

Dr Andreas Nymark Jensen  
1 Trafalgar Road  
CB4 1EU  
Cambridge

Att.: Commercial and Licencing Team, Environmental Services,  
Cambridge City Council

## Objection

**Application Number:** 298057

**Licence Number:** 279321

**Licence Description:** Licencing Act 2003

**Licence Type:** Premises Licence

**Application Type:** Variation

**Status:** In Progress

**Licensee:** Othersyde Limited

**Agent:** Dovydas Vilimas

**Trading Name:** The Artyst

**Licence Address:** 54 - 56 Chesterton Road, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire, CB4 1EN

**Received Date:** 15-01-2026

**Consultation End Date:** 13-02-2026

### Concerning Licencing Objective no. 3: The prevention of Public Nuisance

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is with considerable irritation I find myself having to write an **OBJECTION** to the above Licence Application (298057). My irritation stems from the fact the licensee submitted the **same exact Licence Application (279321) just 18 months ago**, which was rejected. I submitted an objection to this application (see appendix A) which I urge you to read. Nothing has changed in these past 18 months that demonstrates the licensee should be given permission to extend their opening hours, as well as nothing within the new Licence Application (298057) exhibits any attempt or interest in solving the issues that led to the original rejection.

On the contrary, the new application (298057) plainly states under "Details Of Proposed Variation" that:

*"The extension of alcohol sales hours will support the sustainability of the business and allow greater flexibility for evening cultural activity, **while remaining appropriate to the character of the area**" (emphasis mine).*

And further:

***“There will be no material change to the nature of the operation”*** (emphasis mine).

These two quotes from the new application (298057) should singlehandedly disqualify the licensee in being granted dramatically extended opening hours, as they themselves state that the business proposal that got rejected just 18 months ago for failing to credibly promote the licensing objectives, has no intention of addressing their substantial shortcomings in any way shape or form.

Likewise, **although** the original Licence Application (279321) was full of promises of regards for respecting the local community and assurances of the appropriateness of the business model to fit within this, **absolutely no consultation with the neighbours has occurred in the past 18 months**. We were told 18 months ago the licensee would actively be seeking to involve the neighbourhood ensuring good faith and understanding of neighbourhood concerns. There has been no communication from the licensee.

As an additional concern, I see that “outside seating” is mentioned in the new application (298057)

**The prevention of crime and disorder.**

28. *“The outside seating area will be carefully monitored by staff to ensure it is being used in a responsible manner as not to cause a disturbance to local residents.”*

**The prevention of public nuisance**

32. *“The outside seating area will close each day at 21:30. All tables and chairs will be taken out of use and stored securely within the premises.”*

We have previously voiced concern (see appendix A) about the prospect of outside seating, and we remain vehemently opposed to the idea of the licensee being granted permission for this.

I urge you to read my original objection below (Appendix A).

Sincerely,

Dr Andreas Nymark Jensen

# Appendix A

Dr Andreas Nymark Jensen  
1 Trafalgar Road  
CB4 1EU  
Cambridge

Att.: Cambridge Licensing authority

# Objection

**Application Number:** 279321  
**Licence Type:** Premises Licence  
**Licensee:** Othersyde Limited  
**Trading Name:** The Alcademy

**Licence Address:**  
54 Chesterton Road  
Cambridge  
Cambridgeshire  
CB4 1EN

Concerning Licensing Objective no. 3: **The prevention of Public Nuisance**

Dear Sir/Madam,

My objection in regards to Application Number: 279321 (Licensee: Othersyde Limited) is with the real and demonstrable risk of impact of another licensed premise in Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham's Corner on the promotion of the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, in particular no. 3: **The prevention of Public Nuisance**.

With an already significant number of licensed premises concentrated in the immediate vicinity of the proposed premises on the corner of Chesterton Road and Trafalgar Road, this increase in negative, cumulative, impact on the promotion of the four licensing objectives (prevention of Crime and Disorder; Public Safety; the prevention of Public Nuisance; and the Protection of Children from harm), as evidenced in the available statistics, by granting a premises licence to the applicant, will prove detrimental to our neighbourhood.

