



Dover District Council
Licensing Section
24 NOV 2016

Please read the guidance notes on page 6 before completing this form.

1. Your details:

Name: Police Constable 8492 Stephen Noddings

Address: C/O Community Safety Unit , Dover District Council , Whitfield , Dover

Telephone number: Home: N/A Work: Mobile: 00 000

Email address:

2. Name of the premises and applicant applying for a licence:

Hope & Lane

3. Address of the premises applying for a licence:

92A High Street,
Deal,
Kent Police CT14 6EG

4. Which category of objector are you? (See Guidance Notes)

(Please specify paragraph number eg "3(a)".)

Please ✓

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | a person living in the vicinity of the premises | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | a body representing persons who live in that vicinity* | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | a person involved in a business in that vicinity | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | a body representing persons involved in such businesses | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

5. **Please indicate in relation to which of the four Licensing Objectives your representation is made:**

	Please ✓
Prevention of Crime and Disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prevention of Nuisance	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Protection of children from harm	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. (a) **If you are representing someone else (categories 3(b) and 3(d)), please give the names and addresses of all persons or business that you represent together with which category such persons or businesses fall into.**

Kent Police – Responsible Authority

(b) **Please give details of the nature of your objection to the application.**

Kent Police are objecting to the placement of tables and chairs to the front of the premises on the basis that the pavement has insufficient width to cater for the placement of tables and chairs and the ability of the public to use the available pavement in a safe manner.

7. **What evidence do you rely on in support of your objection?**

On the evening of Wednesday 23rd November 2016 I attended the location and found that there were two tables and four chairs already outside the front of the premises.

I measured the pavement and found it to be 1.87 metres wide from the edge of the building to the edge of the pavement. The tables and chairs occupied 0.8m of the pavement without having any members of the public utilising the seating.

This left just over 1 metre of available space for pedestrians and others to pass by the premises.

The location of the premises is directly adjacent to a limited waiting parking area which limits vehicles to be parked within the parking bays for an hour before requiring them to move so there are regular vehicle movements within the area.

Whilst considering the application I must be mindful of the rights of Disabled persons. When I consider mobility issues where a person may require the use of a mobility scooter. The average width of a mobility scooter is between 750 mm and 1000 mm. (pathsforall.org). Therefore if there was a larger mobility scooter

attempting to pass the tables and chairs they would have extreme difficulty as there would only be about 70 mm of available space (and this is prior to anyone sitting on the chairs.

For the visually impaired within the Government paper titled "Inclusive Mobility" the minimum width requirement for a blind person who requires the use of an assistance dog is 1100 mm.

The location of the premises is on the side of the High Street that is busy with pedestrians who are accessing shops within the town centre and also the shops to the northern side of Deal town centre where there has been a great amount of effort to promote those shops not within the centre.

Therefore with all of the above factors the placement of tables and chairs to the front of the premises is not suitable as it will increase the risk to pedestrians who are attempting to walk past the premises and force them to walk near the kerb near to moving or parked vehicles. There is insufficient pavement to allow tables and chairs to be placed and for the safe movement of pedestrians of all ages and abilities to be able to pass.

I have no objections to the tables and chairs being located to the side of the premises as these are within a pedestrian area where there is a reduced risk and more available space.

8. In your opinion can this objection be overcome by conditioning the licence or negotiation with the applicant?

NO

There are no conditions that could be applied that would prevent this incident from re-occurring.

9. If you answered YES to question 8, please give details of what condition(s) should be imposed to overcome your objection or what negotiation should be undertaken.

N/A

I understand that, if accepted as relevant, my representation will form part of the documentation disclosed to all parties to the Hearing before the Licensing sub-committee.

SIGNATURE..........

DATE.....24-11-18.....

From: deal.town.council

Sent: 29 November 2016 11:20

To:

Subject: Street Furniture Application - Hope and Lane 92a High Street, Deal, CT14 6EG

Good Morning Katy,

Deal Town Council **object** to the application from Hope and Lane, 92a High Street to place tables and chairs on the highway as the proposed seating on the pavement at the front of the café and up St Georges Passage will obstruct the movement of pedestrians, prams and wheelchairs.

Kind regards

Kelly

Planning Clerk

Deal Town Council

From: Bill Gardner **Sent:** 29 November 2016 09:51

Subject: Re: Street Furniture Application - Hope and Lane 92a High Street, Deal, CT14 6EG

As ward Cllr for North Deal, which includes the whole of Deal High St,

I wish to object to this application for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the pavement at the front is far too narrow for the 2 tables and 4 chairs that they are planning to put there.

Indeed they have been putting these out without a license and without planning permission for a while. They are forcing parents with pushchairs and buggies to cross over the road or at least go into the road to get down the High St because they cannot pass these obstructions on what is supposed to be a pavement.

Secondly, and this is in a way part of the same point, Deal has a lot of elderly people that use mobility buggies to get around and these people have exactly the same problem as mentioned in point one.

I understand that the application has been altered following the Police objections so that these two tables and four chairs no longer are part of the application.

I trust that the committee will still consider this part of the application and decide that this area of pavement is not suitable for tables and chairs. The reason I state this is because Hope and Lane when they first applied for a license had already put the tables and chairs out before they even applied, and again this time round, they put the extra tables and chairs out on the pavement without remission, so I would ask the committee to clearly state when they consider the revised application that they would not have allowed the tables and chairs on the pavement. This is because having seen past history, Hope and Lane have tried it on before and have obviously got form for pushing at and breaking the boundaries.

Thirdly, I wish to object to extra tables and chairs in St Georges alleyway, the ones they currently have are more than enough, and cause problems to people trying to visit the shops in this busy little extra part of the High St.

What they already have is more than enough.

Cllr Bill Gardner.

DDC Cllr for North Deal ward.

From: Bill Gardner

Sent: 29 November 2016 10:07

To: Louise Bentley

Subject: Re: Street Furniture Application - Hope and Lane 92a High Street, Deal, CT14 6EG

Sorry, they have had benches and trestle tables out in the alleyway at the side of the shop for 3 or 4 years at least, and I honestly thought that they had permission for these to be there.

If they have not got permission previously for these benches and tables, how have they been able to get away with this breach for so long without DDC taking any action.

I seriously assumed that these 2 tables and benches were legal and that they were going for an increase, not finally putting in an application to put right a long running

situation where they have been allowed to break the rules for ages.

So your quick reply and this further email can all be counted as part of my objection,

Bill Gardner.

Sent from my iPad