

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF PARIS HOUSE LICENCE

07 MAY 2024

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

07 MAY 2024

The Applicants hesitate to refer the LP to yet more documents but have little choice if it is to be made aware of all relevant matters.

This is because of the absence of a report from the Police Licensing Unit ("PLU") and information missing from the reports of the BHCC Environmental Health and Licensing Officers ("EHO" and "LO" respectively).

As the LP will be aware, the Applicant CH's FOIA request produced information for the period 2016 - 15 August 2022. It was anticipated that some reference would be made in the above reports to the information listed below and, in its absence, this document is provided to assist the LP.

1. 27/2/19 – CH email to BHCC officer offering to meet with the PLH if felt appropriate. No response received. (Noise diary details videoclips being sent to officer ±).

2. EHO/CH contact re provision of video clips on USB by CH to assist in investigation. First suggested 30/08/22 and ready for collection 06/09/22.

(31/08/22 re sending video clips to EHO by email

01/09/22 EHO requesting video clips on a memory stick. **Mentions PH say they are not the cause of the noise nuisance.**

02/09/22 CH - EHO re putting video clips onto a USB and **rejecting PH claim they are not the cause of the nuisance**

06/09/22 USB ready for EHO to collect

12/9/22 CH informed EHO USB handed to her colleagues on 10/09/22

USB subsequently returned to CH by EHO in 2023).

3. EHO information regarding recording equipment placed by her in CH/VH's home for period 15/08/22 - 28/08/22 (Schedule of recordings at **APP2 Sched.1 Pt B(ii)**).

07/09/22 - **positive reference** by EHO to 2 clips from the audio recordings as possible basis for action. Possible NAN - noise abatement notice.

EHO subsequently advised by senior officer that recording equipment had not been correctly placed and could not identify source of noise. Referred to in **APP22 p. 3 para.9; p.7 paras.1-4.**

4. **BHCC Officers' visit to Applicants CH/VH's and JK's homes** on the afternoon of **Monday, 12 September 2022.**

12/09/22 – CH email complaining of noise that afternoon and inviting officers to attend to witness it. (Number of officers did attend).

(**APP30** 19/09/22 - CH reporting to EHO his conversation with officer who took decibel readings in CH/VH's rear garden on the afternoon of 12/09/22. She said the reading was 65. When asked how significant that was she said at 80 people are advised to wear ear protectors and "they are looking to lose their music licence." - referring to PH)

Subsequently told this officer had made no note of the reading and her equipment was not calibrated so could not be deemed accurate

- Minutes of meeting with residents 7/11/22 **APP22 p3 paras 13 & 14**

Despite her comments, BHCC's notes of this attendance record "no noise nuisance ."
No reference to SOLP or fact noise audible in homes some distance from PH.

Acceptance at meeting on 07/11/22 that officers should keep notes (**APP22.p6 final para** - subsequently confirmed by email after meeting) and equipment used should be calibrated (**APP22 p.3 paras 13 & 14;p.7 para 3**).

(Recent research shows that **regulations 4 & 7 of The Control of Noise at Work Regulations 2005 specify that those working in noise levels between 80db (lower action level) and 85db must be provided with suitable hearing protection on request.**
Where noise levels reach or exceed 85 dB (upper action level), suitable hearing protection must be supplied and worn.)

5. Complaints of antisocial behaviour in August and September 2022 were made to both the LPU and BHCC.

10/10/22 – email from PLU encouraging residents to make complaints via their complaints number (101) re antisocial behaviour.

10/10/22 CH to PLU setting out concerns in more detail and asking if reports we make to Police are shared with BHCC and PCSOs patrolling in the area.

14/10/22. PLU confirming residents should "keep reporting to both the council and ourselves."

See also following emails -

01/08/22 - CH to PLU asking for help. Response from PLU on 26/08/22 saying will support BHCC investigation.

11/08/22.- CH to LO refers to history and intimidating letter sent to Residents 1 & 2

30/09/22 x 2 - one to EHO at **00.32** saying reported incident near PH and customer of PH (at least) behaving suspiciously with known drug dealer in email to 101; Second one to BHCC officers and PLU at 10.05 with more information re identity. Request this specific incident is raised with PH on officers planned visit to PH.

06/10/22- **00.14** complaint to BHCC officers and PLU about incident on 5/10/22

09/10/22 - **01.07** as above re night of 8/9/10/22

13/10/22 - 21.20 more noise. Call for help to BHCC officers and both councillors.

