

	Objection	Applicant Response
Representations 1 -23 (duplicated)		
1.	This matter has already been decided several times via 7 previous applications for this site	The previous applications were on different terms and proposed an entirely different use of the premises. The last application proposed a number of publicly accessible licensed units on the lower floors, a private members club on floors 1 -3 and a bar on the top floor, including roof terraces. The current application seeks to licence an office and function venue with licensable activities in part of the basement and ground floor only with significantly lower capacity limits than previously proposed.
2.	Each time applications have failed for extensive hours, 7 days a week for an unknown, but obviously very large capacity at this premises. key reasons numerous Committees decided against previous applications for this site are still valid	Please see above. The current proposal is fundamentally different to those considered before it. Each application must be decided on its own individual merits (see introduction to LBI Statement of Licensing Policy).
3.	Previous concerns that are no longer valid are not sufficient justification to break with past Committees’ decisions or the Cumulative Impact Area (CIA)	Invalid previous concerns should not be considered. The responsible authorities objected to the previous applications on various grounds, including the CIA. The responsible authorities have not objected to the current application.
4.	Licensable operations proposed in this application, whilst different than those in prior applications for the site, would still create a substantial and negative cumulative impact	The scope of the licensable activities proposed in the current application is fundamentally different to those previously proposed. The responsible authorities have not made representations on cumulative impact. Please refer to the operating schedule and supporting material which demonstrates why the premises will not add to cumulative impact in the area.

	Objection	Applicant Response
5.	Proposed operations represent a huge increase in the regular, high capacity use of the building	The day to day use of the building will be an office. The previous applications may have proposed regular, high capacity licensed uses accessible to general members of the public/private members' club use. This application does not.
6.	Proposed operations are exactly the same as those for other existing licensed premises within 100m, which past Committees decided to grant only after having restricted maximum capacity and substantially reduced licensable hours (to 1/5th what Ennismore is applying for)	The proposed operations are not the same. The premises is not attached to other buildings as per other licensed premises in Clerkenwell Green. The premises is located on the Western side of Clerkenwell Green abutting the junction of Clerkenwell Road and Farringdon Lane. This is further away from a number of residents and facilities better servicing, dispersal and management of smokers etc.
7.	Licence fails to support all four Licensing Objectives, Licensing Policies 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 27, and Development Management Policies DM4.2 and DM4.3	<p>Please refer to the operating schedule and supporting material which demonstrates how the premises will promote all four licensing objectives. Please also refer to the policy submission.</p> <p>Further clarification is required, for example LP17 relates to Illicit Goods and cannot realistically be relevant to the current proposals. LP 24 relates to smoking, drinking and eating outside. The application includes robust conditions on smoking, outright restrictions on drinking alcohol outside and no scope for eating outside.</p> <p>Development Management Policies DM4.2 and DM4.3 are planning policies and should not be considered under the licence application.</p>
8.	Proposed licensing and opening hours exceed Planning Permission by 600 hours/year, Licensing Policy Core Framework by 180 late-night hours/year, neighbouring offices with the same operations by 3,800 hours/year, neighbouring offices hosting events by 2,300 hours/year and nearby recently licensed restaurants by 500-1,000 hours/year	The planning permission for the applicant's demise of the premises does not include restrictions on hours. The applicant assumes to objectors refer to planning permissions in respect to other parts of the building which do not form part of the application. The planning hours are not relevant to the premises subject to the current application and should not be considered under the licensing process in any event.

