Hi Guys

We live at 23 Gainsborough Street and just wanted to let you know that we feel the proposed tap room at the old Bazaar premises is a fantastic idea.

Happy to discuss further if needed

Best wishes and kindest regards

Tristan Reynolds

23 Gainsborough Street Sudbury Suffolk CO10 2EU

From: Alex Davies and Julia Taylor

Address: 30 Gainsborough St, Sudbury CO10 2EU

To Whom it may concern,

We have seen the <u>application</u> made on behalf of Courtyard Tap for a licence to open a 'micro-pub' by Marc Blake of Courtyard Tap in 26-27 Gainsborough Street, and wish to make the following representations as 'other persons', specifically as residents who would be significantly affected by noise and safety hazards posed by the application:

While opening a business on the vacant premises of Bazaar would be a welcome addition to this residential area, there are aspects in which the application would pose significant concerns under the <u>licensing framework</u> that we wish to raise; particularly in relation to the hours of opening, the use of the garden, and the provision of on-premises consumption of alcohol. These concerns fall within the Public Safety, Prevention of Public Nuisance objectives and Protection of Children from Harm of the Council's Licensing Framework.

Public Safety

The site is situated in a restricted-visibility four-way junction as part of the A131 road with doubleyellow lines, at the junction of School Street, Stour Street, Gregory Street, and Gainsborough Street. It is part of the main route of large lorries as well as smaller vehicles and motorcycles, on a one-way single carriageway, with no room to legally pass vehicles. It is used frequently by ambulances and fire engines (there is a fire station nearby), without sirens, during some of the hours of proposed operation. The nearby free parking facilities on Stour Street are regularly overfilled and there is extremely limited residential parking in the area; and there is a community centre, a church and a care home next door. While in theory the speed limit is 30mph on this street, in practice during the evenings cars and emergency vehicles travel at higher speeds and there are no speed cameras/rumble strips or other traffic control measures in place on this major route. Ambulance access is available to the care home 2 doors down into School Street. The merge into Gregory Street has blindspots for those in School Street. Consequently, the suggestion by the applicant that taxis could be procured by visitors is unlikely and/or hazardous. The premises could not easily restock without blocking one or more major roads, unless the applicant has procured a parking space adjacent, which it is not clear that they have, or they will be carrying stock some distance by hand to/from the premises. We are unsure where the premises would dispose of used barrels/bottles, but this is a key part of managing both noise and hazards that has not been mentioned in the application other than to say that it will take place.

Due to the traffic issues above, primarily visitors would access the premises on foot. As there are no pedestrian crossings on the junction and it is assumed visitors will be coming from the centre of town, this route would be via Gainsborough Street. Pavements on this street are incredibly narrow at best single-file can be achieved, and sometimes less than this, including in front of the premises. To pass one another residents regularly have to walk into the road. Combined with consumption of alcohol next to a major junction after sunset, this poses a real risk of visitors walking into the road and being hit by cars.

There is also a significant risk posed within the premises - looking at the plans for the building, the only access to/from the garden to the building is via the toilet, which presumably is lockable, or possibly accessed by walking around the building on foot (see footnote).* This means that monitoring the garden for consumption of illegal drugs and preventing other crime and antisocial behaviour would be difficult and/or impossible when the toilet was in use. Furthermore, the applicant does not appear to have stated whether smoking will be permitted in the garden, and many of the traditional houses along the road use wood-burning stoves as a form of heating. As a

result there is a significant risk of fire that should be considered, and the only fire escape from the garden may be locked by other visitors if the garden forms part of the premises and there is no pavement access (see footnote). To compound the potential risks from fire, there is no stated maximum occupancy, and as a traditional building the stairs are likely to be narrow and/or have steep risers.

Prevention of public nuisance

The applicant is proposing to alter the use of the premises from a quiet shop to a micro-pub. The distinction between a micro-pub and a pub appears to be a semantic one, given the times of operation, playing music and the on-premise consumption of alcohol, and unrestricted proposed occupancy. There are no proposed noise limits or equivalent related to use of an iPad, or other controls that might meaningfully distinguish from a pub. This is very out-of-keeping with the surrounding area - as Kohinoor is not actively running an on-premise restaurant, the nearest businesses actually serving alcohol on-premises of any kind would be David's Cafe or The Mill Hotel. The other buildings in the area are houses and churches, other than William Wood House, a care home.

