

Appendix 4

This is my objection to the renewal of the SEV license for Wiggle Weymouth.

Director of Wellhot Ltd Jaspal Ojla was fined by Portsmouth Council for not having an HMO license. When this fine was appealed by his letting agent (and by him initially, before being withdrawn by Mr Ojla, as his legal representative was good enough to point out at a previous hearing on other premises) the judgement mentions that the HMO was dangerous because it didn't have fire extinguishers in a large 11 or 12 bedroom HMO. The applicant is therefore unsuitable to hold an SEV license because this involves being entrusted with the safety of people on the premises as both customers and working there. In addition the license doesn't allow nudity to be shown in any advertising, which google street view shows has been allowed.

Furthermore, the apparent fire escape route out of the back and through a small alley to safety does not appear to be under the control of the applicant as it is not on the submitted plan of the premises, so he should be asked what right he has to use it and insist on it being kept clear.

In addition the location is unsuitable as it is near the beach, which people attend in a state of undress. Although moral objections to strip clubs are not usually allowed, Rv Newcastle on Tyne Ex Parte Christian Institute makes clear that objections on the basis of the customers attracted into the area by the presence of a sex establishment, can be considered. People who pay good money to spend time in a small booth with a naked woman dancing for them are arguably not the type of people that are wanted in a resort promoting a family orientated holiday industry based around the beach.

Nearby BCP, Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole's policy on licensing sex establishments was quashed earlier this year for reasons including Equality Act compliance. I would ask the committee to consider whether licensing a club which appears to offer only female performers is in accordance with the Equality Act. Also whether licensing such a club is fulfills your duty to promote good relations between the sexes given the potential damage to relationships which may be done by attending as a customer or performer. A previous objection to a different strip club in Bournemouth some years ago with a different operator spoke along the lines of the pastoral damage he had seen as a parish priest by impressionable people being lured away from their partners. This was not a moral objection but an objection to the damage which he said could be caused by licensing a strip club. In the High Court case quashing BCP's sex establishment policy it was stated that objections on the basis of wider damage done to women and girls by licensing strip clubs had been dismissed as moral when in fact the issue of damage should have been allowed and considered. For example, you can't object to a license for alcohol being granted on the basis an objector considers drinking alcohol to be immoral, but you can object on the basis of the damage to health that drinking alcohol might cause.

I would also ask the committee to consider any public health implications of licensing sex work, given that this form of performing, if it involves full nudity in a small booth, may place a mental strain on the performers. I am not an expert on mental health. I am also not suggesting any sex work other than the licensed activities, takes place at this premises. However, during negotiations on a license variation application by the applicant in Bournemouth this year it emerged that a council officer and a police officer had observed breaches of the SEV Sexual Entertainment Venue terms. The variation was asking to remove

a requirement for drug testing of performers which had been imposed about 10 years ago when police and council officer had observed drug taking and other breaches of the SEV license in Bournemouth.

The applicant is also unsuitable as it emerged during the negotiations mentioned above that access to the female toilets had been via the men's toilets walking past the urinals. I don't think someone who could run somewhere whose toilets were set up like this should be licensed to run a strip club, where the safety and dignity of the performers and customers is paramount.

Neither the committee members nor officer if the decision is made on delegated power need to see evidence of customers of Wiggle behaving inappropriately and impacting on holidaymakers or residents. Prevention and deterrence can be the motivation for making a decision in licensing. *East Lindsey District Council v Abu Hanif (t/a Zara's Restaurant) 2016* If this objection is out of time I ask the committee or officer to exercise discretion to allow it out of time.

If the committee or officer will not allow it, I ask that it be included in the background documents used by an officer to make a delegated decision if the decision is made by an officer.

I am not a resident of Weymouth so possibly don't have any right as such to lobby the councillors elected by residents of Weymouth, nor the members of the licensing committee. As a resident of Poole, also in Dorset I am sure that my representations will not carry as much weight as those of a resident of Weymouth, but still intend to make them if this objection is not allowed.