

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:33
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Sweeney A redacted

From: Tony Sweeney
Sent: 22 April 2025 12:30
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

I have put a great deal of effort into focusing my objection on those matters that only relate to licensing. I was also advised by a member of your team that it was not necessary to fill in your objection form providing I followed the guidance and restricted my comments to the four areas identified, which I believe I have done. Child safety, health and safety and quiet, peace and enjoyment to name but a few.

I have also identified errors within the licensing application which are also very relevant. It maybe that the 'Responsible Authorities' have not adversely commented because they have not been made fully aware of the licensing implications of the entirety of the application.

I would therefore ask that you give my objection full and proper consideration and do not insist that a resubmission is necessary just because it is not on your form.

I really cannot understand why NFDC would not agree to a hearing when there are so many members of the local community expressing such deep concerns.

Yours sincerely

A D Sweeney

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Apr 2025, at 11:54, Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@nfdc.gov.uk> wrote:

Good morning

**Variation to David Lloyd Premises Licence
Licensing Act 2003**

Although I understand your concerns and those of other members who have also sent us a copy of this email about use of the site and changes that are proposed, this variation application is a licensing application and not a planning application and therefore the only matters that can be considered under the Licensing Act must relate to the four licensing

objectives. If an objection is considered relevant under the Act a Licensing Sub-committee would determine the application, but ONLY matters considered relevant under the Licensing Act 2003 may be considered.

In addition, the organisation and operation of a site is the responsibility of the management and should they wish to make changes that affect users of the site, they will have their own considerations about how this information is communicated to users/Members. Management are required to assess risk, fire precautions and health and safety under separate legislation.

The changes to courts layout, increase in footfall and parking are not matters that can be taken into account under the Act, nor is the change of use of certain areas within the site to accommodate different activities.

The application to vary the premises licence has been submitted as there is a small change to the outside area, which slightly increases the licensed area (the whole site), requiring an application to be made under the Licensing Act 2003. The other internal changes to courts and internal layout are not relevant under this legislation.

Any changes to a licensed premises must be notified to the Licensing Authority to ensure that the plan held on the licence is current.

The application is subject to due process under the Licensing Act 2003 with regard to notification, advertising and consultation, all of which have been adhered to. There is no requirement for local residents to be notified individually, only through the on-site notices and newspaper public notice.

There are no objections from any of the Responsible Authorities (including Police and Environmental Protection) and no increase to operating hours are proposed, (including the sale of alcohol).

As you are aware, we do not share plans of sites in general for security reasons. Premises that have a large number of attendees can be targets and detailed plans for this type of site can pose a risk for users. I have spoken to the Manager Chris Linda who will be sharing further details with Members in the near future.

The application which I sent to you has been redated by us, under GDPR rules.

If you could limit your objection to the impact of the changes to the licensing objectives only, we may consider these. However as today is the last day for representations, please send your revised objections on the form attached, by midnight tonight.

I appreciate that you may not agree with the changes proposed by the operator, but your objections to the change of use at the site must be taken up with the operator and not through the variation application process.

Regards
Christa

From: Tony Sweeney

Sent: 21 April 2025 11:41

To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>

Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the

squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR

2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (R (Kaye) v Leeds [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (Nadarajah v Home Secretary [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be Wednesbury-unreasonable (Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

A D Sweeney BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

On behalf of many racquet sport members of DLR.

The information in this electronic mail (email) and any appendices to it is the property of New Forest District Council. It may contain confidential information. It is intended for the addressee only. Communications using this email system may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. Please examine the full terms of this disclaimer by clicking on the following hyper link: [Email Disclaimer](#)
Our privacy notice can be read here: [Privacy Notice](#)
This email was sent using the New Forest District Council Corporate Email Service.
[New Forest District Council](#)

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:24
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Johnson D redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: D JOHNSON
Sent: 22 April 2025 13:09
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Re: Re: RE: Re: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

To add, how can anyone judge impact and whether this should be approved or rejected when such vague wording is used

How can you approve or reject, or the public comment, on "modest changes" and how can you approve or reject or the public comment on "minor layout changes" - these statements are too vague to be formally assessed

More details must be supplied for appropriate review

regards

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From
To: Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK
Sent: Tuesday, April 22nd 2025, 12:56
Subject: Re: RE: Re: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

Thanks Christa but they are mentioned in the application so we can reference them - I would 100% agree with you if they were not mentioned

Therefore, please can I ask for a formal response or the application should be re-submitted without that wording

regards

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From: Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK
To:
Sent: Tuesday, April 22nd 2025, 12:54
Subject: RE: Re: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

Hi Duncan

Unfortunately not as licensable activities, do not take place in these areas. They are sports areas and the licensing Act doesn't cover sporting activity

Regards

Christa

-----Original Message-----

From: D JOHNSON

Sent: 22 April 2025 12:44

To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>

Subject: Re: Re: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

Hi Christa,

To add, the licensing application references "change layout of numerous unlicensed public areas, new facilities and conversion of squash courts into a multi use hall" so we/I can raise objections linked to that.

