

# APPENDIX 8

## Representations Opposed to the Application

**Other Person 1 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF**

**Sent:** 01 February 2026 21:29

**To:** Diane Kraus <[Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk)>; Audrey Bailey <[Audrey.Bailey@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Audrey.Bailey@rotherham.gov.uk)>; Licensing <[Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk)>; Cllr Rachel Hughes <[Rachel.Hughes@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Rachel.Hughes@rotherham.gov.uk)>; [david.sheppaed@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:david.sheppaed@rotherham.gov.uk)

**Subject:** Formal Objection – Premises Licence Variation Application (Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street)

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

Please note that I have also emailed this to my local councillors as I feel I have been ignored in this process.

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the proposed variations to the premises licence for the **Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street, Rotherham S62 5RF**.

Before anything else, I must highlight a serious procedural concern: **I did not receive the email notification** regarding this variation application, despite having previously submitted relevant representations during the original licence process. As I appear to have been missed from notification, I will now be speaking directly to residents of both **South Street and Main Street** to ensure they too have not been excluded and to encourage them to submit their own views.

### **1. RMBC Will Regret Approving This Application**

If RMBC approves this variation, the Council will face significant and ongoing enforcement workloads. Residents are already frustrated, distressed, and exhausted by this business. Approving further permissions will guarantee increased complaints, increased enforcement intervention, and heightened community tension.

### **2. Ongoing Planning Enforcement Action – Evidence of Non-Compliance**

It must be formally noted that **Planning Enforcement Officers Andrea Jones and Sophie Ward** are currently dealing with this business because the owners are **failing to meet the planning conditions** set out in the original approval. This includes:

- The illegal erection of an illuminated sign with advertisements
- Operating in ways that breach planning conditions
- Showing a complete unwillingness to comply with their obligations
- Erected a tent in December outside the premises without permission to hold events.

This clearly demonstrates a consistent pattern of disregard for planning rules and the local community.

### **3. History of Licensing Non-Compliance**

The venue has already breached its current licensing conditions:

- Holding lock-ins past authorised closing times
- Allowing customers inside after 11pm
- Having a 14 year old work in the premises behind the bar. (this has been already passed to RMBC)

This proves the owners cannot be trusted to operate responsibly or within the law.

# APPENDIX 8

## 4. Significant Ongoing Impact on Residents

### 4.1 Noise, behaviour and language

Visitors regularly:

- Shout, argue and swear outside
- Use vulgar language late at night
- Drink outside the premises and on the street while smoking/ vaping
- Cause general disturbance

This is a residential street, not a late-night strip.

### 4.2 Dangerous and inconsiderate parking

Visitors frequently:

- Park on and block footpaths
- Obstruct junctions
- Block the road entirely at times
- Park on the school marked yellow zigzag road markings.

This poses safety risks to parents, elderly residents, emergency vehicles, and children walking to school.

### 4.3 Inappropriate alcohol sales near a school

The proposal to begin selling alcohol from **09:00AM**, directly next to a primary school, is wholly inappropriate.

Children pass the premises every morning, and extending alcohol-related activity earlier increases safeguarding concerns.

## 5. Roof Terrace – Privacy and Noise Issues

### 5.1 Privacy violations

Residents' gardens and homes will be directly overlooked from the terrace. Main Street residents have already raised this concern previously.

### 5.2 Noise amplification

Noise from elevated outdoor spaces travels further and louder.

Given the venue's poor history of control, allowing roof-level activity will severely harm residential amenity.

## 6. Additional Serious Concerns – Accessibility, Housing Impact & Wildlife

### 6.1 No Disabled Access to the First Floor

The plans show **no accessible route** for disabled customers.

There is:

- No lift
- No internal accessible access
- Only stairs or external rooftop access

This makes the first-floor function room inherently discriminatory.

### 6.2 Impact on Future HMO Residents

Once the adjoining/nearby HMO flats are occupied, residents will be even more vulnerable to:

- Late-night noise
- Music vibrations
- Outdoor terrace disruption
- Smoking/vaping activity
- Extended trading hours

Small bedsits offer minimal sound insulation, making these impacts particularly severe.

# APPENDIX 8

## 6.3 Lack of Parking & Traffic Flow Concerns

There is **no dedicated parking provision** for the increased capacity sought.

Existing on street parking issues already cause:

- Road blockages
- Unsafe reversing manoeuvres
- Congestion near the school
- Increased risk to pedestrians
- Illegal parking on junctions and school marked yellow zigzags

Further intensification of use will make the area unsafe and unmanageable that have already been raised to highways in the council.

## 6.4 Impact on Local Wildlife

South Street and the surrounding area support local wildlife, including birds, hedgehogs, and bats.

Increased late-night noise, lights from the roof terrace, and higher footfall will:

- Disturb habitats
- Interrupt nocturnal activity
- Increase littering risks

Wildlife disruption is a legitimate and material planning and licensing concern.

## 7. Strong Objection to Each Proposed Variation

I strongly oppose **ALL** of the following proposed changes:

### (a) Extending earliest hours to 09:00 daily

Completely inappropriate in a residential area and directly next to a school.

### (b) Extending latest hours to 01:00 on Friday & Saturday

This will worsen noise, antisocial behaviour, parking issues, and enforcement demands.

### (c) Removing the 11pm last-admission condition

This allows uncontrolled late-night entry and increases nuisance.

### (d) Allowing the roof terrace to be used for food and drink until 23:00

This will breach residents' privacy and significantly worsen noise.

### (e) Allowing smoking and vaping on the terrace until closing

This guarantees late-night noise and increased disturbance.

