

RESPONSES FROM MR BUTTERS

From: Brian Butters

Sent: 07 May 2025 15:33

To: Tania Jardim

Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

- *Outdoor music shall be restricted to low-level background recorded music and shall be turned off at 10:00 pm each evening.*

-

Why bother then. It's just an excuse to get the licence through then it will be blasting like last year.

- *No live music shall be provided outdoors.*

Good

- *Alcohol shall only be available for takeaway when purchased alongside food.*

So I can purchase a poke of their poor quality overpriced chips and three bottles of wine? The problem is Tania, people, filthy people, come from out of town with their sup purchased from Asda at the train station. When they run out, it's a trek to the Square, fighting through the knife crime, homeless, rats and other filth, but a trek nonetheless. If the chippy is selling sup with chips and a pickled egg, it will only encourage more and heavier suppery, violence, huffing and crime.

- *All alcohol sales shall end at 10pm.*

Ban them I say.

From: Brian Butters

Sent: 07 May 2025 11:20

To: Tania Jardim

Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Dear Tania

You may use all my feedback without fear or favour.

I cannot speak to the police incident on the Friday as I only observed it on the social media post I sent you. No doubt the premises management have supplied their cctv to the investigation.

The youths I observed were indeed customers and I assume can also be identified by cctv. They were black, in their multiple tens, had huge yellow and orange balloons and large canisters of huff as well as boxes of crap, dry chips from the establishment in boxes no doubt discarded.

The proposed profiteering on off sales at an already identified hot spot for ASB is ludicrous, dangerous and unwelcome.

At the time of writing you may also like to reference my objection to the tacky, underused, smelly pizza place on the beach at Eastcliff which is full of chavs with short skirts, over plump lips and common accents.

Indeed I also object to the new vape shop, all of them actually, but in particular the one in old Christchurch Road opposite Krispy Kreme which seems to think it's Glastonbury on meow meow with its loud, common and unwelcome music.

From: Brian Butters
Sent: 02 May 2025 16:08
To: Deep Blue Facilities
Cc: Licensing Com
Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Dear Michelle

Your memo does not state anything that is not in the application.

To quote Catherine Tate's Nan, "it's a liberty" although I think she added in a delicate further word.

Not even an offer of a complimentary fish supper to oil the decision. Speaking of oil, the smell that comes from the restaurant every day on the Eastcliff slope is beyond rancid. Change your grease more often.

I pray for the day Chez Fred takes over on the sea front, your product, clientele, facilities, food quality and ambiance are all rank.

I wonder if you even had permission to address me. GDPR breach?

I still strongly object to the proposals as it encourages further ASB.

Did you see the thirty or so IC1's outside your restaurant last night all inhaling nitrous oxide? You can't have failed to notice the balloons. It was 6pm.

Did your team call the police?

Thank you but no thank you.

Mr Butters

Sent from my iPhone

The information contained in this email is the property of the sender and is intended solely for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed.

It is strictly confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient please advise me and delete the message from your system immediately. Please do not read, disclose, copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it.

RESPONSE FROM MR COOPER

From: Robert Cooper

Sent: 07 May 2025 16:04

To: Tania Jardim

Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Dear Tania

I still object to the proposal to sell alcohol to take away.

As a resident, I regularly see people heading to the beach with a quantity of alcohol they have purchased, while sober, they feel will be a sensible amount. At lunchtime as I walk down Bath Hill to the gym there is a steady stream of youngsters with cases of Corona and other lager en route to the beach.

Once consumed there is nowhere that is convenient to purchase more. I believe this is a sensible option.

I can see antisocial behaviour increasing further at what is already known to be a flashpoint.

It provides me with no comfort that alcohol can only be purchased with food. What is to stop someone buying multiple bottles of wine, so long as they buy a small portion of chips at the same time.

The beach and its environment should not be allowed to become an open air boozing zone with unlimited facilities to buy more than sensible amounts of drink.

The Police and other emergency services have enough to do rather than pick up the pieces of Harry Ramsdens latest scheme to make money for themselves, with no conscience towards the neighbours and other beach patrons.

The beach and surrounding areas are for the whole public to enjoy and feel safe from over indulgence and poor behaviour which often follow over consumption of alcohol.

I am opposed to the proposals at every level. Harry Ramsdens should be able to sell alcohol to those who dine in their restaurants. As the beach is public, they have no place detracting from other's enjoyment of the area.

If you look at Swanage and Weymouth beaches, they feel safe and inviting. BCP have gone in the wrong direction trying to turn our beaches into a destination where's Ok to get drunk and misbehave. The bars on the sand are poor quality and lower the tone of our most valuable asset.

Having holidayed abroad extensively the bars on our beach are not an aspirational destination that exist elsewhere.

The beach outside Harry Ramsdens is usually frequented by teens and young adults. These will be the target audience,

On my daily evening walks around this area, there are gangs of youths with laughing gas and alcohol. The proposals whilst financially lucrative for the proposer, do nothing for residents who already feel unsafe walking on the prom in daylight hours.