Therefore, the "new facilities" and the "multi-use hall" mentioned are increasing the risk to public safety and to children to due to the inadequate infrastructure to support these changes

I look forward to your reply

regards

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From:

To: Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK

Sent: Tuesday, April 22nd 2025, 11:41

Subject: Re: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

Hi Christa

Thank you for the swift reply but protection of children and public safety are valid licensing objectives and the changes proposed by DL Ringwood directly impact these points

So to be clear, NFDC do not see any issues in the areas of child protection or public safety in the changes proposed by DL Ringwood ?

I jut want you to be clear so we can assess next steps/formal escalation as, in my simple view, these changes are encouraging more children and more people to use DL Ringwood without consideration to the knock on affect to car parking and public and child safety

many thanks

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From: Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK

To:

Sent: Tuesday, April 22nd 2025, 11:28

Subject: RE: David Lloyd Johnson

Thank you for your further email

However objections must relate to the licensable activities and the licensing objectives therefore matter such as car parking, traffic and the "family friendly" theme of a premises cannot be part of the consideration for objection.

Regards

Christa

-----Original Message-----

From: D JOHNSON

Sent: 22 April 2025 10:58

To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>

Cc: Licensing e-mail address <Licensing@NFDC.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: David Lloyd Johnson

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Thank you Christa but re-reading my email to you, it does reference to the impact of the changes on the four Licensing Objectives

e.g.

+ Protection of children..."The site markets itself as family friendly.

Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children ((Kaye) v Leeds [2018] EWHC 404)."

+ Public Safety.... A conservative occupancy model as set out above

estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

Personally, I consider the car park at DL Ringwood to be already dangerous, especially for young children, so any changes must be considered as both a public safety issue and a child protection issue

As my objections raised apply to two of the four licensing objectives, I look forward to your formal and written reply on these formal objections

many thanks

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From: Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK

To:

Cc: Licensing@NFDC.gov.uk

Sent: Tuesday, April 22nd 2025, 10:43

Subject: David Lloyd Johnson

Good morning

Variation to David Lloyd Premises Licence
Licensing Act 2003

Thank you for your email expressing your concerns about the proposed changes to the David Lloyd Leisure Centre, 242 Christchurch Road, Ringwood BH24 3AS.

The application to vary the premises licence has been submitted as there is a small change to the outside area, which slightly increases the licensed area (the whole site), requiring an application to be made under the Licensing Act 2003. The other internal changes to courts and internal layout are not relevant under this legislation.

The application is subject to due process under the Licensing Act 2003 with regard to notification, advertising and consultation, all of which have been adhered to.

Any changes to a licensed premises must be notified to the Licensing Authority to ensure that the plan held on the licence is current.

This is not a planning application and therefore the criteria to object to a variation of licence is strict and must only refer to the impact of the changes on the four Licensing Objectives. General objections about use of a premises cannot be considered and are not relevant for this application.

There are no objections from any of the Responsible Authorities (including Police and Environmental Protection) and there is no increase of hours are proposed, (including for the sale of alcohol).

The internal changes to courts, gym, squash courts etc have no bearing on the premises licence and therefore objections to these changes cannot be considered as relevant under the Act.

I appreciate that you may not agree with the changes proposed by the operator, but your objections must be taken up with the operator and not through the variation application process. Therefore are unable to consider your objection to the variation application under the legislation.

Although we are unable to provide plans for the site for security reasons, I have spoken to the Manager Chris Linda who will be sharing further details with Members in the near future.

Regards
Christa

-----Original Message-----

From: D JOHNSON

Sent: 22 April 2025 08:13

To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>

Subject: Re: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Christa,

I am writing to formally express my personal objection to the proposed changes at David Lloyd Ringwood.

This follows up my detailed letter. These plans, which have evidently been in development for over a year, appear to have been made without any consultation with the members who are most affected.

