Statement of Helen Teasdale and Richard Scragg of Ellington, Tattershall Drive, Nott ingham NG71AD dated 7t1t October 2020

Our pension plan is the owner of the property, The Bramley Apple Southwell and we are the Designated Premises License holders. "We" have been owners of the freehold since 2001. We currently let the premises to experienced pub managers, Avtar Singh and Paul Linehan. They have in place day to day managers of their pub portfolio.

Richard has attended regular meetings with the local licensing officer throughout and also holds meetings with the area manager and the pub manager to monitor both the upkeep of the premises and to be aware of any issues relating to the license of the pub. We are satisfied that the area managers and the pub manager are fulfilling their roles and ensuring full compliance with the agreed licensing terms. It is therefore disappointing that a request for a review of the Premises License has been issued by Jill Morris during a "trial period" of voluntary restricted hours without waiting for the outcome or assessment by the licensing officer. With reference to "the Meeting" in Ms Morris's complaints, it seems to us that she wants <u>all</u> noise stopped, and in effect, wants the pub to be closed as it was in lock-down. Furthermore, CCTV footage shows that the alleged "unreasonable behaviour" is no such thing and that the pub is being run by consent with very strict house rules which do not tolerate anti-social behaviour.

Ms Morris resides about 200 metres from The Bramley Apple and can, of course, hear noise from the pub but she is not a close neighbour. She has made an individual complaint but "on behalf of the community". In respect of attending the pub which in many respects is at the heart of the Church Street community, Ms Morris is not part of the community and we are told she has not visited the pub other than to attend a meeting on 25th August 2020.

We note the allegations made by Ms Morris in her request for a review. These matters were all dealt with at the meeting of 25th August to the *satisfaction* of Mr Dennis, and we believe by most of the community, judging by the letters of support from local residents. Ms Morris has reiterated in particular:

The suggestion that there were large groups at the front of the pub as late as 2.00 a.m. CCTV footage shows that this is not the case, and Ms Morris could not verify this from her home.

Similar allegations of talking *loudly*, shouting, screaming and standing in the middle of the road; Whilst it is feasible that this has occurred, we are assured by the pub manager that there is nothing to link this occasional behaviour with Bramley Apple customers as Church Street is a busy road, being the main road which locals use to go to and fro from the town to the Racecourse end of town. There are two other pubs along Church Street whose customers walk past the Bramley Apple.

Of even more concern is the allegation of drinking outside which she says seems unmanageable. We note the management procedures put in place by James Kemp, the current DPS, and of Jonathan Rice, the day to day manager. The allegation cannot be sustained nor can that of urination, littering and damage to properties. Ms Morris's allegations are hearsay, and whether the poor behaviour she cites has occurred or not, they cannot be attributed to just the customers of the Bramley Apple. For instance, one cannot see any logic in a customer leaving the Bramley Apple and then urinating in the street within 200 metres of the pub.

Ms Morris complains about the back door being left wide open, with ut understanding that good airflow is *essential* to reduce the risk of transmission of Covid 19. Whilst the pub manager must do

all he can to minimise noise, it is not possible to eliminate completely noise. The voluntary restrictions have already addressed the issue of noise.

Comments regarding the two other pubs under "Location" are in our opinion not sustainable. The success of the three pubs is their different characters and att ribut es. We do not accept the premise that the pub attracts those who cannot get a drink anywhere else and are drunk and unable to control their behaviour. This is b ot h insult ing to the customers, and probably untrue. James Kemp and Jonathan Rice both confirm that the late-night drinkers are often other hospitality workers and they most certainly are respectful to the neighbours and to the pub itself.

Whilst one has some sympathy for Ms Morris, it should be acknowledged that the pub has been in existence 1913 and she, like all other local was aware of its existence when she moved to her current address in 1999. Ms Morris acknowledges that the pub has a right to make a living but to restrict the pub opening hours as she wishes would make the pub unviable financially, deprive the staff of a livelihood and close a community venue. Furthermore, this pub belongs to our pension fund and is therefore an important source of income now that we are retired.

Ms Morris refers to "History". We submit that it is unfair to penalise the current lessees or the pub managers for perceived misdemeanors. Furthermore, to suggest that the pubhas never been a thriving concern since 2001is untrue, speculative, and irrelevant. When the pub was refurbished in 2013, more than £100,000 was spent on it. We have not seen any evidence of uncleanliness when we visit. As Ms Morris has not been a recent customer, she should not make this assertion. Similarly, it is a serious allegation that the pubpermitted "a good deal of underage drinking" for which no evidence has been produced. CCIV can be provided to disprove this allegation in recent times.

It is acknowledged that Ms Morris has complained about the pub since 2016. This has mounted to a personal vendetta against the pub. We understand that there were no complaints when she moved out of her house for several months this year, and that she has now sold her property.

To summarise: We believe that the extended opening hours are an asset to the community. Not everyone goes to bed before 11.00 p.m. and well-behaved and well-managed "night owls" should not be penalised as such, nor should the managers, staff and ourselves be deprived of an honest income. We invite the review committee to retain the extended licensing hours with the management commitment to work with andfor the community.

Signed