The building, being a traditional listed building with no recent renovations and in somewhat poor condition, is not likely to have any significant soundproofing comparable to a modern construction. It is situated in an area where use is substantially residential past sunset, save for an Indian restaurant on Gregory Street. As a result, opening a pub, especially one operating until 11pm, would introduce new noise from pedestrians into the area much later into the evening. The majority of nearby houses are of traditional construction with single-glazed windows and no soundproofing, which is enforced to some extent by their grade-II listed status. As a result there is limited ability for residents to mitigate any additional noise introduced if this application is approved. While there is background noise from the road, this is very different to that caused by pedestrians passing close-by, especially those that have been consuming alcohol for potentially 11 hours. The use of signs as a control on this noise or 'reminding visitors' is not likely to mitigate this meaningfully, especially as the continuing route will be on foot and not to a vehicle that leaves the area promptly.

Protection of Children from Harm

As a residential area of Sudbury, there is a youth centre in operation towards town at the Eden Project from Monday - Friday, a short walk away from the premises, and young people frequently spend time in this area in the early evening. As a constructive suggestion, it would be worth either preventing access to under-18s altogether, or restricting hours in which they may be in attendance further in order to avoid issues resulting in youth consumption of alcohol.

For all of the above reasons, while it really would be great to see the shop being used once more, it is of significant concern that a pub is proposed to be opened, and restricted hours and/or an off-premise-only licence with restrictions on occupancy and noise would make far more sense to avoid the above concerns.

* The application may refer to the garden shown on google street view on the opposite side of the property as shown here. This would be a mirror image of the plans shown, and involve visitors essentially standing on the street, with only a hedge separating them from the main road and creating an increased amount of noise and smoke, which would pose different issues.

Kind Regards,

Alex Davies and Julia Taylor

RE: Application for grant of new premises license at 26-27 Gainsborough Street, Sudbury CO10 2EU

My name is Barry Martin and I live at 29 Gainsborough Street, Sudbury CO10 2EU and I would like to make a representation against the above application.

From a Public Safety point of view, I do not think that this location is suitable. Anyone leaving the premises, must do so through a door that opens on to a narrow pavement, beside the very busy A131, with fast moving traffic inches away from them. Alcohol, people and fast moving vehicles are not a good mix. I am aware that the speed limit at this point is 30mph but, unfortunately, this seems to be observed by only a minority of road users

I am concerned about deliveries to the premises. If the deliveries vehicles were to be stop at the front of the property to unload, then this would reduce the A131 to one lane at this point, causing increased congestion and obstructing the vision of vehicles trying to join the A131 from School Street

If the delivery vehicle was to stop to deliver to the side of the property (in School Street), this would close School Street completely, causing more traffic flow problems.

From a Public Nuisance point of view, the noise of customers leaving the premises late at night (the application is for a licences till 11pm) would be disturbing to the local residence, including the nearby Care Home. I am well aware of the, well documented, problems and complaints caused by the "Station Road" Restaurant/ Wine Bar. The fact that the a number of the surrounding properties have Flying Freeholds above the proposed License premises should be a concern as well, especially as the application says that they will be playing music all the time that they are open.

I am not opposed to the idea of a Tap Room, but believe that this location is unsuitable for one, and that there are a lot of better suited and available locations in the Town.

I live opposite the site and everything I mentioned, apart from the "flying freehold", will affect me and my family.

Good afternoon

I have just seen that the premises of 26-27 Gainsborough street Sudbury suffolk. ,Mr Marc Blake has made a application to change this property into a Micropub, which I find this unacceptable due to position it's a lovely quiet residential area school street with a residential home for the elderly which is only 2 mins away , also the pavement in Gainsborough street is very narrow so when the summer arrives there will be people standing outside which will be unsafe as the road can be very busy at times . Also the amount of noise during and after the pub will be closed will definitely not be exceeptable . The landlord will not except any responsibility once the customers are off the premises and the pub is closed So this should be another valid reasons to refuse the property to change also there is no parking out side the premises only parking will be opposite Hardwick house which is where the residents use and that would create disturbance . I personally have experienced all this when I was living in Betty cocker grove ie maldon grey. There are more suitable premises on market hill and north street which will be more suitable . I hope you take all this information into consideration for the respect for the near by residents

Regard Ms Glynis smith

45 Gracefarrant Road Great cornard sudbury suffolk co100fj

The Stone Stour Street Sudbury CO10 2AX

Objection to Licence Application for 26-27 Gainsborough Street Sudbury

My main reason for objecting to the granting of an alcohol licence to above premises is owing to it's location. It is situated on a very dangerous & busy junction. Also it is almost directly opposite Mulberry House, which houses many residents who have alcohol & drug addictions. It will most definitely be detrimental to their health & their fight against addiction to have availability of alcohol so close to home. Their possible increased alcohol consumption could also seriously put them at risk |& could lead to anti-social behaviour.

