

Annex 22

**Charles V.H. Pitt
8 Betteridge Drive
Rownhams
SOUTHAMPTON
SO16 8LE**

Licensing Manager – Michael White
Legal & Democratic Service
Test Valley Borough Council
Beech Hurst
Weyhill Road
ANDOVER
SP103AJ

Your Ref:

My Ref: CVHP

18 April 2009

Dear Sir

**Application for a Premises Licence for Rownhams House, Southampton, S016 8LS
Roger John Barber and Penelope Jill Barber**

We live in the close proximity of Rownhams House and have done so for the past nearly 17 years. It has until now been used in the main as a suite of offices operating mainly for five days per week in office hours. It is no longer a stately house in an area of parkland. All the land around was sold to Heron Homes Limited by the applicant Roger John Barber on 6th October 1986 for residential housing with a restriction on the number of storeys on the housing to be erected. The applicant would not have been able to so easily sell the land for such development had Rownhams House been operating a full on licence with an entertainment licence at that time. Heron Homes Limited imposed covenants that the houses they built could only be used as residential property. No doubt the successor to Heron Homes Limited made similar provision.

Neither Betteridge Drive nor the drive of Rownhams House, are suitable for large flows of traffic with sudden peaks usually to be expected from licensed premises at closing time. Though the present parking area is sufficient at Rownhams House for office use, it is likely to wholly inadequate for the proposed licensed premises. Increase in the car parking area is likely to encroach upon and possibly destroy part of the natural screening between Rownhams House and the estate. More concerning is the likelihood of car parking overflowing into Betteridge Drive and the adjoining streets none of which are designed for on street parking. Not only are these streets not designed for on street parking but also such parking can and has obstructed emergency vehicles from passing along the street to the potential detriment of those persons in need of those vehicles. Also though there may be a certain amount of tolerance of on street parking between neighbours this is not likely to continue in respect of cars overflowing from the applicant premises and the potential for public disorder would be thereby increased.

The Police are already having to deal with drunken behaviour in the estate from other nearby licensed premises that were present before the construction of the estate some of whom already

have late night licenses. To have, in essence, a night club in the middle of the estate will tend to greatly increase this nuisance.

It is common for applicants to stress that they will only run modest and tasteful events. However it is my experience that when they have to pay for the expense of the establishment, these events become more frequent, less tasteful and more rowdy. It is then said that the licensing authority has the powers to discipline such licensees. However this is after the events have become intolerable to the residents and such enforcement procedures are met with arguments that the licensee cannot control customers outside the premises, that the authority will take away the licensee's living and that of his staff and remove a service from the community. We do not wish to enter into this cycle of licensing, problems and objection.

We are not people who object to parties being held by the residents around us, though there are some residents who do. However the occasional private party is not in any way the same as having a permanent party establishment within 50 metres of our front door.

We urge to Licensing Authority to take the view that this application is wholly inappropriate in the middle of a residential area whether that residential area has been developed in essence by the applicant or not.

Yours faithfully

Charles V.H. Pitt

Jill M. Pitt