

From: Georgie Stewart
Sent: 10 August 2022 23:09
To: Overton Adrian: H&F
Cc: Licensing HF: H&F
Subject: ref: 2022/01110/LAPRR REGULAR REVIEW of Chelsea Lodge's 562 King's Road present Premises licence 2022/00975/LAPRR

August 10 2022

I write as a **committee member of Felden/Swift St Neighbourhood Watch** and as current **Co Chair of the presently designated 'Fulham Town Ward'** - prior to its change to fit the new Ward Boundaries.

The Fulham Ward Panels are working together to pay closer attention to licensing Applications in Fulham. I am supporting them in this effort.

We have observed, especially post-COVID, that many of our few but still quite vibrant Fulham high streets/parades of shops that are so close to our 100 percent residential roads suffer from crime, ASB, nuisance problems that actually stem from licensed Premises, especially ones open into the very late or early morning hours in Fulham, which is 99 percent residential.

In the case of Chelsea Lodge, residents of Holmead Road and surrounds suffer nuisance every time there is a bottomless brunch or other fantastic budget reason to come to 562 King's Road, even during the daytime, and especially on weekends and around bank holidays.

I support, and am thankful for the official Review called by the LBHF Lic Authority regarding Chelsea Lodge, 562 King's Road, London SW6 2DZ.

I am asking the Subcommittee to seriously consider revoking the present Premises licence. At the same time, I understand that were the licence to be revoked, the Premises would have the right to appeal, and thus remain open until the appeal is decided.

It is more than disturbing to read the vivid 10-page Application for this Regular Review. The incident of 26 March 2022 concerning a child and three other females who had to be admitted to hospital after eating/drinking at Chelsea Lodge, owned by the largest PubCo, Stonegate Group, should never have happened.

I have passed by this Premises when returning on a Friday or Saturday night and always see and can clearly hear crowds partying in front of the Premises and into Holmead Road.

I hope it is clear to everyone that the Licence should be revoked. This Premises has proven that they are unable to uphold the Four Licensing Objectives.

Hours should be rolled back to 12 midnight closing at the very latest, maybe even 23:30 (not the proposed 01:00), with last orders at 23:15.

So-called Bottomless Brunches and Drink-all-you-want Champagne/Prosecco for 1 hour, or similar promotions, should be specifically banned in very strict, spelled out Conditions as they attract a certain proven demographic which is mainly very young women and young groups of friends.

This leads to public safety issues, nuisance in the nearby neighbourhood (vomiting etc), and the new phenomenon, NSO balloons on the pavement, in the road, in cars on Holmead Road etc.

Thank you for your consideration of the Fulham community and residents represented through our Fulham Ward Panels. We are pleased to have the opportunity to work with the Licensing Authority, the Police and other Responsible Authorities, as well as the LBHF Sub-Committee for a better, more pleasantly habitable Fulham.

(Mrs) Georgie Stewart
Felden St
London SW6 5AF

From: Sarah Chambers
Sent: 10 August 2022 22:42
To: Licensing HF: H&F
Cc: Sarah Chambers
Subject: Ref: 2022/01110/LAPRR REGULAR REVIEW of Chelsea Lodge's 562 King's Road present Premises licence 2022/00975/LAPRR

Good evening,

I am the **Chair of the Fulham Broadway Ward Panel**, and am likely to be appointed co-Chair of the new Walham Green Ward Panel in due course.

The Chairs of the Ward Panels in Fulham are now working together to address licensing issues, as discussion of these issues is occurring more frequently at meetings (from police reports or resident accounts) or in online forums.

I support the call by the LBHF Licensing Authority for a review of Chelsea Lodge. I am disappointed and shocked by the poor management of this establishment, whose owners pay scant regard to the four licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003:

- the prevention of crime and disorder
- public safety
- the prevention of public nuisance
- the protection of children from harm

This establishment frequently has large groups of customers congregating outside on the Kings Road and Holmead Road, usually under the influence of alcohol. The customers stand in the road impeding the traffic, which is clearly dangerous, and the Ubers and other minicabs dropping off and picking up cause traffic jams. The noise of the customers outside the premises disturbs the sleep of the residents of Holmead Road and nearby.

I was absolutely flabbergasted to hear about the infamous brunch episode on 26th March 2022 at the meeting of the Parsons Green & Walham Ward Panel back in the spring. I couldn't believe poor management had led to four women being taken ill on a Saturday afternoon with LAS and the MPS being called. My first thought was the drinks must have been spiked but was advised the cause was due to a bottomless brunch event and excessive alcohol consumption. I am appalled to read in the Licensing Authority's application for the review that one of the unwell women was only 17 years old.