	Objection	Applicant Response
		<p>The planning authority have not submitted a representation or informative.</p> <p>The applicant originally proposed a 2am terminal hour consistent with its existing function spaces in its Hoxton Hotels. The applicant voluntarily reduced the hours significantly following pre application consultation with the residents.</p> <p>The proposed hours for licensable activities are in line with the Council’s preferred hours in Licensing Policy LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises after licensable activities have ceased.</p> <p>The representation omits details of some of the premises closest licensed neighbours, who have authorised hours in excess of what is proposed in the current application:</p> <p>Dans le Noir, 30-31 Clerkenwell Green – 1am The Green, 29 Clerkenwell Green – 3am Crown Tavern, 43 Clerkenwell Green – midnight Brewdog, 45-47 Clerkenwell Road – midnight City Pride, 28 Farringdon Lane – 24/7</p>
9.	Failure to define the maximum capacity	<p>The provisional capacity assessed under the fire strategy is approximately 306 (excluding staff) in respect of the licensed areas (236 ground floor, 70 basement). Previous applications proposed capacity limits ranging from 637 to up to 1000.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
10.	<p>The proposed operating hours are almost exactly the same as the last licensing application for the premises, which was rejected by the Sub-Committee in part due to the extent of the hours and the associated cumulative impact. Licensable hours are 30min more per week than what the last committee rejected. This application should also be rejected.</p>	<p>The proposed hours are less than the previous March 2016 application (the applicant understands the original proposals were 00.30am 7 days a week and possibly later for bar areas).</p> <p>The proposed hours are almost identical to the previous August 2016 application (except Sundays, which previously proposed a closure time of 23.00).</p>
11.	<p>Please note I object to this application as a local resident and as a member of the Friends of Clerkenwell Green. Acting as a community, we discussed our concerns and register this objection. If personal objections are the same/similar, this is due to our approach as a community. For completeness I would note that it is unlawful to disregard or minimise the weight of any one objection on the basis of it being the same/similar to others.</p>	<p>The applicant does not ask that the 23 duplicate representations are disregarded but requests appropriate weight is attached accordingly.</p>
12.	<p>Most of the key reasons Committees decided against the previous applications are still valid issues with Ennismore’s current application</p>	<p>The main reasons given by the Licensing Sub Committee for refusing the March 2016 application were:</p> <p>Cumulative Impact Area – the current application has not attracted representations from the licensing authority based on cumulative impact</p> <p>Capacity – the Committee were concerned about a capacity of up to 1000 in previous applications. The current application proposes a capacity of approximately 306, representing almost a 70% decrease. The proposed capacity is also less than half the capacity of the previously licensed Masonic Centre at the premises – 686</p> <p>The previous applicant had not identified tenants at the time of the application – the applicant of the current application is the tenant.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
		<p>Detailed operational management plans have been submitted detailing how the applicant will use and manage the premises.</p> <p>The proposed conditions would not be effective in promoting the licensing objectives – the current application includes wide ranging and robust conditions, including conditions restricting access to the premises by general members of the public and conditions requested by residents during pre application consultation that are consistent with those imposed on the nearby Wallacespace premises licence.</p>
13.	Close proximity to residents including vulnerable populations	<p>Please refer to the operating schedule and supporting material which demonstrate how the premises will promote the licensing objectives and not impact on local residents. In particular the noise impact assessment, the operational management plan and conditions relating to dispersal and restrictions on drinking outside.</p>
14.	<p>Inevitable disturbance from increased capacity and more frequent, extensive use of the building</p> <p>Risk of ASB and other alcohol-related disturbances given the sheer scale of total daily capacity</p> <p>Potential impact of such a large volume of additional people arriving in the area</p>	<p>The premises was historically licensed for the Masonic Lodge to provide various events and functions. The applicant hopes to bring the premises back to life, whilst at the same time respecting the buildings history and heritage listing. The day to day use of the premises will be an office. This use will continue regardless of whether a premises licence is granted. The licence is proposed to authorise some function use alongside the day to day office use. The proposals represent a very significant de-intensification of what has recently been proposed, for example 1000 total capacity publicly accessible restaurants, bars, rooftop terraces and a private members’ club. The office and function use proposed under the current application will not realistically result in ASB or alcohol related dispersal. The premises will not be used for licensable activities at full capacity on a daily basis.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
15.	Inadequate detail to ensure responsible retail of alcohol – vertical drinking is not prevented by the suggested conditions, despite the applicant’s claim	The application proposes 51 licence conditions and an operational management plan detailing how licensable activities will be controlled and provided responsibly. This includes condition 38 requested by the residents during pre application consultation, which requires all alcohol to be supplied with food at functions. The applicant has not claimed there will be no vertical drinking. Staff/guests will be seated and/or standing, for example standing at a drinks reception with canapes.
16.	No reference to a drugs policy, even though the area has seen an increase in illicit drug dealing targeting patrons of late licensed venues	Persons attending the premises for licensable activities will be staff or persons attending a carefully vetted private function only. It is not realistically foreseeable that the premises can be accessed by persons engaged in illicit drug dealing. The applicant does not tolerate this activity in any event and will implement appropriate safeguards.
17.	Hours and capacity far outside the norms for Clerkenwell Green, a CIA and Conservation Area	Please refer to the list of licensed premises in the nearby vicinity in 8 above. The proposed hours are outside the ‘norms for Clerkenwell Green’ insofar as they are <u>less</u> than many of the existing licensed premises in the area. The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises after licensable activities have ceased.
18.	Location in an area with a high concentration of licensed premises; 20 within a 150m radius	Further clarification is requested on details of the 20 licensed premises mentioned in the objection. The responsible authorities have not submitted representations relating to cumulative impact in any event.