Anna Miles

I would like to strongly object to the Licensing Application. The main reasons for this are:

- 1. Public safety; the premises is on the corner of a street and fronted by a busy main road (A131) where cars are often travelling way in excess of the speed limit especially at quieter times including after rush hour.
 - This would coincide with the busiest time at the establishment. There is also an extremely narrow pavement outside the premises which would pose a great risk to people coming out of the establishment, having consumed alcohol. It is also probable that people would also stand on the pavement to smoke.
 - As well as putting themselves at risk they would cause problems for anyone else walking along the pavement. As there are a large number of timber-framed houses adjoining the establishment, there is a significant risk of fire
- 2. Crime & disorder; excessive consumption of alcohol is often associated with disorderly behaviour. As the establishment is in a residential, Conservation Area this is inappropriate for the area and could cause a public nuisance. Another concern is noise generated from both inside and outside the establishment up to 11pm 7 days a week, particularly as the outside area is surrounded by residential property. A lot of people in the area are in employment many leaving for work before 7am.
- 3. Parking in this area is at a premium as many residents do not have their own parking space and available parking spaces are taken by early evening.

Gillian Miles, 1 Stour Street, Sudbury CO10 2AX 4/04/2023

25 Gainsborough Street, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 2EU Tuesday 4th April 2023

FAO Licensing Babergh District Council

I write today in opposition to the application for New Premises Licence for 26-27 Gainsborough Street by Marc Blake.

I own 25 Gainsborough Street, the property next door (and in fact over) 26-27 Gainsborough Street. I am in staunch opposition to a bar opening in the premises attached to and below my home. I began the purchase of this home in September 2022 before the commercial property Bazaar revealed their intentions to close. Whilst I accept I made the decision to purchase a property adjoining a commercial property, the commercial property in question would have been closed for the day by the time I returned home from work and opened reduced hours on a Saturday & Sunday. It was also a commercial business that did not serve alcohol and a clientele that would remain on the premises for some hours therefore the premises would not have affected my right to enjoy peace & quiet within my home without public nuisance.

I would like to point out that not only does my property adjoin the proposed premises it also has a flying freehold OVER the property. This flying freehold will be my bedroom.

I would NEVER have purchased this property had I known that my bedroom would be above a bar/pub area. I am not in a position to immediately sell the house I waited seven months to own, as I cannot afford another set of solicitors fees nor could I afford a new mortgage at current interest rates.

I work a very stressful job in healthcare and I work very hard to reduce stress to my physical and mental health with a healthy sleeping pattern. I go to bed at 9pm and am asleep by 10pm every night during the week and often on Friday and Saturday also. The proposed opening hours of 12pm-11pm would severely impact this, especially as my bedroom is immediately over the bar area proposed. I am sure you can understand that it would not just be the noise of the premises being open but, especially on weekends, patrons that are buoyed by the alcohol they are purchasing from the premises making a nuisance of themselves as they are often bound to do. I say this as a person who not only, unfortunately, grew up in a pub and suffered through years of such nuisance but as a person who has recently moved from a property close to The Prince of Wales pub. The noise from the pub and its drunken clientele was not only one of my main reasons for moving but also moving to a property NOT close to a premises that serves alcohol. You cannot even imagine my utter dismay to find this application has been submitted right as I am able to move into my new home, where this nuisance will be as close as it could possibly be without being IN the home I own.

I note that Mr Blake makes very little mention of how he will prevent his patrons making a public nuisance in his application.

I would also like to note that just because the bar may close at 11pm does not mean that staff or patrons will not be allowed to remain on the premises and/or staff may need to remain to carry out additional duties past closing time. With further regard to the flying freehold both 25 and 26-27 Gainsborough Street are centuries old listed buildings with timber frame. There is not sufficient insulation to prevent noise carrying upwards or over to my property and I would also be concerned about the fire regulations both of the building and of a smoking area outside of the bar and the affect a fire could have on my property. I have a small courtyard separated from the courtyard of 26-27 Gainsborough Street that will contain multiple plants and, in warmer weather, clothing on a rotary washing line, I am concerned about cigarettes being flicked over the fence or even leftovers of drinks as I have known this to happen at other pubs in Sudbury. My courtyard is also overlooked by the upstairs seating area Mr Blake proposes, resulting in me having zero privacy in my own garden.

I would like to also note that there is very minimal space in the courtyard at the proposed premises meaning there are likely to be patrons congregating outside the front of the premises when it is busy and/or when they wish to have a cigarette. I would certainly not appreciate persons congregating outside of my home or indeed in the courtyard outside, again impeding my ability to enjoy my courtyard and/or impede access to my home. The pavement outside of the properties is incredibly narrow & access could be impeded very easily.