We were only informed of these substantial changes on April 7th, 2025, via a club-wide email. This was the first communication we received on the matter, despite the significant impact these changes will have on one of the club's longest-standing and most dedicated groups of members many of whom are older and will not be able to partake in "buggy fit" classes etc .

The justification for these changes appears to rely on flawed usage data. The current system David Lloyd uses to track attendance does not capture participation from member-led racquet clubs, meaning the data being used to support these decisions is incomplete and misleading.

David Lloyd promotes itself as a member-focused and community-supporting organization, but these proposed changes clearly contradict those values.

Many of us within the racquet sports community—both men and women—feel very strongly that the squash courts and the exceptional badminton facilities (the best in Dorset) are vital to the Ringwood community.

Replacing them with more gym equipment, when such facilities are already plentiful in the area, disregards the importance of these Olympic sports and their role in encouraging both youth participation and continued involvement by older members.

Eliminating these facilities now would be a deeply short-sighted move.

Squash and badminton are not only competitive sports but also play a crucial role in community building and promoting active lifestyles across all ages. They also support the mental health of many older, and maybe isolated, members of the community. The situation we are in was not helped, a number of years ago, when NFDC closed the squash and racquetball courts at Ringwood Sports Centre so the decision now is crucial to so as not to leave Ringwood with zero squash and racquetball courts especially for an Olympic sport.

Given the gravity of these changes, I believe it is only fair and reasonable to pause the current plans. Members who have shown long-term commitment to this club deserve to have a voice in decisions that directly affect them.

If this were a simple refurbishment, the situation would be different.

However, what is being proposed is a significant overhaul of the club's offerings, presented under the guise of a planning application.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my additional concerns.

Kind regards,

Duncan

----- Original Message -----

From:

To: Christa.Ferguson@nfdc.gov.uk

Sent: Monday, April 21st 2025, 16:38

Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the

submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted)

so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being

some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.

2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a

highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go someway to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub Committee,
pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness
The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Pla 087 D 210 4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15 8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime

& Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1 2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low impact racquet sports serve older and mobility restricted members.

Replacing them with high intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury* unreasonable (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2,

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Duncan Johnson

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:30
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Solly G redacted

From:
Sent: 22 April 2025 15:22
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Planning objection

Dear Licensing Team,

Please treat this email as my formal objection to the s34 premises-licence variation sought by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood. I also request that the application be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR.

1 Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description omits the loss of two badminton and two squash courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

NFDC has published only a heavily redacted application and partial plan.

The club manager refused to share the full plan with ~20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

2 Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

2.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model (Appendix A) projects >300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

2.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

2.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study

accompanies the bid, despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

2.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

3 Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

4 Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

5 Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals or bar enlargement. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

6 Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided; the “no impact” claim is self-serving and unsupported.

7 Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of ≈50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

8 Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

9 Proposed Conditions (if, contrary to this objection, the application is granted)

Noise Control – External amplified sound/TVs off after 21:00; limiter set by an acoustic consultant.

Occupancy Cap – Max 450 patrons (ex-staff) monitored electronically.

Traffic & Parking Plan – NFDC Highways-approved; peak-time marshalling; 10 % disabled bays.

Door-Supervision Plan – SIA-licensed door staff Friday-Sunday from 18:00.

Racquet-Sport Provision – Min. one badminton and one squash court available at all times.

Community Liaison Group – Quarterly meetings; minutes on NFDC website.

10 Conclusion

The application is procedurally flawed, factually incomplete and incompatible with the licensing

objectives. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee is invited to refuse the variation under s18(4) & s35(3) LA 2003.

If minded to consider approval, the Committee should first:

Require full public disclosure of all plans;

Commission independent traffic, acoustic and equality assessments; and

Mandate genuine resident and member consultation.

These extensive changes demand proper scrutiny to uphold both legality and public confidence in the licensing regime.

Yours sincerely,

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:31
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Solly J redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: Jill Solly
Sent: 22 April 2025 14:50
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Objection to Premises-Licence Variation – David Lloyd Ringwood (s34 REF)

Dear Christa Ferguson

Please treat this email as my formal objection to the s34 premises-licence variation sought by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood. I also request that the application be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR.

1 Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description omits the loss of two badminton and two squash courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

NFDC has published only a heavily redacted application and partial plan.

The club manager refused to share the full plan with ~20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

2 Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

2.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model (Appendix A) projects >300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

2.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

2.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the bid, despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

2.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

3 Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

4 Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

5 Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals or bar enlargement. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

6 Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided; the “no impact” claim is self-serving and unsupported.

