Kate Halsall

From:
Sent: Thursday 15 November 2012 17:02
To: Kate Halsall
Subject: Betting License - Amore

(2)

I refer to the application to the licensing committee which I understand is being heard this evening.

My partner and I live in the second floor apartment above 137, the hairdressers in the High Street. We look out onto the High Street and Rowland Road.

I am writing to record our objection to the application for a Premises Licence for a Betting Shop in Amore. Whilst I am a local business owner and keen to encourage business and employment in the village I do feel that to allow a betting shop in this location would be potentially very detrimental to village life.

Since Oscars opened our evenings (and some nights) have been disturbed by noise from people leaving late, clearly drunk and sometimes violent. We are awoken by people arguing. I fear that the same people who are frequenting Oscars would be drawn by a betting shop.

People pop into a betting shop to place a quick bet. When the cash point was in use – before we were awoken by someone reversing their stolen telehopper into our wall – cars would pull up with their radios blaring at all hours of the day and night. They would park right by the cash point – sometimes close enough to get cash without having to get out of their vehicles – and it was often difficult to reverse out of our parking space. The road was almost continually blocked by bank customers leaving their cars whilst they used the cash point without giving any thought to their careless and anti-social parking.

Our sleep has been better since the bungled raid and I personally hope that the cash point never comes back into use. But I fear that the same people will park outside the betting office without any concern for other road users. Amore is of course on a junction, and the rather strange "crossing" confuses both pedestrians and road users with neither sure who has the right of way and is an accident waiting to happen. Parking outside –although obviously not permitted – would make the junction even more dangerous.

There is already one Betting Shop in our once peaceful village. I cannot see that a second shop is necessary and I feel it is most certainly not desirable.

Kate Halsall

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday 22 November 2012 14:14
To: Kate Halsall
Subject: 2a - RE: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE - 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

(2a)

Dear Kate

1. My home address is [redacted] High Street, Cranleigh
2. It relates to this property
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Objective 1 applies.

Kate Halsall

From:
Sent: (3) Monday 19 November 2012 14:28
To: Licensing Policy
Subject: Betting shop application: Amore, Cranleigh

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to register my objection to either a gaming licence or betting shop application applied for by BetFred with regard to the shop in Cranleigh High Street formally known as Amore. This location is right in the heart of the village, opposite one of the main focal points in the village, Fountain Square. It will be highly visible to all and is likely to encourage gambling and may stimulate children to get involved with an addictive habit. If people want to gamble, there is already a betting shop owned by the same chain on the outskirts of the village.

I live and work in Cranleigh; I am an active committee member of the Chamber of Trade and Commerce and have also worked on a voluntary basis for Ewhurst Junior Football Club for a number of years. I am really keen on helping to make Cranleigh a well balanced village with an attractive shopping centre, but believe that this type of business in this particular location will damage the ambience and may well deter others from setting up shop nearby.

Yours faithfully,

Kate Halsall

From: [redacted]
Sent: (3a) Wednesday 28 November 2012 09:49
To: Kate Halsall
Cc: Licensing Policy
Subject: RE: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE - 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

Further to your email below, I would like to reply as follows:

1. My home address is [redacted]
2. My comments relate to the location of this shop in the centre of Cranleigh. I have no objection to the availability of a second betting shop in the village, but in this case, feel that the high profile location in the centre of the village is unsuitable.
3. I have no problem with my name and address being disclosed.
4. I may be available to attend the hearing, subject to work commitments, if you can provide an idea of how long the proceedings are likely to be.
5. My main concern refers to point 3 from your licensing objectives, 'protection of children from harm' as I feel that the presence of this shop in this location will make a statement that the village endorses gambling. Children are too young to make this decision and although they may be unable to place bets directly it may encourage them to ask others to place bets on their behalf or to try gambling online.

Regards,

Kate Halsall

From:
Sent: Monday 19 November 2012 14:47
To: Licensing Policy
Subject: Re Premises Licence under the Gambling Act 2005 by Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd trading as Bet Fred for 122 High Street, Cranleigh, Surrey GU6 8RF

5

To whomever it may concern, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms about the application for a Premises Licence under the Gambling Act 2005 by Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd trading as Bet Fred for 122 High Street, Cranleigh, Surrey GU6 8RF.

This is wholly unsuitable and entirely detrimental to the local environment and the area around the centre of Cranleigh Village on social and noise grounds as well as likely car parking outside the shop which is on a very busy corner and sightline.

I am a local resident and own a local business which in no way conflicts with this business.