19.	Area attracts many visitors, which already results in incidents of associated nuisance, criminal and disorderly behaviour often reported to the Licensing Service	The Council’s recently amended Statement of Licensing Policy recognises the benefits of businesses and visitors in Clerkenwell:

	Objection	Applicant Response
		<p><i>20. Businesses in Clerkenwell make a significant contribution to the economic prosperity of the borough through the provision of employment opportunities, the well-established creative industries hub and the distinct cultural, leisure and historical offer in the area which attracts local, national and international visitors alike.</i></p> <p><i>21. It is anticipated that the business sector is likely to expand in Clerkenwell as Farringdon Station transforms into one of the most significant transport hubs in London bringing new business and leisure opportunities. The Licensing Authority wants to support applications from businesses that contribute to the wider cultural offer in the area and those that enhance the diversity of the evening economy.</i></p> <p>The applicant understands the source of complaints primarily relate to publicly accessible drinking establishments, in particular those with external drinking areas and late night dispersal. The premises does not fall into this category of premises.</p>
20.	Previous concerns that are no longer valid are not sufficient justification to break with past Committees’ decisions or the Cumulative Impact policy	This concern is a repetition of 3 above. Please refer to response 3 above.
21.	Alcohol consumption in outside areas	The application does not include any outside areas in the licence demise. Please refer to proposed condition 7, which states “ <i>Alcoholic drinks may only be consumed within the premises. The premises licence holder must ensure that no alcohol is consumed outside the premises at any time</i> ” and condition 26 which prevents smokers taking drinks outside.

	Objection	Applicant Response
22.	Delivery and collection hours	<p>Please refer to proposed conditions 31 and 32 which stipulate strict and restrictive delivery and collection times:</p> <p><i>31 There shall be no deliveries or loading or unloading of vehicles between 8pm and 8am, Mondays to Saturdays, and no deliveries before 10am or after 4pm on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</i></p> <p><i>32 No rubbish including bottles will be moved, removed or placed in outside areas on Sundays or Bank/Public Holidays and between the hours of 11pm and 7am other days of the week.</i></p>
23.	Management – i.e. unknown operators, high standard of management or past compliance history	<p>The applicant company operates numerous award winning hotels and restaurants in the UK, Europe and USA. It's premises include Gleneagles in Scotland. The applicant's management team have a wealth of operational experience and excellent track records.</p>
24.	Licensable operations proposed will still create a substantial and negative cumulative impact	<p>There are no responsible authority representations based on cumulative impact.</p> <p>The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with LP5 and LP6 hours, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises.</p> <p>The specific use of the premises, restrictions on public access, comprehensive schedule of 51 licence conditions, operational management systems and noise impact assessment demonstrate that the premises will not add to cumulative impact in Clerkenwell.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
25.	Noise from traffic, pedestrians, taxis/mini cabs and parking	The premises is located on Clerkenwell Green, abutting the busy junction of Farringdon Lane and Clerkenwell Road. Please refer to the operational management plan and dispersal policy submitted with the application which sets out management controls in respect of the arrival and departure of persons attending the premises.
26.	Noise from queues, which are prohibited for all other licensed premises in Clerkenwell Green	Please refer to proposed condition 48 in respect of queuing. This condition was proposed by the applicant after residents expressed concerns about queuing during pre application consultation. The applicant does not anticipate queues will regularly form outside the premises in any event.
27.	Noise from inside the premises, which cannot be acoustically sealed with double glazing given the building, the old Middlesex Courthouse, is Grade II* listed	<p>Please refer to proposed conditions 17 – 24. These conditions were proposed and agreed with the Council’s Licensing Noise Liaison Officer during pre application consultation. The proposed conditions specifically address these concerns.</p> <p>Please refer to the noise impact assessment prepared by independent acoustic consultants, Hoare Lea. The report concludes: <i>“Internal noise from guests and amplified music has been found to be sufficiently contained within the building structure based on electronic noise limitation to Ennismore’s preferred internal noise levels.”</i></p>
28.	Noise from large number of customers leaving at night – applicant’s noise assessment is wrong because it considers as worst-case scenario a handful of patrons arriving or leaving with 1 speaking in a loud voice; the real worst case will be dozens to hundreds of inebriated people leaving at closing time, with many shouting, or talking in loud voices and loitering in local streets	Please refer to paragraph 7.1 of the noise impact assessment for details of the worst case scenario assessment. This is based upon the applicant’s specific use and careful management of the premises. The type of functions proposed, persons attending and management procedures (in particular the dispersal policy) together mean that it is not realistically foreseeable that large rowdy groups of <i>“dozens to hundreds of inebriated people”</i> will leave at the same time shouting.