### (f) Including the first-floor function room as a licensed area

This increases the impact, capacity, and disturbance substantially, which the venue has already shown it cannot manage.

## 8. This Application Must Be Refused

This business has repeatedly demonstrated:

- Non-compliance with planning rules
- Non-compliance with licensing rules
- Disregard for neighbours
- No intention of operating responsibly
- No concern for residents, schoolchildren, accessibility needs, or local wildlife

Approving this variation will **inevitably increase complaints, place huge enforcement burdens on RMBC, and significantly damage local quality of life.**

**For these reasons, I strongly urge RMBC to reject this application in full.**

## APPENDIX 8

Other Person 2 – Main Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5QW

16, 2, 2026

S62 5QW

Dear Diane Kraus,

We are objecting to the application by Mrs Helen Clayton to change the licence conditions of The Wigton Lounge South Street Rawmarsh,

We are objecting to the extension of the alcohol sales, music, dance and films from 9am everyday.

It would mean early morning drinking, noise, and traffic happening only metres from where children arrive each day for school creating an environment that is completely unsuitable for a school and a residential area,

This will affect us because we are owners and residents of the property directly behind the Wigton Lounge

## APPENDIX 8

~

There noise will be created from 9 am to 11 pm Sunday to Thursday and from 9 am to 01:00 am Friday and Saturday taking away our right to have peace and quiet every day and all day on our property. We also object to opening hours being extended to 01:00 am on Friday and Saturday with late admissions being allowed after 11 pm.

Late opening hours and late arrivals would bring significant noise, cars, taxis and groups of people outside until the early hours, this would turn South Street into a late night destination destroying the peace and quiet to the residents of the street and surrounding area currently rely on and seriously affecting sleep and well being.

We are objecting to the opening of the roof terrace for food, alcohol, smoking and vaping from 9 am to 11:00 pm also customers can smoke and vapour until the premises close which would be 1:00 am on a Friday and Saturday night. Noise from a roof terrace travels

## APPENDIX 8

3  
far further than ground level activity, this would cause voices, music, smoke and vapour, and noise from the venue below on the ground floor to escape when the door is opened to enter or exit the roof terrace, to drift directly into nearby homes from morning until late at night disrupting personal space, gardens, bedrooms and every day life of nearby residents.

We have lived here eight years in May, we moved from our house of forty-three years to this bungalow to make life easier and to manage and keep our independence, as we both have health problems, this is causing us both stress. If this flat roof is changed to a roof terrace it will effect myself and my husband because our property is only about 20 metres away from this flat roof.

We also objecting to the first floor function room being used for licensable activities being accessed via the roof terrace.

## APPENDIX 8

4

A function room means bigger crowds and louder groups of people with the constant movement between the terrace and the upper floor.

This would greatly increase the noise, foot traffic for every neighbouring household.

By having the function room used on the first floor it means that both rooms could have events on at the same time, i.e., a wedding party with a disco and dancing on the first floor, also having live music on the ground floor. Both events are significantly noisy events and would increase the noise coming from the total venue. These proposals will make South Street Main Street and surrounding area louder, busier and significantly more disruptive for all the residents who live here.

## APPENDIX 8

o

We have constantly objected to the use of the roof terrace both through the licensing department and planning department on the grounds that it adversely affect our lives and well being due to the noise and nuisance it would create which would disrupt our peace and quiet on our property.

This would be every day, all day making our lives uncomfortable and miserable.

As an example on Sunday 1st February around 6pm we drove past Wigtox Lounge on South Street, there where some men stood outside talking, when we drove on to our property at Main Street, we got out of the car and we could still hear them shouting. If this was the case with four people talking and shouting at the front of the Wigtox Lounge what it would be like for use with twenty people talking and shouting on a roof terrace only twenty metres away

## APPENDIX 8

6

from our property at the rear of  
the Digtot Lounge.

None of us as a community including  
south street, Main street, and surrounding  
area should have to put up with this  
is not fair to have all our lives  
disrupted with the noise and nuisance  
this would cause every day and all day.

## APPENDIX 8

23, 2, 2026

ROTHERHAM

S62 5PW

On Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> February we received the information from Diane Kraus council licensing department in Rotherham regarding to the variation of premises license of the Wigton Lounge in South Street Rawmarsh. This is a additional letter NO 4 and we are still objecting,

We are concerned that if the licence is granted for the first floor function room and the use of the roof terrace with extended hours from 9am and up to 1am the next day it would greatly increase the amount of noise created which would spread to the surrounding area.

At the moment when music is being played in the ground floor function room,

## APPENDIX 8

8

We can hear it on our property therefore if the second room on the first floor is in use for music being played at the same time it would double the amount of sound generated. Also if the roof terrace is in use for music being played at the same time it would double the amount of sound generated.

If the roof terrace is in use for drinking, eating, smoking plus vaping there could be twenty people on there some of them could have been drinking alcohol, they could be talking loudly excited, passionate, and sometimes argumentative this would create extra noise which would flow into the surrounding area from 9am until 1am the following morning, this would be detrimental to this residential area.

These activities are concerning us because our property is only 20 metres away from the rear of the Wigton lounge.

## APPENDIX 8

9

all these functions taking place and we will be the people affected. The provision of a 1.8 metre high screen although prevents our property being overlooked it does not stop noise being transmitted from the roof terrace into the surrounding area because the sound will escape over the top of it. It has been proposed that a fixed pergola roof could be fitted, but we have not seen any drawings, plans or artist impression of what and how it would be constructed and how effective it would be.