14/10/22 - 10.59 in report to BHCC re making noise nuisance and anti social behaviour report to Police 101 number last night ie 13/10/22

second email at 16.10 in response to one received from PCSO Gustard refers to PH staff emptying bottles into bin a few minutes **past midnight** (which "they regularly do") and appearance of drug dealing with the knowledge/encouragement of one or more pub staff .

15/10/22. 16.04 to EHO (copied to six residents who had complained plus Applicants JK and LR) re concerns we had re what had been agreed with PH at 10/10/22 meeting.

16/10/22. 16.19 to EHO and LO, other BHCC officers and PLU re complaint of noise nuisance last night ie 15/10/22 and afternoon of 16/10/22

16/10/22 (JK). **04.59** email to PCSO re anti social behaviour of man using (unauthorised) waste bin built by PH and using PH bench. Also refers to two girls drinking from cans outside 4 OMC and listening to music from PH.

07/11/22 Allegations of drug dealing made at residents' meeting with BHCC (**APP22 p.9 para.8**)

Reports were made to the Police as indicated in CH's statement at **para 4.1 (APP2 Sched.1 Pt A)** where the Police references for two of them are given. It is not known whether any action was taken by BHCC officers or Police re these reports and ,if so what, but it is concerning to note that two of them occurred **after** BHCC and Police meeting with PH on 10/10/22.

6. Noise diary for April 2023.

Having reported noise disturbance for 17 and 18/03/23 earlier, submitting noise diary with email at **01.04 09/04/23**. Details specific complaints for that night and queries at what level the noise limiter has been set (also requested residents be supplied with a call out system " for at least a short period so reports about nights like this one could be given to an officer who could come out and witness it for themselves."

19/04/23 At EHO's request hard copy of diary delivered to her office .

NB. Both above emails referred to availability of more detailed contemporaneous notes of what CH had experienced .

7. Contact number

Requests for a contact number of an enforcement officer so one could be called out to witness noise as it occurred rather than speculative attempted enforcement by officers attending on a day of the week when there had been noise complaints for those days in previous weeks ie attendance in the hope that something similar might occur again ("Speculative enforcement").

17/10/22 05.55 to EHO, LO and Heads of those depts.

07/11/22 **APP22 p.4 para.1**

20/03/23 17.07 to BHCC officers and Police reporting in detail on disturbances on 17 & 18/03/23.

21/03/23 15.15 to Head of LO - concerns re **lack of effective call out service**. (also queried at what level noise limiter set).

09/04/23 **01.04** - see section 6 above.

13/04/23 17.09 CH email to BHCC officer Jo Player re shortcomings in the enforcement system - **a waste of resources** .

26/04/23 16.22 to EHO requesting **call out number rather than waste time and resources by officers attending in hope of witnessing something**.

27/04/23 11.20 to Heads of EHO and LO suggesting that officers' visits in absence of a complaint that night **"is not the best use of valuable resources."**

27/04/23 14.34 EHO's response - "..... we are not in a position to offer "on call" responses to witness alleged noise nuisance out of hours as there is **no out of hours service**, but pre-programmed visits only."

27/04/23 14.55 CH to EHO stating he knows about BHCC's policy but **didn't want officers wasting their time. If residents had a contact number they could call officers and say there wasn't a problem and so save time and money**. If that wasn't possible then things should be left a little longer ie no need for officers to attend .

02/05/23 15.35 Head of LO - CH "Unfortunately **there is not the option for you to ring an officer directly out of hours.**"

12/05/23 09.47 CH - EHO (re correspondence between her and JK) - "We **didn't decline** an offer of subsequent visits but in fact said we saw little point in your coming out the following Saturday just because there had been noise nuisance on Saturdays previously.**Our motive was not to waste your time with a series of pointless visits.**"

8. JK complaint to MP –

E mails between 3/11/22 and 11/11/22. Concerns expressed about **vulnerable residents** needing support to manage noise issues and asking MP to request that BHCC provide an out of hours call service.

9. Letter to Residents 1 & 2

11/08/22 E-mail to LO and others re PLH's behaviour at mediations and reference to letter from PLH to Residents 1 & 2 of the consequences if they continued to complain.