Regards,

Kate Halsall

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday 02 December 2012 22:43
To: Kate Halsall; Licensing Policy
Subject: RE: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE - 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

5a

1. Local home address – [redacted]
2. Comments apply to this particular address
3. Yes
4. No
5. Protection of children from harm

Kate Halsall

From:
Sent: Monday 19 November 2012 15:56
To: Licensing Policy
Subject: High Street Cranleigh-Bet Fred application

6

Importance: High

Dear Sirs,
Regarding the application for licencing and planning permission to enable Bet Fred to open on the Amore Jewellers site on the High Street in Cranleigh, I object very strongly on a number of grounds- this is a corner shop on double yellow lines and this business will increase the likelihood of illegal and dangerous parking. It is an antisocial business which would encourage people to congregate on this corner- again an unsafe place to be standing. The hours of opening again would encourage people to be out on the road at strange times of the day and night.
So on the grounds of noise, safety and car parking, this business should not be allowed to take occupation or trade on this site.
The original site is perfectly okay where it is further down the quieter end of the High Street.
Please register my objection.

Best regards

Kate Halsall

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday 28 November 2012 13:33
To: Kate Halsall
Subject: RE: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE - 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

6a

Importance: High

Dear Kate
The replies you require are as follows;
Business is situated at 40 High Street Cranleigh GU6 8AT
The comments were aimed at this property in particular in that the type of business will attract people standing round and congregating on that corner, may be even parking there to nip in to put a bet on!
Yes please feel free to disclose my details to the applicant.
If necessary yes.
i object to this licencing application on all 3 grounds you have mentioned. This site is of importance in its placing in the village High Street at a busy junction where school children all use/cross/ etc in their daily journey to and from school.
Disorder in that opening early and closing late will encourage youngsters and others to congregate round the corner at all times of the night and day.
I think you mean in a 'fair and open manner'- I feel this is too obvious for the High Street and does not add or enhance the reputation of this village as exactly that- a wholesome, family, independently minded village with community spirit at its heart. This business will have a detrimental effect on our village and should be opposed at all costs!

I hope this answers your questions adequately but please do come back to me if necessary.

Kate Halsall

From: Clerk at Cranleigh Parish Council <clerk@cranleighpc.org>
Sent: Wednesday 21 November 2012 15:37
To: Kate Halsall
Subject: FW: Betfred

(8)

I sent this to the licencing address but it bounced back…would you be able to accept our concerns?
Pauline

From: Clerk at Cranleigh Parish Council [mailto:clerk@cranleighpc.org]
Sent: 21 November 2012 15:23
To: 'licencing@waverley.gov.uk'
Subject: FW: Betfred

Cranleigh Parish Council

Village Way
Cranleigh
Surrey, GU6 8AF

Contact:
Clerk: Mrs P Whitehead - BA(Hons) FILCM

tel: 01483 272311 fax: 01483 277573 web: www.cranleighpc.org

FAO Licensing Officers, Waverley Borough Council.

19th November 2012

Re : Application by Betfred, Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd for a new betting shop premises licence at 122 High Street, Cranleigh where no facilities for gambling will be provided on the premises between the hours of 10pm on one day and 7am on the next day.

Cranleigh Parish Council discussed the above application at a Parish Council meeting on 15th November. The Parish Council had received several e-mails from local residents which expressed various concerns. Those residents have been advised to contact Waverley BC direct.

Cranleigh Parish Council strongly objects to this application for a betting shop in a very prominent position in the High Street, as it is likely to lead to a major increase in gambling, which is recognised as a serious national concern with its impact on families that could already be experiencing financial difficulties in the present economic climate. 122 High Street is a very large retail outlet which, as a betting shop with probably a large number of slot machines, could attract a large clientele, and due to its prominence, become the focus of attention for children and young people travelling past it on their way to and from school. The loss of a major retail outlet to gambling is also a matter of concern in the village centre which is still seeking to recover from the deep economic downturn, and the presence of a gambling establishment in the centre of the High Street could lead to a serious reduction in footfall for adjacent shops already fighting to stay afloat. Finally, the use of this shop for gambling will attract people making much shorter visits than the average High Street shopper, and would result in parking problems on a difficult corner which is a traffic black spot at the best of times as the public car parks are some distance away.

