

Objection 1

This is my objection to the renewal of the licence for Sexual Entertainment Venue SEV licence at FYEO Bournemouth

Crime and Disorder around the club-the taxi rank had to be moved away from the outside of this club to an area well away from all three strip clubs in the centre of Bournemouth. The Safe Bus is parked opposite the club on Horseshoe Common as a refuge for people at night because the area is so unsafe. There has been a murder further up the road at night during the hours of operation of these clubs and more recently a stabbing outside one of the other clubs around closing time. I mention the other club as an indication of the crime and disorder around local strip clubs. Male animals fight as part of courtship and it is perfectly understandable that men coming out a club het up after sexual entertainment will behave aggressively.

Could the licensing committee please consider adding a condition to the already complicated standard conditions approved by full council. Please add a condition that there the no touching rule is broken by intentional touching by either performer or customer that the CCTV recording this is made available as quickly as possible to the police. Without this neither the club, performer or customer has any incentive to report breaches as the performer is at risk of being accused of offences associated with prostitution, the customer of indecent or other assault and the club of allowing these to happen. For the very complicated conditions and expense of CCTV and floor supervisors to be anything other than ineffective this clause requiring submission of the CCTV to the police as soon as a breach is identified needs to be there. Simply throwing out a male customer or warning a performer does not adequately reflect the seriousness nor act as sufficient deterrent given that either of them can just to work or patronise one of the other local clubs. This is the big disadvantage of having so many licensed locally.

Unsuitability of the operator-One reason for this is dealt with also in a separate email which shouldn't be disclosed to the public for legal reasons. In addition, the applicant's business is advertised on a website which does not disclose the identity of the applicant, as required by the Company, Limited Liability Partnership and Business (Names and Disclosures) Regulations 2015 Both that website and the facebook page advertising the applicant show images which are not illegal pornography as they show adult women and are not extreme, in my view, but they are accessible to children without any age verification. As BCP has a duty to protect children in need in the area under the Children Act 1989 then this license should have a condition that the advertising online should not be accessible to children without age verification documents. This would prevent children seeing the images and also guard against minors submitting applications to work for the applicant. I do not say that applications would be accepted, which I'm sure they wouldn't but it is in the nature of teenage girls to try to pass for being older particularly if an opportunity to earn money exists. To their credit this applicant doesn't ask for photos of applicants to be submitted as is the case for other local operators.

The website mentioned for advertising also includes a package called stag on stage which I would question whether it is within the standard licensing condition for BCP as it involves a male customer with two performers on stage. Likewise a picture on the facebook page showing two performers pressed together appears to breach the standard licensing conditions, so is either in breach of some sort of misleading advertising or in breach of the new standard licensing conditions.

In addition on suitability, reports of the applicant's club in Southampton suggested that that club had been temporarily closed recently when a customer complained of large amounts of card

payments being made. I have asked Hampshire Police about this and they have told me that a rogue employees had taken the payments so that they have no objection to the applicant continuing to be licensed in Hampshire. However, it is concerning that an employee would be able to do this and I urge the licensing committee to make it a condition that only payments charged to the applicant can be taken on the premises and that no person working at the premises should have any equipment capable of taking payment to another account, ie one operated by the person working there rather than the applicant. In addition, making the place where payment is taken fixed within the building and covered by CCTV would avoid allegations of payment being taken when the customer has lost mental capacity through intoxication.

Condition of the building-the lane at the back of the building is shown on the BCP map of adopted highways as part of the highway yet access is usually restricted by a locked gate, ie obstruction of the highway, which I believe is a crime. In addition I have repeatedly seen badly overflowing bin that may attract rats in that lane near the rear of these premises. I do not know who is responsible for that bin nor who is responsible for the locking of the gate preventing pedestrian and cycling access along the public highway avoiding the road. However I mention it because both amount to crimes, ie obstruction of the highway and allowing a bin to repeatedly overflow. If these are not anything to do with the applicant could they please say what they have done to report both crimes near their premises and affecting them.