10 Miscellaneous points

(A) BHCC visits

A check of the Applicants' submissions -**F1.16** and **APP8 Pt B** ,BHCC Visits to Assess Noise Nuisance - requires correction & clarification as follows -

- (i) There was one occasion when one of the Applicants (CH) contacted BHCC with a request for officers to attend to hear the noise levels that afternoon. This was Monday 12 September 2022 and is referred to above under **para.4.** and later discussed at the meeting with residents on 07/11/22 **APP22.** CH was not told that afternoon that no noise nuisance had been found and ,in fact, just the opposite from what was said at the time. The problem of inadequate equipment and recording of notes was also discussed at the residents' meeting.
- (ii) Because there was no call out service there was no way for residents to contact BHCC officers out of hours - unless a number was provided. In advance of one pre-planned visit a number was provided but not used because no nuisance was experienced that night.
- (iii) Noise diaries provided by Applicants JK and LR show noise nuisance on 04/09/22 between 7 and 9pm (JK says that the noise was reduced after about 8pm). The officers' report that " a large amount of people congregated outside the premises. Music playing." but decided there was no nuisance. No visits were paid to JK's and LR's homes and no noise measurements were taken inside them. If they could hear music inside their homes and the officers could hear it from outside the PH then the conclusion there was no noise nuisance does not accord with at least the SOLP.
- (iv) Applicant LR's diary refers to his being disturbed on the afternoon of 10/10/22. The same comments as made in (iii) above apply.

(B) The following documents of relevance are provided with highlighting of relevant passages -

A copy of the current CPS charging standards for Public Justice Offences.
- relates to **APP 11A & 11B PLH** - letter to Applicants CH & VH and JK of 13/03/23.

The Metropolitan Police Antisocial Behaviour guidance.

A sample of guidance provided on noise nuisance and its effects. (there are many sources - this one is from the CPD Online College.)

Apart from the documents in para.10(B) above, none of the other documents have been produced as the great majority are already in BHCC's files and the remainder are with the Sussex Police.

Copies can be provided in advance if required and the Applicants will have copies available at the hearing in any event.

C.C.Hallsworth

06/05/24



Public Justice Offences incorporating the Charging Standard

— updated 1 July 2019; revised 13 August 2021; revised 4 August 2022 | *Legal Guidance*


[Headlines](#)
[Key Points](#)
[Charging Standard - Purpose](#)
[General Charging Practice](#)
[Charging Practice for Public Justice Offences](#)
[Perverting the Course of Justice](#)
[Misrepresentation as to Identity](#)
[Perjury](#)
[Perjury by a Prosecution Witness](#)
[Perjury by a Defendant](#)
[Perjury by a Defence Witness](#)
[Offences Akin to Perjury](#)
[Offences Concerning Witnesses and Jurors](#)
[Intimidating or Harming Witnesses and Others - Criminal Proceedings](#)
[Section 51\(1\): Intimidation of Witnesses/Jurors](#)
[Section 51\(2\): Harming People who have Assisted the Police/Given Evidence/Been a Juror](#)
[Application to Set Aside a 'Tainted' Acquittal](#)
[Interfering or Harming Witnesses - Civil Proceedings](#)
[Section 39 - Intimidation](#)
[Section 40 - Harming](#)
[Interference with Jurors](#)
[Offences Committed by Jurors](#)
[Offences Concerning the Police](#)
[Obstructing a Police Officer - section 89\(2\) Police Act 1996](#)
[Wasting Police Time - section 5\(2\) Criminal Law Act 1967](#)
[Misrepresentation as to Identity](#)

Impersonating a Police Officer

Refusing to Assist a Constable

Offences Concerning Prisoners and Offenders

Failing to Surrender to Bail

Escape/Breach of Prison

Harbouring Escaped Prisoners

Assisting an Offender - section 4(1) Criminal Law Act 1967

Offences Concerning the Coroner

Obstructing a Coroner - Preventing the Burial of a Body

Headlines

A large number of offences cover conduct, which hinders or frustrates the administration of justice, the work of the police, prosecutors and courts.

This guidance sets out the key provisions in relation to perverting the course of justice. It also covers perjury, offences concerning witnesses and jurors; offences involving the police (such as obstructing the police and wasting police time); offences concerning prisoners and offenders; and those involving coroners.