7 Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of ≈50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

8 Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

9 Proposed Conditions (if, contrary to this objection, the application is granted)

Noise Control – External amplified sound/TVs off after 21:00; limiter set by an acoustic consultant.

Occupancy Cap – Max 450 patrons (ex-staff) monitored electronically.

Traffic & Parking Plan – NFDC Highways-approved; peak-time marshalling; 10 % disabled bays.

Door-Supervision Plan – SIA-licensed door staff Friday-Sunday from 18:00.

Racquet-Sport Provision – Min. one badminton and one squash court available at all times.

Community Liaison Group – Quarterly meetings; minutes on NFDC website.

10 Conclusion

The application is procedurally flawed, factually incomplete and incompatible with the licensing objectives. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee is invited to refuse the variation under s18(4) & s35(3) LA 2003.

If minded to consider approval, the Committee should first:

Require full public disclosure of all plans;

Commission independent traffic, acoustic and equality assessments; and

Mandate genuine resident and member consultation.

These extensive changes demand proper scrutiny to uphold both legality and public confidence in the licensing regime.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Solly
Burley Road Bransgore

Member of Ringwood David Lloyd for over twenty two years

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:19
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Donabie J. redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: jeremy donabie
Sent: 21 April 2025 20:55
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Objection to David Lloyd Application

Subject: Objection to Premises-Licence Variation – David Lloyd Ringwood (s34 REF)

Dear Licensing Team,

Please treat this email as my formal objection to the s34 premises-licence variation sought by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood. I also request that the application be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR.

1 Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description omits the loss of two badminton and two squash courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

NFDC has published only a heavily redacted application and partial plan.

The club manager refused to share the full plan with ~20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

2 Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

2.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model (Appendix A) projects >300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

2.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

2.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the bid, despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

2.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

3 Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

4 Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

5 Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals or bar enlargement. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

6 Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided; the "no impact" claim is self-serving and unsupported.

7 Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of ≈50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

8 Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

9 Proposed Conditions (if, contrary to this objection, the application is granted)

Noise Control – External amplified sound/TVs off after 21:00; limiter set by an acoustic consultant.

Occupancy Cap – Max 450 patrons (ex-staff) monitored electronically.

Traffic & Parking Plan – NFDC Highways-approved; peak-time marshalling; 10 % disabled bays.

Door-Supervision Plan – SIA-licensed door staff Friday-Sunday from 18:00.

Racquet-Sport Provision – Min. one badminton and one squash court available at all times.

Community Liaison Group – Quarterly meetings; minutes on NFDC website.

10 Conclusion

The application is procedurally flawed, factually incomplete and incompatible with the licensing objectives. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee is invited to refuse the variation under s18(4) & s35(3) LA 2003.

If minded to consider approval, the Committee should first:

Require full public disclosure of all plans;

Commission independent traffic, acoustic and equality assessments; and

Mandate genuine resident and member consultation.

These extensive changes demand proper scrutiny to uphold both legality and public confidence in the licensing regime.

Thank you

Jeremy Donabie

Christa Ferguson

Subject:

FW: Lawes S redacted

From: Suzanne Lawes

Sent: 21 April 2025 22:04

To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>

Subject: Re: Variation Premises Licene (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

On Mon, Apr 21, 2025, 20:06 Suzanne Lawes wrote:

Dear Ms Ferguson,

I have seen the objection Mr Sweeney has made on our behalf and fully support his objection.

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR

2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

This will have a great impact on me personally, with only one badminton court available which will be shared with pickle ball and children during the school holidays, it will be almost impossible to book the badminton court and also impossible to have club sessions with just one court, as this just wouldn't work. At the moment on average 15 or more members play and with just one badminton court, this just wouldn't work with so many having to sit out and wait. I play at the moment at least three times a week and this keeps me fit and keeps my anxiety at bay, which I have suffered in the past especially during covid when the club had to shut for a number of weeks.

Yours Sincerely

Mrs Suzanne Lawes
Craneview
Holwell
Cranborne
Wimborne
Dorset
BH215QS

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:26
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Mears R redacted

From: rob mears
Sent: 21 April 2025 15:03
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Objection to application for a change in license David Lloyd Ringwood

Hi Christa.

Further to our previous correspondence please find attached a formal objection to the above application.

Kind regards

Rob Mears

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is

probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the

same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not

been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's

warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Robert Mears

Ringwood resident, and DL member for over 20 years

Sent from my iPhone

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:29
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Robb D redacted

From: David Robb
Sent: 21 April 2025 15:38
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

As a squash and Racketball member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 30 years, I support this objection from Tony Sweeney for all the same reasons.