The building also has had a broken window at street level at 140 Old Christchurch Road for some time and is revoltingly grimy with some sort of viscous liquid having been thrown at it. The broken window also has the frame around it giving in slightly. The window display is also, in my view, in breach of the Indecent Displays (Control) Act 1981 because it includes an image in silhouette of a woman who is clearly naked because the nipple is shown in profile. I have previously reported the full sized image in the window of a woman in the process of opening the top part of her clothing as if undressing but I'm not sure if that is still there. The door of about 136 Old Christchurch Road has what look like LED cabling for an outside light display coming out of a hole from the inside and having the sheath around the cable partly stripped which looks very tatty, matching the decrepit state of the window at 140 above. I am assured that as LED cabling it is not particularly dangerous to an adult because of the low voltage needed for LED lighting, but it nevertheless looks very slapdash. It seems a terrible waste of public money to have revamped the road outside at great expense and provided public entertainment through music on the common opposite and yet this building to continue to look so bad. I have asked planning to enforce on a s215 notice because the windows and door drag down the rest of the neighbourhood and also that there is no permission for the lighting from the cable. So far they have not agreed to serve a s215 notice that I know of and also have told me about a planning permission for the outside of the building which I can't see allows the cabling and the lights it leads to. The fact that the Echo has just published a picture of the outside of this building in connection with this application, will, I hope prompt planning to reconsider on enforcement. In particular the tatty look of these windows and door could be blighting the building for letting purposes of the area previously a bar between 140 and 136.

There is also no CEPC certificate for this property listed on the public register. As BCP has a climate change commitment having declared a climate change emergency I would urge them as licensing authority to request a CEPC for this premises as information reasonably requested as permitted by the statute. I also urge the licensing committee to request sight of the legally required fire risk assessment made by the applicant. In the light of the ongoing disrepair of the front of the premises could the licensing authority also please reasonably request sight of the most recent electrical testing for the premises.

The new standard licensing conditions for Sex Establishments adopted by BCP council since the last SEV licence was issued include performers having to use a separate smoking area. If it is at the rear of the premises then I would raise concerns about the safety of this area and the overflowing bin mentioned, whether of this or a neighbouring premises because of the risk of the presence of rats, who urine can I think be poisonous? I have not seen rats here, only seen the overflowing bin which is a risk. I am also aware of high rates of crime in the area as released in statistics from Dorset Police, which might make the area at the back of the premises unsafe for the performers. I have seen a plan of this premises but it is not sufficiently legible for me to see everything on it, nor does it show the separate smoking area the BCP standard conditions require.

Location. Could the licensing committee please distance itself from that part of the BCP licensing policy which restricts objections about location to the immediate vicinity. The reason for this is that the club is situated in the heart of an area closed to cars during the majority of the hours of operation. In addition many premises don't have parking for every resident/customer/member of staff to arrive by car in the day time. Consequently it is unreasonable to assume that people travelling around this area will be using cars and able to travel door to door avoiding walking in the area where customers of the club will also be walking, and having to walk past those customers both when queueing to get in, smoking outside and leaving the premises making their way all through the area closed to cars either to the taxi rank in one direction or the night bus stops in the other direction at the Square/Westover Road. Within this area are every type of premises listed in BCPs policy on licensing of sex establishments as being unsuitable for being near sex establishments. It can also be reasonably assumed that people associated with almost all of them will be moving about at the time this and other strip clubs are open and either customers staff or residents are walking about on foot. The only exception to this is the places of worship which I don't know enough about to say whether night time vigils or services are undertaken there as can sometimes be the case. Although the Home Office has issued guidance which it states is not law that moral objections cannot be made to licensing SEVs, case law has made clear that the people attracted to an area by sex establishments can be a concern for objectors on that basis of the morals of those people, which is different from the morals of the applicant.

