

I am writing on behalf of residents of Pier Terrace to object in the strongest possible terms to the application of a license to sell alcohol by the Cherries Ice Cream Parlour.

Our objections are based on the following:

Pier Terrace is a residential block with private communal garden amenity to the front. The Cherries Ice Cream Parlour is a business addition and customers access via a door adjacent to this shared garden amenity. We already face issues with people using the cafe thinking they can use the garden amenity area and, at present, a polite word generally suffices to encourage compliance. This will not be the case if people are fuelled with alcohol.

The café at the end of Pier Terrace has been operating since Ben and Annette Bryant (who live above and previously owned it) built it and ran it for 20 years until 1980 and has been tenanted as a café, both unlicensed and licensed ever since. I am currently unaware of any problems with our customers using the grass areas belonging to other residents. No-one has raised this as an issue since I have owned it, even during the busy summer season of 2019. As any of the residents who have spoken to me will know, I am very aware that this is a residential block and have been trading responsibly with this in mind. I am, of course, happy to increase our vigilance in this matter. I understand that the resident or residents concerned may think these will increase, but there is no record or anecdotal evidence that there has ever been a problem with this before, when the café was trading as a licensed premises under previous tenancies. We cannot sell alcohol without complying with the very stringent codes in place to safeguard the public and prevent irresponsible inebriation. We are simply hoping to serve customers a glass of wine with their lunch. The customer age group that frequents our cafe actually mirror the residents of Pier Terrace. We have a lot of older customers and a lot of young families, neither of which are prone to alcohol abuse or public nuisance. We will never serve customers excess alcohol as it is irresponsible as well as breaching the guidelines necessary to successfully trade with a license.

Further, there are basement areas which will, in no time, be used as urinals if people are drunk and hanging around finishing drinks after the cafe closes.

We are not selling any alcohol to take away and not proposing to open late, hence the license application cut off time of 9pm. We have toilets in the café and I'm sure our customers will prefer to use them.

The block is a mix of residents with a high number of senior citizens and also some young families. We do not want more vulnerable people put at risk by people drinking alcohol in the midst of an otherwise residential block and in an area where young children are, at present, safe to play unattended.

As I mentioned, our customers are the same profile as the residents. There will be no more risk with people buying a glass of wine with their meal than there currently is amongst the residents themselves having a glass with their dinner. We will not serve

excess alcohol to anyone, as it is irresponsible and we are a small, friendly family café with our customers and the residents best interests at heart.

There is no need for the café to sell alcohol as the Bridport Arms is less than 50 yards away, providing a licensed service to those who wish it. Drinkers in the Hotel bar do not assume they can use our garden area because it is separated by a wall. This would not apply in the case of the Cherries.

I feel that the main concern here, seems to be unauthorised use of the garden area by our potentially increased business. Of course we would like customers to come to us for their meal, rather than the Bridport Arms or any of the many other licensed premises in West Bay. We offer a really lovely menu and would like to add the option of a drink with a meal choice to widen our overall offering. The café has always been licensed in the past without issue, so I'd like to understand more about the nature of the objection on this point.

As part of our pre contract enquiries when purchasing our property, we checked that the premises now known as the Cherries did not have a license. The present business conversely took the lease on that basis. To reverse this situation would be inequitable.

The café at the end of Pier Terrace has been operating since Ben and Annette Bryant (who live above and previously owned it) built it and ran it for 20 years until 1980. Since then, it has been leased to third parties to run as a café with only a break for 18 months during 2017 – early 2019. I know that the café was licensed under Cyndy Mudford's tenancy for 9 years, from 2008 to 2017, and the license was also active for the short time her successor ran it. I have no idea what year the objector bought his property, but no application was made to us about our intentions to apply for a license or whether our lease has a clause concerning this. As I have only owned and been trading in the property since May 2019, I can only assume it's a recent purchase?

I must stress that I haven't 'taken a lease', I have bought the building and, as such, do not have a rental agreement with any such clause in place. If the objector would not have bought their flat if our café had a license, it is a conversation they may wish to have with their conveyancing solicitor. If the flat was bought before our ownership, then the café would have been trading with a license already.

As the building owner, I also am a 'resident' of Pier Terrace and enjoy friendship and custom with many of the residents. This last point seems to be a personal point and not one shared by other residents of Pier Terrace, which makes me query whether this is a personal objection or, as intimated, a group one. I am very happy to meet with anyone to talk about their concerns and let them know what plans I have for the café. Maybe they would like to come in, once this current crisis is over, and see for themselves the lovely, family-friendly café they have on their doorstep.

I trust the application will be rejected in the light of these concerns.