# APPENDIX 8

## Other Person 3 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF

**Sent:** 22 February 2026 19:56

**To:** Diane Kraus <Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk>; Licensing <Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk>; rotherham\_licensing@southyorks.pnn.police.uk; Sophie Ward <Sophie.Ward@rotherham.gov.uk>; Andrea Jones <andrea.jones@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr David Sheppard <David.Sheppard@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr Rachel Hughes <Rachel.Hughes@rotherham.gov.uk>; John.Healey <john.healey.mp@parliament.uk>

**Subject:** Wigtox

### **Representation Against the Application to Vary the Premises Licence – Wigtox, South Street**

I am writing to formally object to the application by Wigtox to extend its licensing hours and to add a rooftop terrace and function room.

I make this representation on the basis that granting this application would seriously undermine the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, in particular:

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

However, before addressing the legal framework, I feel it is important that the panel understands what it has actually been like to live next to this venue over the past few months.

#### The Human Reality : What Residents Have Been Living With

Since the beginning of November, residents of South Street have found themselves living next to what has become a noisy late-night drinking venue in the middle of a quiet residential street.

This has not been a minor inconvenience. It has fundamentally changed our ability to live peacefully and safely in our own homes, enjoy our weekends, go to work and have the energy to spend time with loved ones.

On a regular basis, and particularly at weekends, we are subjected to:

- Shouting, screaming, and arguing in the street beyond midnight
- Loud music echoing down the road
- Patrons leaving intoxicated and behaving aggressively
- People urinating in the street, including directly outside homes and in the area where children line up for school
- Bottles, litter, and broken glass left behind

As a resident, I no longer feel safe walking my dog in the evening. I have been subjected to inappropriate comments and intimidating behaviour from intoxicated people outside the venue.

My home no longer feels like a place of safety or rest.

The Licensing Act 2003 exists to prevent exactly this type of harm.

# APPENDIX 8

## **The Premises Is Not Operating as Promised**

When the premises licence was originally granted, residents were assured by Mr Clayton that the venue would be:

- Family friendly
- Playing soft jazz
- Not a nightclub
- Not a late-night drinking venue

None of these assurances have proven true. Instead, the venue regularly hosts:

- DJs
- Karaoke
- Late-night drinking
- Club-style events

This is not a family venue. It is a late-night alcohol-led premises. This misrepresentation is highly relevant.

*In East Lindsey District Council v Abu Hanif [2016] EWHC 1265 (Admin), the High Court confirmed that licensing authorities are entitled to consider the management and conduct of the operator when deciding applications.*

The operator's conduct and misrepresentation of the nature of the venue demonstrates that the premises is not being run in a manner consistent with the licensing objectives or as intended when submitting the initial application.

## **The Premises Is Already Failing to Promote the Licensing Objectives**

*The statutory guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states at paragraph 1.16: "The licensing authority must carry out its functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives."*

This premises is already failing to follow licensing objectives.

This application seeks to expand its operation further. This is not appropriate when a venue is already failing to meet the 4 licensing objectives.

## **Prevention of Public Nuisance**

This is the licensing objective most obviously being breached.

*Paragraph 2.15 of the Section 182 Guidance states: "Public nuisance includes low-level nuisance affecting a few people living locally."*

Residents are being deprived of sleep on a regular basis.

We cannot open our windows.

We cannot escape the noise.

We cannot relax in our own homes.

This is not how people should have to live.

# APPENDIX 8

We are faced with excessive public nuisance every weekend whether that is:

- The base and music from club nights making it impossible for us to relax
- Late night screaming and shouting as people enter and leave the venue
- Cars using their horns, not to alert patrons to their presence, but to replicate songs with each other at 1am
- People arguing and fighting in the street
- Fighting from inside the club which staff are unable to control being heard from the street.

The premises has only been open during winter thus far, this has somewhat prevented the noises from inside the club we can hear at home. This will no longer be the case in the summer where the doors and windows are opened for ventilation in the heat or if the addition of a rooftop terrace is granted.

The proposed expansion to the license, including the roof top terrace would make this significantly worse

Noise from elevated outdoor drinking areas travels further and more directly into nearby homes and the neighboring school. There are no realistic conditions that could prevent this. While there has been some sound proofing identified, considering the current level of noise local residents are being subjected to, a small reduction such as the one proposed would not have meaningful impact.

*The High Court confirmed in Hope and Glory Public House Ltd v Westminster Magistrates Court [2011] EWCA Civ 31 that licensing authorities are entitled to refuse applications where granting them would undermine licensing objectives.*

The nuisance is already happening.

It will worsen if this application is granted.

## **Prevention of Crime and Disorder**

Residents have witnessed and experienced:

- Fighting
- Public urination
- Aggressive behaviour
- Intoxicated individuals driving vehicles
- Discussions of drug use
- Abuse

This demonstrates a clear failure to promote this objective.

*Paragraph 2.1 of the statutory guidance confirms:*

*“The prevention of crime includes prevention of disorder and drunkenness.”*

Having grown up with parents who themselves ran a working mens club, I am more than aware of the duty of staff to ensure that patrons are not sold alcohol when they are clearly intoxicated.

*Under Section 141 of the Licensing Act 2003, it is a criminal offence to sell alcohol to a person who is drunk.*

## APPENDIX 8

On more than one occasion, I have witnessed patrons entering the venue late at night clearly in an altered state. These patrons have then been on the street in the early hours of the morning causing disturbance and on another occasion causing a physical altercation.

Security presence appears to be non-existent and I have never seen a security presence nor has one been captured on our cameras since the venue opened. I would suggest that the venue does not have security, if they do then I have significant concerns about the effectiveness of this measure.