Best regards,
David Robb,
80 Northfield Road,
Ringwood,
Hants.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Tony Sweeney
Date: 21 April 2025 at 11:40:41 BST
To:
Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be

no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in McCarthy.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect

discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be Wednesbury-unreasonable (Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

A D Sweeney BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

On behalf of many racquet sport members of DLR.

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:18
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Aubin N redacted

From:
Sent: 21 April 2025 21:18
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Objection to Variation Premises License (S34) submitted by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood.

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and formally present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or the provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan

087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who also play tennis and squash and from recent feedback, believe I am speaking on behalf of a large number of members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They

estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times feels me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running

across busy roads to get to their class on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 days statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely
Nick Aubin FCCA

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:19
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Barnes M redacted

From: Malcolm Barnes
Sent: 22 April 2025 11:07
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: FW: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

22.04.2025

Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 20 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard

badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but my two sons aged 22 and 20 are frequent gym users, although not this one as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted with my sons on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Barnes
(I reside at BH24 2HG)

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:34
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Wallom J redacted

From: Julie Wallom
Sent: 21 April 2025 18:01
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-

D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play badminton, pickleball and padel tennis and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 35 years. I know many members who play badminton, pickleball, squash and racketball who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym but know many who are,

although not this one, as it is too expensive! I have accordingly consulted friends who do, on how many people are likely to use the additional space and for how long. They estimate 40 additional members over 1 1/4 hours so 80 members over 2 1/2 hours which I believe would compare with 16 members over a similar period for pickleball or badminton. I have assumed for this exercise that the new multifunction court will have similar usage to the existing squash courts.

Based on an additional 64 new users every 2 1/2 hours and allowing for peaks and troughs over the current opening hours of 7.00 am to 10.00 pm, it would not be unrealistic to estimate that an additional 384 new members could be using David Lloyd every day. Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50

cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing, rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear, that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR

2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example, omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R(Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R(Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury*-unreasonable (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Yours sincerely, Julie & Clive Wallom

Christa Ferguson

From: Christa Ferguson
Sent: 24 April 2025 11:35
To: Christa Ferguson
Subject: Watts A redacted

From: Andy Watts
Sent: 21 April 2025 15:55
To: Christa Ferguson <Christa.Ferguson@NFDC.GOV.UK>
Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Sent from Outlook for Android

Subject: Variation Premises Licence (S34) by David Lloyd Leisure Centre, Ringwood

Dear Ms. Ferguson,

This is an objection to the above application and a request for a hearing so that members of David Lloyd, Ringwood (DLR) many of whom are part of the local community, can actually see the detail of what is being proposed and present their licensing concerns.

To date, there has not been sufficient time or provision of detailed information, to enable a proper assessment of the application.

The description on the New Forest District Council (NFDC) web site does not fully describe the proposal and does not include a plan even though this is specifically referred to. For example, there is no mention of the loss of two badminton courts to be replaced with a gym.

In addition, Chris Linda the current manager of DL failed to provide the detailed plan that accompanied the application (plan 087-D-210-4) in a meeting held with over 20 DL members.

NFDC have only been prepared to share a small extract of the submitted plan 087-D-210-4 to indicate the proposed increase in the outdoor drinking and dining area.

Without sight of the plan in its entirety it is not possible to fully evaluate the current proposals.

Due to the strict deadline imposed for submitting an objection, which unfortunately coincides with the Easter holiday, this objection can only

be based on a verbal description of the proposals by the DLR manger, Chris Linda, at a meeting held on Tuesday 15th April at 6.00 pm and the limited information provided by NFDC including the description on the web site; the redacted licensing application form and a small extract from plan 087-D-210-4. There has also been some feedback to me from many DLR members on what they have heard from various members of DLR staff.

Overall, the impression is that DLR are trying to under state the significance of their proposals and rush through a decision so that works can commence as early as May 2025. It is strongly believed that the significant increase in the membership numbers brought about from changing relatively low intensity racket sport areas into high intensity gym areas will considerably increase activity on the site which is already at full capacity at peak times. Such intensification is likely to have an adverse impact on all the stated objectives upon which a licensing application is determined.

DLR has always been a rackets orientated club with large areas devoted to tennis, badminton, squash, racketball and more recently, to the rapidly expanding racket sports of padel tennis and pickleball.