Yours faithfully

Kate Halsall

From: Clerk at Cranleigh Parish Council <clerk@cranleighpc.org>
Sent: Friday 30 November 2012 15:40
To: Kate Halsall
Cc: B Cheesman Cllr ; Cllr B Arendell; Brian Ellis; Cllr David Gill; Cllr J Bainbridge; Janet Somerville; Cllr Ken Reed; 'Cllr MaryForyszewski'; Patricia Ellis; Cllr Richard Cole; Cllr Robert Wilson; Cllr Ruth Reed
Subject: FW: Betfred

8a

Dear Kate,
I have responded to the questions below as requested.
Kind regards
Pauline

I refer to your recent representation on the above application. May I ask you please to respond briefly to the following questions, before this matter can proceed:-

1. Please confirm your local home/business address and postcode.

Cranleigh Parish Council
Village Way
Cranleigh
GU6 8AF

2. Can you tie your comments to this particular premises, or is your comment a more general one?

The comments relate to the proposed new betting shop premises licence at 122 High Street, Cranleigh

3. Do you agree to the disclosure of your name and address to the applicants, who are entitled to see at least the main body of all representations received to the application at this stage? The information may aid negotiations between the applicants and neighbours. Address and contact details may eventually have to be released at a Hearing of the matter, and the Council has to be satisfied that you are affected by the application.

The comments expressed by the Parish Council as an elected body represent those of the community, therefore we agree to the disclosure of our name and address.

4. Will you be available to appear on Monday, 17th December 2012 if the application requires a hearing before a Licensing Sub-Committee, as seems likely?

There may be a Councillor willing to attend, but we would need to confirm this closer to the date.

5. Applications are considered having regard to the three Licensing Objectives (listed below) set out in the legislation. May I ask you please to confirm which of the three objectives you feel applies to your representation/covers your concerns:-

Licensing Objectives:

1. Prevention of crime and disorder

2. Gambling conducted in a fair and open manner

3. Protection of children from harm

The main concern of the Parish Council is associated with objective 3.

Will you please respond within five days of receiving this letter, if possible. A telephone call or email to licensing@waverley.gov.uk<mailto:licensing@waverley.gov.uk> would be quite acceptable if this is convenient for you. Please also note that if representations received are maintained, a formal hearing of this application will take place, and you will be asked to attend to support your representation. If needed, this is likely to be on 17th December 2012 at 10.00 am. If the application goes to that stage, everyone making and maintaining representations has the opportunity to attend the hearing and be heard and questioned regarding the application.

It is important that concerned individuals are fully aware of the extent of an application of this nature. You may inspect the application at the Godalming offices during office hours, and those making representations are strongly advised to try to do so. You may feel that further information on the application could allay your concerns further. If I can put you in contact with the applicants, or if you have any queries on this letter or the application please telephone me.

From: Clerk at Cranleigh Parish Council [mailto:clerk@cranleighpc.org]
Sent: 21 November 2012 15:23
To: 'licencing@waverley.gov.uk'
Subject: FW: Betfred

Cranleigh Parish Council
Village Way
Cranleigh
Surrey, GU6 8AF
Contact:
Clerk: Mrs P Whitehead - BA(Hons) FILCM
tel: 01483 272311 fax: 01483 277573 web: www.cranleighpc.org

FAO Licensing Officers, Waverley Borough Council.

19th November 2012

Re : Application by Betfred, Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd for a new betting shop premises licence at 122 High Street, Cranleigh where no facilities for gambling will be provided on the premises between the hours of 10pm on one day and 7am on the next day.

Cranleigh Parish Council discussed the above application at a Parish Council meeting on 15th November. The Parish Council had received several e-mails from local residents which expressed various concerns. Those residents have been advised to contact Waverley BC direct.

Kate Halsall

From:
Sent: Wednesday 05 December 2012 13:29
To: Catie Hipgrave
Cc: Licensing Policy
Subject: RE: Betting premises license application

(10)

Dear Catie

Further to my earlier voicemail, I would like to put the below to you. If this is not the correct procedure to submit a formal representation, please advise me.

With regards to the betting premises license application in relation to 122 High Street, Cranleigh, I would like to formally make a representation, which I trust you will take into consideration when making a decision on whether to award the betting premises license for 122 High Street in Cranleigh.

My company (MHA) is directly above said premises and will therefore directly affected by Betfred carrying out its trade at 122 High Street. I have sought assurances from the landlord, who incidentally is also my landlord, that we will continue to enjoy peaceful enjoyment of our offices as per our lease. I have specifically asked for assurances regarding the following:

- That there will be no congregation of betting shop clientele outside the front door of my office, which is directly adjacent to the entrance of the premises where the betting shop hopes to be based. My staff may well feel intimidated should they have to go through a small group of punters every lunch time.
- That there will be no adverse noise from slot machines, screened events and such travelling up, bearing in mind I have staff working directly above the premises, with a lot of this work being telephone based advice to clients.
- That there will be no issues in relation to parking, with only a small car park directly behind the office, where my staff parks it cars in allocated parking spaces.
- That there will be no unauthorised use by betting shop clientele of our car park through noise, littering and such.