This establishment should stop serving drinks from 11pm, with all customers to leave by 11:30pm. This will reduce the current considerable noise and anti-social behaviour inflicted on local residents and their children way into the early hours of the morning and reduce the public safety hazards from large groups of intoxicated customers milling around on the pavements and in the roads.

Alcohol should not be served before 1pm and all promotions and events such as bottomless brunches, drinks offers etc should be banned. Drinking to excess should

be discouraged with an emphasis on drinking in moderation. This should avoid LAS and MPS being called out because customers have drunk too much.

All customers should have their photo IDs scanned without exception. It is ludicrous that 20 people should be exempt each evening. Why? Will they be the first 20 people without photo ID or random people or a select list of specific individuals? Everyone knows nowadays to carry photo ID on them in order to buy alcohol, whether in a supermarket, off licence, bar or restaurant. This is standard practice and I don't see there being exceptions in say Waitrose or my local NISA store. Why should there be an exception for entry to a bar?

I fully support this review in my capacity as a local Ward Panel Chair. Residents expect licensed establishments in Fulham and throughout the borough to be well run by professional, responsible owners who adhere to and respect the licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003 at all times. As this has not happened with Chelsea Lodge over the last couple of years, stringent conditions should be imposed or the licence revoked.

Kind regards

Sarah Chambers
Chair - Fulham Broadway Ward Panel

From: Simon Enoch
Sent: 09 August 2022 21:32
To: Overton Adrian: H&F
Cc: Licensing HF: H&F
Subject: ref: 2022/01110/LAPRR REVIEW of Chelsea Lodge's present Premises licence 2022/00975/LAPRR

Dear Sir

I am the Chair of the **Parsons Green and Walham Ward Safer Neighbourhood Panel**, which will shortly be the Parsons Green and Sandford panel, when it is officially created.

We support the official Review called for by the Licensing Authority regarding Chelsea Lodge, 562 King's Road, London SW6 2DZ.

We believe that given the past history there are strong grounds for the revocation of the Licence, especially in light of the incident of 26th March 2022 that concerned a child and three other females who had to be admitted to hospital after visiting the premises.

I frequently pass by these Premises on a Friday or Saturday night. More often than not I see people partying in front of the Premises and into Holmead Road. The Premises certainly do not seem to manage their customers in accordance with their Licensing Conditions.

The Licence Holder has proven that they are unable to uphold the Four Licensing Objectives, as clearly set out by the Licencing Authority in its Application for Review.

If notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Sub Committee is minded not to revoke the licence, I believe that as minimum the terms of the Licence should be amended so that :

1) The hours should be reduced to midnight closing at the very latest, as opposed to the proposed 01:00, with drinking up from 23:15.

2) The "Bottomless Brunches" and drink all you want Champagne/Prosecco for 1 hour ,or similar promotions, should be banned as they encourage young drinkers ,in particular to drink to excess. The subsequent drunken behaviour leads to public safety issues, nuisance in the nearby neighbourhood (vomiting etc), and noise at a time that residents are trying to sleep.

3) The proposed Amendments suggested on pages 5 and 6 of the 10-page Application for Review, should be revised to take into account a closing at midnight as the Terminal Hour. The amendment to only start the service of alcohol from 13:00.

4a) ID checks and scanning should start at the opening time of the Premises, not 21.00 as proposed. Starting at 21:00 can tempt young people, i.e. underage, to show up at 20:30 and wait for the crowds to roll in through the ID checks that start at

21:00. Once they are in, the chances of their ID being checked will be very slim; alternatively, others will buy alcohol for them.

b) Allowing a special list of 20 guests of the manager, who do not need to show ID or be scanned etc., defeats the whole purpose of scanning and ID checks. All ID 's should be checked for age and scanned by the latest technology so that if there is an incident, a fire, shooting or otherwise, the Premises will be able to account for everyone who was in the building. This would also assist the Licencing Objective of Protecting Children from Harm (underage customers) being upheld.

Thank you for your consideration of the wider community and residents as these issues cross artificial boundaries on the map, hence this submission.

Regards

Simon Enoch
Chairman Parsons Green and Walham Ward SNT

From: Charlotte Dexter
Sent: 09 August 2022 21:22
To: Overton Adrian: H&F
Cc:
Subject: DEADLINE Aug 10 Wed, DEXTER Rep 2022/01110/LAPRR REVIEW of Chelsea Lodge's present Premises license 2022/00975/LAPRR

.....
To: Adrian Overton, LBHF Licensing
by email:
cc:

From: Barclay Road Conservation Area NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

ref: 2022/01110/LAPRR REGULAR REVIEW of Chelsea Lodge's 562 King's Road present Premises licence 2022/00975/LAPRR

August 9, 2022

I write as a resident of our Neighbourhood Watch and as a member of the newly-formed 'Walham Green' Ward Panel (formerly certain roads of former 'Fulham Town' Ward).