I personally play squash and racketball and have been a member of David Lloyd Ringwood for over 26 years. I know many members who play badminton and pickleball, who are extremely concerned about the proposed loss of their courts. From recent feedback, I believe I am speaking on behalf of a large majority of these members, many of whom are also part of the local community.

The current proposal as described verbally to us by the manager, without reference to a plan are of great concern and whilst some of these concerns are not necessarily a licensing matter, many are.

It is noted on the application form that the 'impact assessment' of the proposed changes has been 'assessed' internally presumably by DLR themselves (NB the applicant on the application form has been redacted) so it is probably not surprising that their conclusion is that there will be no impact. Surely, a proposal of this scale should be independently assessed? Unfortunately, I am unable to undertake my own detailed assessment because I do not have plan 087-D-210-4 and a detailed description but would make the following impact related observations:

1. The two existing badminton courts which are acknowledged as being some of the best in the South of England are to be replaced with a new gym area. These two existing courts have also been adapted for Pickleball.
2. Two existing squash courts are to be replaced with a 'multi function' court area which will provide one sub standard badminton court which could also be used as a pickleball court. There will be no squash or racketball provision.

The manager advised that the reason for the change was to increase membership and profitability as they believe that a larger gym will attract more members. I am not a great user of the gym, but I am aware that within half a mile of David Lloyd there are two existing, and cheaper, gyms, and of course there is the Ringwood Rec gym. I can't see the argument of increasing the gym's size to attract members actually makes sense. However David Lloyd are expending a large amount of money to attract increased numbers of members which then leads on to the subject of noise and parking. To justify a capital spend of £3 million, there must be an expectation of increased membership, at £1000 p.a, of at least 500, based on recovering the cost over 6 years.

Allowing for members leaving due to the consequent lack of racket facilities there could well be in excess of 300 new users per day.

Many of these new users will use the swimming pool and spa areas as well as the restaurant and bar areas and a very high proportion will drive to the site. The licensing application does not appear to contain an assessment of the increased numbers and the consequential impact?

I understand the proposals are to include an extension to the internal and external bar and eating areas but there is no means of determining if these extensions are adequate. I suspect the proposed extensions are inadequate as DLR seem intent on cramming a lot more members into the same built area. This will lead to all the health and safety issues that will ensue from the use of an over crowded facility plus the spilling out onto to external areas, where alcohol is to be sold. If these new external areas are also to include large TV screens, as advised by the manager, the additional noise generated, particularly on a warm, balmy evening, is likely travel to nearby residential properties and be detrimental to their quiet, peace and enjoyment.

It is not clear from the web site if local residents have actually been notified about the application? It is also not clear if the extension of the external dining, drinking and entertainment area requires planning consent as a potential change of use.

As a regular visitor to DLR, I am acutely aware of how inadequate the existing parking is at peak times. The manager mentioned that there was the potential to extend some of the existing parking to accommodate some staff cars but no detail was given and I do not believe that any additional parking is included in the submitted plan. Any extension of the existing parking area would also require planning consent and a highway impact assessment.

Whilst NFDC may consider parking and much increased traffic generation to be more of a planning and highway related issue, I do not believe that the knock on health and safety issues of an inadequate car park can be ignored within this licensing application. The thought of an additional 50 cars arriving at peak times fills me with dread. People rushing to get into the last remaining spaces and then once failing,

rushing to find parking elsewhere on nearby streets, and then running across busy roads to get to their booking on time, with and without children!

Due to the already tight area of the car park, there are no defined car and pedestrian areas. DLR attracts many family memberships and consequently there will be children moving around a very busy car park which clearly has implications for child safety which is an important licensing consideration.

In summary and for the reasons stated above, my request for a hearing is entirely reasonable. At a hearing, all of the licensing concerns raised can be properly considered and a solution derived with full member and local community consultation. There are large numbers of members from the squash, racketball, badminton and pickleball sections of DLR, many of whom are local residents, who are very concerned about the current proposals. They have not been properly consulted and a hearing would go some way to rectifying this.

It will not surprise you to hear that we do also have some legal expertise within the membership and for completeness, I refer you to the following legal observations that have been made.

1. The application needs to be heard by the Licensing Sub-Committee, pursuant to the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, so that affected members and residents may make representations in person – a right recognised in *R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC* [2009] EWHC 1920 (Admin) and Article 6 ECHR
2. Lack of Transparency & Procedural Fairness

The online description for example omits the loss of two badminton courts and withholds the referenced drawing Plan 087-D-210-4.

The club manager did not share the above plan at a meeting circa 20 members on 15 April 2025.

