

Thu 18/02/2016 19:56

Additionally:

Windsor has/had its night time economy issues. Although I am unaware of any direct problems related to Pinks, the existence of a sexual entertainment venue as part of Windsor's night time economy does nothing to raise the quality of the economy or visitors. A further reason this should be declined.

Wesley

**From:** Cllr Richards

**Sent:** 18 February 2016 16:38

**To:** Kieran Clough; Cllr Rankin; Cllr Shelim

**Cc:** Alan Barwise; Steve Smith ( Licensing); Brian Houlton

**Subject:** RE: Renewal of SEV - Pink

Dear Kieran

I would like to formally object to the renewing of this licence as it has breached its licence and upon the basis of two grounds under Schedule 3 (although one is sufficient for it to be refused).

The council should refuse to renew this licence on the grounds (Schedule 3 part 12(3)(c) and (4)) that 'the number of sex establishments in the relevant locality at the time the application is made is equal to or exceeds the number which the authority consider is appropriate for that locality.'

The council should further refuse to renew this licence (Schedule 3 part 12(3)(d)(i) and (5)(a)) as a 'renewal of the licence would be inappropriate, having regard—  
(i) to the character of the relevant locality.'

According to Schedule 3 part 12(2) Subject to paragraph 27 below, the appropriate authority may refuse—

(a) an application for the grant or renewal of a licence on one or more of the grounds specified in sub-paragraph (3) below;

(3) The grounds mentioned in sub-paragraph (2) above are—

(c) that the number of sex establishments in the relevant locality at the time the application is made is equal to or exceeds the number which the authority consider is appropriate for that locality;

(d) that the grant or renewal of the licence would be inappropriate, having regard—

(i) to the character of the relevant locality; or

(ii) to the use to which any premises in the vicinity are put; or

(iii) to the layout, character or condition of the premises, vehicle, vessel or stall in respect of which the application is made..

(4) Nil may be an appropriate number for the purposes of sub-paragraph (3)(c) above..

(5) In this paragraph "the relevant locality" means—

(a) in relation to premises, the locality where they are situated; and

(b) in relation to a vehicle, vessel or stall, any locality where it is desired to use it as a sex establishment.

**Nil Requirement**

I contend that the SEV licence in Windsor exceeds what is appropriate for the RBWM, which should be Nil. The fact that SEV licences have been granted in the past is a mistake that the RBWM should not continue to make into the future.

### **Character of the Locality**

Having such an establishment in central Windsor is not in keeping with the character of the locality.

The venue is approx. 300m from Windsor Castle. As home to Her Majesty the Queen, who is also the Head of the Church of England it is highly inappropriate that such a venue should exist within such a close proximity. This is further highlighted by the fact that Pinks has sought to use the Castle in publicity to generate business. This is hugely embarrassing to the Monarch and the town and should be brought to an end immediately by the RBWM.

Windsor Castle is the main tourist attraction for the town, drawing millions of visitors a year. It is highly inappropriate that Pink has sought to use Windsor Castle to win business. Consider: <https://twitter.com/PinkStripClub/status/637077350283390977> It would be difficult to imagine something more inappropriate in regard to the 'character of the relevant locality.'



Further, Windsor is a residential town with many families living in central Windsor. Having an 'sexual entertainment venue' directly opposite a large residential complex (Ward Royal) and so close to a popular shopping destination is very much out of place.

### **Breach of SEV Licence**

I further believe the licence should not be renewed due to the breach of the existing/prior licence.

Condition 14 is very clear:

14. There must not be any contact by the striptease performer with the patron immediately before, during and after the performance of striptease except:-
- a) The leading of a patron hand in hand to and from a chair or to and from the designated dance area.
  - b) The simple handshake greeting.
  - c) The placing of monetary notes or dance vouchers into the hand or garter worn by the performer.
  - d) The customary kiss on the cheek of the patron by the dancer at the conclusion of the performance.
  - e) If the contact is accidental.

Pink's Twitter feed is also very clear that this is not adhered to:

<https://twitter.com/PinkStripClub/status/633645170110672896> Given their willingness to post to a public website in order to attract business it is clear they do not respect the conditions set by RBWM nor abide by them.



This raises the question of what other conditions may have been ignored (and not posted to Twitter)?

Further, it raises the issue of how frequently, if at all, Pinks is inspected or monitored by the RBWM to ensure compliance. Please could the panel confirm what action has been taken by the relevant authorities to ensure compliance over the past year?

### **Protection of Children**

Pinks advertising in central Windsor as shown by the limo photos presents a clear harm to children. Much great work has been undertaken by the RBWM in regard to MASH to protect children and this should not undermine it.

### **Protection of Vulnerable Adults**

Related to the protection of children the panel should consider how it has ensured the protection of vulnerable adults. It is well documented that it is often vulnerable women who work in SEVs. Please can the panel confirm what action they have taken to ensure that vulnerable adults are protected?

The existing conditions state that dancers should be 18 years or older. Although the age of independence it seems odd that the council will go to great lengths to protect children and girls (as is should via MASH) yet is willing to licence a venue for a woman to dance aged 18 years 1 day.

### **Policy Review**

In conclusion, I propose a wholesale policy review should be undertaken of SEVs in the RBWM to assess their suitability and understand resident opinions.

Kind regards

Wesley Richards

**From:** Kieran Clough  
**Sent:** 22 January 2016 09:38  
**To:** Cllr Rankin; Cllr Richards; Cllr Shelim  
**Cc:** Alan Barwise; Steve Smith ( Licensing); Brian Houlton  
**Subject:** Renewal of SEV - Pink

**Dear Councillors,**

**I attach details of an application for a variation of a premises licence within your Ward.**

**Ward: Castle Without**

**Application Type: Renewal of Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence**

**Premises: Pink, Basement, Darville House, Oxford Road East, Windsor, SL4 1EF**

**Licence Holder: Mr Desmond Murphy**

**Reference: SEV0001**

**Applicants: Mr Desmond Murphy**

**Summary of application:**

**The application is to renew the Sexual Entertainment Venue licence, which is subject to a 28 day consultation period.**

**There will be no change to the current hours or conditions.**

**Last date for representations: 18/02/2016**

**If you have any questions about the application, do not hesitate to contact me.**

**Kind Regards,  
Kieran**

**Kieran Clough** | Assistant Licensing Officer  
**Licensing | Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead**  
**York House, Sheet Street, Windsor, SL4 1DD**  
**Tel:** 01628 68 (5969) | **Email:** [kieran.clough@RBWM.gov.uk](mailto:kieran.clough@RBWM.gov.uk)