads and streets and thus this part of Southampton is completely wrong for a club. You would be surprised quite how many families with young children there are

in this area. In our building alone, I know there are a good 20 or so children that I have seen myself. How could it be right to subject not only adults but children especially to the dangers of this kind of public nuisance?

3./ In relation to Prevention of Public Nuisance, this I feel denotes a need to prevent the smaller issues that will come from this nightclub re-opening, such as noise pollution (I guarantee your Environmental Health Department would see a massive increase in complaints on Friday and Saturday nights should this go ahead, including the Police being called out more regularly), graffiti vandalism, littering and general disregard for the residents living at the surrounding addresses. This nightclub will inevitably bring a lot more litter to our area hence meaning the Council will need to provide more workers to remove this rubbish. It is a case of 'when' not 'if' in terms of whether we will need more Police in this area on the nights this club would be open; there would simply need to be more police patrols and PCSOs on the streets in order to protect the likes of us from the drunken clubbers and also from themselves! There will undoubtedly be the need for other extreme measures of security and surveillance such as CCTV in the city.

In short, a nightclub re-opening here is destined to ruin this area of town and put people off visiting, living and coming here. It will also ruin the environment and give people yet another excuse to cause problems. Coming from someone who likes going out and having a drink and a dance, I cannot see how or why it would make sense to open a nightclub in this area. I am of course biased because I do not want to deal with the problems that are going to arise because of this, and I especially do not want to feel threatened whilst walking around my neighborhood. I believe it is our job to protect our city, removing opportunities that threaten and demean ours and others' experiences of Southampton and it is also our job to stick together as a community. There was a reason these nightclubs closed down the first time around; they had a horrendous reputation and they didn't quite fit this area of Southampton; and that was before it became so residential around there. It will be a waste of your time and money to open these, plain and simple.

Please consider the damage this proposal will do. I appreciate your time.

Thank You

Yours Sincerely

Natalie Larsen and Nick Kemp
210 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
Hampshire
SO14 3JG

MARTIN & DOREEN CURRAN

8 CHANDLERS COURT
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3EZ

4th April 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
- 6 APR 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Miss Fiona D Wright
14 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton SO14 3HF

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
- 6 APR 2009

1 April 2009

To whom it may concern

Dear Sirs

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Oceana Boulevard resident (Flat 14)
Briton Street

FLAT 2
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

RECEIVED
- 6 APR 2009

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

A. Pilkington

Flat number 2
Oceana Boulevard

03/04/2009

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

RECEIVED
- 6 APR 2009

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

CLIFFORD GREGORY

Flat number 1
Oceana Boulevard

28 Coopers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EN

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO BOX 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

3rd April 2009

Dear Sirs,

Ref. application for alcohol licenses for premises

2009/00612/01SPRN (New York New York)
2009/00580/01SPRN (McCluskys)

I am writing in connection with the above license applications.

I would like to request that you do not grant these licenses on the grounds that to do so would have a very detrimental affect on the area in which these clubs are located.

Since New York New York and McClusky's closed down there has been a very noticeable reduction in the incidence of late night fighting, screaming and shouting. There has also been a noticeable decrease in the number of people urinating, vomiting and defecating in and around these premises and there appears to be far less litter in the area. In short there has been a noticeable increase in the quality of life for the residents and a decrease in the health risk.

I have also noticed elderly people and people with children walking out in the evenings in the area, which is something that I rarely ever witnessed when the two clubs were open. I can only assume that this is a result of an overall improvement of the quality of night life in this area.

It makes me shudder to think that all this progress would be undone at a stroke by the re-opening of these night clubs.

Please, for all our sakes, do not grant these licenses.

Yours sincerely,

Dr John Atkinson

RECEIVED
- 6 APR 2009

Flat 30
No1 Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3JD

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Briton Street, which is in the same location as the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention and many other residents that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a residential one with young families and key workers within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

There is a recognised direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. My residence fronts directly onto Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat and has the potential for vandalism and crime to my home, from dunk people leaving the nightclub in a less than sober state.

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

In addition I believe a noise can count as a public nuisance and I would rather not have to cope with the reality of opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It

would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

Further to this there are young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

It is for the above reason I request that the proposal for an alcohol license is not granted

Yours faithfully

PJ O'Maoil Mheana

From: Clegg, Nick : Barclays Wealth
Sent: 06 April 2009 19:38
To: Licensing
Subject: Re: applications for licenses for McCluskies & New Yorks Nightclubs

Dear Sir / Madam,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my grave concerns at the prospect of McCluskies and New York, New York nightclubs obtaining liquor licenses.

I live at 4 Talbot Court, Queensway and feel that by allowing these clubs to reopen my quality of life will be substantially damaged by public nuisance.

Quite simply, in the time since these clubs closed, the area has become a residential area with many homes located nearby. By allowing these clubs to reopen, we will be badly affected by drunkenness, noise and antisocial behaviour.

I would ask that these applications are rejected on the grounds that public nuisance will be unavoidable due to the proximity to residential housing.

Nick Clegg
Financial Planning Manager

From: ellis m.j.s.
Sent: 07 April 2009 11:14
To: Licensing
Subject: Application 2009/00612/01STRN New York New York

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a tenant in a flat in the Ocena Boulevard Residence, Briton Street. It has recently come to my attention that the nightclub (New York New York) opposite has applied for a license to re-open, which includes a license to sell alcohol/remain open until 5AM. I object fully to this application for a number of reasons. Firstly the pollution associated with the areas surrounding nightclubs will become a problem. This relates to a number of issues - noise late at night, litter, vomit. On top of these issues the area around the nightclub will become a more dangerous area from violence. This danger is not just against humans but also against the surrounding buildings where graffiti and damage will not become uncommon. Further, the proximity of the nightclub to the flats will make quiet nights in/sleeping at night nigh on impossible. Lastly and perhaps most importantly the impact to any children living in the flats will be felt most with people smoking outside the club and setting a poor example with drunken antics.

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the application.

Yours Sincerely,

Matthew Ellis
Flat 54 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SO14 3HU

From: Licensing
Sent: 07 April 2009 11:33
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr Barry Taylor has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 07/04/2009 11:32:30 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Mr Barry Taylor
Address:
Interlink Express
8-10 Queensway
Southampton
Postcode:
SO16 0TD
Email:

Representation Type:
Trader

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
We at Interlink Express would like to make you aware of our objection to the proposal to grant late licences or in fact a licence of any form to Nexum Leisure for the purpose of either re-opening New York New York or McClusky's in the future. Having operated next door to these premesis when they were open in the past we would like to make you aware of the very negative impact that they had on the community of businesses operating from the Brunswick Square Industrial Estate. We commonly experienced people urinating in our doorway and even through our letterbox on occasion. Several broken windows had to be repaired and the small glass panels on one door became broken with such regularity that we had to eventually give up and

board the door up instead. Of even greater nuisance was the fact that our alarm system was regularly triggered at around 2 - 3.00 a.m when the clubs were emptying by people banging against doors and also, I understand on occasion, having sex against the shutter doors to the rear of our premesis. Add to this the significant quantities of extra rubbish and empty beer bottles/broken glass deposited in and around our premesis and you can understand why the granting of a new licence to these premesis would be most unwelcome by both the other businesses attempting to trade in and around Brunswick Square and also those people who have purchased apartments in the area in the belief that it was to be redeveloped for residential purposes.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 07 April 2009 11:36
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Nigel Parker has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 07/04/2009 11:36:13 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Nigel Parker
Address:
58 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Comments
Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
Granting a licence for a bar and night club in this area is completely inappropriate to the residential character of the neighbourhood. The flat I occupy overlooks the premises for which the licence has been requested and noise from the street below is already noticeable and can be intrusive. Late night/early morning operation of a night club will generate additional noise both from within the premises and outside it and cause considerable nuisance to the large number of residents in the high density housing that has recently been constructed along Briton Street, especially Oceana Boulevard which is directly opposite.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 06 April 2009 20:23
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Simon Noyce has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 06/04/2009 20:23:22 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Simon Noyce
Address:
172 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
Postcode:
SO143JG

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I object to the application for premises licence (reference: 2009/00612/01SPRN) on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder. I am a resident within Oceana Boulevard and feel that the area is no longer suitable for a nightclub like New Yorks, New yorks. This is now very much a residential area with a large number of apartment blocks and the nightclub would have a detrimental impact in both noise, crime and disorder. Also Living on the Lower Canal Walk alleyway, I feel my property would be a prime target for anti social behaviour, crime and disorder with drunken people leaving the nightclub.

Also, from a financial point of view this will further lower the value of my property.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 06 April 2009 20:25
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Melissa Guthrie has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 06/04/2009 20:25:14 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Melissa Guthrie
Address:
172 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
Postcode:
SO143JG

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
I object to the application for premises licence (reference: 2009/00612/01SPRN) on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder. I am a resident within Oceana Boulevard and feel that the area is no longer suitable for a nightclub like New Yorks, New yorks. This is now very much a residential area with a large number of apartment blocks and the nightclub would have a detrimental impact in both noise, crime and disorder. Also Living on the Lower Canal Walk alleyway, I feel my property would be a prime target for anti social behaviour, crime and disorder with drunken people leaving the nightclub.

Also, from a financial point of view this will further lower the value of my property.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 07 April 2009 20:12
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
Mrs S McIntyre has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 07/04/2009 20:12:15 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN
Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Mrs S McIntyre
Address:
Castle Place
117 High Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 2EA

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
Briton Street and the lower part of the High Street are now residential, we do not welcome or require a night club, dancing and drinking establisment in this area, which will cause increased late night noise, vandals to our property, litter and disturbance. All establishments of this nature must be confined to the Leasuire World Complex away from residents. Please not not allow a licence for this club. I am sure that the police would have further concerns and objections.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

ADRIAN FORD
MCKENZIES FURNITURE
49 – 53 QUEENSWAY
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3BL

LICENSING TEAM
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
PO BOX 1344
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 1WQ

07 04 2009

RE , LICENSE APPLICATION 2009/00612/01SPRN

DEAR SIR / MADAM

I am writing to lodge an objection to the application for a license to sell alcohol at the former New York New York night club premise at no 2 Queensway in central Southampton .

I am objecting to this licence as follows .

The prevention of crime and public disorder .

We have had first hand experience of the problems caused by late night licences in this area as we have owned a shop in Queensway for the last 12 years . When the above premises was last open we used to have broken windows to our premise and marks on the wall and windows on a regular basis ,and it got so bad that our insurance company would not insure the glass in the windows anymore/ since it has closed we have had no broken windows or marks on the windows or walls .I feel that this wuld be bound to happen again .

Public safety

When this premises was last open several years ago the surrounding area was largely commercial , since then many new residential properties have been built and so it is now largely residential . It is also worth noting I feel that the Southampton city councils local plan review (march 2001) listed the area directly opposite the proposed premises as a potential site for extensive new housing development , so it is clear that in future more residential development is likely to take place in the future. Since so much of this area is now residential I feel that there would be significant late night disturbance to residents who could be intimidated by intoxicated groups or individuals leaving the premises.

Prevention of public nuisance

Noise late at night would disturb local residents and damage likely to be caused to property by some drunken individuals I feel would be inevitable.

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

Protection of children from harm

Many families live close to the premises along queenways and children out in the early to moderately late evening with there parents , many families including my own walk by that way on the way to or from the cinema at oceon village or restaurants in oxford street or the bottom of the high street , would be put at risk of harm from intoxicated individuals . In many case being with their parents would not help them as drunk individuals or groups can be abusive to all concerned and not all parents are able bodied.

I hope that you will take my views in to consideration when making your decision upon this licence and that you will refuse this and all future licences for this now residential area of the city.

Yours Sincerely,

Adrian ford
Managing Director
Mckenzies Furniture

MACK SOUTHAMPTON
49-50 HIGH STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
HAMPSHIRE SO14 2NS

WEBSITE: www.mwmack.co.uk

7 April 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

To whom this may concern,

Please accept this letter as my official objection to the Applications from Nexum Leisure Limited for Alcohol Licenses for the Former McClusky's and New York, New York premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following licence applications:

2009/00612/01SPRN - New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN - McCluskys

My Company operates a Fruit & Vegetable warehouse in Queensway, opposite the proposed premises, that Nexum Leisure Limited has applied for alcohol licenses for both premises stated above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar. I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, that part of Queensway was primarily comprised of commercial buildings and offices.

My Night Staff at times felt threatened by the drunken behaviour in the early hours, when the Night Club was previously open, with few police and security staff in attendance.

It is for this reason that I make this objection:

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and general violent behaviour. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my Company`s property and many others alike, from dunk

M & W MACK LIMITED. REGISTERED OFFICE: 100 FETTER LANE, LONDON EC4A 1BN. REGISTERED NUMBER 447404.

people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows or vandalising cars is something funny to do.

Please DO NOT grant these proposals for an alcohol licenses.

Yours faithfully

L Scott
Divisional Director

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 4/4/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed:

Print Name: Dr James Nixon

Date: 4/4/09

Flat Number: 16
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

TO:
The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 4/4/09

This is my official objection to the Application request submitted by the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York New York premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway. I live at Oceana Boulevard in Briton Street, a residential development opposite the above premises, and I wish to appeal against the following applications:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area was NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I understand that regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area now consists of a mixture of young professionals, public service workers, and people with young families.

I therefore submit my objections below based on the four licensing criteria shown in the Southampton City Council Statement of Licensing Policy (Licensing Act 2003):

- **The prevention of crime and disorder**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **Public Safety**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The prevention of public nuisance**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The protection of children from harm**

WRITE Y

Please d

Signed:

Print Name: Dr. James Nixon

Date: 4/4/09

Flat Number: 16
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

12 COOPERS COURT
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3EN

5 April 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Dear Sir

APPLICATIONS 2009/00612/01SPRN – NEW YORK NEW YORK
2009/00580/01SPRN - MCCLUSKYS

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the two above applications.