Key Points

- There is separate guidance in relation to perverting the course of justice - charging in cases of rape and/or domestic violence allegations - and referral to HQ is required.
- Wasting police time requires the consent of the DPP.
- Where police wish to interview jurors an application via the Crown Court to the Court of Appeal should be made by the CPS having first notified the AGO .

Charging Standard - Purpose

The charging standard below, provides guidance concerning the charge which should be preferred if the criteria set out in the Code for Crown Prosecutors are met. The purpose of charging standards is to make sure that the most appropriate charge is selected, in the light of the facts, which can be proved, at the earliest possible opportunity. This will help the police and Crown Prosecutors in preparing the case. Adoption of this standard should lead to a reduction in the number of times charges have to be amended which in turn should lead to an increase in efficiency and a reduction in avoidable extra work for the police and the Crown Prosecution Service.

The guidance set out in this charging standard:

- should not be used in the determination of any investigatory decision, such as the decision to arrest;
- does not override any guidance issued on the use of appropriate alternative forms of disposal short of charge, such as cautioning or conditional cautioning;
- does not override the principles set out in the Code for Crown Prosecutors;
- does not override the need for consideration to be given in every case as to whether a

charge/prosecution is in the public interest; and

- does not remove the need for each case to be considered on its individual merits or fetter the discretion to charge and to prosecute the most appropriate offence depending on the particular facts of the case.

This standard covers the following offences:

- Perverting the Course of Justice
- Perjury
- Offences akin to perjury
- Offences Concerning Witnesses and Jurors
 - Intimidation - criminal proceedings
 - Intimidation - civil proceedings
- Offences committed by jurors
- Offences Concerning the Police
 - Obstructing a police officer
 - Wasting police time
 - Impersonating a Police Officer
 - Refusing to assist a constable
- Offences Concerning Prisoners and Offenders
 - Escape
 - Harboursing
 - Assisting an offender
 - Prison Mutiny
- Offences Concerning the Coroner
 - Obstruction
 - Preventing Burial of a Body

General Charging Practice

Prosecutors should always have in mind the following general principles when selecting the appropriate charge(s):

1. the charge(s) should accurately reflect the extent of the accused's alleged involvement and responsibility thereby allowing the courts the discretion to sentence appropriately; and
2. ensure the clear and simple presentation of the case particularly when there is more than one accused;
3. there should be no overloading of charges by selecting more charges than are necessary just to encourage the accused to plead guilty to a few;
4. there should be no overcharging by selecting a charge which is not supported by the evidence in order to encourage a plea of guilty to a lesser allegation.

Charging Practice for Public Justice Offences

The following factors will be relevant to all public justice offences when assessing the relative seriousness of the conduct and which offence, when there is an option, should be charged. Consider whether the conduct:

- was spontaneous and unplanned or deliberate and elaborately planned;
- was momentary and irresolute or prolonged and determined;
- was motivated by misplaced loyalty to a relative/friend or was part of a concerted effort to avoid, pervert, or defeat justice;
- whether the activities of the defendant drew in others;
- was intended to result in trivial or 'serious harm' to the administration of justice;
- actually resulted in trivial or 'serious harm' to the administration of justice.

Examples of 'serious harm' include conduct which:

- enables a potential defendant in a serious case to evade arrest or commit further offences;
- causes an accused to be granted bail when he might otherwise not have;
- avoids a police investigation for disqualified driving or other serious offences;
- misleads a court;
- puts another person in real jeopardy of arrest/prosecution or results in the arrest/prosecution of another person;
- avoids a mandatory penalty such as disqualification
- results in the police losing the opportunity to obtain important evidence in a case.

Where the evidential threshold is met, it will usually be in the public interest to prosecute public justice offences..

For guidance on charging in cases involving rape and/or domestic violence allegations, please refer to the separate Perverting the Course of Justice legal guidance in cases involving rape and/or domestic violence allegations.

Perverting the Course of Justice

The offence of Perverting the Course of Justice is committed when an accused:

- does an act or series of acts;
- which has or have a tendency to pervert; and
- which is or are intended to pervert;
- the course of public justice.

The offence is contrary to common law and triable only on indictment. It carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment and/or a fine. The course of justice must be in existence at the time of the act(s). The course of justice starts when:

- an event has occurred, from which it can reasonably be expected that an investigation will follow; or
- investigations which could/might bring proceedings have actually started; or
- proceedings have started or are about to start.