Public Sector Equality Duty-please disregard that Home Office advice on licensing of Sex Establishment policy which says that an objection can only be made on the basis of the Local Authority Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1982. Since this guidance was given, which makes clear that it is not law itself, the Equality Act 2010 guidance issued in 2013 has superseded this. If this SEV license is granted it will place BCP in breach of the Equality Act 2010 s.149. I urge the licensing authority to request from the applicant a full equality impact assessment as to compliance with the Equality Act, including people with mobility issues who may find accessing a basement difficult and impact the relationship between people of different genders, given that all people shown as performers in their advertising are female. In deciding whether the applicant should be licensed the licensing authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty, which in this case cannot be decided without provision of and consideration of an equality impact assessment.

Human Rights Act-I do not live near enough to these premises to be disturbed by them on a daily basis. However, I would like to be able to enjoy visiting this area at any time of the day or night and not be concerned by fear of harassment by customers of the strip clubs. I have been warned repeatedly by women not to stand or walk past the strip clubs in the centre of Bournemouth including this one. I have also been harassed by "stag" groups visiting Bournemouth so have avoided it over the years of living locally in Poole. Although I don't think my right to visit Bournemouth is covered by the Human Rights Act I would urge the committee to consider the rights of people who are resident in the many residential units in the centre of Bournemouth, particularly in the area shut off to the traffic at night time. Their right to enjoy their homes is covered by that Act I believe. I

cannot speak for other residents, but the licensing committee has heard in objections to previous licensing applications for strip clubs from councillors who represent residents and business concerned by the presence of these clubs and their customers in the town.

This is a link to the Bournemouth Echo picture of the outside of the premises. It appears from the google image shown that the broken window has been there for over a year at least.

<https://www.bournemouthecho.co.uk/news/20964206.bournemouth-strip-club-fyeo-applies-licence-renewal/>

If the licensing committee is asked to consider evidence from a consultant with previous experience of clubs' licencing in the Metropolitan Police or is swayed by previous evidence of this in other licensing applications, please consider that the this force is currently in "Special Measures" and that there is a national scandal concerning safety of women currently being addressed by forces all over the country. Therefore evidence given as to the safety of women around these clubs should be considered in the light of these issues.

As mentioned above I will send a separate email regarding suitability which is not appropriate for public disclosure.

Kind regards



[Bournemouth h strip club FYEO applies for licence renewal](https://www.bournemouthecho.co.uk/news/20964206.bournemouth-strip-club-fyeo-applies-licence-renewal/)

A THIRD strip club in Bournemouth has applied to renew its licence this year.. The operator of For Your Eyes Only (FYEO) in Old Christchurch Road is seeking permission from BCP Council for its

...
www.bournemouthecho.co.uk

I am so sorry to be piecemeal again but have only just realised a school has just opened off what looks like Stafford Road, off Old Christchurch Road, so could this be tagged onto my objection please?

I was in the area last week in the afternoon and noticed teenagers in school uniform pouring out onto the pavement at the end of the school day.

I checked the website of Livingstone Academy and I think they must have been sixth formers, and apparently they take from all over BCP so probably making their way down to the bus stops in the Square, going past FYEO.

I appreciate that the licencing here has historically been 24/7 even if it hasn't been advertised as being open for all that time.

I would suggest that licensing shouldn't be for when school children will be walking past from regular school or for extra curricular after school activities.

Kind regards

Objection 2

Hello,

I would like to object to the SEV license for For your Eyes only.

The reason for my objection is that the area has changed substantially and continues to do so.

Examples of this are:

Student accommodation - hundreds of new student units have been developed in the vicinity and there are a huge number of young women now living in the area whose safety must be considered

Restaurants have opened near by which are family orientated – please see attached photo with a family eating next to the frontage. (please redact the photo for public papers)

The operator has no regard for residents and businesses in the area with dilapidated signage and objectifying imagery.

A school (Livingstone) is being built close to this site making it no longer suitable.

Best wishes