I have lived in this development since it was built nearly eight years ago, so I can well remember the totally unacceptable problems of extreme noise, petty vandalism and drunken violence which plagued the area when these establishments were last allowed to operate.

A previous application to reopen the premises was, quite rightly, refused by the Council. The reasons for this refusal remain pertinent to this new application, and, indeed, are even more relevant now that the area has become a pleasant residential location as the Council has encouraged further extensive building of new flats. The last thing this burgeoning residential community, which has been enhanced by the recent provision of a convenience store, the imminent opening of a doctors surgery and the most welcome improvements to the roads/ pavements, needs is to have such a disruptive neighbour.

Whilst recognizing the importance of the night time economy to the city I believe that there are well established areas for late night entertainement venues, such as Above Bar and Leisure World, where there is limited adjoining residential development. Surely, if there really is the need for another nightclub in the city it should be located in such an area. A night club offering live music, topless dancing and opening to 5am has no place in this

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

residential location. In addition I believe there are clear benefits in containing the disruptive behaviour associated such establishments to specific zones rather than spreading the police presence over a wider area.

I trust that the Council will take notice of the strong feelings of its' Council Tax payers and not permit this application which would lead to a huge diminution in the quality of life in this area and raise the prospect of the individuals and families who have chosen to make their home here reconsidering that decision.

Yours faithfully

Steve Westhorpe

12 COOPERS COURT
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3EN

5 April 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Dear Sir

APPLICATIONS 2009/00612/01SPRN - NEW YORK NEW YORK
2009/00580/01SPRN - MCCLUSKYS

Please can you note my objections to the above applications on the following grounds:-

1] the adverse impact on the quality of life for those living in the hundreds of flats in the vicinity with noise vandalism and drunken violence throughout the early hours of the morning and the prospect of constantly interrupted sleep - I do not think that the owners intention of using notices asking customers to leave quietly will have much influence on this problem

2] there are already many nightclubs in established areas where there are fewer residential properties and it would make sense to restrict any extra nightclubs to these areas

Yours faithfully

Rebecca Westhorpe

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

Flat number 23
Oceana Boulevard

D YOUNG & CO

CHARTERED PATENT ATTORNEYS
EUROPEAN PATENT ATTORNEYS
EUROPEAN TRADE MARK ATTORNEYS
EUROPEAN DESIGN ATTORNEYS

A list of partners is available at
www.dyoung.com or on request

BRITON HOUSE
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3EB

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
SOUTHAMPTON
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my company's official objection to the Application from Nexum Leisure Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York

To whom it may concern, we are a long established business on Briton Street, which is adjacent to the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol premises & entertainment license for the premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton Street was plagued with numerous issues.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton Street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton Street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operates large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of low cost drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton Street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton Street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that

RECEIVED
- 8 APR 2009

LONDON OFFICE 120 HOLBORN, LONDON EC1N 2DY TELEPHONE: +44 (0) 20 7269 8550 FAX: +44 (0) 20 7269 8555
ISDN FAX: +44 (0) 23 80719888 EMAIL: mail@dyoung.co.uk WEBSITE: www.dyoung.com DX.0078 LONDON.CHANCERY LANE

the proposed nightclub is adjacent to our business property which would be an easy target for drunken vandals. We as a business have previously experienced anti-social behaviour under the previous occupiers of New York New York. Members of staff who report for work, have been confronted with issues from the previous night. Finding such issues as litter, damage to plants, cigarette ends, vomiting and urine either on or adjacent to our property.
There already exists a significant litter issue surrounding our property from other late night visitors passing our property, which is not currently resolved by the local authorities. This is currently being cleaned up at our own expense.
We strongly feel that this will significantly increase this issue and degrade the area in general, particularly in light of the recent works carried out to improve the street.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular our staff and visitors would be at risk if the license was granted to open all day as per the application. Staff would be vulnerable to harassment by people drawn to the area due to the club being potentially open all day, which would clearly jeopardise their safety.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the club queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this adjacent to our premises. As a business we have previously experienced noise issues coming through the walls from the club during our working hours. If the club opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the day and into the night until 5am.

The Protection of Children from Harm
I understand young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton Street. Briton Street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

Name: Pasquale Lorusso

Facilities Manager

Signed on behalf of D Young & Co:

From: Licensing
Sent: 07 April 2009 19:20
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Miss C A Bemand has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 07/04/2009 19:20:09 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Miss C A Bemand
Address: 9 Coopers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3EN

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives
Comments:
We raise the following objections in relation to this licence, in particular the intention to serve alcohol and open until 5 am each night:
o Briton Street is now a largely residential area and should be treated as per the licence agreement for premises in Ocean Village- acknowledging this and only allowing licences until 11pm.
o As a residential area, Briton Street previously suffered from unacceptable levels of anti-social behaviour relating to noise, decency and safety.
o Music could be heard in our home from the old premises until the early hours of the morning, even with double glazing closed. This was not just restricted to weekends and invaded every evening of our week.

o Noise pollution also extended to patrons leaving the premises in a drunk and disorderly manner along Oriental Terrace (directly beneath our window)- this was often extensive and included fighting and foul language well past the licenced hours.
o Refuse and damage to communal property was not unusual and directly impacted our service charges e.g. cleaning of communal bin stores used as public lavatories, repairing damage to doors and windows, re-painting surfaces- above and beyond normal wear and tear frequency of repair.
o Our right to live in a decent community was blighted by the sale of drugs, fighting and indecent exposure including sexual activity directly on our street.
o Personal safety for both the patrons and residents would be compromised through serious assaults and incidents occurring between patrons- emergency responses from the Police and Ambulance were frequently required.

We are not convinced that the notice to ask patrons to leave quietly will have any impact and are particularly concerned that drunk and disorderly patrons will be 'dumped' on Briton Street.
Check 21 and Pub Watch membership do not alleviate any of the above concerns as it is the licence until 5am that will directly impact on the premises becoming a hotspot for patrons seeking entertainment once Ocean Village and Oxford Street premises stop serving alcohol (they would usually migrate to the city centre High Street and Bedford Place areas). Drunk and disorderly activity will surely increase in what is now a highly developed residential area as a result.
The impact on our quality of life is simply not acceptable, especially recognising the growing community of young families within the new residential developments.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 08 April 2009 13:17
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr Richard Amundson has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 08/04/2009 13:16:37 from IP :

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Mr Richard Amundson

Address:
24 Goldsmiths Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3ED

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Local Neighbourhood Group

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:
The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

There is a public footpath called Oriental Walk which goes through and is in very close proximity to five residential buildings, from this footpath there is also easy access to private garages and cars parked in allocated spaces. This footpath runs from the High Street to Queensway ending across the road from New York New New York's entrance. I am concerned that granting a premises licence especially with very late hours would increase the number of people using this path and lead to crime and disorder in relation to parked cars and noise nuisance from rowdy people late at night.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Richard Amundson

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Renata Mazik
Sent: 08 April 2009 14:56
To: Licensing
Subject: Objection

Renata Mazik
163 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HW

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street.

This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street.
Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.
I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Regards,
Renata
tel.

Surfing the web just got more rewarding. Download the New Internet Explorer 8

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

Flat number 36
Oceana Boulevard

From: Lynette Bowen [uk]
Sent: 08 April 2009 15:52
To: Licensing
Subject: Licensing objection
To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of flat 73 Oceana Boulevard in Briton Street and have serious concern with regard to the application of the alcohol licences for the sites formerly McCluskys and New Yorks.

This area of town is now predominantely residential and having a night club open to all hours is not appropriate for this part of town.

I object upon the grounds that it will encourage drunk and disordely behaviour in the area, leading to potential crimes such as vandalism to property, fighting, noise and public nuisance.

Yours Faithfully,

Lynette Bowen

Share your photos with Windows Live Photos – Free. Try it Now!

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

To whom this may concern,

Please accept this letter as my official objection to the Applications from Nexum Leisure Limited for Alcohol Licenses for the Former McClusky's and New York, New York premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following licence applications:

2009/00612/01SPRN - New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN - McCluskys

I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and a very large number of other residents in the buildings, on and around Briton Street, that Nexum Leisure Limited has applied for alcohol licenses for both premises stated above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar. I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton Street was not a residential area and primarily comprised of commercial buildings.

Since 2004 the regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House, Merchants Quarter and several other residential dwellings in the area. This area is now what I would class a sophisticated, "young professional" area and also has young families as tenants within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties, we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down. I can honestly say that if I or any of the purchasers had known the nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your four licensing objectives, that I make this objection:

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and general violent behaviour. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area, that crime and disorder would not dramatically increase? I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat of vandalism and crime of

my property and many others alike, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows or vandalising cars is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above, the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do so in West Quay or Bedford Place where there are plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm to the public. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar in this quiet residential area.

- The prevention of public nuisance

Public nuisance can count as noise and you can only imagine what it would be like living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children or a job to be rested and prepared for in the morning. It would be a constant life of disrupted sleep created by noise and nuisance. I, as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will also cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I do not have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone can see what danger, media frenzy and nuisance granting these licenses would cause.

<u>Please DO NOT grant these proposals for alcohol licenses.</u>

Yours faithfully,

Joao Assuncao

Flat 87, Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3HU

From: Licensing
Sent: 08 April 2009 18:59
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
J.Rowsell has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 08/04/2009 18:58:39 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
J.Rowsell
Address:
8 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3HF
Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident
Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I strongly object to this application on the grounds that if a licence to sell alcohol in a premises that will be open till 5am will result in the following social disturbance issues for nearby residents :
* Drunken behaviour by customers causing shouting and load noises disturbing the peace.
* Vandalism to prperty and cars in Briton Street and Queensway.
* Increased amount of litter and bodily fluids in the vicinity of the residential area.
* This would also have a negative result in ability to sell or lease residential property.
* Resulting in lowering the value of the residential property.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Ms Sarah Taggart
Flat 4
6 Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3ES

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

6th April 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.

The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Taggart

Joe Moore
13 Chandler Court
Merchants Quarter
Briton St
Southampton
Hants
SO14 3EZ

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team

Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

8th April 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely,

Joe Moore

Flat 4, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME:

SIGNED.

Flat 5, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME:

CHRIS RICHARDS

SIGNED:

Flat 5, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: OLIVER DORMON

SIGNED:

Flat 10, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: DOUGLAS SUTHERLAND

SIGNED:

Flat 9, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: DR. N. SAMBU

SIGNED:

Flat 10, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Ellen McCARTHY

SIGNED:

Flat 17, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Z. MST

SIGNED:

Flat 35, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
09 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: LABROUSSE Delphine

SIGNED:

From: Licensing
Sent: 09 April 2009 14:25
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)
PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Andrew Crowley has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.
Comments were submitted at 09/04/2009 14:24:58 from IP
Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
Andrew Crowley

Address:
Select Education
10A Queensway
Southampton
Postcode:
SO14 3AZ

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Trader

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Dear Sir/Madam

As we are literally a few metres down Queensway from the premises in question, I must say that frankly I am appalled at the request for a licence of any sort for NewYorkNewYork. Since the previous club ceased to operate, we have experienced an unparalleled period of peace, quiet, no vandalism, no mess, no graffiti, no theft

and no threats to staff and visitors. I wish to lodge the strongest possible objection on the following grounds:

1. As an education service, we are open from 0700 - 1800 each day and also hold weekly evening training sessions. Also, at various times we will have children of all ages visiting our premises. Suffice to say that when the previous clubs were functioning, our visiting schools and children had some pretty nasty experiences from the left overs of a night out including abuse, vomit, condoms and urine.
2. The treatment that my staff and some visitors received especially for early morning and late evening sessions was sometimes terrifying and was a public safety issue.
3. Our premises were regularly vandalised - signs, lights, doorway - regularly damaged, broken, covered in grafffiti.
4. In conjunction with the above, there were also clear issues of public nuisance as our entrance canopy was frequented by people exiting from the clubs who would leave interesting items such as needles and condoms in the open porch area. The area around our entrance was also regularly used as a public urinal and depository for vomit, bottles and glasses. Worst of all, we often find drunks sleeping off their excesses when we arrived for work in the morning.

I trust that the above comments will be respected and taken note of in what I sincerely hope will result in the Late Licence Application being refused. Please contact me if I may be of further assistance or if I can provide more information.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Crowley, Business Manager.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 09 April 2009 15:19
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

vikki upchurch has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 09/04/2009 15:18:48 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ
Licence Description:
Case Officer:
Customer Details

Name:
vikki upchurch

Address:
23 goldsmiths court, 2 briton street, southampton

Postcode:
so14 3ed

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.
I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway.
Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.
Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:
The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.
I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.
My maain concern is that there is a public footpath called Oriental Walk which goes through and is in very close proximity to five residential buildings, from this footpath there is also easy access to private garages and cars parked in allocated spaces. This footpath runs from the High Street to Queensway ending opposite McClusky's Bar. I am concerned that granting a premises licence especially with very late hours would increase the number of people using this path and lead to crime and disorder in relation to parked cars and noise nuisance from rowdy people late at night. Should this go ahead locked gates would need to be erected and paid for by the council to provide security of residents and their property With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.
As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 09 April 2009 15:39
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Benjamin Rowe has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 09/04/2009 15:38:39 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Benjamin Rowe

Address:
Flat 23 Goldsmiths Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3ED

Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:

Objection Type:

Comments:
Flat 23 Goldsmiths Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3ED
The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

9th April 2009
To whom it may concern,
I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.
I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway.
Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.
Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:
The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.
I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.
With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.
As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely,

Benjamin Rowe

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

RECEIVED
14 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that precedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do at Leisure World where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. There is also the issue of people being attacked in the unlit Queens Park next to Oceana Boulevard.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning or just trying to relax at the weekend? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable. There would also be extra traffic noise from taxis picking up and dropping off.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours sincerely

JOLANTA GIEL

Flat number 38
Oceana Boulevard

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
Po Box 1344

Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Jenny Baker
162 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton
SO14 3HW

RECEIVED
14 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

8/4/09

Dear Sir/Madam:

I would like to raise an objection for the reopening of New Yorks + McCluskys night clubs.