In *R v Cotter and Others* [2002] EWCA Crim 1033 it was held that where the prosecution case is that a false allegation has been made, all that is required is that the person making the false allegation intended that it should be taken seriously by the police. It is not necessary to prove that she/he intended that anyone should actually be arrested. The offence of perverting the course of justice is sometimes referred to as "attempting to pervert the course of justice". It does not matter whether or not the acts result in a perversion of the course of justice: the offence is committed when acts tending and intended to pervert a course of justice are done. The words "attempting to" should not appear in the charge. It is charged contrary to common law, not the Criminal Attempts Act 1981: *R v Williams* 92 Cr. App. R. 158 CA. The offence of perverting the course of justice overlaps with a number of other statutory offences. Before preferring such a charge, consideration must be given to the possible alternatives referred to in this Charging Standard and, where appropriate, any of the following offences:

- corruption: Prevention of Corruption Act 1906 and Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act 1889;
- agreeing to indemnify a surety: s.9 Bail Act 1976;
- making false statement: s.89 Criminal Justice Act 1967, s.106 Magistrates' Courts Act 1980 and s. 11(1) European Communities Act 1972;
- using documents with intent to deceive: s.173 Road Traffic Act 1988;
- impersonating a police officer: s.90 Police Act 1966;
- acknowledging a recognisance or bail in the name of another: s.34 Forgery Act 1861; and
- concealing an arrestable offence: s.5 Criminal Law Act 1967.

Pervverting the course of justice covers a wide range of conduct. A charge of perverting the course of justice should, however be reserved for serious cases of interference with the administration of justice. Regard must be had to the factors outlined in General Charging Practice, above in this guidance and in Charging Practice for Public Justice Offences, above in this guidance, which help to identify the seriousness of the conduct.

If the seriousness of the offence can properly be reflected in any other charge, which would provide the court with adequate sentencing powers, and permit a proper presentation of the case as a whole, that other charge should be used unless:

- the facts are so serious that the court's sentencing powers would be inadequate; or
- it would ensure the better presentation of the case as a whole; for example, a co-defendant has been charged with an indictable offence and the statutory offence is summary only.

Note that in *R v Sookoo* (2002) EWCA Crim 800; the Court cautioned against adding a count of perverting the course of justice when the conduct could properly be treated as an aggravating feature of the principal offence. However, consecutive sentences may be imposed when the conduct is a separate and subsequent act, in which case a count of perverting the course of conduct should be considered.

The following are examples of acts which may constitute the offence, although General Charging Practice, above in this guidance and Charging Practice for Public Justice Offences, above in this guidance should be carefully considered before preferring a charge of perverting the course of justice:

- persuading, or attempting to persuade, by intimidation, harm or otherwise, a witness not to give evidence, to alter his evidence or to give false evidence;
- interference with jurors with a view to influencing their verdict;
- false alibis and interference with evidence or exhibits, for example blood and DNA samples;
- providing false details of identity to the police or courts with a view to avoiding the consequences of a police investigation or prosecution;
- giving false information, or agreeing to give false information, to the police with a view to frustrating a police inquiry; for example, lying as to who was driving when a road traffic accident occurred;
- lending a driving licence to another to produce to the police following a notice to produce, thereby avoiding an offence of driving whilst disqualified being discovered;
- agreeing to give false evidence;
- concealing or destroying evidence concerning a police investigation to avoid arrest;
- assisting others to evade arrest for a significant period of time; and
- making a false allegation which wrongfully exposes another person to the risk of arrest, imprisonment pending trial, and possible wrongful conviction and sentence.

In deciding whether or not it is in the public interest to proceed, consideration should be given to:

- The nature of the proceedings with which the defendant was trying to interfere;
- The consequences, or possible consequences, of the interference.

A prosecution may not be in the public interest if the principal proceedings are at a very early stage and the action taken by the defendant had only a minor impact on those proceedings.

