

Detailed Assessment of the Nomination of University Arms

Assets of Community Value Nomination Assessment			
DATE OF SUBMISSION	23 rd December 2016	DATE DECISION TO BE MADE BY:	Friday 17 th February 2017
NOMINATED ASSET	The University Arms, 197 Brook Hill Sheffield, S3 7HG		
NOMINATION SUBMITTED BY:	CAMRA, David Pickersgill		

Step 1

Part A and B criteria for assessing whether an asset is of community value is in accordance with that set out in the Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012. Each section contains a reference to the relevant legislation but please refer to the guidance notes accompanying this document when assessing the nomination. The paragraph numbering (e.g. A1 etc.) links between this assessment form and the guidance notes.

PART A-CRITERIA SPECIFIED IN THE ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE REGULATIONS 2012	CHECKLIST
A1. Is the nominating organisation an eligible body to nominate? (Section 5 of the Regulations)	Pass

A2. Does the nominating body have a local connection to the asset nominated? (Section 4 of the Regulations)	Pass
A3. Does the nomination include the required information about the asset? (Section 6 of the Regulations)	Pass
A4. Is the nominated asset outside of one of the categories that cannot be assets of community value? (Schedule 1 of the Regulations)	Pass
IF 'YES' TO ALL OF PART A, MOVE TO PART B IF 'NO' TO ONE OR MORE OF PART A, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS	Pass
PART B -ESTABLISHING THE CURRENT OR RECENT NON-ANCILLARY (PRIMARY) USE THAT THE APPLICATION IS BASED ON	CHECKLIST
B1. Does the nomination form establish the current or recent usage of the asset which is the subject of the nomination to be an actual and non-ancillary usage ? (Part 5, Chapter 3, Section 88 (1) and (2) of the Localism Act 2011.)	Pass
IF YES, GO TO STEP 2. IF NO, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS	

Part C and D criteria for assessing whether an asset is of community value has been developed by Sheffield City Council based on Part 5, Chapter 3, Section 88 of the Localism Act 2011.

Section 88 of the Localism Act states that the asset will be considered to be one of community value if:

- a) its actual current use furthers the social wellbeing and interests of the local community, or a use in the recent past has done so. *(the legislation does not provide for a specific period, but as a general rule use in the past five years is considered to be relevant)*
- b) that use is not an ancillary one; and
- c) for land in current community use it is realistic to think that there will continue to be a use which furthers social wellbeing and interests, or for land that has been in community use in the recent past, it is realistic to think that there will be community use within the next five years (in either case, whether or not that use is exactly the same as the present or past); and
- d) it does not fall within one of the exemptions.

PART C

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER THE USAGE CURRENTLY OR IN THE RECENT PAST FURTHERS SOCIAL WELLBEING AND INTERESTS OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY			
C1. What is the 'local community' of the asset as defined by the geographical area?	Evidence provided by nominee	<p>Nominee states that the public house is used by staff and students of the university, those living in both the centre of Sheffield, in residential areas to the west of the city centre and visitors from further afield.</p> <p>It also has an upstairs room hired by the wider community such as</p> <p>Christmas parties for a local badminton club. Rutland Cycling Club monthly meetings</p>	

		<p>Monthly 'loft club' – blues music night Sheffield Board Games club meets every Tuesday Wedding receptions eg ex Landlord and Landlady.</p> <p>Visitors have to come downstairs to the bar which encourages interaction between customers.</p> <p>In response to objection the nominee again states that it could be argued that the whole of Sheffield (and beyond) is local to the pub nominated. They also draw on previous SCC decisions such as at the Sheffield Tap and Castle Inn regarding identifying a community.</p>	
	<p>Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)</p>	<p>The owner states that the nominee has failed to demonstrate who the "local community" is for the Asset, they argue that they 'have failed to demonstrate that a cohesive section of the community is centred around' the Asset.</p> <p>In respect of the use of the function room they state:</p> <p><i>Furthermore we fail to see how other examples in the Nomination including private parties, one-off meetings or the wedding reception of the ex-Landlord and Landlady being held in the upstairs function room demonstrate who the local community is. No evidence has been provided of who attends these events and whether they regularly visit the property and form part of the local community.</i></p>	
<p>C2. What is the current/recent use of the asset? (<i>types of activities</i>)</p>	<p>Evidence provided by nominee</p>	<p>The asset is currently used as a public house. Left of the entrance is the bar and small alcove seating area, with the larger lounge area on the right. There is also a</p>	