I have lived now in town for 2 years and I appreciate a level of noise, but I would not have chosen to have lived near a night club. This will cause alot of noise, antisocial behaviour, potential fights and in turn reduce the value of my property.

In addition the garage door 2 the flats is opposite the club, which would mean that people could slip in, cause mayhem, damage cars + property + access flats.

I am very disappointed that this has ever been considered

But please note my objection as I am happy to take this further

Thanks

RECEIVED
14 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Miss LJ Drummond
89 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3HU

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this email as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- **The protection of children from harm**

My partner has a young child of 5 who stays with us each weekend. Her bedroom faces out onto Briton Street and would therefore be subject to any noise disturbances that are bound to happen within the surrounding area. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

- **The prevention of crime and disorder**

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- **Public Safety**

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- **The prevention of public nuisance**

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Laura Drummond

the Licensing Officer
Southampton City Council
Southampton
SO15 1YG

Mr. G.L. TAYLOR
9, Talbot Court,
Queensway,
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

RECEIVED
14 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

11th April 2009

Dear ~~Sir or Madam~~,

re: Licensing applications for former 'New York, New York', 2 Queensway and 'McCluskys', 8 Queensway, Southampton.

I am writing in objection to the above application.

Since the last applications in this respect in 2005, the Queensway/Brinton St. area has become predominantly residential in character. The recently completed Oceana Boulevard apartment complex is now only metres from the old 'New York, New York' entrance. There are now a number of occupied apartments to the immediate rear of

the proposed establishments in Orchard Place.

The area is well served by restaurants and other licensed establishments, which do not raise the same concerns as those in the application in consideration. There is currently no need for any more, especially nightclubs open until the early hours.

Given the area's current reputation as the 'restaurant district' of Southampton, and its predominantly residential character I believe the application under consideration to be wholly inappropriate.

When the establishments in question operated previously the lower Queensway area was notorious for incidents of public nuisance, incidents of violence and vandalism, and urination in the street and doorways. Local residents felt unsafe in the vicinity of these establishments, when open.

A number of my neighbours and myself have direct experience of this, which can be directly attributable to the clientel frequenting the establishments in question.

Since they have been closed crime and disorder, public nuisance and threats to public safety have significantly diminished. My concern is that these issues will appear again almost immediately should the application be ~~considered~~ granted.

Thank you for your due consideration.

Yours Faithfully,

GARY TAYLOR

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 12 April 2009.

Re: New York New York & McCluskys Applications – Nexum Leisure Ltd

I am writing to express my concern in relation to the two Applications below, submitted by Nexum Leisure Limited, to re-open the former McClusky's and NY NY premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, requesting 24-hour Alcohol Licenses, and I wish to appeal against the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN - New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN – McCluskys.

The nightclub scene is not for everyone, and consideration should be given as to the appropriateness of a 24-hour nightclub with a license to sell alcohol up to 5 am 7 nights a week being allowed to operate in a residential area. In terms of the health and safety of people living in the area the impact on our Community would be devastating. The whole character of the area has changed since these premises last operated. It is a relatively quiet area for most of the time, with the normal background sounds of life and the living, and people going peacefully about their business, a good place to live, not in the hub of the noise and bustle of the city, and yet conveniently situated with local facilities, as well as for shopping in town.

This is now very much a residential community with a mixture of age groups living here, and from all walks of life, including professionals, public service workers, those with young families, and retirees. With all the improvements that have taken place in this area it does not make any sense at all to re-open these premises, even now the Council are carrying out work to provide new pavements with trees and seating for the residents to enhance the area. It was Southampton City Council who encouraged developers to build affordable properties in this area to enable first time buyers living and working in Southampton to purchase homes, the majority of whom are hard-working people, key to the area, who have taken on mortgages, and have to work. To work efficiently everyone needs a good night's sleep.

To allow the type of establishments being considered to re-open after so much residential development would be a complete about-turn by SCC, and a betrayal of all who live here. It was generally understood by people in the area that the run down properties extending up from the Briton Street / Queensway corner were to be demolished for development, and as far as can be ascertained so far, no solicitor advised their client that there was a possibility of these premises being re-opened. In the past the area was known for its regular outbreaks of fighting in the streets and vandalism by patrons of McCluskys & NYNY, they were renowned for their rowdy, foul-mouthed behaviour fuelled by alcohol.

Nexum Leisure Ltd now want to sell alcohol every night of the year until 5am, and for entertainment through the night they would have an in-house amplified system, with visiting groups (and their groupies) pounding out amplified music; music-based Videos and DVDs; Films; Karaoke; and other adult entertainment, which includes topless dancers, and topless staff serving drinks; all the noise and associated problems would be spilling over into our community. It would be a constant source of nuisance to residents, and very difficult to police due to the number of people attending these clubs, innocent people could be caught up in volatile situations that occur between people who have been subjected to a period of loud music and alcohol. Noise would be an endless source of nuisance, and there would be a constant threat to the safety of the people living in close proximity to these premises, crime would escalate, and everyone in our community would be sitting ducks.

There are so many bars, restaurants, clubs, casinos and nightclubs throughout Southampton that offer adult entertainment, including those close-by in Lower High Street, Oxford Street, and the Ocean Village area, that it would be more appropriate for our community to have some family orientated project introduced into the area, not a nightclub of this nature that would drastically disrupt people's lives in the neighbourhood, and be totally out of place. Nexum Leisure need a suitable site away from residential living, a site similar to the Leisure World complex which is ideally based to make it easily accessible for tourists, and the population of Southampton and surrounding areas, not in the centre of, what is now, a local residential area.

My objections to each of these applications are based on the four licensing criteria shown in the Southampton City Council Statement of Licensing Policy (Licensing Act 2003).

To sum up:

1) The prevention of crime and disorder

Based on my statement above: The likelihood that crime and disorder will soar in our area due to the number of people coming into the area, and the effects of loud music and late-night drinking cannot be denied. Pleasant, reasonable men and women can lose total control as a result of the misuse of alcohol, and there is always a percentage of people who get so hyped up, and out of their heads with booze and music, that all reason vanishes, and this is what the area will have to live with for 364 nights a year:

- Residents will not feel safe in the streets, innocent passers-by will be in the line of fire, subjected to verbal abuse, or worse.
- Car crime will increase, cars parked in Briton Street and Queensway will be at risk of damage or theft every night of the year.
- Homes will be vandalised and at risk of break-ins, people in the area will not feel safe in their own homes.

Nexum Leisure justify their ability to prevent crime and disorder by: a) installing CCTV: b) management risk assessment / DrinkWatch; c) control alcohol consumption by not having a "happy hour" / drink promotion, there will be an unlimited supply of alcohol at a set price; d) anyone who turns up drunk, will not be let in; e) anyone who shows signs of inebriation will be turned out of the club.

a) CCTV is passive observation, it tells us what has happened after an event, as we see in the media, this is a very hit and miss process, it may catch the perpetrator some of the time, but it does not stop crime (ask any victim), and those who intend to commit crime go out to avoid identification. b) It is very difficult to monitor in a crowded, dimly lit environment, and with so many people a lot will slip through the net, and it has not worked in the past. c) The police will confirm that this has not proved to be the case, like 24 hour drinking was supposed to reduce drunkenness, the number of drunk and disorderly cases has increased. d) and e) in each case the individual will be free to roam our area, with the potential of being a public nuisance. Nexum Leisure's responsibilities lie inside the clubs, and begin and end at the club entrances.

2) Public Safety

As demonstrated in 1) above: An ongoing threat to the safety of residents would be present due to the number of patrons visiting the area, and the nature of this business is likely to attract the wrong people into the area, i.e. drug peddlers, and sexual predators, general troublemakers /gangs, and the local vagrants. After a night of clubbing, patrons would be departing, as residents were starting to leave home for work, they would be at risk.

Nexum Leisure have referred to: the standard building regulations, fire safety, number of patrons permitted at any one time (200 max) ****their responsibility is to ensure that the environment within the club is safe for patrons and to eject those who become a source of trouble into the neighbourhood.**

With such high numbers of people coming into our area on a regular basis, residents would be put at risk, we would be concerned for our own personal safety, and that of our families. A police presence would be needed through the night, CCTV surrounding the club would not be sufficient.

3) The prevention of public nuisance

McC+NYNY = noise, disruption, trouble = general public nuisance = sleep deprivation for residents, a wide-awake nightmare for 364 nights a year!

- Loud noises, alcohol/drug induced behaviour of people roaming the streets, sexual predators, broken glass, vomit, urine, litter; residents will not be able to escape this nightly invasion into our lives.
- Patrons arriving and departing in vehicles throughout the day and night; car doors slamming; arguing couples, raised voices, hysterical screaming; groups out of control; vandalism to residents property; passers-by subjected to verbal abuse from rejected drunk and disorderly patrons; trashing groupies leaving their mark.

Nexum Leisure will be: a) placing up notices in the club asking their patrons to leave quietly, and b) will give some consideration to acoustics, and c) refuse.

a) What good will a notice do? But it is all that is required! Are patrons going to read it? Will they care? Even if they are asked to be quiet, will they listen? There is no reasoning with people hyped up by music and alcohol: b) Music, entertainers over the microphone, and the raised voices of the crowd inside are bound to be heard outside in the community, noise travels: c) Refuse-rats could become a neighbourhood problem, food would be served from11pm-5am.

4) **The protection of children from harm**

Children would be at risk: The chances of some underage drinkers getting into the club are high, and they would be vulnerable to having their drinks spiked, and to the other dangers referred to below:

- The streets will not be safe for our children, due to the unsavoury characters that are drawn to events where crowds congregate, the sexual predators (paedophiles) and those who peddle drugs.
- More risk of road accidents as there would be a large increase in vehicles coming and going in Briton Street and Queensway. There would also be the threat of drunken drivers.
- Loud noises disrupt young lives too, it can be challenging enough for parents to get babies and toddlers to sleep, but it can be very difficult to get them back to sleeping soundly again once disturbed.
- Toddlers out walking with their family would be at risk from broken glass through vandalism, cigarette butts, and pavements soiled with vomit, urine and litter.

Nexum Leisure will: a) ensure there are no under age sales; and, b) no person under 18 will be permitted entry.

a) and b) Good, but how can they be so sure among so many people, young people will find a way in if determined enough.

****

The effect it would have on my life:

My flat is on the 6th floor of Oceana Boulevard, and immediately overlooks the Briton Street / Queensway corner, and the main entrance to the nightclub. Noise carries outwards and upward, and the noise from these establishments would penetrate every room in my home, there would be no escaping this intrusion into my life. The source of nuisance would be never-ending 364 days of the year, and would make my life a total misery, a living hell! Nightclubs are ok, BUT NOT ON MY DOORSTEP.

To argue that the lives of residents in the area will not be affected by the entertainment and music taking place inside the nightclubs, is totally unrealistic. Of course the entertainers over microphones, and music will be heard, amplified or un-amplified, in addition there would be the responding sounds from the patrons, they are there to have fun and enjoy themselves, which is as it should be, <u>but not at the expense of the residents in the area.</u> The sounds will carry through the night, with constant noise intruding on the lives of everyone living in the area, and in particular those, like me, in such close proximity to these clubs. I would never knowingly purchase a property in close vicinity to a nightclub, let alone a flat overlooking the main entrance to the nightclub.

The position of my flat is such that I would not be able to get away from the continual pounding music and sounds of the entertainers and patrons inside the crowded nightclubs, it would ruin my ability to work effectively, through lack of sleep (I have a mortgage to pay) and I am early to bed each night as I depart at 5 am each day. Sleep deprivation is a health hazard and the quality of my life would drop to zero. The nightly disturbance would be a constant source of nuisance, not only would my health be adversely affected by the noise emitting from the clubs, there would be the additional sounds of the vehicles driving along Briton Street, and down Queensway dropping off groups of people below my flat throughout the night, with the slamming of car doors, and voices of the patrons as they arrive and depart from the clubs.

In addition, because my home is so close to the proposed nightclub premises I would not feel safe in my own home, for it is a fact that groups of men and women who are hyped up by music and alcohol can get out of control, and turn to threatening the safety of another, just for the hell of it. I have had people try to break into my flat due to the effects of alcohol, after they had left a nearby party in Briton Street. On the 27th September 2008 I was awoken by a group of drunken, foul-mouthed revellers who had found a way into the development. It was 3.15 am. They were banging and kicking my front door, shouting obscenities and trying to force the door handle to get into my home. I was terrified. They finally departed running amok through our development. I was not hurt, but deeply shocked, and reported the incident to the police (ref: SRS042) once I had recovered.

Although the above is an isolated case, it is just another illustration of the dangers that are likely to occur should these nightclubs re-open so close to residential property. People will be partying every night, and with the number of people coming into the area, statistics have proven that a percentage of these will cause trouble of some kind, and the threat would be there 364 nights of the year.

I strongly object to the re-opening of either of these nightclubs
THIS IS A RESIDENTIAL AREA, and
is an unsuitable location for a nightclub.

Please do NOT grant either of these proposals for alcohol licences.

Signed: J M Trevellyan
(Emailed with a signed hard copy in post)

Print Name: JANET MARGUERITE TREVELLYAN

Date:12 APRIL 2009.

Flat Number 21
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON
HANTS SO14 3HF

12 April 2009

Mr Colin Reynolds
21 Goldsmiths Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3ED

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
14 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

8th April 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block on Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.
The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building on Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours Sincerely

Colin Reynolds

From: Licensing
Sent: 14 April 2009 09:04
To: Licensing
Subject: COLLINS - NEW YORK NEW YORK

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Shaun Collins has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 14/04/2009

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Shaun Collins

Address:
200 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3JG

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I object to this licensing application on the grounds that the area around this property is now, in the majority, residential. In order to continue the 'regeneration' of this area the area should remain as is, or the use of buildings should be sympathetis to the residential majority in the atrea.