It is likely that perverting the course of justice will be the appropriate charge when:

- the acts wrongfully expose another person to risk of arrest or prosecution;
- the obstruction of a police investigation is premeditated, prolonged or elaborate;
- the acts hide from the police the commission of a serious crime;
- a police investigation into serious crime has been significantly or wholly frustrated or misled;
- the arrest of a wanted person for a serious crime has been prevented or substantially delayed, particularly if the wanted person presents a danger to the public or commits further crimes;
- the acts completely frustrate a drink/drive investigation thereby enabling the accused to avoid a mandatory disqualification;
- the acts strike at the evidence in the case. For example, influencing a vital witness to give evidence/alter evidence/false evidence, or destroying vital exhibits or frustrating a scientific examination;
- the acts enable a defendant to secure bail when he would probably not have otherwise secured it;
- the acts strike at the proceedings in a fundamental way. (For example, by giving a false name so as to avoid a mandatory disqualification or a 'totting' disqualification: giving false details which might significantly influence the sentence passed; giving details which may result in a caution instead of prosecution);
- concerted attempts to interfere with jurors; attacks on counsel or the judge; or conduct designed to cause the proceedings to be completely abandoned);

- a concerted attempt has been made to influence significant witnesses, particularly if accompanied by serious violence;
- the sentencing powers of the court for an alternative offence would be inadequate.

A prosecution is more likely to be in the public interest where there is a nexus between a person's role in the administration of justice and the act.

The 'administration of justice' refers to civil justice as well criminal justice.

Handling Arrangements

Cases alleging perverting the course of justice arising from a false or a retracted complaint of rape or other sexual offence or domestic abuse should be handled in accordance with the [Guidance for Charging Perverting the Course of Justice and Wasting Police Time in Cases involving Allegedly False Allegations of Rape and/or Domestic Abuse](#).

Misrepresentation as to Identity

The most common example is when a suspect provides false details to an officer - whether it involves giving a false name, date of birth, address or a combination of the three. Usually in such cases the facts of the basic offence (often motoring) are not in dispute.

In the absence of any other aggravating features, it is unlikely that it will be appropriate to charge perverting the course of justice in the following circumstances:

- Giving a false name in circumstances in which no-one else is exposed to the risk of prosecution.
- The attempt to avoid prosecution is inevitably doomed to failure.
- The misrepresentation is discovered before a significant period of time has elapsed.

In these circumstances, the alternative offences of wasting police time and obstructing the police should be considered, but may not be necessary in the public interest depending upon the nature of the misrepresentation and the circumstances of the offence.

Regard should be had to the case of [R v Sookoo \(2002\) EWCA Crim 800](#), which cautioned against adding a charge of perverting the course of justice when the conduct could properly be treated as an aggravating feature of the principal offence, and [R v Cotter \(2002\) EWCA Crim 1033](#), which suggests the use of offences other than perverting the course of justice when other individuals are not exposed to risk.

Note that extended time limits apply to some summary only motoring offences and the principal offence can be prosecuted beyond the 6 months' time limit. Note also section 49 Road Traffic Offenders Act 1991. This allows a Court to re-sentence an individual who has deceived it about circumstances which were or might have been taken into account in deciding whether, or for how long, to disqualify that person.

Perjury

By section 1(1) of the Perjury Act 1911, perjury is committed when:

Cookies

We use some essential cookies to make our website work. We'd like to set additional cookies so we can remember your preferences and understand how you use our site.

You can manage your preferences and cookie settings at any time by clicking on "Customise Cookies" below. For more information on how we use cookies, please see our [Cookies notice](#).

Accept cookies

Reject cookies

Customise cookies



Your cookie preferences have been saved. You can update your cookie settings at any time on the [cookies page](#).

Your cookie preferences have been saved. You can update your cookie settings at any time on the [cookies page](#).

Close



What is antisocial behaviour?

Antisocial behaviour is defined as 'behaviour by a person which causes, or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to persons not of the same household as the person' ([Antisocial Behaviour Act 2003](#) and [Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011](#)).

But what does this mean? Find out more about how we classify antisocial behaviour and the many activities that it covers.

What is antisocial behaviour?

There are three main categories for antisocial behaviour, depending on how many people are affected:

- **Personal antisocial behaviour** is when a person targets a specific individual or group.
- **Nuisance antisocial behaviour** is when a person causes trouble, annoyance or suffering to a community.
- **Environmental antisocial behaviour** is when a person's actions affect the wider environment, such as public spaces or buildings.