Patrons are allowed to leave and remain outside causing disturbance. There is no adequate dispersal of patrons between midnight and 1:30am and staff have, on at least one occasion, left patrons in the street and gone home. Meaning that residents have had to intervene due to the level of disturbance they were causing.

This is not responsible management and puts local residents in harms way. A function room and roof top terrace would only increase numbers and encourage day time drinking during the summer months, meaning patrons consume more alcohol.

This would only serve to exacerbate the current situation, adding more disturbance and impacting residents safety, undermining licensing objectives.

### **Protection of Children from Harm**

This is a particularly serious concern due to the immediate proximity of the school and the number of children who live nearby.

Currently in the evenings children are already exposed to:

- Swearing
- Sexualised comments
- Discussions of drug use
- Aggressive and abusive language

The rooftop terrace would significantly increase this exposure.

Paragraph 2.22 of the statutory guidance confirms:

“Protection of children from harm includes moral and psychological harm.”

Children should not be exposed to intoxicated adult behaviour in their school or home environment. I have significant concerns that the roof top terrace overlook the school and the homes of people with young families. This is a significant safeguarding risk.

On another note, from a practical perspective there is also no way for the proprietor to moderate the conversations of patrons or reduce the sound to 0 in school hours. Alongside the safeguarding concerns this would cause significant disruption to children’s learning.

### **Public Safety**

Public safety includes the safety and wellbeing of residents. The impact on public safety is already detailed but to be clear.

Residents have experienced intimidation and harassment.

We feel unsafe.

The Licensing Act is intended to protect communities. It is not currently serving that purpose and any agreement to extend the license would further undermine that aim.

# APPENDIX 8

## **Serious Concerns Regarding Management and Compliance**

One of the concerning issues is the operator's failure to comply with existing legal requirements.

The premises only has planning permission to operate until 11pm.

Despite this, it regularly operates until 1am.

This demonstrates a clear disregard for regulation.

This is highly relevant.

The High Court in *East Lindsey v Abu Hanif* confirmed that past conduct is relevant when determining licensing applications.

If the operator is already failing to comply, there is no reason to believe they will comply with extended permissions.

## **The Impact on Residents Has Been Severe**

I would ask the panel to consider how they would feel:

- If they had not had a proper night's sleep for months.
- If they felt unsafe walking outside their own home.
- If their children had to walk past urine and broken glass on the way to school.
- If their concerns were brushed off only to be proven correct

We did not choose to live next to a nightclub. We were told this would be a family-friendly venue and not for late night drinking. That has not been the reality and have been lied to.

## **The Application Will Make the Situation Worse**

The function room, rooftop terrace and extended hours will:

- Increase noise
- Increase nuisance
- Increase crime and disorder
- Increase safeguarding risks

The premises is already causing harm. This application would expand that harm.

## **Licensing Authority's Legal Duty**

Under Section 4 of the Licensing Act 2003, the licensing authority has a legal duty to promote the licensing objectives.

Granting this application would fail to do so.

For all the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that this application is refused in full.

I also respectfully request that the licensing authority consider reviewing the existing premises licence given the ongoing breaches and harm being caused.

## **Evidence**

All claims in this response are evidenced through home CCTV equipment. I am more than happy to share this evidence with licensing however due to the online abuse another local resident faced at previous objections and other concerns that have been made clear to licensing, I am not comfortable sharing these with the applicant as my home is identifiable.

## **Final Thoughts**

***This venue has had a profound negative impact on our lives.***

We simply want to be able to live peacefully and safely in our own homes. The Licensing Act exists to protect residents. I ask that the panel uphold those protections.

# APPENDIX 8

## Other Person 4 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF

**Sent:** 22 February 2026 20:03

**To:** Diane Kraus <Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk>; Licensing <Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk>; Andrea Jones <andrea.jones@rotherham.gov.uk>; Sophie Ward <Sophie.Ward@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr David Sheppard <David.Sheppard@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr Rachel Hughes <Rachel.Hughes@rotherham.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Licensing objection

Dear Licensing Officer,

I write to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed variation of the premises licence for the above premises. My objection is submitted under the Licensing Act 2003 and is based on direct, ongoing experience of the serious and cumulative harm that the operation of this premises is causing to residents. The grounds for my objection are that the variation would undermine the licensing objectives of (1) the prevention of crime and disorder, (2) the prevention of public nuisance, (3) public safety, and (4) the protection of children from harm.

### Introduction

I live on South Street, very close to the premises. Since the premises began operating in its current format on 7 November 2025, my home has ceased to be a place of rest or safety. I have diagnosed obstructive sleep apnoea; uninterrupted sleep is a medical necessity for me to function safely at work and to maintain my health. Every Friday and Saturday (and on some weekdays) I am woken by shouting, car horns, arguing, loud conversations and music bass that continues into the early hours. I routinely cannot go to bed at a reasonable hour because I am woken repeatedly. I cannot watch television in my home without hearing the bass from the music. Instead of restful weekends, I spend them exhausted and trying to recover from sleep deprivation, which causes cognitive impairment, emotional strain and constant anticipatory anxiety about the coming weekend. Following an incident where a patron asked where I lived, asked to follow me home and made an unwanted sexual proposition, I no longer feel safe walking on my own street after dark at weekends. I have tried to resolve matters informally by calling the business number provided and by attending the premises; my calls went unanswered and, when I attended in person, my details were taken but I was not contacted. I have therefore exhausted reasonable informal remedies.

