

Section 17/Grant of a New Premises Licence - Premises: Mount Farm Vineyards, Blooms Hall Lane, Stanstead, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 9BY - Applicant: Mount Farm Vineyards Ltd

I object to the Applicant's application for a premises licence.

My objection is made on the grounds that, if a licence were to be granted, the licensable activities on the premises would,

- a) Endanger public safety on the premises, on the bridleway through and to Mount Farm Vineyards and in Blooms Hall Lane,
- b) Cause a significant public nuisance, which would adversely affect the existing rights of members of the public living, working, or carrying out their normal activities in the vicinity of the premises, and,
- c) Give rise to crime and disorder.

Granting a premises licence to premises which are more than a mile down a single track lane barely 8 feet wide, that is heavily used by local residents and members of the public on foot and on horseback and which must be used by some local residents to reach their own homes, cannot possibly promote the licensing objectives. The proposed licensable activities will inevitably and directly cause public safety and public nuisance issues and interfere with the lawful right of passage of existing users of the lane and bridleway.

Overview

The land upon which the vineyards have been established was purchased by the Applicant in 2018.

Prior to this purchase, the land had been the site of a free-range chicken shed/egg farm. All agricultural activity on the site ceased when the egg farmer retired, and the chicken sheds were decommissioned. The land was not sold with the benefit of any planning permission permitting a change of use and to the best of my knowledge there was not, and has never been, a retail shop or any form of licensed premises on the site.

Since 2018, the Applicants have planted a 20,000-vine vineyard and have converted the former chicken shed into a winery. They have developed a business plan which seeks to establish the vineyards as a tourist destination offering, amongst other things, vineyard tours, wine tasting events and a retail outlet.

The current licensing application is made in circumstances where the Applicants must reasonably be regarded as having knowledge of the following facts:

- The only vehicular access to the premises is via Blooms Hall Lane.
- Members of the public have an established right of way, as evidenced by the Definitive Map maintained by Suffolk County Council, over the public bridleway running to and through the site.

- The only way that members of the public can access the premises is by driving over the bridleway.
- While not directly relevant to this license application, there is no planning consent permitting the operation of a retail shop or licensed premises at the vineyards.
- The four facts set out above were known to the Applicants before the vineyard was planted.
- The route of the public bridleway, and public footpath, runs along the track leading to the premises, and in close proximity to the outdoor seating area proposed to form part of the licensed premises.
- In a meeting with neighbours in December 2021, Mr Hans Engstrom acknowledged that Blooms Hall Lane was an unsatisfactory means of vehicular access to the premises.
- No attempt has been made to consult with neighbours or the wider community in relation to this or any previous licencing application in respect of the vineyard, and invitations from neighbours to discuss the application constructively have been declined.
- There is significant opposition to this application from local residents and the wider community, as evidenced by the Parish Council meeting on Monday 21 March 2022, attended by Mr Hans Engstrom and Ms Amanda Engstrom.

Since 2018, the Applicants have, at their own risk, taken steps to establish an entirely new commercial venture including the planting of vines and the construction of a winery. They have done so without first seeking the necessary planning or licensing consents to enable them to sell or serve that wine to members of the public either through online sales or by means of sales on the premises for consumption on or off the premises. Knowing that the only access to the site was unsatisfactory, they have not secured an alternative access. In these circumstances, the Applicants have exposed themselves to the commercial risk that the necessary consents may be justifiably withheld by the appropriate authorities in the exercise of their statutory duties.

The grant of a premises licence in the terms sought would, in my view, breach the licensing objectives set out in the Licensing Act 2003, as it would cause a public nuisance, endanger public safety, and encourage crime and disorder.

The intention of the 2003 Act is to prevent the operation of licensed premises in these circumstances. The Act, the Statutory guidance produced pursuant to s.182 of the Act and Babergh's own Licensing Policy, all impose a duty upon the licensing committee to uphold the licensing objectives and, in doing so, to have due regard to the existing rights of members of the public living, working, or carrying out business in the vicinity of the premises.

