

Good Afternoon,

I would like to object the issuing of license to MAXI MARKET LIMITED for supplying of alcohol for consumption off the premises between 8 am to 11 pm.

As we already have several businesses who supply alcohol in the BH7 postcode area (christchurch road) not less than 15 shops within this area, I think we don't need any more alcohol supplying businesses around that place as the area already has increased crime and public nuisance.

This disorder might cause more problems to us residents, other businesses and the Dorset police too.

In view of the above issues I strongly urge you, the licensing authority to refuse this application for the supply of alcohol for consumption off the premises.

Regards
Vijay



LSL solicitors

Prama House,
267 Banbury Road
Oxford OX2 7HT

The Old Counting House
82e High Street, Wallingford
Oxon, OX10 0BS

The Licensing Authority
Bournemouth, Christchurch & Poole Council

Town Hall, St Stephens Road,
Bournemouth BH2 6LL

Tel : 0844 556 1191
Fax: 0844 272 5591

Web: www.lsl-solicitors.co.uk
E-mail: enquiries@lsl-solicitors.co.uk

5 July 2022

Our Ref : SUL01262/22

Your Ref:

Dear Sirs,

RE Maxi Market Ltd 673-675 Christchurch Road Bournemouth BH7 6AA

We have been instructed to lodge a representation on the above application on behalf of a number of clients who live in the vicinity of the premises and are identified on the enclosed sheet.

Our instructions on this matter are relatively recent and for this reason, the representation that is made is of a fairly general nature given the short period before the consultation period is due to close and our clients will seek to expand on these points at the hearing. Thank you for providing us with a link to the application as the register on the Council's website was not working correctly.

In relation to a hearing, we are conscious that with the holiday season there may be a number of dates when our clients cannot attend a hearing. At the moment, our dates to avoid are [for the month of August]; 8th, 22-26th, 29th August.

Turning to the matter of the representation, our clients object in relation to the likely impact on crime and disorder, public nuisance and protection of children from harm that will arise if the application is granted. By way of example ;

Crime and Disorder

Although there are proposals for CCTV, it is not clear as to where cameras will be located. Given the approach of the Applicant in relation to Public Nuisance, as outlined below, it is assumed that there will be no cameras outside. The condition as proposed would only actually require the installation of a single camera and so is insufficient.

The measures to prevent street drinking are welcomed but it is suggested that they do not go far enough and are limited to measures inside the premises. There seems to be no awareness of the issues such a street drinking can cause and the conditions offered seem to be based on historical licences that have been granted. The applicant needs to take a more pro-active stance to preventing crime and disorder that could arise through the activities that it wants to undertake.



The presence of an Incident Book is of value but it is noted that there is no need for the Applicant to have any regard for what is written in it. At the very least, we would hope to see that the applicant will take corrective measures if such are reasonably evident to be necessary.

Public Nuisance

Although there is a general proposal to prevent nuisance from arising, this does not cover issues that may occur from patrons who attend the premises. The applicant appears to have taken the approach that responsibility ends at the door of the premises. Whilst the display of signage is welcomed, it should not be seen as deterrent that will prevent nuisance from occurring. It is suggested that the Applicant should offer more to protect the local residents living in the area.

Protection of Children From Harm

We note that the operating schedule make reference to the delivery of alcohol. With such provision being arranged, we are of the view that the application is deficient and greater controls are required. There is no indication as to whether delivery is by staff engaged at the premises or a third party provider.

Under each of these headings, we are of the view that training is important. Although the Applicant has offered to train staff, there is no standard of training required and compliance with what has been offered could be achieved by simply handing to staff members a sheet of paper for them to read. As such, the condition that is offered is of little value.

It is noted that the only precaution in place to ensure compliance with the requested hours of trading for the sale of alcohol are the display of signs. If the premises are to be open for hours beyond this (the application on the Councils website giving no indication of when the premises are open to the public) then it is suggested that additional measures are required and particularly as there is no offer of an EPOS system with time limitations.

On the whole, there seems to be no analysis of the relationship of these premises with others that also sell alcohol along the road. We are aware that there are a number of other premises authorised for off-sales and consider that granting a new licence may have a negative effect, especially if there is competition with other premises to supply alcohol at a cheaper price. There are, of course, other issues that can arise through over-saturation of an area with licensed premises and the Council will be very familiar with these, having had a Cumulative Impact Policy in force in the past.

As explained, this is not intended to be an exhaustive list of issues with the application but rather an indication that our clients believe that granting a licence would have a negative impact on the licensing objectives. It is anticipated that more detail will be provided prior to the hearing.

In view of these points and others that arise from the application, our clients are of the view that the application should not be granted.



As an aside, we see that the plan submitted with the application appears to be defective in that there is no scale marked and the plan is itself of poor quality, with very rough hand-drawn annotations and additions made to the footprint. Clearly the hand-drawn extension to the rear is not accurate as the door widths seem to vary significantly. We note with some concern the access to flats above, which is assumed to fall outside of the licensable area although this is not indicated. Whilst these may be points that can be corrected, it would seem that in doing so there would need to be a fresh consultation.

On the matter of consultation, we are told that the blue notice was not on display for the required 28 days. We are looking into this matter and will write to you further. As you will appreciate, this may have a bearing on the ability of the application to be considered and it may be that an additional consultation period is needed to rectify the defect, particularly as we understand that some local residents may not have seen the notice.

Yours faithfully,

LSL solicitors

Direct Line : 01484 789 454

Email : enquiries@lsl-solicitors.co.uk

Representor List

Constantin Țurcanu



Daniel Sulimierski



Bogdan Primac



Silvia Primac



Claudiu Marian Cazacu



Andreea Oprea