### Summary of facts and pattern of harm

The premises opened in November 2025 and the disturbance has occurred every Friday and Saturday since opening, with particular problems between 20:00 and 02:00 and the worst disturbance between 23:00 and 01:00 due to lack of dispersal and high levels of intoxication. The venue has traded late (for example, until 03:00 on New Year's Eve) and occasionally on Wednesdays.

On 20 February 2025, according to staff within Wigtox, a door supervisor was present. Noise from the premises was audible at 01:00 and patrons remained outside shouting until 01:20, demonstrating that the presence of a single door supervisor did not prevent continued external nuisance.

On 20 February 2026, the premises claimed a door supervisor assessed noise as acceptable; an out-of-hours noise officer separately confirmed that noise on the street was loud that

# APPENDIX 8

evening. There is also a concern that self-monitoring is not accurate, as noise levels appeared to be turned down specifically for the reading.

The premises has received several warnings from Planning and a Planning Enforcement Notice has been issued.

Residents have reported incidents to the police; on multiple occasions police did not attend due to other operational priorities. They did not provide crime reference numbers, making it difficult to evidence.

Residents have provided recordings, Ring footage and submissions via the Council's noise app to Planning. The nature of the disturbance (sporadic bursts, shutter openings, staggered release of patrons) makes consistent evidence-gathering difficult.

## **1. Prevention of public nuisance**

The primary source of nuisance is unmanaged external congregation and dispersal, not merely internal music. The nuisance is predictable (twice weekly since opening) and characterised by sudden, intermittent spikes of shouting, arguing, swearing and loud conversation which repeatedly rouse sleeping residents. The premises is located on a T-junction in a wholly residential street; this street layout amplifies and carries sound, causing voices to echo between properties. Rotherham's Statement of Licensing Policy 2025–2030 emphasises protecting residential amenity and managing hours accordingly; those principles are directly engaged here.

The applicant's updated plans (airlock corridor, 1.8 m acoustic screening, relocation of a bar) focus on internal mitigation. However:

- An airlock corridor and internal screening do not control patrons once they are outside. They do not prevent shouting, arguing or intoxicated conversation on the pavement and simply create another area for this to happen.
- Acoustic barriers on a rooftop terrace will not prevent loud conversation or shouting being audible across neighbouring properties; elevating patrons often increases sound propagation.
- Relocating an internal bar does not prevent congregation outside or late-night dispersal issues.

There are practical enforcement and evidential gaps:

- The Council's Noise Team monitoring ends at midnight, yet the worst disturbance occurs between 23:00 and 01:00. Extending licensable activities to 01:00 would formalise activity into a period where routine monitoring is not in operation, leaving residents without an effective monitoring mechanism.
- The premises has been observed lowering shutters to give the appearance of closure, then reopening to release patrons; the shutter movement itself generates noise and staggered dispersal complicates attempts to capture clear evidence.
- The intermittent nature of the disturbance means single-point dB readings often do not reflect the true lived experience of frequent, sleep-disturbing spikes.

The latest Section 182 Guidance recognises that public nuisance includes noise and the reduction of residential amenity where the effect is disproportionate and unreasonable. In short, the nuisance is established, foreseeable and recurrent. The proposed variation would intensify these problems by authorising later hours, activating outdoor areas and increasing

# APPENDIX 8

capacity without any proven record of sustained effective management that prevents the external congregation which causes the nuisance.

All of the above has been experienced during winter with windows closed; summer will predictably worsen the impact when residents open windows.

## 2. Prevention of crime and disorder

There is a demonstrable failure of management control and supervision:

- There is no consistently effective external supervision on Fridays and Saturdays. Staff leave and go home while patrons remain outside shouting after closing; there is no active dispersal or de-escalation.
- Patrons have been observed openly discussing illegal drug use while dispersing. There have been repeated incidents of aggressive and confrontational behaviour both amongst patrons and towards local residents.
- Police have been contacted but on several occasions did not attend.
- A patron made an unwanted sexual proposition and watched me walk home; this has materially altered my behaviour and means I no longer feel safe walking on the street after 20:00 at weekends.
- Removing the 23:00 last-admission safeguard would be unsafe. The most significant incidents occur between 23:00 and 01:00; permitting admissions after 23:00 will increase late arrivals, the concentration of intoxicated patrons at closing, and the scale and duration of dispersal problems. The inclusion of a first-floor function room and a rooftop terrace will increase capacity and the number of patrons to be managed, yet current management has not demonstrated reliable control.
- Patrons are also threatening to local residents. On several occasions, when putting items in the bins, patrons have shouted insults or made disparaging comments about residents being “up their own arses”, “trying to ruin the pub”, “needing to get a life and leave the pub alone”, as well as other profanities, all directed at residents who were simply putting rubbish in their bins. Patrons have also used social media to intimidate local residents, including posting photographs of local residents’ houses online in order to make them feel unsafe. This attitude and disrespect towards local residents is evidenced in the disregard shown by the establishment.

## 3. Public safety

The bright external television screen affects night-time driving visibility on an already residential street. There is also a large, bright advertisement. Neither the television screen nor the advertisement has relevant planning permission, and none has been sought by the owner despite requests (again demonstrating a lack of respect for the community and the rules set by the local authority). There have been instances of intoxicated patrons driving after leaving the premises and an apparent collision with a nearby school wall has been captured on video and sent to the local authority. Children have been seen playing in the street while adults remain in the venue, exposing them to raised voices and intoxicated behaviour. The current operation places residents and road users at increased risk; extending hours and activating outdoor areas will heighten those risks.