Most local residents, and I include myself in this number, are not opposed to local enterprise and have no desire to restrict economic activity which is of benefit to the local community, and which does not give rise to a public nuisance or loss of amenity, or otherwise infringe the existing rights of those who live, work, or go about their normal activity, in the vicinity of such businesses.

In these circumstances, I believe that, subject to the imposition of satisfactory conditions relating to the fulfilment of these sales, there would be likely to be support for an application which permitted

on-line sales only. Satisfactory conditions would be conditions which sought to reduce public nuisance and would be likely to include, for example, conditions seeking to control the number of delivery vehicles permitted to attend at the premises and the days of the week on which such deliveries/collections were to be permitted.

A licence limited to online sales (subject to satisfactory conditions) would permit the applicant to market and sell the wine produced on the premises, would avoid significant public nuisance, and would respect the existing rights of those living, working or carrying business in the vicinity of the proposed premises.

Save in respect of online sales, and for the reasons given above, I strongly oppose this application and ask the licensing committee to refuse it.

The detailed grounds for my objection are set out below and will be expanded upon at the licensing hearing.

Detailed grounds for objection

I object to the Applicant's application on the grounds that, if a licence were granted in the terms sought, it would,

1. Endanger the public safety of members of the public on and in the vicinity of the premises, on the public bridleway and in Blooms Hall Lane,
2. Create a public nuisance adversely affecting the existing rights of residents of Blooms Hall Lane and those members of the public living, working, or carrying out their normal activities in the vicinity of the premises, and,
3. Give rise to Crime and Disorder in the vicinity of the premises.

The public nuisance referred to at paragraph 2 above would include, but not be limited to, noise pollution, environmental pollution, litter and the interference or obstruction of members of the public in the safe exercise of their legal rights, including their rights under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.

In setting out the detailed basis for my objection, I deal with the following issues,

- a. The Location of Mount Farm Vineyards and the physical characteristics of Blooms Hall Lane
- b. The recent history of Mount Farm and the property now known as Mount Farm Vineyards
- c. The background to the Applicant's current Licensing Application,
- d. The legal framework under the Licensing Act 2003, and,
- e. The grounds of objection.

a. The location of Mount Farm Vineyards and the physical characteristics of Blooms Hall Lane

Mount Farm Vineyards are located in open countryside at the end of Blooms Hall Lane in the Parish of Shimpling. The tranquil countryside in the vicinity is of particular interest and attraction to local riders and walkers (the area being given a "Special Landscape Area" designation by the District Council).

The only vehicular access to the premises is down Blooms Hall Lane, a distance of more than a mile. The entrance to Blooms Hall Lane lies within the Parish of Stanstead.

Blooms Hall Lane is a narrow, single-track road flanked by high banks, hedges, and ditches. At its narrowest point the tarmacked surface is approximately 2.5 metres wide. The lane has no pavements, no speed restrictions, no formal passing places and no streetlighting. The lane adjoins Woodhouse Wood, an historic woodland, and designated Site of Special Scientific Interest. The wood is home to a herd of fallow deer who wander into the road at will and often cross the lane without any warning. The Wood, and indeed the whole of the lane, is a biologically diverse and ecologically sensitive area.

In the spring the hedgerows along the lane provide nesting sites for many different varieties of native birds. Between 1 March and 1 September there are legal limitations placed on the ability of landowners to flail these hedgerows and verges and, accordingly, the vegetation reduces visibility for motorists and others using the lane.

In the winter the lane regularly floods, and the road surface is prone to potholes. Road repair budgets mean that potholes frequently go without repair for long periods, further reducing the useable width of the lane.

The physical characteristics of the lane, and the lack of any formal passing places means that if a vehicle meets another coming the other way, one or other of the vehicles will need to reverse. Depending upon the point at which the vehicles meet, one vehicle may have to reverse for hundreds of metres. Reversing can be particularly difficult in the dark and during bad weather. On certain stretches of the road, such as the hill leading to the end of the lane and Stanstead village, meeting another vehicle may involve reversing up or down a steep hill and around a blind corner, something which is challenging even for residents of the lane who have had a lot of opportunity to practice!