		conservatory which leads to an extensive beer garden, the only public enclosed space on the University Campus.	
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)		
C3. How well is/was the asset used? (<i>evidence of the building/property/land use</i>)	Evidence provided by nominee	<p>The Nominee states:</p> <p>The asset is a well used pub by students and members of the wider community. The pub hosts several local events and there is also a beer garden which is enjoyed by local people. University sports teams and societies also meet, both formally and informally, at the University Arms.</p> <p>The Pub has been included in a number of tourist and local pub guides which together increases attraction. It has also featured in the CAMRA national Good Beer Guide on eight successive occasions (2010 => 2017). This long-term inclusion is not only an indicator of quality, but also ensures that the pub is one of the many destinations for 'Beer Tourism' in Sheffield. Inclusion guarantees visits from a wider community, one which geographically, extends well beyond the city boundary. Such 'Beer Tourism' brings more income into Sheffield than the two-week annual snooker World Championship.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the legislation is clear that an ACV application relates solely to the property being nominated - whether there are other pubs nearby is</p>	

		<p>irrelevant. The facts that the University of Sheffield are currently (i) converting the nearby Henderson's building into a bar and (ii) demolishing the nearby 'Star and Garter' are irrelevant. The implication that these actions somehow offset any risk to the University Arms, betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the concept of community. The idea that a community can simply be moved from one location to another, without there being some change or damage to that community is preposterous.</p> <p>In response to the owner's objection the nominator states that the pub is used by the wider community. The petition is clear evidence that there is strong community affection.</p>	
	<p>Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)</p>	<p>Owner states that there is limited evidence of usage by wider community. In particular:</p> <p><i>Whilst limited evidence has been provided of meetings that take place in the property's private upstairs function room this is not sufficient to demonstrate that the property is well used by the local community.</i></p> <p>They also provide details of why the petition regarding the Masterplan should not be considered by the Council when determining the Nomination.</p> <p>They also state <i>The Nomination should be decided on its own merits and therefore the weight attached to different factors in other nominations, including that of</i></p>	

		<p><i>the Castle in at Bolsterstone, are irrelevant to the determination of the Nomination.</i></p> <p><i>The Nomination is broadly in accordance with the 2015 and 2016 Nomination which failed to provide any direct evidence from any actual regular users of the Property. Therefore due to a lack of relevant additional detail provided in the nomination it follows that the Nomination should again fail as it fails to meet the statutory requirements of the Act.</i></p>	
C4. What will the impact be if the usage ceases? If usage has ceased already, what has the impact been?	Evidence provided by nominee	<p>If the pubs usage ceased it would have a huge impact. The University Arms became a pub in January 2007, having previously operated as Club 197, the staff club for the University of Sheffield. As such, the pub has considerable historic interest regarding the development of the University and should be protected - ACV status will assist towards this protection.</p> <p>In response to the owner's objection the Nominator again states that other venues in the vicinity are irrelevant.</p>	
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)	<p>The owner believes this statement is exaggerated. The University has 5 bars/licenced areas in the general vicinity and it will be developing a further pub opening in Autumn 2017.</p> <p>The owner again refers to the fact that no letters in support of the Nomination have been submitted and limited evidence of the level of use of the Property has been provided.</p>	

<p>C5. Does it/did it meet the social interests of the community as a whole and not the users/customers of a specific service? (examples would include use by local community groups or sporting clubs)</p>	<p>Evidence provided by nominee</p>	<p>Live music events are often hosted at the pub, including events which are part of the annual Tramlines Music Festival. There is also an open mic night every Thursday. The pub has gained a reputation as one of the best 'no-cost' venues during the annual Sheffield 'Tramlines' music event, attracting music lovers from a considerable distance. https://www.facebook.com/events/1099559106757176/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pub hosts advertising for local events • There is a beer garden attached to the pub which is used and enjoyed by local people. The quality of this facility is illustrated by the fact that, in 2012, 2013 and 2014, the University Arms won a 'Yorkshire in Bloom' Silver Gilt Award in the Public Houses and Restaurant Category. See, for example: http://www.sheffieldnewsroom.co.uk/sheffield-scoops-15-awards-in-yorkshire-in-bloom/ • The pub has a great food menu enjoyed by the local community • The pub hosts a weekly quiz night which brings the community together (including students, University staff and the public) <p>There are good transport links available to/from the pub</p>	
---	-------------------------------------	---	--

• Local sport teams meet in this pub. Some examples are quoted above.