	Objection	Applicant Response
		<p>Please refer to the dispersal policy which will ensure a quick, quiet and control dispersal of customers away from Clerkenwell Green and surrounding streets towards Clerkenwell Road and nearby transport links.</p> <p>The applicant has considered these concerns and the recommendations of the noise impact assessment further. Management controls will be implemented to control the size of groups leaving the premises, particularly during occasional higher capacity functions in the evenings.</p>
29.	Noise from recorded music, live music, films, dancing and other entertainment – activities that are excluded from other recent licences in the area in order to mitigate cumulative impact	Please refer to the noise impact assessment and proposed conditions 17 – 24 which specifically anticipate and address this concern. The Council’s Licensing Noise Liaison Officer has not submitted a representation as a result.
30.	Large capacity, which applicant fails to define, and which past Committees have required prior to deciding an application for this site	The Committee were concerned about a capacity of up to 1000 in previous applications. The current application proposes a capacity of approximately 306, representing almost a 70% decrease. The proposed capacity is also less than half the capacity of the previously licensed Masonic Centre at the premises – 686.
31.	Increased traffic at a junction of two high-traffic roads; Clerkenwell Road and Farringdon Road	Insofar as this is a relevant consideration under the licensing process: the existing road network is already very busy. There is no realistic possibility that the office use and function use of the premises will represent a material increase in traffic flow.
32.	Public nuisance including noise, ASB, drug selling, etc Crime and disorder, with drug targeting of late night clients in the area and inebriated clients causing noise and other disturbances	The applicant requests further clarification on this concern. The applicant does not anticipate or tolerate drug selling at its office or during carefully vetted private functions. The applicant does not tolerate drug use under any circumstances in any event.

	Objection	Applicant Response
		<p>The comprehensive schedule of 51 proposed licence conditions, operational management procedures and noise impact assessment will ensure the promotion of the Prevention of Public Nuisance Licensing Objective.</p> <p>The premises will not be open to general members of the public so cannot and will not attract late night clients passing by on the street.</p>
33.	CIA saturated with licensed premises, including 20 within just a 150m radius	Please refer to response 18 above where this concern is duplicated and the applicant’s policy submissions.
34.	<p>Proposed operations represent a huge increase in the regular, high capacity use of the building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The premises previously operated as a masonic lodge from the 1970s to 2013 and later surrendered its licence in 2015 • As a masonic lodge and licensed premises, the building was occasionally used for Freemason or hired-out events; while day-do-day use was extremely limited to a few dozen people • There were occasional events and a very ancillary bar/restaurant which, because of the way it was used, never presented noise, disturbance or other problems for the neighbourhood • The frequency with which the building will be occupied at large capacity under this proposed licence will far exceed typical use when it was a masonic hall • The application fails altogether to recognise or address the effect on residents 	<p>The Masonic Lodge established a long standing licence footprint for the premises. This means there is no material effect on cumulative impact in Clerkenwell - the premises has previously been licensed for function use for many years.</p> <p>The day to day use proposed by the applicant will be office use with occasional functions and events. Many of the functions and events will be small scale. In this respect the historical licensed use and the proposed licence use are comparable.</p> <p>The applicant understands the Masonic Lodge licence covered the entirety of the premises. The current application proposes to restrict licensable activities to the ground floor and section of the basement only.</p> <p>Please refer to the operating schedule, noise impact assessment and supporting material which demonstrate how the premises will promote the licensing objectives and not impact on local residents.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
35.	Proposed operations are exactly the same as those for other existing licensed premises within 100m, which past Committees decided to grant but with only 1/5th the licensable hours plus capacity restrictions	<p>The applicant understands Wallacespace is a venue for third party clients only, it operates on a day to day basis as function/event venue and working venue.</p> <p>The day to day use of the application premises will be for the applicant’s own employees to work. This provides an added layer of control and self-policing system to ensure any third parties attending the premises for functions and events are carefully vetted and do not interrupt the applicant’s office use of the premises.</p> <p>Wallacespace adjoins other buildings on Clerkenwell Green. Hill & Knowlton is on the opposite side of Clerkenwell Green, closer to a higher density of residential units. Neither Wallacespace or Hill & Knowlton had an existing licence footprint.</p> <p>The application premises is a standalone premises which abuts Farringdon Lane and Clerkenwell Road. This facilities enhanced dispersal and smoking areas away from residents. The premises were previously licensed.</p>
36.	Licence fails to support all 4 Licensing Objectives, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 27, and Development Management Policies DM4.2 and DM4.3	This concern is duplicated in 7 above. Please refer to 7 above.