The owners of 6 Blooms Hall Lane, Acorn House, Blooms Hall and Coppins House all have private driveways which lead directly onto Blooms Hall Lane. It is not uncommon for motorists to try to avoid the need for reversing significant distances by driving onto this private land, causing damage and inconvenience to the residents of these properties. ***In fact, it is not possible for two cars to pass each other at any point on Blooms Hall Lane, without one of those vehicles driving on/over private property.***

Finally, Blooms Hall Lane grants access to a network of public footpaths and leads to the only Public Bridleway in the village.

Because of its historically quiet and tranquil nature, Blooms Hall Lane has been and continues to be frequently and regularly used by local residents to walk their dogs, take exercise and ride their horses. The importance of the lane as a community asset is demonstrated by the fact that in 2021 Stanstead Parish Council voted to protect the nature of the lane and seek its designation as a Quiet Lane. This process is being championed by local residents and is supported by Suffolk County Council through the Quiet Lanes Suffolk scheme. The designation process is currently moving forward, and it is to be hoped that it will be completed soon.

b. The recent history of Mount Farm and the property now known as Mount Farm Vineyards

Prior to 2018, the site on which Mount Farm vineyards now stands was the location of a chicken shed housing free range chickens. The egg farmer, Mr Geoffrey Laflin, did not live on site.

Eggs produced by Mount Farm were packed in trays by Mr Laflin and members of his family, and twice a week a large egg lorry came and collected the eggs, which were subsequently sold to the public by various major supermarkets. The days on which the egg lorry visited the farm were known to residents of the lane who were then able to take steps to avoid it. Other than the egg lorry, the egg farm generated a very limited volume of traffic.

In 2018, Mr Laflin retired. The chicken sheds were decommissioned and all agricultural activity on the site ceased. Following Mr Laflin's retirement, the land on which the chicken shed stood was sold to the Applicants. Subsequently, the Applicants have planted a commercial vineyard consisting of, in the region of, 20,000 vines and have converted the former chicken shed into a winery. I understand that the Applicants intend to plant a further 5,000 vines by 2023.

In addition, two of the former agricultural buildings on the site have been converted into dwellings. It is understood that three separate households are now living on the site and a static caravan is also in use by seasonal workers. Accordingly, in the last 4 years, the vineyards site has expanded from being a site with an egg farm (generating little traffic) to a site with a substantial winery, seasonal workers and several new residences. This additional residential occupation of the site has led to an inevitable increase in traffic volumes in the lane in addition to the traffic involved in the establishment and running of the vineyard and winery.

The Applicant has advised local residents that the intention is to produce approximately 40 – 50,000 bottles per annum once the vines are fully mature. There is no reason to suppose that the traffic required to service the vineyard and winery will diminish in time, nor that traffic associated with the domestic dwellings will reduce. This level of traffic is already putting strain on the lane.

A further issue which is relevant to the committee's deliberations relates to the Bridleway which runs through Mount Farm. The Definitive Map maintained by Suffolk County Council currently shows this as running through the garden of one of the dwellings occupied by the Engstrom family and then alongside the outside seating area proposed to be established as part of the licensed premises. The route of the bridleway is currently obstructed by a newly installed gate to which a sign has been affixed. The sign requests that members of the public refrain from exercising their legal rights to use the bridleway and suggests an alternative route. At the time of writing, it is understood no application has been made for the deviation of the route shown on the Definitive Map and no consultation about any such change has been undertaken. Accordingly, the route of the public bridleway currently runs through the vineyard site in the immediate vicinity of the premises as defined in this Application and members of the public have a legal right to use that route on foot, on horseback or by bicycle.

c. The Background to the Applicant's current Licensing Application

On 24 November 2021 an application was made by Mr Hans Engstrom and his daughter, Ms Amanda Engstrom, for a premises licence in respect of Mount Farm Vineyards. The Applicants' address was given as Mount Farm Vineyards, Blooms Hall Lane, Stanstead.