The Fulham Ward Panels are working together to pay closer attention to licensing Applications in Fulham. I am supporting them in this effort.

We have observed, especially post-COVID, that many of our few but still quite vibrant Fulham high streets/parades of shops that are so close to our 100 percent residential roads suffer from crime, ASB, nuisance problems that actually stem from licensed Premises, especially ones open into the very late or early morning hours in Fulham, which I might add is 99 percent residential.

In the case of Chelsea Lodge, residents of Holmead Road and surrounds suffer nuisance every time there is a bottomless brunch or other fantastic budget reason to come to 562 King's Road, even during the daytime, and especially on weekends and around bank holidays.

I support, and am thankful for the official Review called by the LBHF Lic Authority regarding Chelsea Lodge, 562 King's Road, London SW6 2DZ. It is not easy to call a Review; much evidence is needed, hundreds of hours of gathering info/data/involving various Responsible Authorities, creating a water-tight file....

I am asking the Subcommittee to seriously consider revoking the present Premises licence. At the same time, I understand that were the licence to be revoked, the Premises would have the right to appeal, and thus remain open until the appeal is decided. Difficult...

To the facts:

It is more than disturbing to read the vivid 10-page Application for this Regular Review. The incident of 26 March 2022 concerning a child and three other females

who had to be admitted to hospital after eating/drinking at Chelsea Lodge, owned by the largest PubCo, Stonegate Group, should never have happened
FACT: The Premises was incapable of upholding/promoting the Four Licensing Objectives on 26 March 2022.

My own observations

Since the opening up again of venues/theatres in the West End and a mild Winter/Spring, and now Summer, I have passed by this Premises when returning from the West End on a Friday or Saturday night and always see and can clearly hear crowds partying in front of the Premises and into Holmead Road. Often, I am on my bicycle, so I've had a chance to stop and observe. One night there were about 150 people outside the Premises and in Holmead Road. The Premises certainly was not managing their customers and those attracted to this very Premises, as per their Licensing Conditions. I had read articles, and was able to find one again, in the newspaper (6 Feb 2020) about a stabbing at this Premises in February 2020, '*Clubber left with bleed on the brain in vicious attack at London celebrity venue Chelsea Lodge*'.

You can read the article and watch the actual camera scanning on that very night at Chelsea Lodge here: <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/crime/partygoer-attacked-chelsea-lodge-king-s-road-cctv-appeal-a4355016.html> I add shorter and easier to type in tinyURL in case Sub-Committee members do not encounter a live link: <https://tinyurl.com/fe3sb6at>

I hope it is clear to everyone that the Licence should be revoked. This Premises has proven that they are unable to uphold the Four Licensing Objectives. My sense is that they have no intention of doing so. I set out why, below.

I also note that it has taken the Licensing Authority to push for this Review. I do wonder why Police did not push for a review; instead, it seems that they were satisfied with more Conditions agreed in yet another minor variation-ish situation where residents really cannot comment and if they do, not much happens and we don't get to a hearing; I am unclear if the Sub-Committee is even aware of all this. There are grey areas in the 2018 Guidance of the 2003 Lic Act that I think should be discussed, but where? We can't contact Licensing Committee members as that would compromise them.

Twenty people in , 'Scott-Free'

Those newly agreed Conditions (Annex 4) now allow a special manager's list of 20 people every night who do not need to be ID checked or scanned.

I asked about this; apparently, people are out and about London to go to clubs without ID; really? Is this realistic to even contemplate, I ask the Sub-Committee Contrary to ideas like Public Safety, preventing crime, protecting underage teens: I am supposed to believe that after Covid, in this still somewhat Covid/post Covid world, people actually go out without proper ID, without a tissue in their pocket, without a card to pay for things (even if they have their phone and use ApplePay, but it suddenly might not work), even maybe with/without a mask, just in case they decide that they suddenly need one?

"People are using Ubers so they don't have their driver's licence with them," I was told. I don't buy that argument and I don't see how the Sub-Committee could either, in the interest of promoting the Four Licensing Objectives; Prevention of Crime and Disorder, Public Safety, Prevention of Public Nuisance and Prevention of Children from Harm.

It is also very dangerous to go out on the town without ID (public safety); what if something happens to you? People need to be able to identify you, quickly; they will immediately search for your ID.

I hope the SubCommittee will revoke. But in these Representations, one has to also say what one does not want but what one would want were revocation not on the minds of the decision makers.

1) 23:30/ MIDNIGHT latest Terminus Hour

Please; hours should be rolled back to 12 midnight closing at the very latest, maybe even 23:30 (not the proposed 01:00), with last orders at 23:15.