This contravenes the Home Office s182 Guidance (paras 8.15-8.19) on disclosure and denies meaningful participation, breaching the rule of natural justice affirmed in *McCarthy*.

3. Failure to Promote the Licensing Objectives (s4 LA 2003)

3.1 Public Safety

A conservative occupancy model as set out above estimates 300 additional users/day. The car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes, and cannot safely absorb the growth – conflicting with the objective and the authority's duty under s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998.

3.2 Crime & Disorder

A larger, late-operating bar and outdoor screens increase alcohol-related risk. No updated operating schedule, Door-Supervisor plan (Security Industry Authority) or incident-reporting protocol is provided, contrary to s182 Guidance (paras 2.1-2.5).

3.3 Public Nuisance

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will elevate evening noise. No acoustic impact study accompanies the application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2011] that external entertainment can materially disturb neighbours.

3.4 Child Protection

The site markets itself as family-friendly. Additional traffic through a constrained car park – with no pedestrian-safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children (*R (Kaye) v Leeds* [2018] EWHC 404).

4. Community Reliance & Legitimate Expectation

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Members on long-term contracts reasonably relied on continued access. Removing facilities without consultation undermines that reliance and offends the good-administration principle (*Nadarajah v Home Secretary* [2005] EWCA Civ 1363).

5. Equalities & Accessibility (Equality Act 2010)

Low-impact racquet sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. Replacing them with high-intensity gym space risks indirect discrimination under ss19 & 29. No Equality Impact Assessment is supplied.

6. Material Omissions & Misdescription

The statutory notice fails to mention the court removals. A grant premised on incomplete information would be *Wednesbury-unreasonable* (*Associated Picture Houses v Wednesbury* [1948]).

7. Inadequate Impact Assessment

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic, noise and capacity studies for material changes. None are provided.

8. Parking & Highway Safety

A peak uplift of circa 50 cars will cause overspill parking, contrary to NPPF §115. Public-safety objective engaged (Guidance 2.7).

9. Lack of Community Engagement

Residents were not directly notified, breaching the Cabinet Office Consultation Principles (2018) and NFDC Policy §6.2.

I would be grateful for your confirmation that this objection has been received within the 28 day statutory timescale and will accordingly be given full and proper consideration.

Andrew Watts

racquet sport member of DLR.

Date that this
representation form
must be submitted by

22.04.2025



New Forest
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Licensing Act 2003

Representation form and guidance-Other persons

Under the Licensing Act 2003 objections can be raised against an application for a new premises licence or a variation of an existing licence.

The term used in the 2003 Act, regulations, and associated guidance is not "objections" but "representations".

All representations must be relevant to at least one of the licensing objectives:-

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

Once an application for a premises licence has been accepted by the licensing authority, responsible authorities and other persons have 28 days starting on the day after the application is accepted to make representations.

Responsible authorities are the bodies that must be fully notified of applications and who are entitled to make representations to the licensing authority in relation to the application for the grant, variation or review of a premises licence.

Responsible Authorities are:-

- Licensing Authority
- Police
- Environmental Protection
- Trading Standards
- Local Safeguarding Children's Board
- Health & Safety
- Fire & Rescue Service
- Local Planning Authority
- Maritime & Coastguard Agency (if applicable)
- Public Health

As well as responsible authorities, any "other person" can make representations.

It is also possible for a person to request that a representative makes a representation on their behalf – for example, a Member of Parliament or a local ward or parish councillor.

In addition to being relevant, representations must not be vexatious or frivolous and can be rejected on this basis.

If a licensing authority decides that representations are relevant, it must hold a hearing to consider them. The need for a hearing can only be avoided with the agreement of

the licensing authority, the applicant and all of the persons/agencies making relevant representations.

In determining an application with a view to promoting the licensing objectives, in the overall interests of the local community, the licensing authority must give appropriate weight to:

- the steps that are appropriate to promote the licensing objectives;
- the representations (including supporting information) presented by all the parties;
- Statutory Guidance;
- its own statement of licensing policy.

Representations must be made in writing and emailed or posted to Licensing Services. They may be amplified at the hearing or may stand in their own right. Additional points, which are not referred to in the original representation received during the 28 day period may not be referred to at the hearing. However if there are any additional documents that refer to the original matters that you wish to be included, these must be sent to Licensing Services at least 5 days before the hearing.

