

445.

From:
Sent: 05 May 2013 10:50
To: Pubs Consultation Responses
Subject: Pubco reform survey - comments
Regarding: Q 5:

I believe that good companies that have tied tenants should be respected for keeping their tenants happy. If the pubco is one that is still a brewer, allowing tenants to effectively not stock any of the landlord's (i.e. the brewing company) own brews by allowing carte blanche to tenants to choose whatever beers they like may well dramatically reduce income to that brewery that, more often than not, may have invested heavily in the fabric and quality of the given pub, and - via such investment - have also kept it as a functioning business, where it otherwise may have closed. However, some mechanism that is far more effective than the guest beer set up, which clearly has been ignored by many landlords, should be enforced.

As an example: in the Hampshire/West Sussex area, many pubs are owned by Fullers, a company that I do support, which has led to both the domination of Fuller's pubs selling only Fuller's beer (many being old brews from Gales, which they took over). Fuller's money and investment has no doubt kept pubs open - that otherwise could have closed - and invested in them to make them attractive, but the complete domination of their beers over others dramatically reduces variety. Fullers should be allowed to manage their business and selling their own brews must be part and parcel of doing so. However, greater variety of beers from other companies must be enforced; I therefore believe that an enforceable compromise should be in place, i.e. to allow Fullers (Green King, Adnams, Wells & Youngs etc) to keep their businesses viable but to reduce the dominance of their own brand brews.

Regards,

(a CAMRA member - not a CAMRA clone!)

This email was received from the INTERNET.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
