

[REDACTED]

From: HOEY, Kate [HoeyK@parliament.uk]
Sent: 06 February 2013 12:12
To: [REDACTED]; isabel.dedrixx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx; Daniels Leon
Cc: Field Jo; xxxxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.xx [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Clapham Gateway & Alcohol-Related Anti-Social Behaviour

Dear [REDACTED] As you know there is a substantial number of people living above the dispersed bus stops being proposed who are very very angry- just another reason why TFL must over rule Lambeths flawed judgement and allow live bus stands in the Old Town Thanks Kate

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 February 2013 12:08
To: HOEY, Kate; isabel.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.uk; xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx
Cc: jofield@tfl.gov.uk; caroxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxxuk; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Clapham Gateway & Alcohol-Related Anti-Social Behaviour

Thank you Kate.

I am a police advisor in addition to my advocate work with a small group on transport. The risk of having drunkenness in Old Town to women is very palpable, particular where bus stops are dispersed and fragmented, causing confusion. This would make some women, particularly those slightly the worse for wear, vulnerable to taxi touts or potential assault.

It is therefore common sense that TfL should provide a terminus that is coherent, cohesive and easy to use at night.

I know from reading substantial evidence that Leon Daniels believes live stands represent the best overall outcome for residents and passengers. As such he should have the courage of his convictions to uphold not only accessibility but also public safety. Fragmented bus stops and a drinking zone go totally against this

[REDACTED]

From: HoeyK@parliament.uk
To: [REDACTED]; isabel.dxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.uk; xxxxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx
CC: jofield@tfl.gov.uk; caroxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.uk; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Clapham Gateway & Alcohol-Related Anti-Social Behaviour
Date: Wed, 6 Feb 2013 12:00:16 +0000

Dear [REDACTED] As you know I support your views entirely. Venn street has been pretty much of a disaster for those living there and I am horrified that TFL can spend money which should be going on transport on vanity schemes like this. Yes the street needed improvement bit not the kind of overall changes which are done not at the request of those who live there but usually someone in the Council who wants to leave a vanity project behind. I, from my position as chair last night was struck by the number of residents there who raised the fear of what will happen if TFL fund the Old Town /Gateway project without allowing live bus stands. These were people who had not been involved before but just saw the obvious repercussions of a grandiose TFL scheme not rooted in reality. As I understand Lambeth has still not put in its business plan but I, for one will be urging TFL not to spend a penny in the area unless the public transport system is improved with live buses being in the Old Town.
Thanks Kate

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 February 2013 10:01

To: xxxxxx.xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.xxx.uk xxxxxxxxxx@xxx.xxx.xx

Cc: jofield@tfl.gov.uk; HOEY, Kate; caroline.pidgeon@london.gov.uk; [REDACTED]

Subject: Clapham Gateway & Alcohol-Related Anti-Social Behaviour

Dear Ms Dedring and Mr Daniels

last night a major meeting took place in Clapham to discuss the very severe levels of anti-social behaviour that has arisen from extended hours licensing in the area. The meeting was very well attended by many across the different components of Clapham (Clapham High Street, Wandsworth Road, Venn Street, Old Town): there were several accounts of the misery and negative impact this has caused, from the obvious noise, to urine/vomit in residential streets, drug dealing and vandalism.

The Council and some councillors acknowledged this and were quick to emphasise that far too many late licences had been granted. However, Lambeth also stated that it was very hard to review existing licences and apply new tougher licensing law retrospectively.

What was striking was that residents from Venn Street - which has been part-pedestrianised under the first stage of the Clapham Gateway Scheme made a number of complaints at the meeting and separately to the Council that since the changes they have had to put up with noise and drug dealing alongside drunkenness and noise from clients in Venn Street Records (the bar which has gained most from the Gateway Scheme in Venn Street).

To this comes the obvious concern - again raised by Old Town residents (and not those who have already corresponded with you) about the Gateway Plan to have a designated outdoor drinking area with tables in place of the space that would otherwise be occupied by live accessible stands for passengers. The plan for tables and chairs would be for the use of pubs that already hold licences - in other words ones to which new licensing laws cannot be applied.

As you are aware this raises an obvious key risk that alcohol-related disorder will implant itself in the Old Town with little or no powers to control it once developed.

Furthermore the fragmentation and dispersal of bus stops under the 'dead stand' option for the Gateway will cause confusion and encourage loitering: similar to what is now happening in Clapham High Street. TfL does not provide adequate transport provision at night for Clapham: it was noted last night by residents that they were dismayed that the new Overground publicity encourages people to take the train to "come to bars in Clapham" where is not already a huge problem of mass people concentrated in a small area, yet not the transport to take them quickly away. This critical mass of drunkenness is what causes the problems of violence and anti-social behaviour. There have been a number of sexual assaults on women.

Therefore I must express my incredulity that TfL would be prepared to put public money to fund a outdoor drinking zone in the Old Town given the very severe problems encountered in Clapham and lack of power to control or restrict existing licences.

[REDACTED] has stated in an e-mail of 30 May 2012 that a drinking zone **"can be managed through licensing and planning permission and, in theory at least, can be flexibly allowed, disallowed, expanded or contracted."** [REDACTED] comments can be seen in full in the attachment

I am afraid [REDACTED] is somewhat mistaken on this point: in practice it is very hard indeed to manage problems arising from existing licences, which is precisely why Clapham has such a severe problem. The risk therefore of funding an expanded area for drinking outside an existing licence is very clear

The consensus in Clapham is for a piazza in the Old Town upon which everyone is agreed; there is a far stronger consensus against any expansion of drinking capacity. As such I do not see how or why TfL would seek to reduce the quality of bus facilities in order to release space for drinking and all its attendant problems. The drinking area has no relevance or place in the main Gateway Scheme (it is not part of the Piazza which is central to the project). Therefore TfL can rightly exclude this from its funding and base its decision solely on a) the core Piazza proposal and b) its legal duty to put passengers and accessibility first

I trust TfL will be examining the legal risks relating to crime and anti-social behaviour when reviewing Lambeth's submission. I do not see frankly any legal or moral basis for TfL to agree to a downgrading of passenger facilities purely to release space for a drinking zone. To do so would be an appalling betrayal of passengers and local residents, and an utter misuse of public money

Yours sincerely



UK Parliament Disclaimer:

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

UK Parliament Disclaimer:

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.