

**RESIDENT 1**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

>

to: Premises Licensing  
<premises.licensing@manchester.gov.uk>

date: 26 Mar 2020, 14:21

subject: Re: amendments proposed to new  
premises application 244535AM2  
Assembly

Hello Ashia

Just to clarify, you will be aware I was copied in on the email sent to you this morning from Licensing Legal with the attached Acoustics report .

The report is based on false information regarding the water feature which I have made you aware of. Could you please clarify whether Licensing Legal are now aware of this or not? They may wish to rethink their application on behalf of their client.

In answer to your questions, the amendments to the closure times are insufficient to allay my concerns, and therefore to affect my objection.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Re: 244535AM2 Assembly New premises application

[REDACTED]

12:11 (1 hour ago)

to me, [REDACTED]

Hello

Thanks for furnishing me with the copy of the attached Acoustics report. I must however draw your attention to a factual inaccuracy contained in Section 2 of the report. The water feature you refer to does not present as a constant noise to nearby residents. It has a timing mechanism which switches on at 8.00 in the mornings and switches off at 21.00 in the evenings. There is very little noise from the rear of the building for Chepstow House residents to contend with outside this timeframe despite the central location.

Regards

[REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESIDENT 5**

[REDACTED]

>

to: remises Licensing  
<premises.licensing@manchester.g  
date: 27 Mar 2020, 14:40  
subject: RE: amendments proposed to new  
premises application 244535AM2  
Assembly

Dear Ashia  
Thank you for your email.  
Please find attached our response as requested.  
Please could you kindly confirm safe receipt and the next steps by return of email.  
Kind regards

[REDACTED]

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESIDENT 7**

On Thu, 26 Mar 2020 at 16:14, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Ashia  
Thank you for your email in respect of the planning application noted above. We are given a measure of reassurance by the points made regarding the adjustments to opening hours but still have great reservations in respect of the lateness of the hours on Friday and Saturday . We are pleased to see the proposals regarding sound proofing and other modifications aimed at reducing sound levels .  
A minor point regarding the fountain in the canal basin . It does not run all through the night.  
We do take a degree of comfort from the work and effort put into supporting the application by the applicant.

[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs

In response to your proposed amendments regarding the licensing application by Pop City regarding the premises at Barbirolli Square, we would wish to make the following observations:

1. We have no expertise in relation to sound measurement and monitoring but would note that that report relied upon is deficient in a number of respects in our experience. In particular:
  - a. It fails to take into account that the canal basin is a natural echo chamber that amplifies the slightest noise generated within it. The points at which the measurements were made does not take this into account and it is of particular note that early morning use of machinery to clean the steps leading into the basin was stopped by the Council as even this minor noise was causing noise disturbance to residents of Chepstow House and the Bridgewater Hall.
  - b. Noise is generated by people using the pathways through the canal basin and the numbers doing so will be significantly increased if the proposed night club were to go ahead.
  - c. Chepstow House has large windows that are single glazed and cannot be soundproofed due to its status as a listed building.
  - d. When the Pitcher and Piano was operating the playing of background music alone was sufficient to cause nuisance to residents.
  - e. Noise nuisance is not simply a matter of decibel readings.
  - f. The proposed noise levels are premised on the basis that the insulation shall remain in place and static. But this fails to take into account the constant opening of the doors to the premises and the noise generated by customers whose sole purpose is to dance and drink alcohol and who will be entering and leaving the premises regularly throughout the night (whether to smoke, go home or simply get a breath of fresh air – which cannot be monitored or prevented). The result at best will be continued bursts of loud music and noise from the customers themselves, doubtless gathering in groups, when outdoors.
  - g. No provision is made for the noise generated by vehicles arriving at the top of the stairs and/or on Chepstow Street to deliver and pick up customers.

- h. Our experience of a venue far less noise intensive than that currently proposed is a far more reliable test of the noise nuisance that is likely to be caused than the current technical assessment which is defective for the reasons set out.
  - i. The current proposal in any event clearly envisages that there will be an outside area specifically provided with tables and chairs for customer use up to 10pm. Are these customers to have no access to the bar and is it really the case that they will not be able to listen to the music? In each case the noise and disturbance will, on your own proposals, continue until 10pm.
2. The use of the outside area cannot cease at 10pm. People will continue to come outside to smoke and leave the night club or otherwise seek some fresh air. The noise will continue (for the reasons set out above) until the premises close.
3. It is naive to propose that outside furniture will be removed by 10pm. Even if this was put into effect, the current outside furniture is fixed and with good reason. The previous movable furniture was constantly thrown into the canal as were various customers with many voluntarily throwing themselves into the canal under the influence of alcohol or otherwise. In any event, this will not resolve the issue as the steps are used continuously for seating and consequently gatherings of groups who remain even when the venue is closed (in our experience). The steps were covered with people during the summer months when the Pitcher and Piano was in place and this continued into the early hours. It is simply not possible to monitor who is a smoker and who is not and the use of the canal as an impromptu swimming pool is a real threat. It is unclear whether your client (or the Council) is willing to permit this risk with a possibility of injury or even fatalities but we would wish to go on record that this is a significant problem if permission is granted for this night club and granting this application would be a clear endorsement of a known danger.

4. The hours proposed are entirely unreasonable for residents who are working and need to have a reasonable period for sleep. There are shift workers and elderly residents upon whom the proposed hours of exposure to noise nuisance will impact to a significant expense.
5. The hours and the proposal further fails to take into account the risk of vandalism and criminal damage. Vehicle are parked facing the canal and within easy access of persons outside the venue should they wish to climb over or around the railings. The vehicles are also easily open to damage from items that may easily be thrown from the venue or in the vicinity of the same. There is an access gate directly adjacent to the venue that is used by many residents and the presence of people from the venue outside and next to the gate will be a threat to many of the elderly (and not so elderly) residents who wish to use that gate. It is also likely to be obstructed if sufficient numbers are outside.
6. This is an entirely unrealistic proposal that would do irreparable damage to residents and businesses within the area and we strongly oppose what amounts to a total loss of quiet enjoyment of our property and of those around us.