Under these main headings antisocial behaviour falls into one of 13 different types:

1. **Vehicle abandoned:** This covers vehicles that appear to have been left by their owner, rather than stolen and abandoned. It includes scrap or 'end of life' vehicles and those damaged at the scene of a road traffic collision that have been abandoned and aren't awaiting recovery.
2. **Vehicle nuisance or inappropriate use:** This relates to vehicles being used in acts such as street cruising (driving up and down the street causing annoyance and bothering other road users), vehicle convoys and riding or driving on land other than a road. It also covers the misuse of go-peds, motorised skateboards and electric-propelled cycles, and the unlicensed dealing of vehicles where a person has two or more vehicles on the same road within 500 metres of each other.
3. **Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour:** This refers to general nuisance behaviour in a public place or a place to which the public have access, such as private clubs. It does not include domestic-related behaviour, harassment or public disorder which should be reported as crimes.
4. **Rowdy or nuisance neighbours:** This covers any rowdy behaviour or general nuisance caused by neighbours, including boundary and parking disputes. It also covers noise nuisance from parties or playing loud music.
5. **Littering or drugs paraphernalia:** This includes fly posting and discarding litter, rubbish or drugs paraphernalia in any public place.
6. **Animal problems:** This covers any situation where animals are creating a nuisance or people's behaviour associated with the use of animals is deemed as antisocial. It includes uncontrolled animals, stray dogs, barking, fouling and intimidation by an animal.
7. **Trespassing:** This is any situation in which people have entered land, water or premises without lawful authority or permission. It ranges from taking an unauthorised shortcut through a garden to setting up unauthorised campsites.
8. **Nuisance calls:** This covers any type of communication by phone that causes anxiety and annoyance, including silent calls and intrusive 'cold calling' from businesses. It does not cover indecent, threatening or offensive behaviour which should be reported as crimes.
9. **Street drinking:** This relates to unlicensed drinking in public spaces, where the behaviour of the persons involved is deemed as antisocial. It also covers unplanned and spontaneous parties which encroach on the street.
10. **Activity relating to sex workers or sex working:** This relates to any activity such as loitering, displaying cards or promoting sex worker services. It may also refer to

activities in and around a brothel that impact on local residents. It does not include 'kerb-crawling' which should be reported as a crime.

11. **Nuisance noise:** This relates to all incidents of noise nuisance that do not involve neighbours (see 'Nuisance neighbours' above).
12. **Begging:** This covers anyone begging or asking for charitable donations in a public place, or encouraging a child to do so, without a license. Unlicensed ticket sellers at or near public transport hubs may also fall into this category.
13. **Misuse of fireworks:** This will include the inappropriate use of fireworks, the unlawful sale or possession of fireworks and noise created by fireworks.

If you're experiencing any of the above, we may be able to help.

Report

[Report antisocial behaviour](#) >

Check out the courses we offer →



CPD Online College
Knowledge base

[Business](#)

[Food Hygiene](#)

[Health and Safety](#)

[Safeguarding](#)

[Care](#)

[Mental Health](#)

[Resources](#) ▼

[Knowledge Base](#) » [Health and Safety](#) » Noise pollution

All about noise pollution

25th August 2023 by Louise Woffindin



In this article

What is noise pollution?

Causes of noise pollution

Effects of noise pollution

How to reduce noise pollution

Reporting noise pollution.

What can be done?

Final thoughts on noise pollution

According to the [UK government](#), the annual social cost of urban road noise is estimated to be in the region of £7 billion-£10 billion. What's more, a World Health Organization (WHO) report in 2011 showed that environmental noise was the second largest environmental health risk in Western Europe. So what constitutes noise pollution and what can we do about it?

What is noise pollution?

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, noise pollution is defined as “noise, such as that from traffic, that upsets people where they live or work and is considered to be unhealthy for them.”

To clarify, noise pollution refers to the presence of excessive or unwanted sound that can have negative effects on human health and the environment. It occurs when the sound level exceeds a certain threshold that causes discomfort, annoyance, or physical harm to living beings or disrupts the natural balance of the ecosystem.

Sources of noise pollution can include transportation, industrial and construction activities, and recreational activities. Some common examples include loud music, traffic noise, aircraft noise and noise from construction sites.

Noise pollution can have various adverse effects on human

health. Examples include hearing loss, stress, sleep disturbances and cardiovascular problems. It can also negatively impact wildlife, disrupting their communication, feeding and mating behaviour. Additionally, noise pollution can have economic impacts, such as decreased property values and reduced productivity in the workplace.



Causes of noise pollution

Noise pollution exists in various forms. These range from human activities to natural phenomena.