In addition, having a premises attracting young people and alcohol into the area which would presently be accomodated elsewhere in the city would no doubt lead to more crime and damage occuring to the neighbouring residential properties. This coupled with the increase in alcoho-fuelled aggressive behaviour would make the resedential area an intimidating place on Friday and Saturday evenings.

Finally the playing of loud music until approximately 5am, and the associated noise of people leaving the premises does not compliment the majority residential area and would prevent sleep to residents and in fact be a nuisance to those dwellings nearby.

I trust you take on board my comments when considering this application, please feel free to call me if you wish to discuss.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 11 April 2009 11:35
To: Licensing
Subject: Livingstone - New York New York

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Rachael Livingstone has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 11/04

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Rachael Livingstone

Address:
141 Oceana Boulevard,
Orchard Place,
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HW

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Living right next to the building I feel the noise and the vandalisim that a night club will bring is not suitable for this area. The council are currently rennovating this area with new paving, trees and benches which will be quickly ruined with a nightclub.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 10 April 2009 17:13
To: Licensing
Subject: STEWART - NEW YORK NEW YORK

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Kelly Stewart has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 10/04/2009 17:12

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Kelly Stewart

Address:
31 coopers court
4 Briton street
southampton

Postcode:
so143en

Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am strongly opposed to this bar opening till 5am as I am a resident here and the bar has been open before and caused alot of trouble with fighting outside and dammage to cars in the area. I would also feel unsafe walking home from work.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 10 April 2009 17:39
To: Licensing
Subject: Vardy - New York New York

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Alastair Vardy has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 10/04/2009 17:38:34 fro

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Alastair Vardy

Address:
31 Coopers Court
4 Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
so143en

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:

Comments:
I am strongly opposed to this bar opening.
I am a resident here and when this bar was open before there was constant fighting and brawling, with damage to the cars and property's in the surrounding area. I would not feel safe at night walking home from my work.

There are plenty of other nicer bars in this neibourhood to drink at, we do not need that crap hole opening up again
Thank you!

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 13 April 2009 13:47
To: Licensing
Subject: NI - NEW YORK NEW YORK ?

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr and Mrs Ni has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 13/04/2009

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Mr and Mrs Ni

Address:
64 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Dear Sir or Madam,

As residents of Oceana Boulevard in Briton Street, we wish to register our objection to the proposed application to re-open and extend the licensing hours of the night club, New York, New York, located at 2 Queens Way, Southampton.

2 Queens Way is obviously not a suitable location for a nightclub, because it's in the centre of our housing. The re-open and extended hours of New York, New York will result in drunkenness, anti-social behaviour including loud talk and shouting by drinkers during the night. We feel that the extended licensing hours would cause a major disruption to what is a quite residential area.

We would be gratefull if you would take into account our objections to the re-open and extended hours.

Yours sincerely,

Mr & Mrs Ni

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 11 April 2009 10:59
To: Licensing
Subject: Ansari - New York New York ?

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Salman Ansari has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 11/04/2009 10:59:04 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Salman Ansari

Address:
Flat 274 Oceana Boulevard
Lower Canal Walk
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3JP

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Supporting Representation

Comments:
I wish to OBJECT to this new premises - we already have enough noise over the weekend nights when late-night partyers are rowdy on the streets so this new bar will only exacerbate the problem and it will be happening daily. I have to be up at 5AM for work and I have to sleep early for that. Please consider my plea. Thanks!

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 10 April 2009 11:45
To: Licensing
Subject: GALBRAITH - NEW YORK NEW YORK - invalid part of same rep

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Rebecca Galbraith has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 10/04/2009 11:45:10 fro

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Rebecca Galbraith

Address:
47 Telephone House,
Southampton,

Postcode:
sO14 2NW

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
We have also just noticed than this license application asks for topless dancing by performers and staff. We would object very strongly to this type of establishment opening at all. Southampton needs sustainable development NOT entertainment for niche audiences. We already have to put up with For Your Eyes Only which has made that part of the High Street feel seedy and unsafe and in my view, stunted investment by other A1 and A3 uses.

Please do not grant this license application.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

Flat 59
Telephone House
70 High Street
Southampton S014 2NW

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team
Southampton City council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WO

12.04.09

Dear Sirs

Re: Briton Street, NY nightclub proposed extension to opening hours

I am writing this letter to express my objection to the application for extended opening hours made by NY night club in Briton Street.

With the development of several apartment blocks, Briton Street has become a well established residential area. The City council has invested a large sum of council taxpayers' money to redevelop the environment of this area.

If the relevant premises are allowed to extend their opening hours to 5 am in the morning, this will inevitably lead to instances of noise, crime and anti-social behaviour

Not only will this affect the living standards of local residents, which is reason enough to object to the proposed extension of opening hours, but yet more tax public funds will have to be spent on dealing with crime and anti-social behaviour. The proposed extension of opening hours cuts across and interferes with the efforts of the City council to improve the image of the city.

I sincerely hope that the Committee will take this and no doubt other representations from the local community seriously and reject the application in a forthright and categoric fashion. As a law binding citizen, I for one do not welcome such premises in my local area.

Yours faithfully

Dr Licheng Chang

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Date: 5/4/09.

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed: ....

Print Name: CHRIS THICKETT

Date: 5/4/09

Flat Number: 9
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

TO:
The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 5/4/09.

This is my official objection to the Application request submitted by the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York New York premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway. I live at Oceana Boulevard in Briton Street, a residential development opposite the above premises, and I wish to appeal against the following applications:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area was NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I understand that regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area now consists of a mixture of young professionals, public service workers, and people with young families.

I therefore submit my objections below based on the four licensing criteria shown in the Southampton City Council Statement of Licensing Policy (Licensing Act 2003):

- **The prevention of crime and disorder**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **Public Safety**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The prevention of public nuisance**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The protection of children from harm**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed

Print Name: CHRIS THICKETT

Date: 5/4/09

Flat Number: 9
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Date: 08/04/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed: ...

Print Name: ...B. PAINTER.....

Date: 08/04/02.

Flat Number: 8

Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

105 Oceana Boulevard
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3HW

Dear Sirs,

Re: Licence Application Nos: 2009/00612/01SPRN
2009/00580/01SPRN

Notice of Application for the grant of a Premises Licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 by Nexus Leisure Ltd in respect of premises formerly known as New York New York and McCluskey's 2-8 Queensway, Southampton SO14 3AZ

My wife and I moved to our present address two years ago to be nearer to our daughter and grandchildren. When we purchased our flat we were given to understand by Barratt Developments that the area around Briton Street had been earmarked for residential development and we had no reason from our observations to suspect otherwise. We also noted from the Planning Permission granted on the 16th June 2003 (Section 04) for Oceana Boulevard that proposed retail outlets on the site should not be open for business outside the hours of 07.30 to 22-30. Therefore we are dismayed to learn that Nexus Leisure Ltd are proposing to open a new nightclub providing regulated entertainment and alcohol Mon to Sun 00.00 to 24.00 hrs with late night refreshment 23.00 to 05.00 hrs less than 25 metres from Oceana Boulevard.

Prior to coming to live in Southampton my wife and I had occasion to spend few nights at one of the two hotels in the High Street where we occupied a room at the top of the building facing onto the

High Street. This gave us the unwanted experience of having a bird's eye view of the young people of Southampton spilling out onto the streets in the early hours of the morning from the pubs and clubs of the area. The noise and uncouth behaviour etc., is something which should not be experienced on a nightly basis in a residential area.

There are 281 flats in this development many of them with bedrooms overlooking Bilton Street and Queensway. There are babies and children living here and some elderly people - are they going to be able to sleep? It is intolerable that they should be subjected to the sort of disturbance associated with a 1300 capacity nightclub.

In the past three months at Oceana Boulevard two plate glass entrance doors and one plate glass window have been shattered; at least eight cars in the underground car park have been vandalised and items stolen; also two motor bikes and a number of bicycles have been stolen, and there is a continuous problem with noise and litter from passers-by returning home after frequenting city centre and Oxford Street nightspots. Last weekend we drew our bedroom curtains on Sunday morning to see vomit on the pavement outside our bedroom window and this weekend it was two unfinished takeaway meals thrown on the pavement outside our window.

We feel that the opening of a 1300 capacity night club with a Premises Licence for the supply of alcohol and provision of regulated entertainment 24 hours a day within 25 metres of our development is much more likely to make these problems worse rather than better. This part of the city

is now unquestionably a residential area providing considerable income in the form of Council Tax to the City's budget. People's lives should not be aggravated by the likely noise, bad behaviour and vandalism etc associated with large numbers of people coming into the area and inevitably consuming more alcohol than is good for them.

We, therefore, strongly OPPOSE the licence applications listed above, because we believe the establishment of a new nightclub on this site is certain to increase public noise and nuisance and is very likely to increase the threat of vandalism, crime, disorder and threaten public safety in this residential area. Also, it will undoubtedly devalue the residential property in the Briton Street area.

Yours faithfully

D. G and B. J. TRUPHET

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
P O Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Mrs N Sharrocks
165 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3HW

14th April 2009

Dear Sirs

Please read this as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton.

The reference numbers for these applications are:

2009/00612/01SPRN
2009/00580/01SPRN

I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention and many other resident's at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area where my young family resides with me.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton. At the time when I purchased my property I was 7/12 months pregnant and WOULD NOT have bought the property had I know these establishments were to re-open as opposite a night club is not an appropriate place to bring a child up.

It is for this reason and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

The prevention of crime and disorder - It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a night club within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero? Doubtful. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my property, from dunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

Public Safety - As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar. I quite often attend the gym which is situated within the development but is only accesable via the street and I wouldn't happy walking down the street alone at night if this club was to open.

The prevention of public nuisance - I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

The protection of children from harm - Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep (myself; included), this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Yours faithfully

Nicky Sharrocks

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

12 Chandlers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EZ

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

13th April, 2009

Dear Sirs,

Objection to license application: New York New York, 2 Queens Way, Southampton

We are writing to object to the application for the supply of alcohol and regulated entertainment at New York, New York, 2 Queens Way, Southampton.

The grounds for our objection are as follows:

1. The area is heavily residential, with flats less than 15 yards from the door of the premises, and the noise from both the nightclub and its clientele leaving/entering the premises will be very disruptive to local residents.
2. Briton Street is a quiet and safe residential street. A nightclub in the local area will cause Briton Street and Bernard Street to become cut-throughs from the city centre bars and Leisure World with a potential increased level of petty crime and vandalism.
3. There is already a lack of parking in the area for residents and this will be further exasperated by the opening of such a venue.
4. There has been significant recent development in the area including the building of a large number of new residences. The granting of this licence is likely to negatively impact upon the value of these residences at a time when house-owners are already losing money in their properties.

From discussions with other residents, we are aware that our feelings are shared by many and we trust that these will be taken in to consideration in reaching your decision.

Yours faithfully,

Lucy Christopher & Neil Brooks

25 Guild House
4a Briton Street
SOUTHAMPTON SO14 3EY

RECEIVED
15 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

14 April 2009

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box No. 1344
SOUTHAMPTON S015 1WQ

Dear Sirs

New York, New York/McCluskeys Nightclub

I moved to my present address, which is within Merchants Quarter at Briton Street, in January 2002. It soon became very apparent after a few months that considerable late night/early morning disturbance was being created by the patrons of the above club.

Driving down Queensway in the early hours one was faced with intoxicated club members weaving about in the street and yelling at cars and their occupants; eventually I stopped using that route to my home for safety reasons. My flat bedroom looks on to Oriental Terrace and again in the early hours I was disturbed by shouting club patrons coming through that footway and sometimes throwing cigarettes and bottles into the shrubbery. Occasionally one had to suffer the indignity of seeing patrons vomiting/urinating on the footway at various points through to the High Street.

I have to say that I was delighted when the license for the two properties was removed and even more delighted when a subsequent attempt to obtain a new license was rejected.

You will, of course, be aware that there has been considerable development within the lower part of the High Street and in Briton Street (the latter pavement/road area is presently being completely redesigned, at considerable expense to improve the general area). The development is predominantly residential.

I am extremely surprised, and very disappointed, to find that the above clubs are yet again seeking to obtain a license, I understand with a 5.0am license. There is no doubt that all the problems we residents previously had to tolerate will be repeated; now by considerably more residents. Incidentally the new pavement outside the clubs premises will become a public ashtray now that smoking is prohibited inside.

Every local resident I speak to is of the same opinion as me that the City Council should reject this further application on the grounds that there will be very increased noise, possible vandalism and litter in a now quiet large residential area.

I do hope that the Licensing Team will reject this latest application from the above names Clubs.

Yours faithfully

GARY WHITAKER

From: Licensing
Sent: 14 April 2009 16:30
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Neal Rudkin has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 14/04/2009

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Neal Rudkin

Address:
Flat 186,
Oceana Boulevard,
Lower Canal Walk,

Postcode:
SO143JG

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:

Objection Type:

Comments:
I feel that opening a nightclub, especially one with such long opening hours, in this area will create a lot of nuisance for local residents. As the area is more residential than commercial, the noise, litter and drunken behaviour that will be generated by this club, is not in keeping with the areas character. It is my belief, that what is currently a peaceful, safe neighbourhood, will become a no-go area at night, due to the behaviour of the clubs customers and could result in an increase in vandalism and minor criminal actions in the surrounding area.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 15 April 2009 10:14
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Callum Donnelly has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2009 10

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Callum Donnelly

Address:
104 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HW

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:

Objection Type:

Comments:
I currently live in the building opposite the premises - Oceana Boulevard. I strongly object to opening of the nightclub as the area is now predominantly residential. A number of residents bought properties with reassurance that the premises would be demolished and the only likely use would be residential or possibly retail (i.e. a convenience store). The noise pollution would be intolerable, especially if a licence is granted until 5 am. Oceana Boulevard/Briton Street is now an area with residents from a variety of age groups, a nightclub in an area where young families and elderly couples are commonplace is a very bad idea. I would also be concerned about an increase in alcohol related crime, specifically vandalism and intimidating behaviour with drunken people falling out of a club just yards away from our front doors. It is not a case of 'not on my doorstep' but the majority of other clubs in Southampton are in appropriate areas where residential population is minimal such as Leisure World and Bedford Place. Opening a club in the heart of a densely populated residential area is asking for trouble, especially when you consider the reputation of the previous clubs situated on the premises. Here's hoping common sense prevails!

