

CONSULTATION RESPONSE
SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY 2011

Reference Number: SEV/2011/01

Date Received: 11/7/2011

Name and Address of Respondent:

Mr Jackie Biard,
Senior Planning Officer,
Cannock Chase Council.

Comments / Observations made by the Respondent:

Mrs Biard suggests that it would assist all concerned if it were made clear that any necessary planning permissions should be obtained as a matter of priority and that there should be a specific reference within the policy to the Town and Country (Use classes) Order 1987 for the benefit of those who may require relevant sex establishment planning consents.

Appraisal of Comments by the Authority:

Mrs Biard's comments are noted and reflect the Council's intention in ensuring that their policy is clear and informative.

Response of the Authority:

The draft policy will be amended to incorporate Mrs Biard's comments.

Signed

K.J. Sweeney

22 August 2011

Agreed

S. Shovel

22 August 2011

Sean O'Meara

Subject: FW: Sex Licensing Policy response

From: Jacqueline Biard
Sent: 11 July 2011 12:33
To: Sean O'Meara
Cc: Development Control
Subject: Sex Licensing Policy response

Memo

To: Sean O'Meara	From: Jackie Biard
Section: Licensing	Section: Development Control
Date: 11 th July 2011	Ref: DC/Licensing
Re: Sex Establishment Policy - Consultation Draft	

Message

Thank you for consulting this department on the above document.
 I have considered the document and would wish to comment only in respect of condition 20.

It may be helpful to refer specifically to The Town and Country (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) where sex club premises fall within use class D2 (as do bingo halls, cinemas and bingo halls for example); a shop predominantly selling goods for the purposes of sexual entertainment is within class A1 (retail) - the same as any shop; a peep show place is classed as "sul generis" and does not fall within any use class but would need planning consent in all instances.

I am suggesting this so that it is made clear to the applicant that any relevant Planning consents should be obtained in the first instance, rather than including it in "all necessary consents."

JACKIE

CONSULTATION RESPONSE
SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY 2011

Reference Number: SEV/2011/02

Date Received: 14/7/2011

Name and Address of Respondent:

Sgt. Mark Czechowski,
Southern Licensing Department,
Staffordshire Police.

Comments / Observations made by the Respondent:

Sgt Czechowski comments that he has read the draft Policy document and is content that it will provide scope for the Police to address any issues which might arise from applications of this nature.

Appraisal of Comments by the Authority:

Sgt Czechowski's comments are noted.

Response of the Authority:

There is no requirement to amend the draft Policy document as a result of Sgt Czechowski's comments.

Signed

KJ. Sumway

22nd August 2011

Agreed

S. Shred

22 August 2011

LicensingUnit

To...

Cc...

Bcc...

Subject:

Attachments:

From: Mark.Czechowski@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Mark.Czechowski@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: Thu 14/07/2011 11:28 AM
To: sean.omeara@cannockchasedc.gov.uk
Cc: LicensingUnit
Subject: Sex Establishment Policy

Hi Sean

I have read through the policy i do not see anything of a contentious issue. I make the assumption that it is based on a national set of guidelines or similar to other areas.

I think it is sufficient to give us all some scope to address issues should an application of this nature be received.

Kind regards

Mark

Sgt. 3491 Mark Czechowski

Southern Licensing Unit
Burton-on-Trent Police Station
Horniglow Street
Burton-on-Trent
DE14 1PA

Tel. 01785 234722
Mobile 07815 923162

Keeping our Communities Safe and Reassured

The information contained in this e-mail and attachments is confidential and is intended only for the named person or organisation to which it is addressed. It is protected by copyright law and may be legally privileged. If you have received it in error please disregard and advise me immediately.

Any unauthorised disclosure or use of such information may be a breach of legislation or confidentiality. Staffordshire Police cannot accept liability for any loss or damage arising from this e-mail or attachments, from incompatible scripts or from any virus transmitted.

E-mails sent and received from and by members of staff and officers of Staffordshire Police may be monitored for purposes including virus scanning, unauthorised e-mail usage and obscene or inappropriate material.

Staffordshire Police reserves the right to read all such material and to reject and return any material which is considered either to be a security risk or unsuitable. Any monitoring will comply with the legislation currently in force and in particular the Human Rights Act 1998.

To find out more about our work visit www.staffordshire.police.uk

CONSULTATION RESPONSE
SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY 2011

Reference Number: SEV/2011/03

Date Received: 25/7/2011

Name and Address of Respondent:

Mr Michael G

Comments / Observations made by the Respondent:

Mr G states that although he has not seen the draft policy document he wholly agrees with increased regulation of sex establishments. He says that he works next to a "Gentleman's Club" in Birmingham and goes into some detail about what he calls the undesirable impacts of such premises. He is also concerned that an increase in such premises may have a negative impact upon the family unit and social and economic prosperity.

Appraisal of Comments by the Authority:

Mr G's comments are noted and have been considered in light of his statement that he has not read the draft policy document.

Response of the Authority:

There is no requirement to amend the draft policy document as a result of Mr G's comments.

Signed

K.J. Sweeney
22 August 2011

Agreed

S. Ouel
22 August 2011

LicensingUnit

To...

Cc...

Bcc...

Subject:

Attachments:

From: Michael G. [mailto:...]
Sent: Mon 25/07/2011 8:31 PM
To: LicensingUnit
Cc: aidan.burley.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: FAO Steve Shifvock re Consultation on Sex Establishment Policy

Dear Steve,

I would like to add my voice to the Council's current consultation on the licensing of sex establishments. Although I have failed to find the consultation document on the Council's website, the impression from the short article is that there is the intention to increase regulation of these establishments.