Turning Bournemouth beach into Magaluf will not help the fortunes of the town for residents and council tax payers

Regards

Robert Cooper

Sent from my iPhone

RESPONSE FROM MS GOMEZ DEL OMO

From: Barbara GOMEZ DEL OLMO
Date: 4 May 2025 at 18:06:28 BST
To: Ramsden Facilities Harry
Cc: tania.jardin@bcpcouncil.gov.uk
Subject: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Hello Tania

I recently became aware, through a neighbour, about your recent communication. For some reason you have not written to me

I'm reaching out to express my concerns based on the information my neighbour shared with me. Your application reportedly describes the music as comparable to that of an outdoor café. My residence is located nearby, on the Cliff-top.

When there are South Easterly winds, which are frequent in our location—the sound from speakers carries clearly to my home. While visitors to a café experience such music for a brief period, residents like myself are exposed to it for extended hours, which can become disruptive. Additionally, I understand your application seeks permission to play recorded music outdoors until midnight, seven days a week, despite a mention that music would cease by 10 PM nightly. If your intention is indeed to stop at 10 PM, I kindly urge you to amend your application to reflect this accurately and withdraw the current request.

Should you proceed with the existing application as described, I must maintain my objections. Thank you for addressing these concerns. I look forward to your clarification and response.

Sincerely,
Barbara GOMEZ DEL OLMO,

RESPONSES FROM LOCAL RESIDENT WHO ASKED FOR ANONYMITY

From:
Sent: 07 May 2025 12:28
To: Tania Jardim
Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Thanks for your email this morning. I am happy for our correspondence to be shared with the applicant and the committee which will make the licence decision. I don't object to its text being on a web site but do not wish my name, address, web address or phone number to be published.

It would be helpful if you, I and the applicant could agree what are the premises covered by the existing licences, and what change if any is planned to that area. My understanding is that the existing Harry Ramsden operation consists of a two-level interior, one outdoor area with tables at high level with access from the bottom end of East Cliff Slope, and a serving hatch serving take-away food at lower level at the Pier end of East Undercliff Drive. I don't think it would be proper for me to enter into correspondence about the validity of that description with the representative of Harry Ramsden, but I suggest it could be helpful for you to check it and establish any proposed changes. In particular I had assumed the plan was to place tables along the outer wall of the building on the pavement of East Undercliff Drive (underneath Harry Ramsden's existing awnings). If that is not the plan, where are the late night refreshments to be served? Are the loudspeakers for the playing of recorded music outside to be (i) at East Cliff Drive level (ii) in the open air dining area off East Cliff Slope (iii) somewhere else?

Leaving the Live Music Acts to one side for the moment, you quote a Condition. What does your Licence team regard as the proper (under law) interpretation of its words, particularly its final phrase? Is there a total ban on noise which is audible at noise sensitive premises, or only if that noise causes unreasonable disturbance to local residents?

Interpreting what is "unreasonable" is a major problem between residents and the BCP Environmental/Noise team, when that word is used in a Licence Condition or in the application of the rules prohibiting Statutory Nuisance in the Environmental Protection Act. When the Licensing team is able, without breaching the Live Music Act, to impose a Condition, please in future can the wording be specific. "Inaudible" or "not more than xDb at any time at the exterior of residential premises" can be enforced; in practice "unreasonable" can't other than in exceptional circumstances.

Name Removed

From:

Sent: 06 May 2025 22:32

To: Tania Jardim

Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Thank you. I am aware of the right to play music but am under the impression that it applies to the relevant premises. In this case, I suggest those are the interior of the Harry Ramsden's restaurant (which already has licences). As I see things, the operator is now applying for a series of licences for new premises, being the part of the undercliff promenade and adjacent land which is adjacent to the restaurant. My objection is to the granting of licences to that new premises

Name Removed

Subject: Re: Harry Ramsden Bournemouth - Premise Licence Variation

Date: Sun, 4 May 2025 15:18:45 +0100

From:

To: facilities@deepbluerestaurants.com

CC: tania.jardin@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

Thanks for your letter of 2 May.

In relation to your application to play recorded music you state "similar to what you hear at an outdoor cafe". My home is east of and above your restaurant; it is closer to your premises than the beach cafe which existed last summer at the east side of the pier in the vicinity of the end of the zip wire. When the wind blew from the west, as it does more often than from other directions, the sound from their amplifiers was audible in my flat. When one visits a cafe or restaurant one hears the amplified music for the hour or two one is at the premises; those who live in the area hear it constantly, hour after hour.

You also state "music will be turned off by 10pm each evening". Your application is for a licence to play recorded music outdoors until midnight 7 days a week. If that is not your intention, please withdraw that application and re-apply for what you actually intend.

If you continue with your existing application my objections stand

Name Removed