In response the landlord has told us that it should all be OK, because there are no issues in Godalming either. No assurances are given, which leads me to conclude that the application for a betting premises license merely has financial drivers, and that suitability of tenant and location has not been given appropriate thought.

Aside from the above, the location at a very busy point in the village, with no available parking, the typical behaviour by Betfred's current clients would cause severe traffic disruption. The normal modus operandi is to pull into the lay-by, place bet, and drive off. Has the landlord and/ or Betfred put in place a strategy to change this typical client behaviour?

Another point of concern is the location directly opposite the village pub. The betting shop may well attract the type of patrons, that are not within the target market of the pub. Historically there are obviously situations where organic growth of a community resulted in a betting shop and pub to be close together, but to actually encourage that development may not be wise.

And possibly even most importantly, with all the associated public information on the downsides of gambling, it is surely not prudent to place a betting shop in a very prominent position, highly visible and right in the middle where a large number of teenagers congregate every afternoon whilst awaiting their transport home after school?

In light of this I would urge you to reject the application, ensuring that the gambling activity remains at the fringes of the community, away from the impressionable teenage population.

I would be happy to explain my objections in more detail should this be required.

Kind regards

Kate Halsall

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday 05 December 2012 16:11
To: Licensing Policy
Subject: RE: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE - 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

10a

Responses below.

[redacted]

Telephone: [redacted]
Mobile: [redacted]

From: Kate Halsall [mailto:Kate.Halsall@waverley.gov.uk] **On Behalf Of** Licensing Policy
Sent: 05 December 2012 13:47
[redacted]
Subject: GAMBLING ACT 2005 - APPLICATION FOR A NEW BETTING PREMISE LICENCE – 122 HIGH STREET, CRANLEIGH, SURREY, GU6 8RF

I refer to your recent representation on the above application. The closing date for representations in respect of this application is 7th December. May I ask you please to respond briefly to the following questions, before this matter can proceed:-

1. Please confirm your local home/business address and postcode. MHA, 122/124 High Street, Cranleigh GU6 8RF (directly above property subject to application)
2. Can you tie your comments to this particular premises, or is your comment a more general one? Both. We're directly affected in being the neighbours above. Comments also relate to concerns relating to bringing gambling into a priority location where young adults congregate.
3. Do you agree to the disclosure of your name and address to the applicants, who are entitled to see at least the main body of all representations received to the application at this stage? The information may aid negotiations between the applicants and neighbours. Address and contact details may eventually have to be released at a Hearing of the matter, and the Council has to be satisfied that you are affected by the application. Yes, that is no problem.
4. Will you be available to appear on Monday, 17th December 2012 if the application requires a hearing before a Licensing Sub-Committee, as seems likely? Yes, I would be available.
5. Applications are considered having regard to the three Licensing Objectives (listed below) set out in the legislation. May I ask you please to confirm which of the three objectives you feel applies to your representation/covers your concerns:-

Licensing Objectives:

1. Prevention of crime and disorder (the location would certainly result in traffic disorder, but equally it brings gambling to a very prominent position in the community, making it very accessible to young people with all the associated negative consequences in relation to debt induced crime)
2. Gambling conducted in a fair and open manner
3. Protection of children from harm (A large proportion of Glebelands' pupils congregate near the proposed location early afternoon to catch their

respective buses home. Responsible gambling is one thing, but to market gambling this openly to teenagers is quite another.)

Will you please respond within five days of receiving this letter, if possible. A telephone call or email to licensing@waverley.gov.uk would be quite acceptable if this is convenient for you. Please also note that if representations received are maintained, a formal hearing of this application will take place, and you will be asked to attend to support your representation. If needed, this is likely to be on **17th December 2012 at 10.00 am**. If the application goes to that stage, everyone making and maintaining representations has the opportunity to attend the hearing and be heard and questioned regarding the application.

It is important that concerned individuals are fully aware of the extent of an application of this nature. You may inspect the application at the Godalming offices during office hours, and those making representations are strongly advised to try to do so. You may feel that further information on the application could allay your concerns further. If I can put you in contact with the applicants, or if you have any queries on this letter or the application please telephone me.

Yours sincerely

Paul Hughes
Licensing Manager
Waverley Borough Council
Telephone: (01483) 523333
(Calls may be recorded for monitoring and training purposes)
www.waverley.gov.uk/licensing