• A number of groups meet in this pub. For example, Sheffield Amnesty International hosted a 'letter writing' meeting (27th.April 2016)

• The Pub has been included in a number of tourist, national and local pub guides.

• The pub provides free access to local newspapers and magazines (including 'Beer Matters,' 'Exposed,' 'Now Then' and others).

• The pub was recently 'Yorkshire Post' pub of the week <http://www.yorkshirepost.co.uk/what-s-on/dining-out/pub-of-the-week-the-university-arms-sheffield-1-8276334>

There are many examples of such use (see C1), for example:

(i) Broomgrove Badminton Club held their Christmas celebration in 2014. Then after a disappointing 2015 event elsewhere, returned to hold their 2016 event.

(ii) The long-established Rutland Cycling Club holds their monthly meetings on the first Friday of every month.

(iii) Local music promoter Bob Swift ('Saxbob') hosts the highly regarded monthly 'Loft Club'

(iv) The Sheffield Board Games club meets every Tuesday evening

In response to the owner's objection they state that the

		<p>'activities listed... as generic are activities that can enhance the social interests of the community.'</p>	
	<p>Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)</p>	<p>The owner states that ' the activities that are listed are generic' and 'do not go beyond the ordinary ancillary functions of a commercially run pub.'</p> <p>They also note that 'a number of events mentioned in the nomination are specifically not for the local community and therefore cannot be held to meet the social interests of the local community.' The examples include the private hire of the Property's private function room.</p>	
<p>C6. How is the building/property/land regarded by the community? (<i>community consultation, evidence of support</i>)</p>	<p>Evidence provided by nominee</p>	<p>The University Arms has considerable historic interest regarding the development of the University (see C4). For a number of years it was the Sheffield University Staff Club. Hence, many discussions among academics would have taken place within its walls. It should easily be possible for the University to document, and mark, some of the many historic happenings.</p> <p>For example, we would hope to see a blue plaque similar to the one at the Eagle in Cambridge; 'For decades the Eagle was the local pub for scientists from the nearby Cavendish Laboratory. It was here on February 28th 1953 that Francis Crick and James Watson first announced their discovery of how DNA carries genetic information. Unveiled by James Watson 25th April 2003.'</p> <p>We would be very surprised if similar events had not taken place in the Staff Club. We hope that the University would wish to mark such events in a similar</p>	

		fashion. Such an undertaking could only strengthen the community awareness of the building. As evidenced elsewhere, the pub is highly regarded by the wider community.	
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)	The owner states that no meaningful evidence has been provided to demonstrate the level of use of the Property by the local community. It is therefore impossible to gauge how the Property is regarded by the community.	
	RATIONALE		FAIL
IF THE NOMINATION PASSES PART C, GO TO PART D. IF THE NOMINATION FAILS PART C, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS			

PART D: This section considers whether it is realistic to think that there can continue to be non-ancillary use of the building or other land which will further (whether or not in the same way) the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community).

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER (FOR 'CURRENT' USES) THERE WILL CONTINUE TO BE SOCIAL USE OF THE ASSET OR (FOR 'RECENT' USES) THAT IT IS REALISTIC TO THINK THERE WILL BE COMMUNITY USE AGAIN WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.