37.	Proposed licensing and opening hours exceed Planning Permission, Licensing Policy Core Hours and other recently licensed premises in the immediate vicinity	There are no relevant restrictions on planning hours for the applicant’s demise of Old Sessions House. Please refer to 8 above. The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6. Please refer to 8 above which lists the later hours of other licensed premises in the area not included in the objector’s submissions.

	Objection	Applicant Response
38.	5x the licensable hours granted to 2 businesses in Clerkenwell Green that run the exact same licensable operations	Please refer to 35 above. The licensable operations are not exactly the same. The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6 and have been very significantly reduced from the initial proposal presented to local residents during pre application consultation.
39.	Wildly out of scale for the area	Please refer to 8 above which demonstrates the applicant's proposed hours and use are well within, and in some cases significantly less than, existing licences in the area. The proposals are entirely consistent with the local Clerkenwell Cumulative Impact Policy objectives.
40.	46 extra operating days/year vs planning consent	There are no relevant restrictions on planning hours for the applicant's demise of Old Sessions House. Please refer to 8 above.
41.	Late-night hours exceeding LP5&6 Equivalent to 14 extra operating days/year	The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises.
42.	Ennismore –many extra weeks of licensable operations!	The previous Masonic Lodge licence authorised licensable activities 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The day to day use of the premises will be the applicant's head office.
43.	Seven previous applications failed to get longer hours for this site.... Reasons for rejecting/part granting previous applications	This concern is duplicated in 1 above. Please refer to 1 above.
44.	Failure to define maximum capacity Floor plans show 240 seated capacity in the licensable areas	Previous Committees were concerned about capacities of up to 1000 in historical applications. The current application proposes a capacity of approximately 306. The proposed capacity is also less than half the

	Objection	Applicant Response
	<p>Total capacity estimated around 400-600</p> <p>Without knowing the defined maximum capacity, it is impossible to assess the cumulative impact. Using different scenarios, we can still estimate the potential total number of people coming and going on a daily basis. This gives us a range within which to consider the cumulative impact of this proposal. And it is substantial!</p>	<p>capacity of the previously licensed Masonic Centre at the premises – 686.</p> <p>The majority of persons coming and going on a daily basis will be the applicant’s employees going to work in their office.</p>
45.	<p>The committees and responsible authorities that considered these applications did so bearing in mind cumulative impact on the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Please refer to 1 and 2 above. The previous applications were on different terms and proposed an entirely different use of the premises. The last application proposed a number of publicly accessible licensed units on the lower floors, a private members club on floors 1 -3 and a bar on the top floor, including roof terraces.</p> <p>Please refer to 3, 4 ,12 and 34 above in respect of cumulative impact.</p>
46.	<p>The application fails to adequately demonstrate why this Sub-Committee should break with past committees’ decisions for essentially the same licensable proposals.</p>	<p>Please refer to 2 above. The current application seeks to licence an office and function venue with licensable activities in part of the basement and ground floor only. The current proposal is fundamentally different to those considered before it. Each application must be decided on its own individual merits (see introduction section of LBI Statement of Licensing Policy).</p>
47.	<p>There is no requirement, industry standard or presumptive right for businesses to have a premises licence.</p> <p>There is no business justification for Ennismore to be awarded a premises licence with larger capacity than any other premises in this sensitive area.</p>	<p>Insofar as these concerns are relevant:</p> <p>The applicant is not suggesting there are such rights.</p> <p>The Committee is not required to consider business reasons and/or ‘need’ when determining the application.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
	<p>There is no business justification to award extensive hours so much greater than those recently granted in the area that it would provide Ennismore a 5-fold competitive advantage in licensed hours over two other businesses in Clerkenwell Green with the exact same licensable operations.</p>	
48.	<p>There is no reason this Licensing Committee should treat this application as special. The application and associated documents do not present a compelling justification to break with the CIA.</p>	<p>Each application must be decided on its own individual merits (see introduction section LBI Statement of Licensing Policy).</p> <p>Please refer to the various responses above in respect of the supporting material, evidence and submissions on cumulative impact.</p>
49.	<p>Please reject this application for the same reasons that 7 prior licensing and planning applications failed.</p> <p>The reasons behind those Committee decisions are still valid concerns with the current application.</p>	<p>Please refer to 1 and 2 above.</p>
50.	<p>This application undermines the residential / commercial balance in the community and fails to rebut the presumption against new licensed premises.</p> <p>A reasonable number of reasonably sized premises are welcome provided they respect their domestic neighbours' reasonable needs. This application does not. It will significantly add to the cumulative impact in an area defined as saturated by Islington's licensing policy. It is contrary to the character of the Conservation Area and would disrupt the residential/commercial balance in the borough.</p>	<p>This concern relates to a number of planning considerations which are not relevant to the licence application.</p> <p>The application seeks a licence for a premises that has historically been licensed on a larger scale (more than double capacity) – it is not an entirely new licensed premises.</p> <p>Please refer to 3, 4 ,12 and 34 above in respect of cumulative impact.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
51.	Other recent applications in Clerkenwell have been rejected for far less. Please reject this application too.	Please refer to 1 and 2 above. Each application must be decided on its own individual merits (see introduction section of LBI Statement of Licensing Policy).
