

## Licensing

---

**Subject:** FW: Re Wiggle Weymouth

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 28 November 2024 04:22  
**To:** Licensing [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re Wiggle Weymouth

Hi

This is my objection to the current application for a sex establishment licence for the sexual entertainment venue SEV trading as Wiggle strip club in Weymouth-

Suitability of applicant. As mentioned last year the applicant is unsuitable because of a fine paid for an unlicensed HMO in Portsmouth in Hampshire and because at time of writing his club in Southampton has work outstanding on a building control matter. Neither of these are listed in your policy for suitability of a licensee, but I would suggest it is perfectly reasonable to refuse a license on the basis of non compliance in another licensing area or requirement from a council department.

Suitability of location, neighbourhood. This location is in the vicinity of the esplanade. Last year the chair of licensing and I got our wires crossed as objected on the same grounds but the chair gave the impression that I was concerned about people stumbling across the actual premises, which I was, but I was also concerned about the premises drawing in people unsuitable to be in a family resort and liable to move around the neighbourhood of the strip club making a nuisance of themselves. Their own staff handbook filed in Portsmouth City licensing hearing refers to "obnoxious" "regulars", whilst a similar document for another very experienced operator FYEO warns staff of danger from customers away from the security provided at their workplace and warns against visiting late night bars after shift in case customers are still around. R v Newcastle on Tyne ex parte Christian Institute includes comments by a judge to the effect that a sex establishment will attract people of dubious morals and that this is why you would not want to license them at locations where, say, children are present. In this case of course many children visit the Esplanade and the beach.

Use to which other premises nearby are put includes at least one holiday home for which I have read a review saying that the noise from the club had kept her awake. In fairness though, a councillor I approached told me he had never had any noise complaints for this club but had had from other venues along the front. I think it is more likely that residents would complain to a councillor rather than holidaymakers do so. There are historic buildings further down the street and other things of interest to holidaymakers which will bring them into the area. From what I can gather the Weymouth Bowl and the Peninsular are earmarked for regeneration, and both are about five minutes walk away from the premises, so in the vicinity for the purposes of regeneration. The point is that if the regeneration is aimed at people that include women and children then the presence of a strip club is a deterrent to investment. Women want to be able to walk around an area safely at any time. If you have to park a distance from your home, holiday home or workplace you don't want to be encountering strip club customers in the street when you are on your way between the car and destination.

Suitability of premises-from memory of last year the plan doesn't show any area for smoking, which will mean people gathering in the street which may be noisy and will also be intimidating for anyone making their way through the throng on their way back to a holiday home in the old town area. As I tried to explain last year, someone who doesn't know the area will use a navigation aid on their phone after an evening out on the Esplanade for example and risk being sent past the club on foot.

You will be breaching your public sector equality duty by licensing a strip club, given that it will go against your duty to improve relations between the sexes. This club's website uses or has used images of a

manager standing in an overbearing manor over one of his staff who is wearing a costume which parodies a girl's school uniform hardly conducive to healthy relations between the sexes. If Weymouth uses CSAS officers then I would suggest that in refusing this license on the basis of location and breach of public sector equality duty, you will also meet s40A of the Equality Act which is the new duty this year to take proactive steps to prevent sexual harassment of your employees. You already have a the Pineapple Project to give women and girls outside of the home places of refuge from unwanted male attention, or sexual harassment in public places. How much better to support that work by stopping licensing an establishment that objectifies women and encourages the obnoxious behaviour mentioned in Wiggle's staff handbook above which damages relationships between men and women in the home, in public and in workplaces.

This is a reminder that there is no legal requirement to prove harm in a licensing refusal as your action can be proactive. There is also no presumption in favour of licensing sex establishments, unlike that in Licensing Act 2003 applications. Lastly, the committee can make a different decision than last year, even if the circumstances remain identical to last year according to R v Birmingham City Council ex parte Sheptonhurst Ltd.

Kind regards

██████████