Thanks
Callum

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 15 April 2009 12:40
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Bruce Granger has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2009 12:39:38 fro

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Bruce Granger

Address:
99 oceana boulevard
Briton Streeet
Sothampton

Postcode:
SO 14 3HU

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Supporting Representation

Comments:
Objecting to licencing of McCluskey's and New York New York night Clubs based on:
-current experience of vandalism /theft in area likely to deteriote further.

-objective should be to invest in improvinng surround as residential area-see current works and local developments.

-obvious concern with impact on propert values and general enironment/noise /charachter of area etc.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 15 April 2009 18:29
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Richard Rombouts has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 15/04/2009 18:28:40 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Richard Rombouts

Address:
Flat 51 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am writing to object to the above application on the ground of potential public nuisance. I am greatly concerned that the proposal, if it goes ahead, will have significant detrimental effects on the living area. As a local resident this is a matter of concern which affects me and other local residents who live in the Oceana Boulevard apartment block facing Briton Street (over 50 addresses).

The proposed location is not suitable for a night club because it is in the centre of a recently developed residential area. I live across the road from the proposed entrance on the 1st floor (my bedroom is directly overlooking the entrance to New York, New York) and I am deeply concerned about the potential nuisance this nightclub will have.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 16 April 2009 10:03
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Lee Crudgington has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 16/04/2009 10:02:31 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Lee Crudgington

Address:
Flat 20 Coopers Court,
4 Briton Street, Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3EN

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I object to this licence application because of the certainty of noise damage and vandalism it would bring to an entirely residential area.

While this building was previously operated as a nightclub, this was years before there were any flats nearby.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

Flat 30, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: BADER ALMUTAIRI

Flat 38, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McCluskys and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton.

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME:

Nathalie Mein

SIGNED:

Flat 6, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: C. REECE
6 City Court

Flat 33, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: RAY DEVINE
APARTMENT 33
CITY COURT
SOTON

SIGNED:

Flat 46, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Carolin Palmer

SIGNED:

Flat 16, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
16 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application ~~from the~~ Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Ali Alshehri

SIGNED:

Flat 39, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

RECEIVED
17 APR 2009

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: ALAN PATTON

SIGNED:

From: Licensing
Sent: 19 April 2009 18:31
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/0

Darren Baker has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 19/04/2009 18:31:08 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Darren Baker

Address:
Flat 7
6 Briton Street
Southampton
Hampshire

Postcode:
SO14 3ES

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:

Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am writing to lodge an objection regarding the reapplication of the licence to McClusky's, 8 Queens Way and New York nightclub, 2 Queens Way, Southampton and the proposal to transform both of these premises into a 'superclub'.

As a resident of 6 Briton Street, about 50 metres from the club entrance, I am very against the reopening of both these premises. When I first purchased my property on Briton Street five years ago, both premises were open for business and made life very unpleasant for local residents for the following reasons: the bass noise from the loud music could be heard from within the flats, especially at weekends, until closing time at 2am; from closing time at 2am, shouts, screams and loud singing from people leaving the nightclub could be heard outside in the street; cars were often being vandalised including wing mirrors being broken; rubbish, and even vomit, was often found in the doorways of the communal entrances.

However, all these problems have now stopped since the closure of both McClusky's and New York nightclub following the council's refusal to renew the licenses in 2005.

With the amount of new housing attracting many professionals into the city, Briton Street has become a desirable residential area during the past few years. Is a 'superclub', with the reputation of McClusky's and the New York nightclub, really what Southampton Council would agree to in the centre of this up and coming new community? After all, the council is investing a lot of money in Briton Street with the redevelopment of the road and pavements. People are spending a lot of money on these properties and agreeing to reissue the licences is going to have a devastating effect on the market value of our properties, the quality of living and the safety of all residents with up to 1300 clubbers on our doorsteps.

I was interested to read in the Echo, following the protest by local residents, that Nexum chief executive Paul Kinsey said he would target 19 to 24-year-old clubbers and was not looking to attract "undesirable characters" but "people with good jobs". With the addition of a closing time of 5am and "topless dancing on select nights" I do not understand how this would attract anything but the "undesirable characters" Mr Kinsey is talking about. Do the council agree this would be a "better quality club than anything in the town" and attract a "good quality clubbing crowd"?

Having spoken to other residents regarding this matter I know there is a very strong feeling that a bar/nightclub is not needed or welcome in this area. There are other locations possible for a nightclub like the one proposed that would not damage the quality of living for the many residents that have been encouraged to invest in the city.

I look forward to hearing what the decision will be in the future.

Darren Baker
Flat 7
6 Briton Street
Southampton
Hampshire
SO14 3ES

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Claire Smith
Sent: 19 April 2009 12:42
To: Licensing
Subject: Public Access For Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

My husband and I own a property,flat 200 at Oceana Boulevard.
We currently rent out this property and feel this has been successful because of the proposed regeneration of the area and the quieter nature of the surrounding streets in recent years.
Whilst we appreciate that this is still a town centre location we do not feel it at all appropriate to open a night club facility so close to residential properties. The late hours that the club would open,would no doubt increase noise levels,encourage alcohol fuelled aggressive behaviour and the need for increased emergency calls due to complaints of noise and unrest.

We both strongly object to the current proposal and would hope that it will be declined for all of the above reasons.

Mr and Mrs T. G. Smith
The Cottage
Dappers Lane
Angmering
West Sussex
BN16 4EN

From Claire Smith

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Mr F Taggart
403 Imperial Apartments
South Western House
Canute Road
SO14 3AL

19th April 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

I live in a residential block close to Briton Street. At present there is one restaurant called POSH and no other pub, bar or club in the vicinity of Briton Street or Queensway. Briton Street is a quiet mainly residential street and I am concerned that two premises opening in this area is going to attract a large number of people to this otherwise quiet road.

Section 4(2) of the Licensing act 2003 states the licensing objectives, two of which are:

The prevention of crime and disorder.

The prevention of public nuisance.

I feel that granting a premises licence with licensable activities finishing after 23:00 would increase disorder and public nuisance in the area from people who had been drinking either entering or leaving the premises and would encourage large groups of people to the area, which would contravene the licensing objectives.

With the introduction of the no smoking regulations in 2007 there has been an increase in the number of people congregating outside of premises which leads to an increase in noise nuisance, which I believe would also occur at this premises.

As I live in a residential building close to Briton Street I believe that granting a premises licence would have a large detrimental effect upon my life in regards to any noise emanating from the premises and from any rowdy customers that had come from the premises. This would affect me all year round but would be especially prevalent during the summer months when I am likely to have my windows open throughout the night and there are more people on the street, and because in the warmer weather people tend to stay around a premises longer thus increasing the potential for disorder and nuisance.

Yours sincerely,

RECEIVED
21 APR 2009

From: Licensing
Sent: 21 April 2009 10:05
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

David Robinson has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 21/04/2009 10:04:31 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
David Robinson

Address:
2 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Briton Street

Postcode:
SO14 3HL

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:

Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I object strongly to this application because it will greatly impose on the quiet enjoyment of my property. When this was purchased it was in a 'disadvantaged area' which the government allowed Stamp Duty relief on to bring the area 'up' and make it residential rather than commercial. This proposal will do the opposite, and instigate much more noise to the area, with intoxicated young people, taxis, and the inevitable police cars, etc. Vandalism which we already have a problem with will undoubtably increase with the volume of people. As will the vomit and urine in the vicinity. Also the safety of residents will I feel decrease, as they are already sometimes followed into their premises by strangers pretending they live there. The bravado created by alcohol will increase this aspect. The cost to the community, and the council, would be too great to allow this.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: JOHN BAKER
Sent: 21 April 2009 21:34
To: Licensing
Subject: Objection to Applications: 2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York, 2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

John A Baker
111 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
SOUTHAMPTON
Hampshire
SO14 3HW

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

21 April 2009

Dear Sirs,

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

This email is my objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I confirm that I wish to appeal to the applications detailed below;

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is located opposite the above-mentioned premises on Briton Street/Queensway. I see that the Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises.

When the above premises were last used as a nightclub, Briton Street was a commercial area with the City Court, Customs House and Telephone House all being used during normal working hours.
Now all those premises have been replaced with residential dwellings, including Oceana Boulevard, City Court, and Telephone House. Many families are now moving in to the area to take advantage of St John's Infant and Nursery school at the end of Briton Street.
Briton Street is now a residential area, and the Council have recognised this by pumping in £6 million to regenerate the city centre, including the excellent improvements to Briton Street, which are still underway.

When I purchased my flat I was made aware that the premises in question had planning permission for residential use. If I had known that these nightclubs were to be re-opened I would not have purchased a property in this area of Southampton.

It is for this, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The Prevention of Crime and Disorder

Take a look at the areas where pubs and clubs are located. In the late evening it is not unusual to see the police in attendance, and young people drunk in the street. Is opening a night club with a ‘late license’, and within a residential area really not going to increase crime and disorder?
This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of the properties in Briton Street, from dunk people leaving the nightclub that may think that petty vandalism and smashing windows is ‘fun’!

- Public Safety

As per the above, public and residents safety will be put at risk.
The opening of these clubs in a residential area will reduce public safety. Currently, Southampton’s ‘late night’ clubs are located away from residential areas. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The Prevention of Public Nuisance

I am a shift worker, sometimes I have to leave for work at 0500 and I do not want to have to negotiate groups of people leaving the club as I am on my way to work. I do not want to live opposite a nightclub that plays dance music until 0500! I want to sleep. I am an Air Traffic Controller – I have to have a good night’s sleep and be rested for the morning. If this permission is granted it will be a constant hell, of noise and nuisance. I am a council tax payer and do not find this acceptable.

- The Protection of Children from Harm

As stated earlier, young families live in this area. What state is the surrounding area going to be in after the club closes in the morning? The vandalism previously mentioned will surely endanger children.

In conclusion, this proposal to issue an alcohol license to Nexum Company for either of the locations is madness. By granting any applications for licenses, the Council are going to cause a big nuisance to a large number of local residents. This will also alienate a large number of council taxpayers.

I urge you NOT to grant these applications for alcohol licenses.

John A Baker

From: Licensing
Sent: 22 April 2009 08:03
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Natalie Allen has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 22/04/2009 08:02:44 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Natalie Allen

Address:
Apartment 70
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Email:

Phone Number:

Representation Type:

Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I am writing to object to the licence application for New York, New York and McCluskey's on the grounds of potential public nuisance, increase noise during unsocialable hours. My apartment although is on the 9th floor, my bedroom faces one of the entrances to the site in question. I can hear people walking along in the street at night, therefore increase in people will naturally create an increase in noise. I am also confident that when people will be leaving the venue, we will experience an increase in vandalism. I own my property and since my purchase 4 years ago (I brought a year before I moved in), the nightclub was closed. I would never had even considered the purchase if a nightclub was going to be granted a further licence. Clearly during this period the surroundings of the nightclub have changed to residential rather than social venues. Therefore I do not wish for the licence to be granted as it so no longer an appropriate location for a nightclub. If granted the licence, all our properties will reduce significantly in value. I already experience increase in noise from 2 social venues in my surrounding area, POSH and the Dockers Club behind New York New York. Numerious residents have complained to both of these venues in the past due to excessive noise in the early hours of the morning. I am sure you will appreciate all properties have reduced in equity in this current climate, therefore if value is reduced further by the licensing being approved, a large proportion our apartments will fall into negative equity. This would be highly unacceptable. Therefore on all the above reasons I do not wish for the license to be granted.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 22 April 2009 10:12
To: Licensing
Subject: Farragher - NYNY

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Donna Farragher has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 22/04/2009 10:11:57 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Donna Farragher

Address:
74 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Dear Sir,

As a resident of Briton Street I am disturbed to note this application and I trust the licensing committee will see sense and dismiss this at their earliest opportunity.

There are many reasons to object, the obvious ones being; the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance, vandalism and protecting children from harm.

Southampton absolutely does not need a nightclub or bar in this part of town. It would clearly link revelers between Ocean Village, Oxford Street to bars like Walkabout at the bottom of the High Street and the sheer number of drunken incidents; noise and general nuisance would be incredible. Oceana Boulevard, directly opposite, would become a prime target for incidents of drunken vandalism, as would the beautiful Queens Park.

I am aware this was a previously licensed venue, but that was well before Briton Street became a residential area. I used to frequent New York New York as a teenager and remember witnessing many fights outside in the street. On one occasion I ended up accompanying a friend to Southampton General Hospital as he had been head butted and lost a tooth directly outside the venue.

The general noise upon leaving the venue was something I remember well, not to mention the regular flashing blue police lights and stench from the nearby burger vans are instant memories.

I would estimate 2000 people live on or adjacent to Briton Street and to put a nightclub slap bang in the middle of it all is a ridiculous notion, especially when Southampton City Council are currently spending hundreds of thousands of pounds redeveloping the street.

From a personal point of view we have a 15 month old child whose bedroom is roughly 15 metres from the entrance to the venue, how is he supposed to sleep with all the goings on associated with a licensed venue until way after 5am when all the revelers / taxis / food outlets have gone home?

Why was this license not applied for prior to all the redevelopment that has gone on? And why have Barratt's sold a plot of land that was set aside for housing to an entertainment company?

I hope common sense prevails and this application is thrown out.

Donna Farragher

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Pete Devereux
Sent: 22 April 2009 10:31
To: Licensing
Subject: Licensing Objection
Dear Sirs

Re: 2009/00612/01SPRN & 2009/00580/01SPRN

As a resident of Briton Street I am disturbed to note this application and I trust the licensing committee will see sense and dismiss this at their earliest opportunity.