52.	Islington is London's 2nd highest density of licensed premises and suffers from higher than London average for violent crimes attributable to alcohol.	The applicant's trading record at its existing premises, specific type of operation and management controls mean that alcohol related violent crimes should not be foreseeable at the premises, which will be used as the applicant's office on a day to day basis.
53.	Clerkenwell is already an area of cumulative impact, saturation, ASB and crime.	The LBI " <i>Alcohol related violent crime & density of premises</i> " map used in the recent statement of licensing policy consultation indicates low levels of alcohol related violent crime in this area of Islington. Please refer to 3, 4 ,12 and 34 above in respect of cumulative impact.
54.	Clerkenwell has the highest number of complaints about drinking in the street than any other ward in the borough	The application does not propose off sales of alcohol. Proposed conditions 7 and 26 impose absolute prohibitions on alcoholic drinks being taken outside onto the street.
55.	Residents continue to experience adverse impacts of the late night licenced venues	Please refer to the operating schedule, noise impact assessment and supporting material which demonstrate how the premises will promote the licensing objectives and not impact on local residents. The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises.

	Objection	Applicant Response
56.	Use LP6 to set licensable hours to a maximum of 5-9pm Mondays to Fridays only, with 30min maximum drinking up time	The hours proposed by the objectors are not consistent with LP6.
57.	Restrict the capacity to a maximum of 150 people during licensable hours (and certainly after 5pm)	Please refer to 9 above in relation to capacity.
58.	Maximum of 6 smokers at a time, including staff, on Farringdon Lane near the junction with Clerkenwell Green (so as to be as far removed as possible from residential premises, but far enough from the junction so as not to cause congestion)	Please refer to proposed conditions 25, 26 and 27 which address concerns in respect of patron smoking.
59.	No outdoor queuing, where a queue shall consist of more than 1 person	Please refer to proposed conditions 48 which address concerns in respect of queuing.
60.	No loitering outside before entering or after existing the premises	Please refer to the applicant’s operational management plan and dispersal policy.
61.	No obstructions of the public footpath at any time, including rubbish or recycling	Please refer to the applicant’s operational management plan and dispersal policy. Please refer to proposed conditions and 30, 31, 32 and 45 in respect of the public footpath and waste refuse arrangements.
62.	Management plan to ensure customers leaving on foot are directed away from residents, i.e. out Farringdon Lane at night and down to Farringdon Station (not into Clerkenwell Green past Clerkenwell Green Estate and many other residents on all the roads leading from Clerkenwell Green which are very quiet at night, and not up Farringdon Lane towards Kings Cross and past the Peabody Estate)	Please refer to the operational management plan and dispersal policy which proposes to direct patrons consistent with the objector’s request. The applicant will add further detail to the dispersal policy consistent with the objector’s request.

	Objection	Applicant Response
63.	Prohibit use for filming and advertising because activities cause roads to be blocked and increase congestion	<p>Filming and advertising are not licensable activities under the Licensing Act 2003.</p> <p>Please refer to the operational management plan and dispersal policy in relation to traffic management.</p>
64.	Exclude applying to hold licensed weddings, which the masonic lodge did not have either	<p>The applicant understands one of the objecting residents under duplicated representation 1-23 held their wedding at Old Sessions House. The applicant is surprised this has been raised as a concern and would not want to rule out the possibility of holding weddings for local members of the community in the future.</p> <p>The applicant would have to apply for a separate Marriage Licence to hold weddings at the premises in any event.</p>
Representation 24		
65.	I would like to object to certain aspects of the application made by Ennismore for an alcohol license at the Old Sessions House, Clerkenwell Green. Whilst the applicant has considered a number of previous concerns expressed by residents, the current application should not be approved for the following reasons:	The applicant is grateful for the objector’s confirmation in respect of addressing previous concerns.