The Council’s policy specifically flags women’s safety as a local priority; my experience speaks directly to that concern in the public realm immediately outside the premises and with no supervision by premises staff. The individual who propositioned me could see my house from the pub, knew I was alone and could have easily knocked on my door at a later time, in addition to the harassment by patrons leaving the pub when residents are merely putting rubbish in the bin. Without proper intervention, harm to a resident is foreseeable.

# APPENDIX 8

## **4. Protection of children from harm**

Late-night congregation in a residential street increases the likelihood of children being exposed to antisocial and unsafe behaviour. The presence of intoxicated individuals and loud shouting near where children live and play is of concern.

Activating a roof terrace (which overlooks the school and residents' houses with children) and extending hours increases the likelihood of children's exposure to late-night disorder in a residential area. The licensing objective requires you to consider this risk specifically.

### **Rebuttal to the applicant's claimed improvements**

The applicant's email asserts that the updated plans (airlock corridor, 1.8 m acoustic screening on the terrace and a fixed bar within the function room) are significant improvements. These measures are primarily architectural and inward-facing and do not address the primary and proven issue: human behaviour outside the premises following consumption of alcohol. In practice, the disturbance stems from congregation, shouting, staggered dispersal and intoxication—none of which is adequately controlled by internal layout changes alone. The Council should not grant extended permissions on the basis of design changes where there is no sustained record of management success in preventing these external harms.

### **Enforcement and compliance history**

The premises has received planning warnings and a Planning Enforcement Notice. It has operated beyond the intended planning hours on a number of occasions. The Licensing Sub-Committee previously accepted conditions such as a Noise Management Plan and outside CCTV to mitigate impacts; however, these measures have not prevented ongoing disturbance. The Licensing Authority should take into account prior non-compliance and enforcement action when assessing the applicant's competence to manage increased hours and capacity.

### **Requested decision and, if applicable, conditions**

For the reasons set out above, I request that the variation be refused.

If the Committee is minded to grant any part of the variation, I ask that the following minimum, enforceable conditions be imposed (in addition to any already on the licence), and that the Committee require clear, verifiable evidence of sustained compliance before considering any future relaxations:

- Terminal hour to mirror planning permission at 23:00 for all licensable activities.
- Retention of the last-admission condition at 23:00.
- Refusal of permission to use the rooftop terrace for consumption after 23:00 and refusal to permit the terrace for late-night smoking beyond the current restricted hours.
- The first-floor function room not to be authorised for late-night licensable activity until the applicant demonstrates a sustained period of compliance (minimum 12 months) with robust dispersal results.
- Mandatory SIA-registered door supervisors on site from 21:00 until close on Fridays and Saturdays (minimum number to be determined by the Authority), with evidence of staffing to be provided to the Licensing Authority weekly for the first three months.
- A robust, written dispersal policy to be submitted, approved by the Licensing Authority and actively enforced; this must include procedures for supervised, staggered dispersal, smoking management and the prohibition of congregation in the street.
- External, high-resolution CCTV covering the pavement and immediate street to be maintained, recorded for 31 days and made available to the Licensing Authority, Police and Environmental Health upon lawful request.
- Independent acoustic monitoring (commissioned and paid for by the licence holder) for a

## APPENDIX 8

minimum of three representative weekends, including monitoring through the period 23:00–01:00, with the results provided to Environmental Health. If monitoring shows repeated breaches of acceptable levels or repeated spikes causing disturbance, the licence must be reviewed.

- No re-entry after 23:00 once a patron has exited the premises.
- A limit on the maximum number of patrons permitted in the function room and on the terrace, to be specified on the licence and enforced by the licence holder.
- Evidence of meaningful community engagement to be provided, including a named local contact who responds to residents' concerns within 48 hours.
- Community liaison: a named contact who responds to residents within 48 hours, plus a quarterly log shared with Environmental Health.

Note: If problems persist, I reserve the right to request a licence review, which is a key community protection tool under Section 182 Guidance.

### **Request for withholding of personal details**

I respectfully request that my name and address be withheld from the applicant and redacted from any publicly circulated copy of this representation.

I make this request under the Licensing Act 2003 and the statutory guidance issued under Section 182, which allows licensing authorities, in exceptional circumstances, to withhold personal details where there is a genuine and well-founded fear of intimidation, harassment or reprisal. My concern is not speculative: a patron has made an unwanted sexual proposition; patrons have harassed residents online. Given the history and connections within the community, I have a genuine fear for my personal safety if publicly identified as an objector.

The premises has clientele who can be aggressive, and there is a planning enforcement history that demonstrates previous tensions. Disclosure of my address would, in my view, expose me to real risk and has already limited my ability to gather and submit evidence (recordings made from my property would reveal my address; however, I am happy to share these with the Licensing Authority). I therefore ask the Licensing Authority to exercise its discretion and withhold my identity and address from the applicant.

### **Conclusion**

The Section 182 Guidance expects licensing decisions to be preventative and tailored to the premises, with conditions that actually work in practice. The above points must be considered alongside the potential impact the proposed changes will have in exacerbating these issues.

The variation sought is not a minor amendment but a material intensification of late-night activity in a wholly residential street. The premises has demonstrated an ongoing pattern of nuisance and insufficient management control since opening in November 2025. The proposed changes would embed activity into the period when the worst harm occurs and would be likely to increase both nuisance and risk to public safety. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee refuse the variation. If any part of the application is granted, I strongly urge the Committee to impose the strict, verifiable conditions above and to require independent proof of sustained compliance before any further relaxation of controls.

