

Marygate
York
[REDACTED]

23rd August 2007

CITY OF YORK
COUNCIL
24 AUG 2007
RECEIVED

Licensing Unit
City of York Council
9 St Leonards Place
York
YO1 7ET

HOSPITIUM; MUSEUM GARDENS
APPLICATION FOR LATE NIGHT LICENSE

NOTES OF A MEETING HELD WITH THE YORK MUSEUMS TRUST

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a further initiative to the local residents petition, [REDACTED] and myself sought a direct meeting with the York Museums Trust regarding their application for a late night alcohol and entertainment license for the Hospitium in Museum Gardens. The notes of this meeting are attached for your consideration.

We believe that the agreements made at the meeting regarding restrictions will allay the fears of residents, although the short timeframe for representation does not allow us to either retract the petition or present these notes formally as part of it.

We hope these matters will be given due consideration.

With best regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Tel (mobile): [REDACTED]

Copy: [REDACTED]

CITY OF YORK COUNCIL
APPLICATION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
DATE: 26/8/07 LC

Meeting to Discuss Alcohol License for the Hospitium, Museum Gardens
York Museums Trust and Representatives of Marygate Residents

Held on: Tuesday, 21st August 09.45
Held at: St Mary's Lodge, Museum Gardens

York Museums Trust

Janet Barnes Chief Executive
Jane Nicholls Events Manager

Marygate Residents

[Redacted] Marygate
[Redacted] Marygate

1. The Meeting had been requested by [Redacted] and [Redacted] to discuss concerns of the residents with respect to the terms of the alcohol and entertainment license applied for by the Museums Trust for the Hospitium in Museum Gardens.
2. Janet Barnes explained that the Museums Trust had applied for a permanent license primarily to reduce the effort associated with applying for individual temporary event licences. The prime intention with respect to the use of the Hospitium would remain the promotion of daytime conferences and occasional use for weddings. She explained that the Hospitium tried to apply rules to event organisers and wished not to cause disturbance to local residents. She also explained that a number of license restrictions would be applied by the police (regarding the precise area in the direct vicinity of the Hospitium where alcohol may be consumed)
3. [Redacted] explained that a petition had been organised to express the concerns of the residents with respect to the license which had been applied for:
 - a. Residents were concerned regarding the intended use of the Hospitium and a potential step-change rise in the number of events and consequent disturbance
 - b. Late night serving of alcohol until 2am is considered unreasonable by residents, due to the noise as well as the disorder of late leavers. [Redacted] explained that many weddings had proven that events could be successfully conducted in the Hospitium (up to midnight) without disturbance, but that an event in June had generated unreasonable noise until after 3am
 - c. Residents are concerned about late night noise nuisance after 12 midnight
 - d. Residents are concerned about the adequacy of precautions for security and disorder of late leavers exiting via Marygate

- e. Residents are concerned about alcohol availability from 8am despite prohibition of consumption in the Museum garden
4. In a constructive discussion which followed the parties agreed a number of measures:
 - a. Alcohol availability and music at events would be limited by contract with venue users to 12 midnight, with clearance of the premises by 1am.
 - b. Music providers would be briefed on the need to restrict noise levels. In addition, the Museums Trust would investigate ways of restricting and self-monitoring of noise levels and would act on direct reports of noise nuisance
 - c. Leavers after the normal closure of the Museum Gardens would only be able to leave via the main entrance on Museum Street. This would encourage leavers to consider public transport or taxi or at least have a longer "cool off" period if returning to private cars parked on Marygate or Marygate car park.
5. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] felt that these agreements would be sufficient to allay residents concerns, but explained that the short timescale associated with the representation process (which had resulted from its conduct during the holiday period) would not allow them sufficient time to stop the concerns being raised by the petition
6. However, with the agreed restrictions of the license as outlined in §4, and on the understanding that the number of annual evening events would not rise significantly and that the number of weddings/evening events in a month would be unlikely to exceed 4, these meeting minutes would be submitted with the petition and residents would not further oppose the license application.

Notes: [REDACTED], 22nd August 2007