There are many reasons to object, the obvious ones being; the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance, vandalism and protecting children from harm.
Southampton absolutely does not need a nightclub or bar in this part of town. It would clearly link revelers between Ocean Village, Oxford Street to bars like Walkabout at the bottom of the High Street and the sheer number of drunken incidents, noise and general nuisance would be incredible. Oceana Boulevard, directly opposite, would become a prime target for incidents of drunken vandalism, as would the beautiful Queens Park.

I am aware this was a previously licensed venue, but that was well before Briton Street became a residential area. I used to frequent both New York New York & McClusky's as a teenager and remember witnessing many fights outside in the street. On one occasion I ended up accompanying a friend to Southampton General Hospital as he had been head butted and lost a tooth directly outside the venue.
The general noise upon leaving the venue was something I remember well, not to mention the regular flashing blue police lights and stench from the nearby burger vans are instant memories.
I would estimate 2000 people live on or adjacent to Briton Street and to put a nightclub slap bang in the middle of it all is a ridiculous notion especially when you, Southampton City Council, are currently spending hundreds of thousands of pounds redeveloping the street.

From a personal point of view we have a 15 month old child whose bedroom is roughly 15 metres from the entrance to the venue, how is he supposed to sleep with all the goings on associated with a licensed venue until way after 5am when all the revelers / taxis / food outlets have gone home?
Why was this license not applied for prior to all the redevelopment that has gone on? And why have Barratt's sold a plot of land that was set aside for housing to an entertainment company?

I do hope common sense prevails and this application is thrown out.

Yours sincerely,

Pete Devereux

74 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street Southampton SO14 3HU

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 17/04/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

RECEIVED
22 APR 2009

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed: .....

Print Name: .....

Date:.....

Flat Number:.....
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

TO:
The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date:

This is my official objection to the Application request submitted by the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the former McClusky's and New York New York premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway. I live at Oceana Boulevard in Briton Street, a residential development opposite the above premises, and I wish to appeal against the following applications:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area was NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I understand that regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area now consists of a mixture of young professionals, public service workers, and people with young families.

I therefore submit my objections below based on the four licensing criteria shown in the Southampton City Council Statement of Licensing Policy (Licensing Act 2003):

- **The prevention of crime and disorder**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **Public Safety**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The prevention of public nuisance**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

- **The protection of children from harm**

WRITE YOUR OBJECTION

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed: ....

Print Name: Angela Davies

Date: 17/04/09

Flat Number: 22
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

Lesley McIvor
Flat 7 Goldsmith Court
2 Briton Street
Southampton
Hampshire
SO14 3ED

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

17/04/2009

Dear Sir / Madam,

Reference: Application for License for New York, New York

I am writing to you within the designated appeal time to make you aware of my objections and fears of New York, New York being granted a license.

My residence is situated on the very corner of the High street and Briton Street. It is located by the traffic lights opposite the coop and opposite Telephone House on the first floor. I have been living in this flat for the past 2 and a half years and have made it my home.

I have read the vision for Southampton (see attached) and do not believe that by re-opening the nightclub it will '... encourage further residential use' in this area.

In literature about the French Quarter it gives details of 6 commercial units including cafes, restaurants and a convenience store...not a nightclub. The section about City Centre Management clearly states 'Evening and night time activity will be concentrated in designated zones, away from residential areas'.

I will be disappointed to find that I have invested my time and money in this regenerated area and trusted published city council documents to have this form of entertainment venue on my doorstep.

I wish to object for the following reasons:-

Noise pollution

Currently there is noise at a weekend of people travelling from high street venues to Margarita's. Moving to the high street I except that people go out at the weekend and there will be occasional noise. However if we have a nightclub on the same road it will result in people continually walking underneath our bedroom and balcony areas on there way out and on their journey home (please see attached map).

RECEIVED
22 APR 2009

People and cars continually coming and going and the nightclub itself will lead to a dramatic increase in noise pollution that will have a substantial impact on our lives and our sleep.

Smoking Regulations

An outdoor area will need to be created for smoking patrons. If there is an outdoor or an area in the street it will lead to increased noise pollution and litter.

Increased Rubbish

A higher footfall will ultimately lead to increased rubbish and increased vermin in the area.

Increased Traffic

The works taking place on Briton Street are due to finish the 1st June 2009 (only after a phone call today I have discovered the completion date and had it clarified that this will only be the date if the works are as scheduled and no not overrun for any reason). If the venue opens any time before this all taxi's who have dropped people of or picked people up from the venue will be sat at the traffic lights at unsocial times of the morning right next to our bedroom which will inevitable cause noise. Even after the roadworks have been completed taxi's sitting at the traffic lights will still be an ongoing problem.

Possible damage to property

Oriental Terrace is a public walkway and having a large amount of late night revellers using it as a shortcut between the venue and the high street (see attached map) will not only lead to increased noise and rubbish but possible damage to property. I have not worked hard to invest to a new car with my partner to run the risk of drunken people abusing it on the way home.

Increased Violence and Crime

If there is trouble in the venue where will the people be sent by the nightclubs security...onto the street, outside our front doors. I do not wish to have or have to witness increased violence or crime and smashed windows in the area which I live in.

In conclusion I feel that I am lucky to be in employment in the current economic climate and feel this will impact upon my life and my job.

I currently have a 9-5 job and believe late night noise would seriously impact on my sleep and effectiveness at work. My partner works shifts and has to commute to London. It would not be fair to have a late night venue

producing noise (or its patrons producing noise) until the early hours when he needs to be out of bed at 5 o'clock in the morning.

I would have never considered moving to this area whilst the nightclub was open. Yes this venue was here before the flats were built, however the area has since moved on. I believe the opening of this venue would be detrimental to this area and ultimately devalue the property situated around it.

If I wish to live next to an operation nightclub I would have moved to a site next to an operational nightclub.

Yours sincerely

Lesley McIvor
Resident of Merchants Quarter



Photos: Joe Low

southampton city centre management

City Centre Management

A place that welcomes and is well looked after

The management of the city centre will be increasingly supported by the private sector as more businesses take ownership of their environment. A wide range of companies from all sectors will be involved, including landowners, the transport industry, leisure and culture, commercial agents, the service sector, large city centre employers, and the media.

Key achievements sought include:

- Development of a comprehensive strategy to improve people's understanding and experience of the city centre through implementation of identity, information and transportation projects.
- High quality and attractive seasonal events and entertainment.
- Ensuring the city centre is a safe place to visit and trade.
- Development of themed quarters such as the restaurant quarter on Oxford Street and speciality shopping in the Bargate Quarter.
- An attractive and cared for city centre with improved maintenance programmes in core areas.
- Easy accessibility for the disabled, elderly and families.

Development of the evening and night time economy is sought for a broad mix of activities to attract a wide audience and range of adult groups.

- Evening and night time activity will be concentrated in designated zones, away from residential areas. These will be linked together by safe pedestrian routes, avoiding residential areas that are sensitive to late night noise and disturbance. The late night zones are located around the Bargate and Leisure World. These will be linked via West Quay 3 and the City Plaza. The locations for evening activity are around Oxford Street, Town Quay (eventually Royal Pier), Bedford Place and the proposed cultural quarter at Northern Above Bar.
- City Centre Management will be working closely with the shopping centres and High Street stores to develop evening opening, with many shops open late six nights a week.
- Night buses and shuttle buses, sponsored by commercial beneficiaries, will be operating at weekends between Bedford Place, the High Street and Leisure World. The badged city centre cleansing team will be operating a three-shift system working through the night to ensure that streets are kept clean.

See also:
Southampton City Centre Health Check (pdf/online)

A range of people, including families and elderly people, will want to visit the city centre at all times, simply because it is pleasant to do so. A range of activities and a civilised ambience will be achieved.

The Vision

The vision for Southampton, over the next five to ten years, is a city centre comparable with the best in Europe, as well as the principal centre of the South, offering a vibrant, exciting, well designed, sustainable and maintained centre with a real sense of 'place'.

To achieve the vision, the city centre will:

- **Reconnect** with its waterfront
- Establish **a north-south pedestrian spine**, with the Bargate at its heart, incorporating a series of major new public spaces which will provide a memorable experience equal to any of the great pedestrian thoroughfares in the UK and Europe. It will link the city's historic parks through the retail core with the Old town and a new public promenade on the Royal Pier Waterfront.
- Become increasingly **pedestrian friendly** with public transport circulating around and across the pedestrian spine. Vehicular access will be maintained to all parts of the city centre, but through traffic will be restricted except for public transport.
- Become **a high quality urban environment**, incorporating iconic buildings, new and refurbished urban spaces, landmark buildings around the parks, enhanced entry points into the city centre, a waterfront of distinction and international identity, and a cultural quarter.
- Promote **the Old Town** as a vibrant quarter based on its own unique historic identity. It will sustain existing, and encourage further residential use, as well as enhance its attractiveness to residents and visitors.
- Embrace the development of 'new quarters' at the **Royal Pier Waterfront, West Quay 3, Northern Above Bar, Central Station** and **Charlotte Place**.
- Incorporate new **employment, retail, leisure** and **residential** uses.
- Be more **attractive, efficient** and **welcoming** to all users of the city centre.
- Develop a **night time economy** that will be promoted and managed to appeal to a wide audience.
- Become a major centre for **culture and tourism**.



Respecting our heritage

The Old Town

An 'historic quarter'

The vision for the Old Town is to create '...a vibrant quarter at the city's heart based on its own unique historic identity, which will continue to evolve and reinforce its distinctiveness as an integral part of Southampton's identity as a successful European city'.

The Old Town Development Strategy

This provides for:

- A place that rediscovers, conserves, enhances and redefines the Old Town's historic character.
- An area connecting Above Bar and the central parks with the waterfront.
- A pedestrian and cycling priority location served by an integral public transport network.
- A tangible 'sense of place'.

Key sites are identified for development and there are also aspirations to improve the public realm and the open-space network. Key developments have already been or are being constructed e.g. Oceana Boulevard and City Court. Other key sites have planning permission e.g. The French Quarter and the former Telephone House.

French Quarter

The development of the 'French Quarter' sets a high standard for development in the Old Town with contemporary architecture that responds to its historic setting at the heart of the Old Town. The scheme incorporates:

- 170 residential units comprising a range of housing types, including open market flats, elderly persons' units, affordable housing and 'micro' starter units.
- 6 commercial units at street level including a convenience supermarket, cafe, and restaurants.
- A new pedestrian route through the site, removal of the inappropriate post-war architecture and re-instatement of the historic medieval urban grain.

See also:



x My home

Possible routes from high street to venue site.

From: Licensing
Sent: 22 April 2009 19:47
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Nickolas Hartshorn & Hannah Harwood has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 22/04/2009 19:46:30 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Nickolas Hartshorn & Hannah Harwood

Address:
30 Coopers Court
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3EN

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Since this was last a nightclub this area has changed to be substantially more residential with many new falts built. In adddition Briton Street now has 5 storey buildings on both sides of the road which reflect noise. We occasionally get disturbance at night with noisy indivuals but the likelihood is much greater with people leaving late night clubs in the area. Opening a late night club in this locaion seems inconsistent with the plan to encourage the area as a residential area. There are already many clubs and large drinking establishments in the lower high street although these seems to be struggling due to lack of demand so why should an additional club open in the middle of a large residential area.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

Dr John Blythe MBBS BDS MFDS RCS(Eng)
189 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3JG

21.4.09

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Dear Licensing Team

Re: Objection to licence application for the premises on 2 Queensway, formerly known as NewYork's and McCluskey's. 2009/00612/01SPRN

I am writing to strongly object to the 24-hour licence application submitted by Nexum Leisure. As a resident in Oceana Boulevard located on the opposite side of the road to the former nightclub I have great concerns with the plans to redevelop this site into another nightclub on the following grounds:

1. Excess noise from the premises during the night. I work as a surgeon at the local hospital. My ability to provide an effective and efficient service requires me to have sufficient rest. Intermittent noise from the nightclub will cause sleep disturbance and will be detrimental to my daytime performance.
2. Excessive vehicle activity and the related noise in the street of people arriving and leaving the premises. An increased demand for taxis, buses and private transport will lead to unacceptable noises and increased dangers on the roads around this area.
3. Increased activity around the streets at this time may increase the rate of property and car crime and interpersonal violence.
4. Since the former night club was open a number of residential properties have been erected in close proximity to 2 Queensway. This has lead to a positive shift from a commercial area to a luxury residential neighbourhood. The resident demographics span all generations. Such a redevelopment may have a negative impact on children and the elderly in the area.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my objections. If you require any further information do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Dr John Blythe

Flat 1, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: C. Sturman.

SIGNE

No 1 City Court.
15 LOWER CANAL Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 2, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Mr & Mrs Robinson

SIGNED:

Flat 2 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat_____, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Mr and Mrs Barnett.

SIGNED:

3 city court
15 Lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 4, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: E. Lydon

SIGNED:

4 city court
15 Lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 5, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Dave McGeown

SIGNED:

5 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 6, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Mr P Reece.

SIGNE

Paul Reece
6 City court
15 Lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 7, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: T Fiddimore.

SIGNED

7 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 8, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Pam Heffelon

SIGNED:

8 City Court.
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL.

Flat 9, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Matt Graver

SIGNED

9 city Court
15 Lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 10, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: D Searle.

SIGNED:

10 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 11, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Paul Griffiths

SIGNED:

11 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3QL

Flat 12, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: M. Madon.

SIGNED:

12 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL.

Flat 4, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Leisure Limited for an alcohol license for the former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004, regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements.

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as large a number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a significant increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – aspects of life which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub. This would clearly jeopardise their safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would have to pass through a throng of drunken clubbers in order to get home .

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this disturbance will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: NORA MCGRATH

SIGNED:

4 CITY COURT
15 LOWER CANAL WALK
SOUTHAMPTON
SO14 3HL.

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 20 . 4 . 09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed: ....