# APPENDIX 8

## Other Person 5 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF

**Sent:** 22 February 2026 19:58

**To:** Diane Kraus <Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Licensing <Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr Rachel Hughes <Rachel.Hughes@rotherham.gov.uk>; Cllr David Sheppard <David.Sheppard@rotherham.gov.uk>; Audrey Bailey <Audrey.Bailey@rotherham.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Issues - Variation Application - Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street, Rotherham S62 5RF

Formal Objection – Premises Licence Variation Application (Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street)

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the proposed variations to the premises licence for the Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street, Rotherham S62 5RF.

1 – ‘Extend the earlier authorisation hour to allow the sale of alcohol, playing of recorded music, performance of dance and exhibition of films on every day of the week at 9am’

I oppose this variation as I think this is highly irresponsible of the owners to allow the sale of alcohol at a time where children at the neighbouring school may be present of this. This is both irresponsible of the owners of 33 south street and this clearly shows their lack of interest and respect of the local residents.

2 – ‘They wish to create an outdoor seating area for drinking to the front of 33 south street for disabled patrons’

I Highly oppose this and I think it is quite disgusting that the owners will use disability to appear more favourable into obtaining approval. This is not for disabled patrons at all, their whole premise is not disabled friendly as they have no ramp access to gain access to the building for disabled patrons and no washroom and toilet facilities for them to access.

The front outdoor seating area is for their local patrons to smoke, shout, drink and cause a nuisance which they have been doing since opening. The owners of 33 south street are just trying to fabricate that this area is for disabled patrons to gain favour.

As state they have no disabled access facilities at the premises so why would they even think about them to drink outside.

3 – ‘They will employ a door supervisor outside the front of the premises to control noise and disturbance’

Again this is complete nonsense and will not come to fruition. The owners again are just putting anything out there they think the council and committee board want to here. Since opening I am yet to see a door supervisor at the premises at all.

They also claim they will install noise monitors so they can monitor the levels of noise outside the premises to avoid disturbance to residents. Again, complete nonsense, just because they may (which I highly doubt) install noise monitors, it does not guarantee they will act upon it.

The owners since taking over the premises have not engaged with local residents at all over concerns as they are not interested in any disturbances caused to local residents and they

## APPENDIX 8

have proven this over and over again by flouting conditions of the premises that they were ordered to abide by (hence enforcement action has already been taken against them and I have this confirmed in writing from the council)

4 – ‘Extend the latest authorised hour to allow the sale of alcohol, playing of recorded music, performance of dance, exhibition of films and provision of late night refreshment on Friday to Saturday to 1am on the following day’

I oppose this idea because of the disturbance to neighbouring properties that are in too close proximity to the venue and proposed outside drinking areas. Everyone needs to be reminded that this is a quiet residential area and not the magaluf strip. There are young children, new born babies and even a disabled child in close proximity and I strongly feel the extended opening hours and drinking hours with cause both mental and emotional distress to residents in such close proximity.

Again on this point, the owners have shown complete disregard to the local residents as they have been going over their current permitted hours currently authorised and again I have this confirmed in writing by the council.

5 – ‘Remove the condition restricts the last admission to the premises at 11pm’

Again as stated in point 4, I oppose this idea for the same reasons stated.

6 – ‘Remove the condition that prohibits the use of the roof top terrace and replace it with a condition that allows the terrace to be used for the consumption of food and drink between 9m and 11pm on every day of the week and for the purpose of smoking or vaping only between 9am until the premises close.’

I highly oppose this for the same reasons I outlined when the owners first took over and proposed this idea. I think it is a huge breach of privacy to neighbouring properties on south street and main street. Directly behind where they propose the roof terrace are Bungalows and other properties with bedroom windows where patron will be able to see into. I notice that when the owners stated they will erect a 1.8 metre covering, there was no elaboration on what material this will be and whether it will be transparent or non transparent, whether there will be air gaps in it for air flow which will be allow patrons to be able to pry into residents windows and gardens. I think this is too much of a privacy concerns and does not safeguard the safety of children living in those properties which will be disturbed by this and open up the opportunity for paedophilic behaviour.

I also think this is a big health and safety risk. If it is used for smoking and vaping, I think there is a big fire risk of flammable material and furniture that will be used. Patrons tossing discarded cigarettes over the edge which will subsequently end up in residents gardens again opening up the opportunity to fire hazards.

The owners have stated they will introduce an air lock corridor to mitigate the noise level and also install noise level monitors. This does not guarantee that it will have the desired effect in mitigating any noise and controlling disturbances to residents, therefore I think its idiotic to try and pacify that this is some kind of guarantee that it will work when they cannot prove this. Again they are just wanting these new conditions approved and will state anything to do so.

## APPENDIX 8

The terrace wont be a complete enclosed space therefore patrons will cause noise disturbance to nearby properties and residents and this noise will be able to travel to cause this.

7 – 'Include the first floor function room (accessed via the roof top terrace) as part of the area authorised for the provision of licensable activities'

I would oppose this because where the planned first floor function room is mapped out to be at the rear right hand side of the premises, it is too close to neighbouring properties on main street and the school next door on south street. The noise levels will cause too much noise disruption to these properties and again mental and emotional distress.

I also want to point out that when the premises first went through this stage, highways commented and state they though this premise was an overdevelopment of the space it has. So I cannot understand why it may even be considered to increase this when it has already raised professional concerns that it is overdeveloped already.

Other points I would like to voice about why the premises should not have anymore development or conditions removed or approved.

Traffic is a big concern since this business has opened and I voiced this a lot. I have submitted photographic evidence of patrons cars parking anywhere they like, blocking residents driveways, double parking to a point where cars trying to drive up and down south street have had to enter the business to ask people to move cars so they can get through, this was photographed and uploaded on social media and I sent a copy of this to diane at rmhc.