66.	There are 180 hours per week of late night licensable hours requested in EXCESS of the council’s own licensing policy for core area applications. These hours need to be reduced significantly to avoid a dangerous precedent.	<p>The applicant seeks clarification on “<i>180 hours per week of late night licensable hours requested in EXCESS of the council’s own licensing policy</i>”</p> <p>There are 168 hours in a week.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
		The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises.
67.	600 weekly Opening hours in excess of planning approvals.	<p>The applicant seeks clarification on “600 weekly Opening hours in excess of planning approvals.”</p> <p>There are 168 hours in a week.</p> <p>The planning permission for the applicant’s demise of the premises does not include restrictions on hours. The applicant assumes to objectors refer to planning permissions in respect to other parts of the building which do not form part of the application. The planning hours are not relevant to the premises subject to the current application and should not be considered under the licensing process in any event.</p>
68.	Maximum headcount capacity should be a condition.	The provisional capacity assessed under the fire strategy is approximately 306 in respect of the licensed areas.
Representation 25		
69.	I object to the granting of a new licence to the OSH on the basis of the Bunhill and Clerkenwell Cumulative Impact Area of Islington order and under the terms of public nuisance.	<p>Please refer to 3, 4 ,12 and 34 above in respect of cumulative impact.</p> <p>Please refer to the operating schedule of 51 conditions, noise impact assessment and operational management plan in respect of the applicant’s proposals to ensure the promotion of the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
70.	<p>With the possibility of up a thousand people exiting the OSH in the early hours of the morning and using the surrounding streets and areas (as has happened in the past in the days of Turnmills) as toilet areas I most object most strongly. The plans of the OSH that I saw did not to me provide enough toilets for the amount of people expected at events. The noise and general disturbance such a large amount of people leaving a building (which is within sixty feet of a block of flats) in the early hours is disturbing in the least.</p>	<p>There is no possibility of up to 1000 people exiting the premises in the early hours or any other time.</p> <p>Previous applications in respect of the premises proposed a capacity of up to 1000. The current application proposes a capacity of approximately 306, representing almost a 70% decrease. The proposed capacity is also less than half the capacity of the previously licensed Masonic Centre at the premises – 686</p> <p>The applicant’s Approved Inspector for building control has assessed the number of toilets as adequate.</p>
Representation 26		
71.	<p>Opening hours, The sale of alcohol, Late night refreshment - I object to how late this premises can stay open for. As a resident I already experience disturbance from people making lots of noise and sometimes urinating in the Clerkenwell Green/Close estate when they leave the surrounding establishments. My concern is currently these premises close between 11pm - 12am and so is restricted to last no later than this time. Therefore I’m worried that if Old Sessions house can remain open until 12:30 am on Fridays & Saturdays. I will be forced to go through two bouts of disturbance, the first when the current pubs/restaurants close and the second when Old Sessions House closes.</p> <p>Inline with this I then also object to the times in which alcohol can be sold and late night refreshments served because these are linked to the current opening hours proposal.</p>	<p>The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises.</p> <p>Please refer to the operating schedule of 51 conditions, noise impact assessment and operational management plan in respect of the applicant’s proposals to ensure the promotion of the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
72.	<p>Live music, Performance of dancing - I object to any form of live music or dance performances being conducted at Old Sessions House. My worry is that these type of events tend to involve large amounts of binge drinking. Furthermore the people attending typically leave the venue at the same time once the performance has finished. Therefore my concern is once a performance finishes, a large number of heavily drunken people will pile outside creating large amounts of anti-social behaviour. Moreover I worry that before a performance would begin, a large number of people would gather outside waiting to enter causing disruption and blocking the pavements.</p> <p>In addition to this I worry about how loud the music may be and causing a nuisance to local residents.</p>	<p>Please refer to the noise impact assessment.</p> <p>Entertainment will occasionally be provided as part of carefully vetted functions or events. The applicant does not propose to use the premises as nightclub or live music venue with associated problems of queuing and dispersal of large groups at the same time.</p> <p>The applicant will not tolerate binge drinking at the premises under any circumstances.</p>
Representation 27		
