

From: *Relevant representative 10 (3J)*

Sent: 11 September 2024 17:04

To: 'Hyde, Emma' <Emma.Hyde@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Notification of Hearing - Fig, 5 The Shambles, Bradford On Avon, BA15 1JS

Dear Emma,

Thank you for your 'Notification' – previously submitted.

You have confirmed that my Representation concerning 'Public Nuisance' is a valid objection.

- You confirmed that my commentary has been passed to the Applicant for their consideration and for their direct contact with me to discuss any concerns.
- I have heard nothing – and yet the Applicants have responded to other Representations received (*ref.: a range of comments which you kindly attached to your preceding email to me, dated 3rd September 2024*).

It would seem to me that necessitating me to attend a Hearing simply to repeat all that I have submitted in a Representation is both excessive and/or abstracted. The Representation I have made is clear-cut and needs no more than the Applicant to make contact and talk through the options available, so as to achieve mutually satisfactory outcome.

I have lived in this immediate neighbourhood for nearly 15 years and feel, therefore, based on direct experience, a degree of 'licence' to make comment, to offer support and to offer suggestion. I am also directly acquainted with the Applicant's Associate's landlords – and was privy to all their former neighbourhood concerns and constraints regarding 'evening external hospitality' which had to be, subsequently, respected and attended to.

Please - I would ask you to note the following - The Applicant (in previous responses) has made reference to:

- *"The operating hours (on the patio area) will be during **sociable** hours only"*.

The interpretation of '**sociable**' is wholly subjective – i.e. open-ended - on the Applicant's part - and would seem to side-step a moral obligation to respect other Resident's right of (quiet) enjoyment of their own neighbouring properties after, say 8pm (as I suggested). And there is no mention *at all* of the 16 covers/seating area that form The Fig's main Frontage area, situated in The Shambles – a much more acoustically confined and amenity-sensitive zone.

I think the Applicant should respond more helpfully and worthfully than 'sociable hours'.

- From the Plans supplied, it is clear that there is no storage for the chairs and tables which constitute the seating area of 'The Fig's main Frontage area – and concerning which my Representation turned.

This presupposes that said Frontage covers will remain – and have to remain 'in use' - until all other patrons have vacated the Premises' interior – whereby the furniture can be finally removed and stored safely within.

This particular fact has likely given cause for the Applicant to seek external table service until 11pm or later to facilitate the storage problem. I would be grateful for the Licence Committee to take note of this issue. And make comment.

(Note: other 'hospitality venues' in the immediate area either close early (enabling furniture storage within) – or have dedicated and designated external storage areas.

I feel, respectfully, that the Applicant has a responsibility, if not an obligation, to make a written response, pre-Hearing, to my concerns. Or better still, to agree to a convenient personal meeting whereby any issues can be addressed amicably.

For my part, it does not need personal attendance at an administrative, municipal assembly to present facts that the Licence Committee itself should already heed - and submit to - as part of its legislative remit.

I apologise, Emma, for the extent of this email – but I believe all of the contents are pertinent ... and I would respectfully ask you to acknowledge them, to understand my position, my perspective on the matter, and to include it within my Representation (c.f. Public Nuisance).

Yours sincerely,

Relevant representative 10 (3J)