The licensable activities for which the licence was sought included the screening of films, the performance of live and recorded music, the provision of late-night refreshment, the hosting of weddings and other events, and the sale of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises. The licensing hours were seven days a week, from 10.00 until 23.00 Sunday – Thursday and until 1.00am on Fridays and Saturdays, with extended licensing hours until 3.30 am on New Year's Day.

The then Applicants did not inform their immediate neighbours of their plans before submitting the application and there was no attempt to engage in any constructive discussion or to try and find common ground with village residents.

During a discussion with neighbours on 12 December 2021, Mr Engstrom acknowledged that Blooms Hall Lane was unsatisfactory as a means of vehicular access to Mount Farm Vineyards and informed them that he was negotiating an alternative means of access which would allow visitors to the Vineyard to access the site via the Parish of Shimpling rather than down Blooms Hall Lane from Stanstead.

The November application aroused huge concern in the area, not just from those living in the immediate vicinity of the site, but from the residents of the wider Parish, and many others. In the light of the concerns voiced by village residents, the Stanstead Parish Council called an Extraordinary Public meeting, which took place on Monday 20 December 2021.

The meeting was not attended by either Mr or Ms. Engstrom, but to avoid "any inaccuracies" during the meeting, the Engstroms provided the Parish Council with extracts from what was described as their "Mission Statement" – See Appendix 1 – on the basis that copies of this document would be distributed to those attending the meeting.

The mission statement did nothing to allay residents' concerns in respect of the Application. On the contrary, the mission statement revealed the Engstroms' plans to host regular events throughout the year, to set up a Ramblers' and Riders' Café, to run Pop up Dining events at the site, and to erect tourist accommodation on the site.

In the light of the information provided by the Engstroms, and the concerns voiced by those at the meeting, the Parish Council unanimously voted to oppose the Engstroms' Licensing Application and a written objection was subsequently submitted.

In total more than 20 written representations were lodged with the Licensing Authority. The objections included a petition signed by more than 80 local and village residents.

A date was set for the Licensing Hearing on Tuesday 25th January and a Public Document Pack was circulated. However, on 20 January 2022, the Applicants' application was withdrawn and the hearing was therefore cancelled.

Subsequently, on 15 March 2022, a fresh application was made for a premises licence at Mount Farm Vineyards. The Applicant is named as Mount Farm Vineyards and their address is given as Blooms Hall Lane, Stanstead. This is the application currently under consideration

by the Committee. The application seeks a licence for the sale of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises. The licensable activities identified include online sales, a Farm Shop, wine tastings with food/snacks – both indoors and outdoors - and Vineyard tours.

It is disappointing to note that, once again, no attempt was made to consult with, or try to reach any sort of common ground with, local residents. Indeed, offers from neighbours to meet the applicants to discuss the matter in the hope of finding common ground were refused. We understand that a meeting took place at Mr Engstrom's home on 10 March 2022 between Mr Engstrom, Mr Roy Weedon, the Stanstead Parish Clerk, Mr David Finch, the Chairman of the Stanstead Parish Council and Mr Richard Kemp, the Councillor for Long Melford, following which Ms. Amanda Engstrom provided Mr Finch with a copy of the revised, although unsigned, application.

At a Parish Council Meeting in Stanstead on Monday 21 March, the Chairman of the council advised those present that no consultation had taken place during this meeting and that Mr Engstrom had simply outlined the details of the new application, a copy of which was then supplied to Mr Finch/Mr Weedon for information.

d. The Legal Framework

The legislation governing the grant of a premises licence by a licensing authority is set out in the Licensing Act 2003.

Section 4 of the 2003 Act provides that a licensing Authority must carry out its functions under the Act, with a view to promoting the four licensing objectives. These licensing objectives are the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.