D1. What is the proposed future use of the asset? (<i>types of activities</i>)	Evidence provided by nominee	The University Arms could potentially be under threat from the University of Sheffield to make way for more university buildings. The University are considering three development options for the Hounsfield Site, one of which could result in the demolition of the valued public house. The other two options, both smaller in size, retain the pub. ACV status would assist towards this protection. An online petition with almost 2000 signatures against such a demolition was handed in to the University authorities in October 2014. At the time, Harry Matthews, Liberal Democrat candidate for	
---	------------------------------	---	--

		<p>Crookes, said: "The University says that they wanted the public to respond - and they have. It is clear that University must not proceed with their proposal to demolish the University Arms." http://www.uoslibdems.org.uk/petition_to_saveuniarms_handed_in http://www.thestar.co.uk/what-s-on/out-and-about/petition-to-save-pub-attracts-1-700-signatures-1-6900384</p> <p>The University has responded to their consultation, and this petition: https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.458135!/file/masterplan-consultation-summary-responses.pdf</p> <p>In this document, Sheffield University states: 'The potential removal of the University Arms was the single most mentioned issue throughout the consultation. There was virtually no support for options two and three for the Hounsfield area, primarily because of the loss of the University Arms. In addition to many objections on the online form, we also received a petition with around 1700 signatures asking for the University Arms to be saved. Some of the comments included: "Please do not get rid of the University Arms. This place is one of the major plus points about this university; a perfect place to meet colleagues and entertain visitors. It does more for interdisciplinary research and staff morale than any number of fancy initiatives or 'public realm improvements. I am generally very supportive of the campus masterplan but demolishing the University Arms would be a major mistake." "I notice one of the proposals is to demolish the University Arms pub in order to build new high rise buildings and form a green square to socialise in. I think the demolition of the pub would be a mistake and the University should do the opposite and refurbish/restore the pub and make it a focal point of that social area."</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>“I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.”</p> <p>“Massing of new build developments around University Square needs more careful thought than indicated on the options.”</p> <p>“The plans for the University Arms are truly shocking and should be rescinded. If you want to see ‘community engagement’ in action, go there.” ‘</p> <p>These comments, from regular users, allied to the fact that the pub has appeared in every CAMRA Good Beer Guide since 2010 shows that this potential proposed future use of the building does not match the feeling of the University Arms community. The community wants the Arms to remain as a public house. These comments also indicate that the pub acts as a hub or focal point for a significant community.</p> <p>Any objections to the award of ACV status raised on the basis of this petition are perverse. It is irrelevant that the petition was not undertaken in relation to this application. The response to a perceived threat to the University Arms is clear evidence that there is strong community affection. There is no evidence that in the relatively short time since the petition the community response would be any different and an assertion that it is likely many of the signatories have moved away, is speculation. Similarly, an assertion that signatories were not regular users of the pub or were not from the local community is also speculative and irrelevant. Indeed, in the successful ACV application for the Castle Inn at Bolsterstone (April 2014), specific reference is made to the strength of feeling demonstrated when the pub closed in April 2013 and 39 people went to a meeting at a day’s notice to discuss</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the future of the pub. The University Arms petition was signed by almost 2000 people, in response to a potential threat.</p> <p>The University Arms attracts a community who travel considerable distances to visit the pub. Hence, it is reasonable to consider local in the context of this venue as one that encompass a large area, one that it beyond the boundaries of the City limits. For example, I live in Stocksbridge (10 miles away), but would consider myself part of the 'University Arms Community.' On occasion, I have held business meetings on the premises.</p> <p>It is also the only all-inclusive social area on the University campus with a secure, closed garden. As such, it is not likely to have limited appeal to certain parts of the community. This fact, alone, should be enough to assure ACV status.</p>	
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)	The University are considering development options	
D2. Will it meet the social interests of the community as a whole and not the users/customers of a specific service?	Evidence provided by nominee	<p>If the property remains as a pub which ACV status would help ensure, it would continue to meet the social interests of the community by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a food menu enjoyed by the local community - Having a beer garden which is enjoyed by local people - Hosting regular quiz nights which bring the community together - Having excellent transport links to ensure people can get home safely - Having local groups and sports teams meet at the pub. 	
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.)		

	RATIONALE		
IF THE NOMINATION PASSES PART D, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR ELIGIBLE NOMINATIONS			
IF THE NOMINATION FAILS PART D, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS			

RECOMMENDATION	To accept the registration of The University Arms, Brook Hill Sheffield as an Asset of Community Value.
REASON FOR DECISION	It appears that this property's actual and current use furthers the social wellbeing and interests of the local community sufficiently to satisfy the statutory tests set out in sections 88 a) to d) of the Localism Act 2011
DECISION TAKEN BY	Jack Scott - Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries
DATE	