Print Name: PAUL JONES

Date: 20:4:09

Flat Number: 18
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton
Hants SO14

Flat 14, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: J Broomhead

SIGNED:

14 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 18, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Paul Highett Smith

SIGNED:

18 city court
15 lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 19, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Nick Lemon

SIGNED:

19 city court
15 cowper canal walk

Flat 20 City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Mark Smith

SIGNED:

20 city court
15 lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 21, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: J. Butler

SIGNED:

21 City Cart
15 Cowley Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HC

Flat 25, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: Ben cross

SIGNED:

25 city court
15 Lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3AL

Flat 30, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: L. [illegible]

SIGNED:

30 city cars
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 36, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: J. Butler

SIGNED:

flat 36
15 lower canal walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat 144, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: C. Rae

SIGNED:

44 City Court
15 Cowe Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

Flat 45, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: M. Allen

SIGNED:

45 City Court
15 Lows Canal Walk
Southampton
SO14 3HL

Flat_____, City Court
15 Lower Canal Walk
Southampton
S014 3HL

RECEIVED
23 APR 2009
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL
Legal Services

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of City Court on Briton street, which is opposite the above mentioned premises. It has come to my attention that Nexum Leisure Limited have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a nightclub and bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, Briton street WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings in immediately adjacent streets. The area, particularly along Briton street, is now principally a quiet residential neighbourhood occupied by many young families and couples. The changed tone of the area is reflected in the investment that the council has made in improving Briton street including the planting of trees and the upgrading and widening of the pavements..

It is my understanding that Nexum Leisure Limited typically operate large, aggressively promoted nightclubs that specialise in selling high volumes of cheap drinks to as greater number of patrons as possible. Such establishments, however well run, inevitably give rise to a large increase in night time noise, violence, vandalism and general anti social behaviour – events which are happily absent from Briton street at present. It is for this reason that I think that Briton street is an unsuitable place for a new nightclub and the reason I make this objection. Specifically, in terms of the criteria for objection:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder
There is a direct link between late night drinking and crime. Areas in Southampton where nightclubs and bars are located require a near constant police presence during late night drinking hours and frequently witness people drunk in the street, fights, vandalism and general disorder. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the proposed nightclub is within feet of a number of street-level residential properties which would be an easy target for drunk vandals.

Public Safety
As a consequence of that set out above, the safety of the public and in particular local residents would be at risk. For example, there is a supermarket (Co-op) opposite the west end of Briton street on the High street. This shuts at 2200hrs and is well frequented by local residents. Late night shoppers would be vulnerable to harassment by drunk people drawn to the area due to the nightclub, with a corresponding impact on public safety. Furthermore, people returning from work late at night (there are many nurses, doctors and public sector shift workers resident at Oceana Boulevard, City Court and Telephone House) would be put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from the nightclub and bar.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance
Beyond an increase in antisocial behaviour, a hitherto quiet street will experience increased noise and commotion coming from both patrons of the nightclub queuing/smoking outside and from loud music and noise from inside. All this mere feet from the street facing flats in Oceana Boulevard and City Court. If the nightclub opens to the full extent permitted by the applied for license, this noise and commotion will be relentless, all through the night until 5am. Those in exposed apartments will struggle to sleep.

The Protection of Children from Harm
Young families live in this area and there is an infant school at the west end of Briton street. Briton street is therefore a well used thoroughfare for parents taking their children to school and picking them up. These parents and children will have to navigate the litter, broken glass and vomit left from the night before. Furthermore, the children who live in apartments overlooking the street below, along with their parents, will be deprived of sleep.

I believe that granting the proposed license will have a terrible effect on the local area for the reasons outlined above. For the sake of the large number of council tax payers who currently enjoy the quiet and pleasant environment that Briton Street provides and are horrified at the prospect of living with vomit, litter, noise and the constant threat of drunken violence on their doorstep, please do NOT grant the proposed alcohol license.

Yours Faithfully

NAME: TRIMWISE GYM

TRIMWISE GYM
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON

SATBIRE SINGH DIGWA
DIRECTOR

The Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Alison Cole
9 Chandlers Court
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14 3EZ

23th April 2009

To whom it may concern,

I would like to make a representation in regards to the application for a premises licence for New York New York night club, 2 Queensway, Southampton,SO14 3AZ, and to the application for a premises licence for McClusky's bar, 8 Queensway, Southampton, SO14 3AZ.

When the premises known as McClusky's and New York's were last open not only were there a number of incidents that the police had to attend to but the use of buildings in the area was very different. Having looked at the applications I do not feel that these factors have been taken into consideration and because of this I can not see how the granting of a licence for these premises will meet the licensing objectives especially the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.

It is the same operator that owned the premises and employed the previous licence holder, that is now the applicant for these two premises licenses.

Before the Licensing Act 2003 came into force McClusky's had a Justices On Licence , a special hours certificate which allowed the to open after 23:00 but no where near 24 hours and a Public Music and Dancing certificate which in addition to the general conditions on all Public Music and Dancing certificate's also had specific conditions relating to this premise. In 2005 the committee refused to renew the public music and dancing certificate for this premises.

New York New York's also had a Justices On Licence, a special hours certificate which allowed the premises to open after 23:00 but no where near 24 hours and a Public Music and Dancing certificate which in addition to the general conditions on all public music and dancing certificate's also had specific conditions relating to this premise. In 2005 the committee refused to renew the Public Music and Dancing certificate for this premises.

The committee decided not to renew the certificate due to residential objections. The committee decided that they could not access the impact of the operation of the premises on the area/community as the operators had not provided a clearly defined operational plan for the premises. Having looked at the application and the fact that the applicant is the same operator and is asking for significantly more than the premises was previously licensed for, and the lack of information in the operation schedule of the application, I find it hard to believe that any thought has gone into how the premises will be run and the impact it will have on the residents in the area.

Although both of these premises had Special Hours Certificates and public music and dancing certificate's which let them open and have entertainment after 23:00 the main use of buildings in the vicinity was considerably different at the time. Directly opposite New York New York's night club on Briton Street there is now a very large residential building, when McClusky's and New York New York's were open this used to be an office building, further along the road there used to be a gym and this is now a residential building and a gym and then at the end of the road there used to be an office building and is now a residential building. The main use of buildings along this road has changed dramatically and there is currently only one premises in the area with a premises licence and this is a restaurant (P.O.S.H).

There is also a public footpath called Oriental Walk that runs from the High Street to opposite McClusky's. This footpath passes very close to five residential buildings including a court yard over looked by balconies. From this footpath people also have access to cars parked in allocated spaces for residents of these buildings and a large number of garages. Therefore there is potential for the increase in Crime and Disorder from customers of McClusky's and New York New York's.

Having looked at the application forms and plans the applicant does not seem to have made or is planning to make any changes internally or externally at either premises and therefore there is no recognition or allowance for the smoking regulation that came into effect in 2007. Since the smoking legislation has come into effect there have been a larger number of people on the street outside of premises which has lead to an increase in noise nuisance. As the applicants have made no provision for smokers at the premises I can only assume that their customers will congregate outside of the main doors of each premises which would be a large source of public nuisance.

In the operating schedule for each application the applicants have only entered a small number of measures in regard to each of the licensing objectives. For the Prevention of Crime and Disorder the have offered CCTV, challenge 21, no drink promotions offering unlimited alcohol for a set price and to be part of the local pub watch scheme, but any decision to use door staff will by way of a management risk assessment which means that this will not be able to be a condition of their licenses.

Apart from complying with existing legislation they have not put in anything on how they will ensure public safety.

Under Prevention of Public Nuisance they have said that they will comply with Environmental Health legislation and that they will put up notices asking their customers to leave quietly.

For the Protection of Children from Harm they have said that no under 18's will be allowed entry to the premises.

From the lack of information relating to the licensing objectives in the operating schedule I think that it is clear that the applicants have not considered the effect that these premise on a quite mainly residential area.

I have attached a photo of the area showing both premises, all the residential properties in the area and the public footpath. This photo clearly shows how close the residential properties are to the two premises and the easy access customers of the premises would have to residential buildings and property.

For your information I am a resident in the vicinity and am acting in that capacity although I am a Licensing Enforcement Officer for Southampton City Council. It is not part of my job to process applications or put committee reports for hearings together. I would like to confirm that I have not had anything to do with these two applications.

Regards

Alison Cole

Position of Residential Properties Around New York New York's and McClusky's

From: Magnus Mckie
Sent: 24 April 2009 12:18
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: RE: New York, New York & McClusky's

Dear Hayley - please consider the below as likelyeffects of the grant under review:

The prevention of crime and disorder

There is a link of alcohol and late night openings to incresed crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you can not deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and general violent behaviour. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat of vandalism and crime of my property and many others alike, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows or vandalising cars is something funny to do. We know this happens.

- Public Safety

As per above, the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do so in West Quay or Bedford Place where there are plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm to the public. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar in this quiet residential area.

The is also the question of health in the context of safety - people who lived in the area when the nightclubs were open often had to deal with cleaning up urine and sickness from outside their front doorsteps. One lady also told me about soeone urinating through a letterbox on the ground floor. We all know such things happen in the vicinity of nightclubs, especially with the age group Nexum are trying to attract. CCTV could record these events to increse the chance of perpetrators being reprimanded but CCTV won't prevent it.

- The prevention of public nuisance

Public nuisance can count as noise and you can only imagine what it would be like living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children or a job to be rested and prepared for in the morning. It would be a constant life of disrupted sleep created by noise and nuisance. I, as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will also cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I appreciate your need to have specific examples as above, and appreciate you giving me the opportunity to add these so my objection can be considered.

Sincerely,

Magnus

Subject: New York, New York & McClusky's
Date: Fri, 24 Apr 2009 09:02:27 +0100
From:
To:

Dear Mr McKie,

Application for a Premises Licence
Nexum Leisure Limited

I refer to your recent correspondence seeking to make representations to the above application under the Licensing Act 2003.

Having carefully considered your correspondence, it does not appear to be a "relevant representation" within the meaning of the Act because:

1. Your correspondence does not contain information about the likely effect of the grant of this premises licence on the promotion of the statutory licensing objectives. You must relate your representation to least one of the four licensing objectives **detailing** how the grant of the licence would impact on either public safety, the prevention of crime and disorder, the prevention of public nuisance or the protection of children from harm.

In the circumstances, unless you can provide further information to clarify the position I am unable to accept your correspondence as a representation which is capable of being considered by the Council in determining this application. For your information further details about representations can be found via the link below:

http://www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing/alcohol-licences/representations.asp

PLEASE NOTE ANY FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY CLOSE OF BUSINESS (4PM) ON 24TH APRIL 2009.

Yours Faithfully,
Hayley Clowes
Licensing Officer
Legal & Democratic Services
Southampton City Council

From: Richard Olney
Sent: 24 April 2009 12:55
To: Licensing
Subject: Reference # 2009/00612/01SPRN - Objection to Alcohol License

Attachments: Objection Letter.doc
The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council
P.O. Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

Please read this as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton. I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

As I am a resident of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above-mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do no know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area **WAS NOT** a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building/revitalisation of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class as a sophisticated “young professional” area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing the properties at Oceana Blvd, **we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down**, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I, or any of the purchasers, had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton. **Barrett Homes assured us that a 4-story set of flats was to replace the dilapidated nightclub building.**
It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

• **The prevention of crime and disorder**
It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights, and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime

and disorder would be at a zero? I think not! My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunken people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do. I do not!

• □□□□**Public Safety**
As per above, the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do that in West Quay where there are NO residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

• □□□□**The prevention of public nuisance**
I think public nuisance can count as noise. Can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning? It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance. I, as a council tax payer, do NOT find this acceptable.

• □□□□**The protection of children from harm**
Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep. This would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass, which will also endanger children, as well as adults.

I feel that I do not really have to say anything more, as **this proposal is preposterous**! Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please, do what is honourably right and respect the regeneration efforts and the many, many residents of the beautiful neighbourhood: **REJECT THIS APPLICATION FOR AN ALCOHOL LICENSE.**
Respectfully submitted,

Richard Olney-Jones
81 Oceana Blvd
Briton Street
Southampton
SO14

From: Sue Jackson
Sent: 24 April 2009 13:12
To: Clowes, Hayley
Subject: Re: New York New York

Dear Hayley,

Our Flat number at Oceana Boulevard is number 43

1 Prevention of Crime and Disorder

There is a direct link between the consumption of alcohol and an increase in disorder, affray, vandalism and crime outside the premises of nightclubs and city centre bars. The entrance gates of Oceana Boulevard opposite New York New York would be a prime target for smashing windows and damaging the doors. This will lead to extra expense for the residents to pay for the necessary repairs.

2. Public Safety

We have already lost good tenants as the wife was afraid to walk the streets at night to get home to Oceana. The presence of a nightclub will make the streets much more threatening with drunk and possibly violent groups of revellers outside the premises and in the street outside the entrance to our flat.

3. Prevention of Public Nuisance

Sleep at Oceana is already disrupted by the banana wharehouses opposite; if this nightclub is allowed, noise disturbance will prevent sleep from 11pm until 5am, when the banana lorries will take over. This is an intolerable intrusion into people's right of a night's rest.

4. Protection of children form harm

There are children living in Oceana, and their safety will be affected by the detritus of broken glass and possibly used syringes around the building and in the park if this nightclub is allowed.

I cannot believe that this proposal will be allowed. Nightclubs should be sited away from residential areas so that property holders have a calm and peaceful environment to rest and sleep between their day's labours.

Yours sincerely

Mrs S M Jackson

Clive Grace
Flat 62 Telephone House
70 High Street
Southampton
SO14 2NW

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

21st April 2009

To whoever it may concern

I would like to object to any licensing being agreed for the old McCluskys and New York New York site on Queensway.

To whoever is thinking this acceptable, I would advise them to go to the top of Southampton High Street on a Friday or Saturday Night 23:30 till 3am, and see the noise and nuisance that is created. This should not be tolerated in a primarily residential area.

Already there is flow or people up and down the high street alongside Telephone House in the evenings, shouting and being loud. This will increase heavily, and will definitely cause a public nuisance.