Section 4(3) further provides that, in carrying out its licensing functions, the licensing authority must also have regard to,

- a) its licensing statement published under section 5, and
- b) any guidance issued by the Secretary of State under Section 182.

Section 5 provides that every licensing authority must, in respect of each five-year period, determine its policy with respect to the exercise of its licensing functions, and publish a statement of that policy before the beginning of the relevant five year period.

Babergh's Licensing policy is currently set out in their Statement of Licensing Policy 2021 – 2026.

Section 1.5 of the current Babergh policy states that,

“In exercising its licensing functions...the Licensing Authority will primarily focus on the direct impact of the licensable activities taking place at the licensed premises on members of the public living, working or engaged in normal activity in the locality of the licensed premises....”

Section 1.6 continues,

“The area impacted by the presence of licensed premises *is a question of fact* and will depend upon the particular circumstances of each case.”

Furthermore, Section 1.7 provides that,

“The aims of this Statement of Licensing Policy include:

- a) Helping to encourage and support strong and inclusive communities that balance the rights of licensable businesses ... and local residents.”

In considering the written and oral representations made by those opposed to this application, the licensing committee will need to consider whether the various nuisances complained of by objectors are such as to amount to a “public nuisance” within the meaning of the act.

Paragraph 2.16 of the S.182 guidance provides as follows,

“Public nuisance is given a statutory meaning in many pieces of legislation. It is however, *not* narrowly defined in the 2003 Act *and retains its broad common law meaning*. It may include in appropriate circumstances the reduction of the living and working amenity and environment of other persons living in the area of the licensed premises. Public nuisance may also arise as a result of the adverse effects of artificial light, dust, odour, and insects or where its effect is prejudicial to health.”

As a matter of common law, public nuisance is held to be, “any act not warranted by law (or the omission to discharge a legal duty) *if the effect of the act or omission is to endanger the life, health, property or comfort of the public, or to obstruct the public in the exercise or enjoyment of rights common to all Her Majesty’s subjects*.” This definition was approved in the House of Lords case *Rimmington; Goldstein [2005] UKHL 63*.

In determining whether a state of affairs amounts to a public nuisance the licensing committee are bound to take all the circumstances of the particular case into account. Any suggestion that it is only noise, odour, litter, waste or street fouling that can amount to a public nuisance under the act is simply wrong. This assertion is supported by Babergh’s own document of licensing policy, paragraph 14.4.2 of which says, in terms,

“The Licensing Authority interprets “public nuisance” in its widest sense.”

Whilst public nuisance *may* include issues such as noise, odour, litter, waste or street fouling, it is clear that the parliament did not intend public nuisance to be limited in this way. The licensing committee has a discretion to decide whether, based on representations made, the issues raised would indeed amount to a public nuisance.

I would also mention that the question of whether a nuisance is taking place in the vicinity or locality of licensed premises, is also something that is to be determined on the particular facts of the case and the term “vicinity” is not determined merely by distance.

Finally, in relation to whether traffic issues can be relevant issues for Licensing Act purposes, they clearly can. For example,

- Babergh’s own statement of licensing policy recognises that in appropriate circumstances traffic can be relevant (see para 5.1 which refers to “traffic congestion and/or parking difficulties”).
- Most licensed events will require a traffic management plan, demonstrating that traffic going to or from licensable activities may be a valid consideration.

e. Grounds for Objection

This objection is made on the grounds that, if a license were to be granted, the licensable activities on the Premises would,

- (a) Endanger the public safety of members of the public on and in the vicinity of the premises, on the public bridleway and in Blooms Hall Lane;
- (b) Create a public nuisance adversely affecting the existing rights of residents of Blooms Hall Lane and those members of the public living, working, or carrying out their normal activities in the vicinity of the premises, and
- (c) Give rise to Crime and Disorder in the vicinity of the premises

In relation to public safety, my objection is based upon:

- The risks to members of the public using Blooms Hall Lane (especially those on foot or horseback) from vehicles going to Mount Farm Vineyards for the purposes of the licensable activities. The risk from additional vehicles using a narrow lane with steep banks and no pavements are obvious. ***(The physical characteristics of the lane mean that it is not possible to pass a horse or pedestrian whilst maintaining the two-metre distance required following recent changes to the highway code.)***
- My concern that, were there to be an incident at Mount Farm Vineyards requiring attendance by emergency services, the limited access would give rise to a risk to the safety of members of the public attending the premises.
- The fact that the safety of those on the bridleway through Mount Farm, especially where it runs right beside the proposed licensed premises, would be put at risk by the proposed licence (a particular concern being the safety of those riding horses, whose mounts might be startled by the presence of cars on and near the bridleway and of Mount Farm Vineyards patrons eating and drinking in the outdoor eating area).

In relation to public nuisance, the direct impact of the proposed licensable activities taking place at the licensed premises will include:

- Nuisance to those living nearest to Mount Farm – this would include, noise, pollution etc from cars and other vehicles arriving and departing, car doors closing, cars starting, cars manoeuvring, guests eating and drinking at the premises (in particular in the outdoor seating area), guests on vineyard tours, etc. This nuisance may infringe residents’ existing rights under the Human Rights Act 1998 in that it would breach the existing rights to respect for their homes and their rights to peaceful enjoyment of their property. This would be exacerbated by the very rural character of the area.

- Nuisance to those using the bridleway and footpath running through and to Mount Farm Vineyards - noise, pollution, etc as in 1 above, plus safety issues since vehicles and users of the bridleway would share a single track;
- Nuisance to those who must use Blooms Hall Lane to access their houses or who use it for the purposes of exercise and recreation. The public nuisance of vineyard traffic would include noise, environmental pollution, and littering. In addition, because of the broad meaning of public nuisance, the nuisance would include for pedestrians, having to avoid traffic by taking evasive action, climbing banks, etc; and for cars, having to reverse, etc. The public has an existing right over the highway (which includes Blooms Hall Lane and the bridleway). That right is an existing right of public passage, that is to say a ***“right for all Her Majesty's subjects at all seasons of the year freely and at their will to pass and repass without let or hindrance”*** (Halsbury's Laws of England 4th edition volume 21 para one page 9). The increase in vehicles in Blooms Hall Lane and on the bridleway from the proposed licensable activities would be a nuisance interfering with that existing right and would extend to the whole length of the lane;
- Nuisance to those who own property bordering Blooms Hall Lane whose driveways are used as passing places by those using the lane, the nuisance being damage to those driveways. In relation to that point, any suggestion that traffic using Blooms Hall Lane cannot amount to a nuisance because it is a public highway fails owing to the point that traffic going to Mount Farm Vineyards will in practice use private driveways (e.g. at 6 Blooms Hall Lane, Coppins, Acorn House, and Blooms Hall) in order to pass; the use of those driveways as passing places is not the use of the highway and is a nuisance.
- Nuisance in the form of pollution affecting the bio-diversity of this sensitive location and increased carbon emissions. In particular the committee should have regard to whether any adverse effects to local bio-diversity and increases in carbon emissions would be in direct breach of the Suffolk County Council's responsibilities and stated policies in this regard.

Finally in relation to nuisance and public safety, there is nothing in the application that restricts the scale of the proposed operation. It is presented as if it will be small scale, but there is nothing to restrict scale at all. The application could lead to 100s of visitors every day to Mount Farm Vineyards.

Conclusion

The premises are situated in a quiet and scenic location, surrounded by sites of special scientific interest. Residents have made their homes here because they enjoy the peaceful nature of the locality, the fresh air and access to the network of footpaths and the bridleway. The Applicant is seeking permission to establish licenced premises in circumstances where to do so will give rise to very significant public safety issues in Blooms Hall Lane and on the public bridleway and to public nuisance affecting more than a mile of ecologically sensitive Suffolk countryside and will destroy the special character and nature of the area around the site. Encouraging people to drive down Blooms Hall Lane for the purposes of visiting the premises, and in many cases drinking alcohol, is plainly contrary to the public interest and will cause significant public safety and public nuisance. For all these reasons the application should be refused, save as it relates to online sales (subject to satisfactory conditions).