2) BAN ALL Promotions that condone getting drunk, and spell them out in words and specific descriptions:

So-called Bottomless Brunches and Drink-all-you-want Champagne/Prosecco for 1 hour, or similar promotions, should be specifically banned in very strict, spelled out Conditions as they attract a certain proven demographic which is mainly very young women and young groups of friends.

This leads to public safety issues, nuisance in the nearby neighbourhood (vomiting etc), and the new phenomenon, NSO balloons on the pavement, in the road, in cars on Holmead Road etc.

All sorts of noise of people (yelling, yelping, screaming, at any time disturbs residents who are trying to sleep. Fulham's Victorian terraced houses cause an echo/sound tunnel down the road. The smallest voice reverberates against the glass windows and bounces further.

This is especially the case later in the evening as people disperse from the Premises and walk down Holmead Road towards Fulham Broadway and pubs on Fulham Road that are open until 2am, and where nighttime street parties are now an attraction until around 4am, especially on weekends, in Fulham Broadway.

3) MIDNIGHT latest: Regarding the proposed Amendments suggested on pages 5 and 6 of the 10-page Application for Review, I suggest that these be revised to take a closing of 23:30 or if necessary midnight as the Terminal Hour. I applaud the amendment to starting the service of alcohol only from 13:00; more on that in a moment, though.

4) I am very concerned about Annex 4 Conditions, attached. These were agreed by the Police with the Premises after the 26 March incident and before the calling of this Review by the Licensing Authority, namely at point 2)a,

a) not scanning/checking IDs for lunch ie from before and after 13:00 (proposed new time for starting to serve alcohol), and only starting ID checks and scanning at 21:00 is a temptation too much and not even good management policy.

ID checks/scanning should start at the opening time of the Premises, namely a short time before alcohol will begin to be served at 13:00.

If that does not happen, those bottomless brunches will attract the very same type of young underage woman of 26 March. Word is now getting out very quickly that there is no real ID check, no scanning for lunch/afternoon, not until 9pm.

This is a HUGE gap in the Conditions and the SubCommittee must please address it.

Starting scanning/ID checks, so called "onboarding of customers" at 21:00 will tempt young people, ie underage, to show up and again pain-free/no ID access at 20:30 and wait for the crowds to roll in through the ID checks that start at 21:00. Once they are in, the chances of being checked for ID will be very slim; alternatively, others will buy alcohol for them.

b) point allowing a special list of 20 guests of the manager who do not need to show ID or be scanned etc.

This defeats the whole purpose of scanning and ID checks.

Eliminate, excuses for "I forgot my ID":

Points 2)b i, ii, iii should be eliminated to assure that EVERYONE is ID checked for age and they are scanned by the latest technology so that if there is an incident, a fire, shooting or otherwise, the Premises will be able to account for everyone who was in the building ie came through scanners, ie a thorough checking of EVERY individual.

As well, how can the Lic Objective of Protecting children from Harm (underage customers) be upheld if this Premises does not complete thorough ID checks and scanning on ALL customers? This was exactly the problem on 26 March 2022! No pity, please.

I read that one of the problems for Police back in February 2020 regarding the incident at Chelsea Lodge mentioned above (Evening Standard 6 Feb 2020) was that one of the male suspects had not been recorded on the Premises camera, so they did not know who they were looking for. It's time for this Premises to learn some lessons and implement very simple, straight forward scanning, cameras, ID checks that are scanned into databases (all within GDPR regs, fear not) etc. The latest, fastest 'onboarding customers' technology is out there and surely Stonegate knows all about the best practices of other Premises. Why owners Stonegate are not putting the Rolls-Royce of onboarding into this Premises is clearly incomprehensible for the very wise Sub-Committee but also for us mere residents.

Hopefully, Stonegate will implement a state-of-the-art system vs relying on a special list of 20 unchecked persons with their 'forgot-my-ID, -again but I am a friend of the Manager' scenarios.

I understand that a decision will normally be made on completion of the hearing but if no decision is made at the hearing, I have read that the sub-committee has a maximum of five days from the day or the last day of the hearing to come to a decision. Following a review, a sub-committee may:

- Decide that no action is necessary to promote the licensing objectives
- Modify or add conditions to the licence
- Exclude a licensable activity from the licence

- Remove the designated premises supervisor
- Suspend the licence for a period (not exceeding three months)
- Revoke the licence

Thank you for your consideration of the Fulham community and residents represented through our Fulham Ward Panels. We are pleased to have the opportunity to work with the Licensing Authority, the Police and other Responsible Authorities, as well as the LBHF Sub-Committee for a better, more pleasantly habitable Fulham. We have a lot of work to do, together!

Leader Cowan has promised us a safer place to live. We certainly need that in Fulham and especially around 562 King's Road.

Barclay Road Conservation Area Neighbourhood Watch
Charlotte Dexter Murray
Barclay Rd
London SW6 1EJ