**I therefore here submit my objection.** Please see below for specification of reasoning underpinning my objection.

The Licensing Authority is required by duty to have regard to the Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA), and thereby to actively promote the four licensing objectives. As stated on Cambridge City Council's website under 'Licences and permits > Alcohol and entertainment licensing > Licensing overview', "**Each [licensing] objective is of equal importance. These four objectives must be addressed in every case as they apply to the consideration of all licensing matters**" (emphasis mine).

In light of this, it would be inconsistent with the Licensing Authority's duty under section 4(1) of the Licensing Act 2003 to grant any further relevant authorisations in respect of premises licences (i.e., with Supply Of Alcohol) in this part of West Chesterton Ward, i.e., Chesterton Road within Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham's Corner, as it would demonstratively add to the rise of 'Alcohol Related Crimes' (cf. 'Cambridge City Cumulative Impact Policy Review 2023'). The rise of 'Alcohol Related Crimes' would add to the cumulative (negative) impact on the licensing objectives, which again goes against the City Council's duty of promotion of the licensing objectives as stated in 'Cumulative Impact Assessment March 2024 - Cambridge City Council, paragraph 4.5'.

This is specified in 'Cumulative Impact Assessment March 2024 - Cambridge City Council', 'Appendix 4', 'Cambridge City Cumulative Impact Policy Review 2023', p. 5:

*"Whilst the figure for reported alcohol related incidents saw a reduction of -36% over the two time periods, **the respective crime rate increased by 11%. Despite this both maps still show the clusters of alcohol related crime and incidents within the West Chesterton CIA [...], indicating there is still a correlation between these figures and the concentration of licensed premises, which may be justification for the existing CIA to be retained**"* (emphasis mine).

According to Cambridge City Council's 'Statement of Licensing Policy', paragraph 2.2, the Council "*must fulfil its obligations under section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to **do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in Cambridge***" (emphasis mine). Specifically, it is the duty of the Licensing Authority to "*exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, (a)crime and disorder in its area (**including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment**); and (b)the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area.*" (Crime and Disorder Act 1998, c. 37, Part I, Chapter I, Miscellaneous and supplemental, Section 17(1)) (emphasis mine).

Consequently, based on the Licensing Authority's "obligation" and "duty" to "*do all that it reasonably can to prevent [...] anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment*", it is certainly *within reason*, i.e., 'reasonable', for the Licensing Authority to refuse the application in question (i.e., 279321).

Quoting now from the 'Section from Statement of Licensing Policy in regards to Cumulative Impact, Appendix 5, 5.10' (Licensing Sub Committee meeting - Monday, 15th June, 2020, 10.30 am).

*"This special policy [Cumulative Impact Areas] creates a **rebuttable presumption** that applications within the areas set out in paragraph 5.8 [as of May 2024 including Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham's Corner] for new premises licences or club premises certificates or variations that are likely to add to the existing cumulative impact **will normally be refused, if relevant representations are received about the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives**, unless the applicant can demonstrate why the operation of the premises involved will not add to the cumulative impact already being experienced"* (emphasis mine).

The facts supporting this designation of Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham's Corner are grounded in years of monitoring anti-social behaviour in the area in question, i.e., Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham's Corner, combined with rigorous data analysis produced by Cambridgeshire Constabulary.

Consequently, it is clear that the applicant **will not** be able to demonstrate that the operation of the proposed premises **will not** add to the cumulative impact already being experienced, as 'Crime and Disorder' is directly linked to increase in licensed premises.

On top of this, current local residents in the area immediately adjacent to the proposed premises of the application (including the undersigned), agree on the obvious and unmitigable consequences of another drinking venue on the doorstep of our residential neighbourhood.

These will inevitably include anti-social behaviour from patrons leaving the proposed premises such like raucous conduct while moving through Trafalgar Road and Trafalgar Street. Concerns are further focused on the area behind the proposed premises (upper part of Trafalgar Road and public alley between Chesterton Road and Trafalgar Street) as a convenient place for public urination precipitated by few available customer toilets in the proposed premises (cf. applicant's submitted plans).