Its irresponsible of the owners to have not created any parking for patrons whatsoever and im concerned that when emergency vehicles try and use south street, they wont be able to due to the parking issues from selfish patrons.

Another example of why the owners have complete disregard to the residents and also to any conditions set out by rmhc, is there own personal property on south street that has a large annex building built in the rear garden which has not had planning permission approved and were given a 6 month order to remove this structure and to date it remains. This again shows the owners are not interested in whether something is approved or not, they will go ahead and do it anyway. Not only is it unprofessional but it is also illegal. Their address if you wish to look into this is [REDACTED]

Illuminated signs and screens that were not approved are still erected and lit up and are causing vast light pollution to properties opposite [REDACTED]. The sign and screens are so bright they shine through our windows all night until they are switched off, I submitted photographic evidence regarding this and were advised the owners did not apply for a license for this and to switch off the illumination immediately but again, they ignored this and to date, still shine bright into our windows.

Conclusion – This Application Must Be Refused

## APPENDIX 8

This business has consistently shown:  
Non-compliance with planning regulations  
Non-compliance with licensing conditions  
No respect for its neighbours  
No intention of operating responsibly  
No care for the impact on the community

Approving this variation will increase complaints, increase enforcement demand, and significantly damage residents' quality of life.

For these reasons, I strongly urge RMBC to reject this application in full.

**Sent:** 20 February 2026 18:37

**To:** Diane Kraus <Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Important Update - Variation Application - Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street, Rotherham S62 5RF

This is just one example of visitors to the club constantly blocking drives and pavements with no intervention by the owners of wigtox lounge. They have no intention of working with residents whatsoever.

Just look at this picture. This is just one example of many per day everyday. Blocking driveways and pavements and making it a hazard to walk and drive on south street.

Great bit of parking on South Street unable to get through as I was in a mini bus, found the driver of the van having a pint in the pub. Luckily it wasn't an ambulance or fire engine wanting to get through



# APPENDIX 8

Over two driveways



# APPENDIX 8

## Other Person 6 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF

Sent: 23 February 2026 12:11

To: Diane Kraus <Diane.Kraus@rotherham.gov.uk>

Subject: Variation Application - Wigtox Lounge

We wish to object to the License Variation Application made by Wigtox Lounge for the following reasons:

i) The venue is on a residential street, next to a school and in close proximity to houses. Extending the hours until 1 am on Saturday and Sunday morning and opening a further function room will result in more footfall and more cars and taxis up and down the street leading to more noise and disturbance well into the early hours. It would seem that the owner is intent on turning the venue into a pseudo nightclub with little regard for residents.

ii) The venue has only been open since late October and has already created problems for residents during the winter months via noise and parking problems and glare from huge signage. As yet the amount of noise and disturbance during the summer months when drinkers are sat outside is unknown but will undoubtedly be considerable especially on the so called front patio which is directly onto the street and has no acoustic barrier.

iii) The car park at the rear as shown on the plans is currently not available and would only have space for 3 cars if it was open. On many occasions cars are parked haphazardly on the pavement and across the corners of South Street and Bisby Road making it extremely difficult for pedestrians to walk past and cars to negotiate the corner having to swing into the middle of the road with limited vision of what is coming in the opposite direction. Parking is already exacerbated by the fact that the school staff park all day on South Street and Bisby Road and also by parents parking to drop off and pick up children from school.

iv) Allowing the venue to serve alcohol from 9 am will only encourage people to drink more and for longer. Why does a venue need to be serving alcohol for 14 hours in the week and 16 hours at the weekend?

v) Allowing the roof terrace for drinking and smoking will also cause more noise and disturbance to residents on Main Street and Hutchinson Road, in particular those whose houses back onto the venue. The owner has stated that acoustic barriers will be erected to minimise noise but unfortunately sound waves travel in all directions not just horizontally. Previously the application to use the roof terrace was withdrawn even though the door to access it has always been in place and we feel it has been the intention all along to use the terrace.

vi) The original application was supported by 57 persons, the vast majority who do not live near to the venue and some of who don't live in the area. The owner himself stated that he lives on the street but his house is well away from the venue and unlikely to be affected by disturbance from footfall and traffic. No doubt there will be letters of support for the application again.

## APPENDIX 8

vii) Originally the venue was to be a beauty parlour, coffee shop and ice cream parlour during the daytime and a family friendly licensed lounge through the evening not a late night /early morning drinking and entertainment establishment .

viii) A fully operating function room will mean larger crowds which will mean an increase in footfall, traffic and disturbance making South Street busier, noisier and much more disruptive for residents.

P

ix) We would suggest that the Licensing Committee visit unannounced the location before the meeting itself to understand why residents have many concerns about the venue.

We do not wish our names or email address to be disclosed.

Yours sincerely ,

# APPENDIX 8

**Other Person 7 - South Street, Rawmarsh, Rotherham S62 5RF**

**Sent:** 24 February 2026 20:42

**To:** Licensing <[Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Licensing@rotherham.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Audrey Bailey <[Audrey.Bailey@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Audrey.Bailey@rotherham.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Objection to Variation Application Wigtox Lounge, 33 South Street, Rawmarsh

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of ■ South Street, Rawmarsh and I have been made aware by another concerned resident of a new variation application that has been made to you for the Wigtox Lounge who have applied to extend licensing hours for alcohol, music and dance at these premises.

I would like to formally object to this licence being granted as I feel this would greatly disturb and impact the residents of our neighbourhood with additional noise and drunken behaviour affecting the peace, safety and quality of life on South Street and the surrounding areas especially in the Summer.

Kindest Regards,