

18/04678/FUL

Dear Sirs,

Continuing on from my earlier comments, I should like to add the following supplementary points :

I take serious issue with the repeated suggestion that the Three Horseshoes is a "bottom end" pub. This is a most

unpleasant slur on the pub itself, its clientele and the entire neighbourhood. It is in fact a beautiful and historic Country Pub, in an idyllic location, which has been neglected by the brewery for many years and for the entire period of their tenancy by

its last tenants.

In the right ownership or tenancy it has many advantages and every opportunity to be a success.

I would further suggest that the available car parking has been significantly understated, by at least a third. I can only think that this would be to give the impression that with limited parking any chance of revival would be less likely due to not being able to accommodate additional business, and that the space remaining outside the area outlined red would seem small and divided, and not likely to raise concerns over the possibility of future development.

The application implies that there had been friction between the pub and its neighbours over noise and traffic etc. Nothing could be further from the truth. I note that this point has already been made in another letter of representation, but it bears repeating, to make sure that it is fully understood that the suggestion is yet another of the many inaccurate statements made

in the application.

Throughout the application it seems that no effort has been made to research properly in order to portray a fair picture, while at every opportunity figures and situations have been tweaked and information omitted to paint the bleakest possible position.

("Lies,damn lies and statistics")

	<p>The same situations, with full information, and many of the same figures should be used to demonstrate the neglected opportunity, which is still there for the taking by the right, and committed, new owners or tenants.</p> <p>One wonders how long ago the standard form was written when they are still complaining 11 years later about the "No Smoking" ban and about a VAT increase of 7 years ago.</p> <p>I understand that while it is generally accepted that the smoking ban did have an adverse affect on "Drinking Men"s" pubs, those which were more food and family oriented were able to benefit. The Three Horseshoes fits into the latter category, and the ban will have had little neagtive impact, if any at all, while offering positive opportunities.</p> <p>If I am wrong I stand corrected, but I thought that the 2011 VAT increase was from 17.5% to 20%, not from 15% to 20%. So, unless beer sales enjoyed a reduced rate, the increase on a £3 pint of beer was all of 6p. Even if the rate was 15% the increase was only 13p. That minimal level of increase, particularly when coupled with the removal of the duty escalator 3 years later will have had absolutely no impact on the pub, and this is yet another attempt to mislead by the applicant.</p> <p>It is claimed that strenuous marketing efforts were made. I have to say that I didn"t notice any.</p> <p>One final point on the barrelage figures is that they show that the entire reduction is due to the management of the last tenants. As we are not party to the other figures we cannot comment, but again the period they cover is solely that of the tenancy of the last tenants, so again everything the figures show is their responsibilty alone.</p> <p>Andrew McGowan.</p>
	Mr. Andrew McGowan
	3, Steepe Way, SN8 3AX
Date:	29.06.2018

Case Officer:

Jonathan James