By publishing a Cumulative Impact Assessment, the Council claims in its '*Cumulative Impact Assessment March 2024 - Cambridge City Council*', paragraph 4.5, that "*this assessment is being published because the Licensing Authority considers that the number of licensed premises and club premises certificates within the areas specified in 4.1 is such that it is likely that granting further licences or variations to licences would be inconsistent with the authority's duty to promote the licensing objectives.*" The Council is, we are told in paragraph 4.6, "*setting down a **strong statement of intent** about its approach to considering applications for grant and variations of premises licences or club premises certificates in the area's set out*" (emphasis mine).

If this "strong statement of intent" is to be taken seriously, the Council must refuse this application (279321).

The Council continues in its paragraph 4.7 *“the contents of the Cumulative Impact Assessment does not change the fundamental ways that decisions are made under the Licensing Act 2003”*, and further that *“the Licensing Authority will make all decisions on applications within the cumulative impact area on a case by case basis **with a view on how best to promote the licensing objectives**. Each application will be considered on its own merits (emphasis mine).”*

While due consideration of every application should of course be the rule, government legislation and local police recommendations on issues of crime and public nuisance must take precedence and be enforced through this clear-cut preventive tool (i.e., Cumulative Impact Assessment) prescribed by those authorities, so as to promote the licensing objectives as faithful as possible.

Therefore, as per the definition in paragraph 4.8 of the same document, the application in question cannot in good faith be considered *“appropriate”* for approval in Cumulative Impact Area – Mitcham’s Corner, as *“the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate to the responsible authorities the suitability of how their proposal will **not add** to the cumulative impact”* (paragraph 4.10, emphasis mine). This will, however, prove impossible to demonstrate for OtherSyde Ltd when considering the available crime statistics, as these – as mentioned above – repeatedly show a correspondence between number of licensed premises and amount of anti-social behaviour.

As stipulated in paragraph 4.12, when *“it cannot be demonstrated that an application **will not** undermine the licensing objectives or demonstrate it **will not** increase the cumulative impact with the areas specified in paragraph 4.1, **then it shall be the policy of this Licensing Authority to refuse to grant the application”*** (emphasis mine).

I would like to comment on a few points found in licensee’s (Othersyde Limited) application specifics (279321), as submitted online ([https://pp.3csharedservices.org/registers/index.html?fa=licence\\_register&licence\\_id=279321&council\\_id=1](https://pp.3csharedservices.org/registers/index.html?fa=licence_register&licence_id=279321&council_id=1))

*“Considering the location of the premises within one of the City’s designated Cumulative Impact Areas, the business owners are **dedicated to ensuring that their operations will contribute positively to the neighbourhood and enhance the well-being of its residents”*** (Application Details, page 6. Emphasis mine).

While the alleged good intentions are appreciated, the above statement is unclear as to precisely ‘how’ this *“dedication”* is supposed to be manifested; whether *“operations”* meant to *“contribute positively to the neighbourhood”* are sought to include ‘all’ or just ‘some’ of the listed operations by the proposed premises; and whether *“enhancement of well-being of the*

*neighbourhood residents*” would include ‘all’ residents or only ‘some’ (in which case who?), and in what ways.

One thing is Othersyde Limited’s proposed operations ***within*** their premises. Another thing entirely is ***the effects*** of those operations ***off*** their premises: while “*yoga and drawing classes*”, “*talks*”, “*presentations*”, and “*poetry readings and exhibitions*” are all excellent ideas for a community-friendly venue, these features are not at all where my concerns (i.e., objections) lie.

My concerns are with the positioning of a “*ground floor bar [...] and cocktail bar in the basement*” (Application Details, page 6) on a residential street, serving/selling alcohol from 11am until 11pm all week. That is 80+ hours a week of alcohol sales.

This would be combined with recorded music being “*played within the venue. On the ground floor, the recorded music will sometimes be playing in the background at a low level that has been agreed on with the Council. In the basement, recorded music will mostly be for background purposes. However, there will sometimes be, usually at the weekends, recorded music played by a DJ. This music will be played through the venue’ PA and won’t exceed the decibel level agreed on with the Council*” (Application Details, page 9). This would potentially be ca. 80 hours a week of amplified live music, and/or 100+ hours a week of recorded music. This does not rhyme with ‘*enhancing the well-being of local residents*’.

Under ‘Conditions offered – General, statement 9, Community Engagement’ the applicant assures they “*will engage with the local community to address concerns and foster a positive relationship*” (Application Details, page 7. Emphasis mine).