Although I would hope solutions will be inplace to try and avoid any nuisance and loud noise from people exiting the premises, I do not believe in anyway this would be adequate due to the number of residential roads around the premises. Also, due to the number of routes away from this location, it will be impossible to police, and therefore could be a waste of resources for our Police, as there now becomes another area for them to monitor.

If these premises are given a late licence, I will certainly wonder about our council's priorities to its residents.

And for a final thought, if such a place was wanted; why was it no considered to be at the site of the Old Branigans (New Lidl Supermarket), and then put the supermarket in this site, close to the residents?

Best Regards

Clive Grace

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

Lynn Flacco
Flat 62 Telephone House
70 High Street
Southampton
SO14 2NW

Licensing Team
Southampton City Council
PO Box 1344
Southampton
SO15 1WQ

20th April 2009

To whom it may concern:

Although I think it's fantastic that the derelict site of the old McCluskys and New York New York on Queensway is being considered for redevelopment; I do not believe that the council has the resident's best interests in mind to reopen it as a 1,300 capacity nightclub.

At the time the club was open, the lower half of town was not residential.

The council pushed to move residents back into the city centre by building several blocks of flats. Why is the council now pushing those residents away whilst devaluing their properties with the highly probably nuisance, crime, vandalism and violence?

If the majority of the 1,300 clubbers exit the building between the typical leaving times of 01:00 and 04:30, that's approximately 370 people leaving the building an hour! Is there council budget / plans for the required increase in Policing and security? Will our council taxes be increased as a result?

Nexum chief executive Paul Kinsey was quoted in the Echo* - "He said he would target 19 to 24-year-old clubbers, and was not looking to attract "undesirable characters" but "people with good jobs". How many 19 year olds seriously have "good" jobs? If the target audience was a bit older this might be acceptable.

Additionally, how seedy do you plan on making Southampton? Do we really need another topless bar? What kind of family atmosphere and tourism does that attract? As Nexum chief executive Paul Kinsey was also quoted in the Echo* - "The licence also would include permission for topless dancing on select nights"

Please accept this as my complete objection to reopening this location as currently planned.

Kind regards,

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

Lynn Flacco

*Echo quote link:
http://www.dailyecho.co.uk/news/4277176.Residents anger over new superclub plans/?action=complain&cid=7635474

From: michael Holloway
Sent: 24 April 2009 15:26
To: Licensing
Subject: PREMISES FORMERLY KNOWN AS NEW YORK, NEW YORK AND MCCLUSKEY'S
Dear Sirs,

We own a flat at 107 Oceana Boulevard, and it has just been brought to our attention that there is an application from Nexum Company Limited for an alcohol licence for both premises, as above.

We object to this application wholeheartedly; whilst we understand that the premises were previously used as a Nightclub and Bar, the area in the immediate vicinity was not a residential area at that time. This has now become a respectable residential area, and as well as professionals, there are also families with young children living within nearby complexes of which there are several very close by. With the reality of loud music continuing until 5 a.m., not to mention fighting, foul language, vandalism, people vomiting on the streets, people urinating in the streets and doorways, etc., this will have a terrible effect on the neighbourhood and especially young children living nearby, and how will young children and adults alike be able to get a decent night's sleep when they have school and work the following day? The whole idea of a nightclub and extended alcohol licence in such an area is absolutely preposterous, and therefore, we vehemently oppose the following applications unreservedly:-

2009/00612/01SPRN - New York, New York
2009/00580/01SPRN - McCluskys

We would be grateful if you will kindly acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Yours faithfully,

Valerie and Michael Holloway

24th April 2009

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 16:02
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr Andrew Gardiner has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 16:02:27 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Mr Andrew Gardiner

Address:
101 Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HU

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:

Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
Dear Sir / Madam

I would like to strongly protest against the application for or granting of a license at the premises formerly known as New York, New York's and McCluskey's for the following reasons.
This is a residential area and it is entirely inappropriate to grant a license for a nightclub proposing to operate from 11pm to 5am less than 20 meters from where we live. This WILL (no possibly!) result in noise, shouting, drunken and abusive behaviour to residents throughout the night and vandalism of our property and vehicles, littering of bottles cigarettes and other more unpleasant artefacts that are associated with clubbing. My young daughter (aged 8) would no longer be able to have the window open in her bedroom at night since she would not be able to sleep through, and for that matter, neither would we. Not a pleasant prospect in a hot flat in summer. In addition I do not particularly relish being threatened and afflicted with violent and abusive behaviour by people considered to be unfit to enter the premises, ejected for bad behaviour, or just plain drunk and dangerous after a heavy night on alcohol. Nor do I wish my daughter to bear witness to unpleasant and inappropriate behaviour from her bedroom. This is our home and it is plainly obvious that granting this licence would make life very unpleasant for myself, my family and all the other residents in the area. I ask you please to reject it accordingly. Please note this is not a knee jerk reaction to the application, it really would make our lives hell and I beg you to reject it.
If you wish me to clarify any of the points that I am making, please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours Sincerely

Andrew Gardiner

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 15:57
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

MR R WILKS, MRS A WILKS, MISS J WILKS has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 15:56:38 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
MR R WILKS, MRS A WILKS, MISS J WILKS

Address:
59 OCEANA BOULEVARD
BRITON STREET
SOUTHAMPTON

Postcode:
SO14 3 HU

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:

Resident

Objection Type:

Comments:
We strongly object to the above licensing application. The proposed nightclub is situated in one of the most prestigious residential areas in Southampton, which has recently been regenerated to a very high standard. The new flat developments are very intensive, and a great many residents of the nearby properties would be intolerably affected by the noise and nuisance generated by 24 hour drinking at the nightclub. We also think the Police are already overstretched in Southampton. Please do not grant this alcohol license.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Glenn Baker
Sent: 24 April 2009 17:46
To: Licensing
Subject: FW: Objection to mega Night club in Briton Street.

Dear Sirs

I have a property directly opposite the proposed re opening of the New York New York night club in Briton Street.
This is right opposite my property 43 Oceania Boulevard for the following reasons:

New York New York was notorious for fighting and noise in Briton street when the club was open.

- The age group of over 18's to 30 would account for over 75% of any noise and violence in the UK.
- Briton street was deemed a residential re generation area.
- The property was reclassified to be converted in to apartments. Unfortunately in Life if the owner can not convert that opportunity, wake up and smell the coffee, that is life.
- You can not regenerate an area that is very up and coming then throw a rat in the middle.
- These properties like all properties have lost value, with this night club being stuck right in the middle of a very up coming affluent area. The fall out for the whole area will be drastic.

If the club was an up market club for over 30's I would still have a problem with it, but at least you know if there was any rowdinace or noise or fighting it would be only at 10% of the level of the 18 -30 group.

Yours

Glenn Baker

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 18:49
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Melvin Pugh has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 18:49:27 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Melvin Pugh

Address:
Flat 94, Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Sothampton

Postcode:
so14 3HU

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
To clarify, I am the Landlord for Flat 94 Oceana Boulevard and firmly believe that the granting of a licence to operate from 11:00pm to 05:00am would have a direct and significant negative impact on the residents of Oceana Boulevard.
In addition to the noise and general disturbacne to residents, an increase in crime, vandalism and anti-social behaviour could be expected.
I object most strongly to the granting of this licence.
I fully intend to live in Oceana Boulevard in the not too distant future and would not want this nightclub on my doorstep.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 20:38
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Miss Gillian Whyment has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 20:38:08 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Miss Gillian Whyment

Address:
108 Oceana Boulevard
Orchard Place
Southampton

Postcode:
SO14 3HW

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I would like to officially object to this application of Nexum Leisure for an alcohol license (2009/00612/01SPRN). Since the closure of the previous nightclubs, the Briton Street/Queensway area has undergone a dramatic change and is now very much a residential area. I strongly feel that a mega nightclub is wholly inappropriate for the following reasons: noise pollution, public nuisance, drunken violence and vandalism, personal safety returning to my flat at night alone. This concern is substantiated by the fact that the previous nightclub was the scene of frequent fights, violent behaviour and vandalism.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 22:21
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

MR B.SAHOTA has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 22:20:41 from IP 1

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
MR B.SAHOTA

Address:
1 OCEANA BLVD
BRITON STREET,
SOUTHAMPTON

Postcode:
S014 3HF

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
This area is now primarily a residential area with several young proffessional families with young children inhabiting the luxury apartments. To reinstate a late night licence to these clubs would be disastrous for these people due to the late night drinking, noise and fighting that inevitably follows. It is difficult enough to rent out these properties in the current climate but these clubs would make it impossible to rent out or re-sell these properties and would also make them practically inhabitable. I strongly object to these licences being granted for the above reasons and urge you not to do so.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

From: Licensing
Sent: 24 April 2009 22:26
To: Licensing
Subject: PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments
(2009/00612/01SPRN)

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

Mr and Mrs Sangha has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 24/04/2009 22:26:21 from IP

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
Mr and Mrs Sangha

Address:
2 Oceana Boulevard
Briton street

Postcode:

Email:

Comments

Representation Type:
Registered Interest in Premises

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
We currently rent out our property to a young proffessional family and know that if these nightclubs were to be granted a late licence we would lose our enants and find it practically impossible to rent out our property let alone resell it. Would you want to live within metres of 2 nightclubs with people drinking, fighting and being sick outside till all hours? It is unbelieveable that anyone would even consider re-opening these nightclubs here considering that this is primarlily a residential area now with many young families and children living in these apartments.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 24/04/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a ~~resident of~~ Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed:

Print Name: LONALD JAMES SUTHERLAND, DENEE RONALD HAYWARD (OWNERS)

Date: 24/4/09

Flat Number: 74
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Soouthampton
Hants SO14

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 24/4/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton,

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern : Jg
I am a ~~resident~~ of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Sig

Print Name: RONALD JAMES SUTHERLAND (OWNER)

Date: 24/4/09

Flat Number: 39
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Soouthampton
Hants SO14

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

The Licensing Team,
Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1344,
SOUTHAMPTON,
SO15 1WQ

Date: 24/04/09

Please read this letter as my official objection to the Application from the Nexum Company Ltd for an Alcohol License for the Former McClusky's and New York's premises on the corner of Briton Street and Queensway, Southampton.

I wish to appeal the following:

2009/00612/01SPRN = New York New York
2009/00580/01SPRN = McCluskys

To whom this may concern :
I am a ~~resident~~ of Oceana Boulevard, which is opposite the above mentioned premises on Briton Street. It has come to my attention, and many other residents at the residential complex that Nexum Company Ltd have applied for an alcohol license for both premises above.

The premises in question were previously run as a Nightclub and Bar, I do not know exactly when they were shut down, but I do know that at the time of their operation, the Briton Street area WAS NOT a residential area.

Since 2004 I believe regeneration within the Bargate area has seen the building of Oceana Boulevard, City Court, Telephone House and other residential dwellings. The area is now what I would class a sophisticated "young professional" area, and has some young families as tenants also within these complexes.

At the time of residents purchasing these properties we were made aware that the premises in question were to be torn down, and I can honestly and realistically say that if I or any of the purchasers had known that a nightclub was to be re-opened I would have looked elsewhere when purchasing a property in Southampton.

It is for this reason, and the following reasons, as per your own criteria, that I make this objection.

- The prevention of crime and disorder

It is a direct link of alcohol and late night openings that supersedes crime, vandalism and disorder. If you look around the areas where the bars and clubs are present in Southampton, you cannot deny that you see police, young people drunk in the street, patrol cars, fights and violence. Are you really suggesting that opening a nightclub within a residential area that crime and disorder would be at a zero. I think not. My property looks out on to Briton Street. This nightclub opening would create an obvious threat to vandalism and crime of my home, from drunk people leaving the nightclub who may think in their heightened state that smashing windows is something funny to do.

- Public Safety

As per above the public and residents safety would be at risk. If you want to go to a pub or club you can do in West Quay where there are no residents and plenty of bouncers on watch to prevent any harm. You cannot police such a thing in a residential area. People wanting to walk safely at night would be harassed and put at risk by the inevitable fights and drunken violence that would result from a club and bar.

- The prevention of public nuisance

I think public nuisance can count as noise, can you imagine living opposite a nightclub which plays dance music until 5am, when you have small children, or even if not, a job to be prepared for and rested for in the morning. It would be a constant hell of noise and nuisance, I as a council tax payer do not find this acceptable.

- The protection of children from harm

Young families live in this area, and I see many a father or mother walking or pushing children along late at night trying to get them to sleep, this would put these children in danger if you allowed a nightclub to open up on Briton Street. Vandalism will cause broken glass which will also endanger children.

I feel that I don't really have to say anything more, as this proposal is preposterous. Anyone with common sense would see what a danger, a media frenzy and nuisance that this would cause.

Please do NOT grant this proposal for an alcohol license.

Signed:

Print Name: RONALD JAMES SUTHERLAND, DEREK RONALD HAYWARD (OWNERS)

Date: 24/04/09

Flat Number: 80
Oceana Boulevard
Briton Street
Soouthampton
Hants SO14

RECEIVED
24 APR 2009

From: Licensing
Sent: 11 April 2009 11:49
To: Licensing
Subject: Stevens - NY NY

PublicAccess for Licensing - Application Comments (2009/00612/01SPRN)

mark stevens has used the PublicAccess website to submit their comments on a Licensing Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for PublicAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 11/04/2009

Application Summary

Application Number:
2009/00612/01SPRN

Address:
2 Queens Way
Southampton
SO14 3AZ

Licence Description:

Case Officer:

Customer Details

Name:
mark stevens

Address:
flat 218 oceana boulevard
lower canal walk
southampton

Postcode:
so143jg

Email:

Phone Number:

Comments

Representation Type:
Resident

Objection Type:
Licensing Objectives

Comments:
I like to object to the licence application due to the the late night noise, possible damage, public disorder and probably the severe one the residents safety. We do not want a nightclub on our doorstep.

PublicAccess for Licensing. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.