Planning and other issues

Unfortunately representations that concern traffic or parking cannot be accepted. This is because the licence holder cannot be held responsible for the use of the public highway outside of the premises. The licensing regime is separate from other local government functions including planning. If a premises licence is granted for the building this will not exempt the licence holder from having to obtain the necessary planning permission. We are therefore unable to accept representations that simply refer to the need for planning permission or refer to parking or an increase in traffic movements. These are issues that are considered when planning permission to use a building for an activity is considered.

It is recommended that representations are made on the following form.

Representation form- other persons

Full name	Helen Porter	Title	Ms
Home address	Ponderosa, Salisbury Road, Blandford BH24 3PB		
Email address			
Phone number			

Name of premises you wish to make a representation about	David Lloyd Ringwood
Address of premises you wish to make a representation about	242 Christchurch Road, Ringwood BH24 3AS

Type of application	(please confirm)	Variation
<p>Please add full details of your concerns or support regarding the application and include any evidence to support your representation under the relevant licensing objective.</p> <p>Please use separate sheets if necessary</p>		
Prevention of crime and disorder		
<p>This is my formal objection to the s.34 premises licence variation sought by David Lloyd Ringwood. I also request that the application be heard by the Licencing Sub-Committee pursuant to the Licencing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005 so that affected members of the club and residents may make representations in person - a right recognised in R (McCarthy) v Basildon DC and Article 6 ECHR.</p> <p>There is a lack of transparency in the online descriptions with the application particularly the absence of any detailed plans, notably the reference Plan 087-D-210-4. Requests for copies of the plan to the local club manager have been ignored in contravention of s.182 Guidance on disclosure.</p> <p>A larger late operating bar and outdoor TV screens increase alcohol-related risk and noise (watching national sporting events).</p>		
Public safety		
<p>A conservative occupancy model projects an estimated 300 additional users a day. The existing car park is already saturated, lacks segregated pedestrian routes and cannot safely absorb the growth which conflicts with the objective and the duty under s.17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998.</p> <p>Currently children exit the club without parental control and run out into the path of approaching vehicles looking for parking spaces and therefore not always concentrating on the children roaming around the car park in their pyjamas late into the evening. This is particularly dangerous in the winter months and in areas where the parking is inadequately lit.</p> <p>The club is aiming to attract around 300 new members with the proposed variations. The current parking is unable to accommodate such increased vehicles which would overspill into neighbouring streets. Children will be required to cross busy roads without pedestrian crossings to reach the club when parked away from the club.</p>		
Prevention of public nuisance		

Expanded external licensed areas with large TV screens will increase evening noise. No acoustic impact study appears to accompany this application despite the Court of Appeal's warning in *R (Hope & Glory) v Westminster* [2001] that external entertainment can materially disturb adjoining residential properties.

Guidance para 9.42 permits the authority to seek traffic noise and capacity studies for material changes. None appear to have been provided/obtained.

Protection of children from harm

David Lloyd markets itself as family friendly. Additional traffic through an already constrained car park – with no pedestrian safety scheme – creates foreseeable risk to children.

**Are there any steps or conditions which the applicant could take or add to the application which would alleviate your concerns?
If yes – please give details below**

For over two decades the club has promoted racquet sports. Removing facilities without consultation undermines the club's ethos and offends good administration principles.

Low impact sports serve older and mobility-restricted members. The club wants to replace them with high intensity gym space which risks indirect discrimination.

The application fails to mention the removal of indoor courts or bar enlargement.

It does not appear that residents have been consulted about these variations or even aware of the application.

In conclusion, the application appears to be procedurally flawed, factually incomplete and incompatible with licensing objectives. NFDC is invited to refuse the variation under s.18(4) and s.35(3) LA2003.

If the council is minded to consider approval, the Committee should first require full public disclosure of all plans; commission independent traffic, acoustic and equality assessments; consult with residents and members.

The proposed extensive changes require proper scrutiny.

Yours sincerely

--

If you make a representation, you will be invited to attend a Licensing Sub-Committee meeting where the application will be considered, together with any subsequent appeal proceedings.

Are you prepared to attend a hearing?	Yes
	Please circle
I acknowledge that my representation will form part of a public document at a hearing, (personal telephone numbers, email addresses and signatures will be redacted)	Please initial
Signature	date
H Porter	18.04.2025

Licensing Services privacy notice can be viewed on the Council's website at newforest.gov.uk/article/1716/Licensing-Services-privacy-notice

Please return this form along with any additional sheets / supporting information to : licensing@nfdc.gov.uk or post to

Licensing Manager
Licensing Services
Appletree Court
Beaulieu Road
Lyndhurst
SO43 7PA

Phone: 023 8028 5505