Othersyde Limited started their engagement with neighbours on Friday evening 31<sup>st</sup> May, less than 5 days before deadline for submissions of representations on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> June. Two representatives from Othersyde Limited went door to door on Trafalgar Road introducing themselves and their business. I was handed a flyer about walking tours and told that their basement space would – among other things – be available for hire for kids’ parties, etc. I was told about poetry nights and acoustic music.

This sudden, albeit late, interest in neighbourhood opinion was likely – presumably only – precipitated by the early submissions of objections to the application in question forwarded by the council to Othersyde Limited. Almost as if genuine “*engagement with the local community to address concerns and foster a positive relationship*” was mere lip service inserted into the application to comply with expectations for applying for an alcohol licence in a cumulative impact area.

This personal (though undocumented) conversation with Othersyde Limited representatives only works to amplify my concerns that other promises (e.g., prevention of crime and disorder and public safety; noise control measures to prevent public nuisance and respecting neighbours; soundproofing, noise level monitoring, and staff training on noise control; regular assessment of

practices to ensure effectiveness in promoting all four licensing objectives, etc.), not testable before after a license has been granted and the cocktail bar has opened, will equally not be taken seriously. In other words, their “*commitment to being responsible and considerate members of the community*” needs to be seriously questioned.

Another point to this end is the lack of consideration of the local city layout (cf. email from Othersyde Limited to Trafalgar Road stakeholder on 23th May 2024) displayed by Othersyde Limited when trying to conciliate an objecting local resident by erroneously arguing Trafalgar Road is a cul-de-sac with no thoroughfare possible to south of river – and therefore would not see any drunk patrons ambling through – when this is demonstrably, even shockingly, false (i.e., the existing of Trafalgar Street as a corridor of traffic from Victoria Avenue, through Trafalgar Road, straight to entrance of proposed premises; public footpaths from the River Cam leading both east (Ferry path/Fort St. George bridge to Midsummer Common) and west (Victoria Bridge/Victoria Avenue).

Under ‘Conditions offered - Prevention of Crime and Disorder’ it is stated:

*“Staff will take **reasonable steps** to ensure that customers do not take partly consumed alcoholic products or drinking receptacles away from the premises.”* (Application Details, page 7. Emphasis mine).

*“Any off sales will only be sold in sealed containers. The outside seating area will be carefully monitored by staff to ensure it is being used in a **responsible manner as not to cause a disturbance to local residents**”* (Application Details, page 7. Emphasis mine).

The outside seating area will **by definition** cause a disturbance to local residents. Furthermore, no policy is being offered in the application regarding “un-seated” patrons drinking (and/or smoking, talking, etc.) outside. Will this be allowed? If not, how will it be enforced? My concern here is that un-seated patrons (i.e., standing) will migrate unto the corner of Chesterton Road/Trafalgar Road and the upper part of Trafalgar Road where – according to the floor plan submitted by Othersyde Limited – the proposed premises have a “customer entrance” and “staff entrance”, respectively. This would lead to animated patrons loudly conversing on the Trafalgar Road pavement outside the proposed premises (likely spilling into the tarmac of the street thereby causing nuisance to traffic), the noise of which will be amplified and cascaded down through the narrow Trafalgar Road bouncing off the brick houses.

Under ‘Conditions offered - Prevention of Public Nuisance’, we hear that:

*Our staff will be trained to ensure that patrons leaving the premises do so **quietly and respectfully**, particularly during late hours. **We will be in constant communication with our***

***neighbours and will have an open-door policy to address any concerns they may have regarding noise or other nuisances***” (Application Details, page 8. Emphasis mine).

Again, the ***consequences*** of patrons leaving the cocktail bar will ***not*** be managed by bar staff, and is – in all fairness – not theirs to manage, as they solely have authority over patrons within their premises -not ***off*** their premises. Consequently, as soon as patrons are off the premises managed by Othersyde Limited, they are free to wander in every which direction they choose. Equally, patrons having left ***“quietly and respectfully”*** are neither bound nor policed by any measures, policies, or promises Othersyde Limited are obligated to enforce.

In conclusion, I hope my above objection will be taken seriously into consideration in order to refuse/reject **Application Number: 279321**

Sincerely,

Dr Andreas Nymark Jensen