I wholly agree with increased regulation. I work next to a so-called 'Gentleman's Club' in Birmingham and have noted the following undesirable impacts since it was opened:

- increased drunkenness in the area;
- an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area;
- problems with drains - Severn Trent have already had to unblock local combined sewers at taxpayers' expense; the disgusting smell of semen is now returning once more;
- it has effectively become a legalised brothel, significantly lowering the tone of the area.

These are only the visible impacts. In practice, such establishments are likely to contribute towards the undermining of trust within marriage and the break-up of the family unit. This can only increase social disintegration and bring with it negative impacts on social stability and economic prosperity for generations to come.

If Cannock Chase wants to move forward, granting licenses to sex establishments is not the way to do it.

Yours sincerely,

Michael G

CONSULTATION RESPONSE
SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY 2011

Reference Number: SEV/2011/04

Date Received: 26/7/2011

Name and Address of Respondent:

Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council,
C/O Mr. P. G. Davies,

Comments / Observations made by the Respondent:

The Parish Council agrees that sex establishments should be properly regulated and states strongly that Parish/Town Council's should be consulted upon any application received for such an establishment.

Appraisal of Comments by the Authority:

The Parish Council's comment and strongly stated opinion are noted. The proposed process for the public advertising of applications for sex establishments follows that prescribed by Regulation for premises licences under the Licensing Act 2003 in that a notice is posted in a prominent position and maintained for 28 days and an advertisement placed in a local newspaper. It is not considered appropriate to bring applications to the attention of any specific group as this could be considered canvassing for objection.

Response of the Authority:

There is no requirement to amend the draft policy document as a result of the Parish Council's comments.

Signed

KJ. Sumner

22 August 2011

Agreed

S. Dwyer

22 August 2011

BRERETON AND RAVENHILL PARISH COUNCIL

DISTRICT OF CANNOCK CHASE
COUNTY OF STAFFORDSHIRE

Chairman: Councillor Miss IJ Brown

Mr PG Davies, ACIS, DMA [Parish Clerk]

[Please reply to the Clerk]

Date: 24th July 2011

CANNOCK CHASE

26 JUL 2011

COUNCIL POST ROOM

Senior Licensing Officer
Cannock Chase District Council
Civic Centre
Beecroft Road
CANNOCK
WS11 1BG

Dear Madam

Draft Sex Establishment Policy

I refer to your letter of 1st July 2011.

The Parish Council agree that these places must be properly regulated and Members are also strongly of the opinion that Parish/Town Councils should be consulted on any such applications received by the District Council.

Yours faithfully


PG Davies
Parish Clerk

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

26 JUL 2011

PASSED TO



CONSULTATION RESPONSE
SEX ESTABLISHMENT POLICY 2011

Reference Number: SEV/2011/05

Date Received: 15/8/2011

Name and Address of Respondent:

Mr John T
Pentecostal Church,
Hednesford,
Staffs.

Comments / Observations made by the Respondent:

Mr T makes comment on behalf of the Pentecostal Church in Hednesford and asks relevant questions about the manner in which sexual entertainment venues (SEV) will be administered and enforced.

His interest lies in whether applicants for SEV's will be required to undertake a Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) disclosure upon application; whether the applicant will be required to keep appropriate records of the performers in respect of their identity, age and nationality; and, whether the obviousness of these premises upon the high street should be controlled by way of restrictions on advertising.

Appraisal of Comments by the Authority:

The Church comments are noted. Applicants are not required to undertake a CRB disclosure upon application but a copy of the application form will be required to be sent to Staffordshire Police. The requirement to keep accurate records of performer's personal details is considered to be good practice and the draft conditions of licence will be amended accordingly. The manner in which SEV's advertise their business is already controlled by way of condition of licence.

Response of the Authority:

The draft Policy and Conditions will be amended to include a requirement for the licence holder to keep accurate personal details of all performers. No other amendments are considered necessary in light of the consultation response.

Signed

K.J. Sumner
22 August 2011

Agreed

S. Clark
22 August 2011

LicensingUnit

To...

Cc...

Bcc...

Subject:

Attachments:

From: John T [mailto:;
Sent: Mon 15/08/2011 3:21 PM
To: LicensingUnit
Subject: RE: Draft Sex Establishment Policy

Dear Sean

Thank you very much for involving myself in the consultation process of this policy.

The policy does appear to be well written and very thorough. It is my personal and professional hope that you will receive no applications; although this may be unrealistic in today's Hellenistic society.

I only have a few comments.

Criminal Record Check

Does section 7.2 (a) ensure that a criminal record check is performed on the applicant?

It might be argued that performers in some parts of this industry where "vulnerable" whilst at their work. Should CRB checks be performed on all employees at the establishment to ensure that no known predators or criminals?

Sex Trafficking

Parts of the sex industry are known for using illegal immigrants, often against the woman's wishes. A large number of girls are kidnapped from Asia, Africa and Eastern Europe and brought to the West to be exploited in brothels etc. Should the any license agreement include the requirement for the employer to keep records of visas and proof of identity, including nationality and age, of performing employees? There may be better safeguards than this!

Visibility

Forgive me if I missed any reference to the "shop front" displays and signage of any establishment. Perhaps this area belongs in the premises planning application.

I would not wish to have a "Soho" type of feel to the town at night with flashing neon lights etc. I would in fact prefer that these establishments were all but invisible. Is there a list a words, phrases and images that would not be allowed in any advertisement?

Thank you again,

Senior Leader, Hednesford Pentecostal Church