Yours faithfully

Judith Lyons, Blooms Hall, Blooms Hall Lane, Stanstead, Suffolk, CO10 9AY

Appendix 1 – Mission Statement Pages 1 - 3

Mount Farm Vineyards Hospitality

As a part of our agricultural activities as a vineyard, with subsequent production of grapes grown at the premises in to wine, we will bottle, market and sell those in part at the premises.

Premises

Tasting and event room with kitchen facilities in parts of the winery building.
Sufficient parking facilities for staff and visitors.
3 x prospective 2 bed cabins/tents for wine tourists.

Opening and events

1. Regular cellar door opening times (strictly for sales and tastings) – Tuesday-Saturday 10.00-17.00.
2. Four events annually - Great British Rose Week, including launch party of our brand this year at Easter weekend; English Wine Week and Midsummer end June; Harvest celebration Oct or Nov; and Christmas Market mid-December.
3. Pop up restaurant with guest chefs and wine tasting (invitation only) - Frequency - 4 times annually. Might co-inside with events stated previously.
4. Live music - This would co-inside with events stated previously and include as an example a string quartet, jazz trio or similar.
5. Movie night - This will co-inside with events previously stated.
6. Late night refreshments - This will co-inside with events previously stated that may run past 11pm and require hot food or snacks.
7. Riders and Ramblers Cafe - Tasting room opening seasonally Saturday and Sundays between 10.00-14.00. May include but not limited to spring/summer months.
8. Tourism - Groups of max 6 people to stay at the premises by means of tent or cabin over the course of a week. Frequency of groups – 5 annually. (NB these may coincide with events previously stated)

Visitor estimations

We have gathered statistics from WineGB and other venues and based our estimations accordingly.

1. 0-5 vehicles per day, 0-10 visitors where in line with our sustainable ethos we would encourage visitors to arrive by foot, bicycle or horse.
2. 5-20 vehicles per event. 5-100 visitors where in line with our sustainable ethos we would encourage visitors to arrive by foot, bicycle and horse. We would supply local minibus shuttle if a higher demand.
3. Same as point 2 above.
4. N/A
5. N/A
6. N/A
7. 0-5 vehicles and 0-20 visitors where in line with our sustainable ethos we would encourage visitors to arrive by foot, bicycle or horse.
8. 1 vehicle per day as this is catered for via shuttle, foot, bicycle and horse.

Mount Farm Vineyards Marketing and Sales

As a part of our agricultural activities as a vineyard, with subsequent production of grapes grown at the premises in to wine, we will bottle, market and sell those in part online, to wholesalers, and by in-house distribution.

Premises

Warehouse and shop in parts of the winery.
Sufficient parking facilities for staff and in-house distribution van.

Opening

1. Online sales 24hours to be facilitated during normal opening hours.
2. Phone orders and wholesalers during normal opening hours*.

Distribution estimations

We have gathered statistics from WineGB and other venues and based our estimations accordingly. Please note in line with our sustainable ethos, we will ship courier deliveries at one dedicated delivery day per week.

1. 1 delivery van per week.
0-7 local next/same day deliveries with in-house distribution vehicle.

*Phone orders to be handled by shop personel as per mentioned in hospitality document.

Mount Farm Vineyards Management and Production

As a part of our agricultural activities as a vineyard, with subsequent production of grapes grown at the premises into wine, we will grow grapes, produce, bottle and label our wine at the premises.

Premises

1. Vineyard at the land
2. Winery with tanks and machinery
3. Garage and workshop with agricultural machinery and materials
4. Convenient facilities for staff including overnight facilities for temporary workers
5. Office
6. Parking for agricultural staff 0-4 per day seasonal dependent

Opening

1. 24hours per day
2. 24hours per day
3. 24hours per day

Normal working hours 8:00-16:00 however is not limited to this based on vineyard and winery requirements throughout the season.