73.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel company Ennismore using OSH for offices + bar for staff/guests + hiring out rooms for pre-booked meetings/networking • Business reasons for licence equivalent to H&K (staff) plus Wallacespace (hiring out), both in Clerkenwell Green • Licensable hours same as last OSH application, and 5x more than Wallacespace or H&K were granted for the same activities • 600 more opening hours than permitted by planning • 180 more late-night licensable hours than Licensing Policy's core hours • Added many conditions we requested, but didn't define max capacity or shorten hours • 240 seated capacity shown on plans - 1,000 est customers/day like previous applications 	<p>This representation copy and pastes a circular email distributed amongst the local community inviting residents to submit representations in respect of the application. The email summarises the application from the residents' understanding and perspective.</p> <p>The applicant seeks clarification on this objectors' specific concerns.</p> <p>The applicant's position in respect of these topics are set out above in any event.</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any licence granted must have same hours as H&K/Wallacespace and same (or less) capacity/smoking as Wallacespace 	
Representation 28		
74.	<p>I would like to object to the licensing laws for the new proposals of the Old Session House. I feel you have no idea of the horrendous levels of noise from pubs ie (Sekforde arms) hotels, clubs etc in this area. There are many residential homes that have families and where we seek peace to live, we have the need and the right to have a good nights rest in order to get up and go to work the next day refreshed.</p> <p>In these last few years this has been made impossible due to the changing culture in Islington from family environments to that of entertainment. The noise from drunken groups of people and individuals is a nightly occurrence making the life of families living in the area a nightmare.</p>	<p>The applicant is sympathetic to these general concerns raised by the objector. However the concerns appear to relate to existing licensed premises and not the specific proposals made in the application.</p> <p>In any event, Please refer to the operating schedule of 51 conditions, noise impact assessment and operational management plan in respect of the applicant’s proposals to ensure the promotion of the Licensing Objectives.</p>
Representation 29		
75.	<p>I strongly disagree the licensing and therefore wish to object this going through. Reason being on the grounds of the prevention of public nuisance and safety.</p>	<p>The applicant seeks clarification on the objector’s specific concerns.</p> <p>In any event, Please refer to the operating schedule of 51 conditions, noise impact assessment and operational management plan in respect of the applicant’s proposals to ensure the promotion of the Licensing Objectives.</p>
Representation 30		

	Objection	Applicant Response
76.	<p>I wish to object to the licensing application made by the old sessions house.</p> <p>The area is a conservation area and to my mind would be ruined with so many people coming to a residential area and being allowed to stay open so late.</p> <p>The granting of any licence after 11pm would make Clerkenwell Green a hot spot for late night entertainment and is totally unsuitable for this ancient site.</p> <p>I do hope you will turn down this latest application</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the Conservation Area relate to the planning regime, not licensing.</p> <p>The proposed hours for licensable activities are consistent with the preferred hours set out in LP5 and LP6, together with an additional 30 minutes winding down period to allow a controlled closure of the premises. The proposed hours are significantly less than a number of exiting licensed premises in the vicinity.</p> <p>The applicant is not proposing a late night entertainment venue in its office.</p>
Representation 31		
77.	This objection is identical to objection 24	Please refer to 24 above in respect of the same objection.
Representation 32		
78.	<p>I wish to object to yet another applicant making another application once again apparently deliberately timed for the summer holidays to minimise likely objections to expanding the licensed hours for the OSH. I Have objected in detail to the previous 6-7 applications and those objections continue for this applicant as well. The committee in each case has refused the greedy extensions sought and NOTHING HAS CHANGED to justify Ennismore’s greed.</p> <p>I endorse Leora Neidle’s/ Friends of Clerkenwell Green’s objections.</p>	<p>The application is an entirely different proposal to those made before it.</p> <p>Each application must be considered on it’s own merits in accordance with the LBI Statement of Licensing Policy.</p> <p>The applicant entered pre application consultation with the local community before the summer to give residents an opportunity to comment on the proposals before the application was submitted. The</p>

	Objection	Applicant Response
	<p>Please reject the application or restrict it to the limited hours such as Wallacespace. The omni shambles of the Burberry fashion show in the OSH demonstrated completely that the local residents’ concerns for licensed events in the OSH were fully justified and a very real risk to the local community and the protected character of CG.</p>	<p>applicant made significant amendments to the application specifically to address concerns raised by residents (including Mrs Leora Neidle) during the pre application consultation.</p> <p>The Burberry fashion event was a one off event with no connection to the applicant whatsoever. The event was authorised under a TEN. The applicant does not intend to host large scale events of this nature with a celebrity guest list. The applicant has proposed comprehensive controls, including premises licence conditions which are not otherwise enforceable under TENs.</p>