I feel I must also add that I am a young single woman. I am already concerned about my safety living alone as are almost all young single women. I already feel unsafe walking alone at night and if I need to leave my home or return home in the evening or night I would feel extreme anxiety if there were patrons of the bar outside my front door. I should not be put in this position.

In further regards to the narrow pavement this premises opens immediately onto a very busy main road. A road on which certain cars go straight through at high speed and also take the turn at a higher speed than they should. It does not seem at all safe to have inebriated persons leaving a premises on such a narrow pavement, immediately past residential homes, along a busy main road. There is also a risk that taxis or indeed other drivers, will pull up outside the bar to collect patrons (or even nip in to buy something) ignoring the double yellow lines present. This increases the risk of accidents and damage to my property as well as further noise disturbances. This would also apply to deliveries for his premises, especially large vehicles delivering kegs or crates.

I am also concerned that my property cannot accommodate having wheelie bins, I must put both my general waste and recycling outside the front of the property in bags to have it collected. Having seen the results of drunken patrons kicking rubbish bags on their way home at the last property I lived at I am concerned this would occur should this licence be granted. I also note that there are no plans for Mr Blakes waste disposal in his application, there is very limited space for bins at the property or surrounding area.

Further regarding waste, on a visit to my new home several months ago (which prior to my receiving the keys recently, had been empty since February 2022) we found the drain had become blocked by sewerage and the seller had to request attendance of a drain specialist. He was able to unblock the drain but advised the drains are rather shallow and shared with neighbouring properties making them not entirely fit for use. He suggested further issues be raised with the Water Board specifically because they are communal. I am concerned that if the drains became blocked by sewerage &

associated waste when my house was empty and there were only 1-2 staff present at Bazaar then how much worse is the situation going to be with increased use at a premises that not only comprises staff but members of the public. Especially as they will be drinking alcohol, a known diuretic.

The granting of this licence will also lower the value of my property. I have had this confirmed by several estate agents contacted by my solicitor. Should you grant the application, I may be utterly miserable in my home that I can no longer sell for enough to move to a different property. I have also contacted my buildings insurer and have been advised it will raise the cost of my buildings and contents insurance.

There are 14 public houses in Sudbury. 17 if you include the 3 in Great Cornard (granted I would accept The Brook is somewhat outside of the radius of an easy walk back to the town centre). There are many restaurants that serve alcohol also. There are also many, many empty properties in Sudbury town centre that are not terraced to a residential property nor have a residential flying freehold above them. It seems unnecessary to request a licence to turn this property into a premises that serves alcohol and is open for 11 hours per day when there are more appropriate premises available for this use. For example, per Birchall Steel there are properties for leasehold available on King Street (1), North Street (5), Borehamgate (1) and there is even a public house available for leasehold in Ballingdon!

I urge you, strongly, pleadingly, to decline Mr Blakes application for the sake of my right to enjoy my home (my first owned property, a property I should be allowed to love living in as a young person who has worked hard to purchase her first property), for my safety and for my sanity.

I would also like to request you not share my concerns or comments with Mr Blake as if you were to do so & also grant his application I would be extremely concerned about retaliatory or antagonistic behaviour on his part.

Sincerely

Public Safety

The premises has no provision for off road loading/unloading. The premises is on the busy crossroads A131//Stour Street/Gregory Street where loading & unloading from vehicles stopped by the premises would pose a danger to pedestrians using the narrow pavement in Gainsborough Street (A131) & School Street. Pedestrians would be at additional risk when attempting to cross this busy junction. This junction has a history of injury accidents.

Protection of children from harm

Crossing these roads & using the pavements daily by children going to & from the two nearby primary schools would pose an additional risk to their safety from stopped vehicles, loading & unloading.

Prevention of public nuisance

The small outside courtyard of the premises is actually at the rear of 25 Gainsborough Street. This would pose a noise nuisance to the occupants of no. 25 and other neighbours in this terraced street.

Peter Cockett 91 North Street Sudbury CO10 1RF

We object strongly to the application on the following grounds.

Public safety.

The pavement along the stretch of road is too narrow as it is and there is also a dangerous junction adjoining the proposed premises where there have been several accidents with pedestrians and cars already. Coupled with poor street lighting and inebriated patrons this is a recipe for disaster.

Lack of nearby parking available for residents will be further impacted by the proposed premises.

Many residential properties near by with young children who will be impacted by late night noise.

There is no available smoking area at the proposed premises which will result in this happening on the street. This will cause a public nuisance and disorder.

Adjacent properties are residential which will be severely impacted by noise and disturbance at night.

Nowhere for deliveries to take place due to yellow lines and a busy main road.

Adrian Green 32 Gainsborough Street Sudbury Suffolk Co10 2eu