Some of the most common causes of noise pollution include:

👉 **Neighbours:** Noise from neighbours can be a significant cause of noise pollution in the home, particularly in high-density residential areas. Loud music, noisy parties and barking dogs are all examples of sounds that can disturb others and constitute noise pollution.

👉 **Air traffic:** Aeroplanes, helicopters and other aircraft can generate significant noise pollution. This is particularly problematic when they fly low over populated areas.

👉 **Traffic:** Noise from cars and other road vehicles is a pervasive source of noise pollution in urban areas and it can cause significant health problems to those who live near busy roads.

👉 **Construction work:** Building sites can generate a high level of noise pollution due to the use of heavy machinery, power tools and other equipment.

👉 **Animals:** Whether it's barking dogs, chirping birds or crowing cockerels, animals can be a cause of noise pollution, especially when they occur at night.

👉 **Nightlife:** Partying and loud music can cause significant noise pollution, especially in urban areas that have a vibrant nightlife scene.

To summarise, noise pollution can arise from a wide range of sources, including natural and human activities. To reduce or prevent noise pollution, it's necessary to identify its causes and implement effective reduction measures.

Effects of noise pollution

Noise pollution has significant effects on the environment, human health and animal behaviour.

Here are some of the most common effects:

Psychological effects

Noise pollution can cause stress, anxiety and other

👉 **Traffic:** Noise from cars and other road vehicles is a pervasive source of noise pollution in urban areas and it can cause significant health problems to those who live near busy roads.

👉 **Construction work:** Building sites can generate a high level of noise pollution due to the use of heavy machinery, power tools and other equipment.

👉 **Animals:** Whether it's barking dogs, chirping birds or crowing cockerels, animals can be a cause of noise pollution, especially when they occur at night.

👉 **Nightlife:** Partying and loud music can cause significant noise pollution, especially in urban areas that have a vibrant nightlife scene.

To summarise, noise pollution can arise from a wide range of sources, including natural and human activities. To reduce or prevent noise pollution, it's necessary to identify its causes and implement effective reduction measures.

Effects of noise pollution

Noise pollution has significant effects on the environment, human health and animal behaviour.

Here are some of the most common effects:

Psychological effects

Noise pollution can cause stress, anxiety and other

psychological effects, especially when the noise is continuous, loud or unpredictable. Prolonged exposure to noise pollution can lead to irritability, sleep disturbances and decreased concentration.

The effects of noise pollution are even more pronounced when people are exposed to the noise for prolonged periods. One of the most common psychological effects of noise is stress. When people are exposed to loud or continuous noise, their bodies produce cortisol, the stress hormone. High levels of cortisol have a negative impact on health. This can lead to a range of mental and physical problems, including anxiety, depression and even heart disease.

Besides stress and anxiety, noise pollution can also disrupt sleep. Even if the noise levels aren't high enough to wake you up, they can still cause disturbances that lead to fragmented sleep. This then can lead to sleep deprivation.

When a person has poor sleep quality, they can experience problems with their physical and mental health. They might suffer irritability and decreased concentration and have reduced performance at school or work.

In children, noise pollution can have an impact on their development. Over time, it can affect their ability to learn, concentrate and communicate. It can also lead to behavioural problems, including aggression and hyperactivity.

Physical effects

Noise pollution can also cause physical health problems, including [hearing loss](#), high blood pressure and cardiovascular disease and it can also interfere with communication.

Hearing loss is caused by prolonged exposure to loud noise. The noise damages the hair cells in the inner ear. The risk of hearing loss increases with the noise level and the duration of exposure. Noise-induced hearing loss is irreversible and can have a significant impact on a person's quality of life.

Besides hearing loss, noise pollution can also impact cardiovascular health. Being exposed to high levels of noise pollution can cause an increase in blood pressure. This, in turn, leads to cardiovascular disease. This is particularly problematic for people who are already at risk of heart disease (e.g., people with high blood pressure or diabetes).

In addition to hearing loss and cardiovascular disease, noise pollution can also interfere with communication. When noise levels are high, people may be forced to shout or strain their voices to be heard, which can lead to vocal cord problems. Those who [work in noisy environments](#) like construction sites, airports or nightclubs are most at risk.

Effects on animals

Noise pollution can disrupt animals in a variety of ways. This includes feeding, communication and mating behaviours. This leads to reduced reproductive success and declines in population. Some animals also suffer from hearing loss, stress

