

## Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Friday 15 February 2019 at 10.00 am at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02C - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Renata Hamvas (Chair)  
Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle MBE  
Councillor Charlie Smith

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Rebecca Millardship, legal officer  
Wesley McArthur, licensing officer  
Andrew Weir, constitutional officer

### 1. APOLOGIES

There were none.

### 2. CONFIRMATION OF VOTING MEMBERS

The members present were confirmed as the voting members.

### 3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

### 4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

### 5. LICENSING ACT 2003: PANHEAD CUSTOMS ALES, 96 DRUID STREET LONDON SE1 2HQ

The licensing officer presented their report. They advised that the responsible authorities had conciliated with the applicant. Members had no questions for the licensing officer.

The applicant and their legal representative addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the applicant and their legal representative.

The applicant was given five minutes for summing up.

The meeting adjourned at 10.32am for the members to consider their decision.

The meeting resumed at 10.37am and the chair advised all parties of the decision.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the application made by Fourpure Limited for a premises licence to be granted under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Panhead Customs Ales, 96 Druid Street, London SE1 2HQ be granted as follows:

Recorded music (indoors):

- Thursday - Sunday from 12:00 to 21:00:

Supply of alcohol (on and off the premises):

- Thursday - Sunday from 12:00 to 21:00

Operating hours of premises:

- Thursday - Sunday from 12:00 to 21:00.

### **Conditions**

The operation of the premises under the licence shall be subject to relevant mandatory conditions, any conditions derived from the operating schedule in Section M of the application and the conditions agreed with the Metropolitan Police Service and the licensing authority during the conciliation process.

### **Reasons**

The reasons for the decision are as follows:

The sub-committee heard from the licensing officer who was able to confirm that the applicant and the responsible authorities had discussed the concerns which had been raised within the initial report contained within the agenda. He stated that a suite of conditions had been agreed between the parties and that the two responsible authorities, the police and licensing as a responsible authority, had since withdrawn their representations subject to these conditions becoming part of the licence, should the sub-committee grant the application.

The licensing officer finally confirmed that the conditions had been sent through, by email, to the member of the public who had objected to the application. The member of the public had responded, stating that whilst they acknowledged the conditions, their concerns regarding the safety of the area for the residents was compromised by the potential patrons of the premises exhibiting noisy, drunk and disorderly behaviour remained.

The sub-committee heard from the representative for the applicant who emphasised how limited the licence application that had been applied for was both in terms of how many days and hours. He also drew attention to the suite of conditions that had been agreed between the responsible authorities and the fact that the other premises in the vicinity had significantly longer hours over more days, thus this premises would have less of an impact on the area.

The concept behind the premises was explained, namely that the company intends to import from two brewers based in New Zealand and that the premises at Druid Street will act as a base for their 'brand awareness' office. They also stated that there will be a tap room included in this space with the capacity of patrons limited to 150 patrons. The applicant was able to state that the management team for the premises were extremely experienced, with the designated premises supervisor (DPS) having 21 years experience working within bars.

In response to questions raised by the sub-committee, the applicant stated that they would be able to ensure that they comply with the conciliated conditions, most notably the limiting of the number of patrons using the smoking area, by stating that there would be appropriate signage, that staff would be trained to deal with situations and the licensing conditions and finally on their busiest day – Saturday, the SIA staff would be responsible for ensuring compliance.

The sub-committee also wanted confirmation of how the premises would ensure that capacity wasn't breached. The applicant stated that a clicker counter would be used. In the same line of questioning, the applicant was asked about the number of toilets available for patrons. The applicant stated that there was just one disabled toilet available at the moment. The sub-committee expressed concern that the single toilet would not be sufficient for the 150 patrons who may attend the premises. It was noted that the sub-committee felt that it would be more appropriate for a ratio of one toilet for 50 patrons. In response to this issue the applicant stated that there would be scope to add in an extra toilet within the premises.

In making their decision, the sub-committee were very concerned about the adequate provision of toilets. It was noted that there had historically been complaints, made by residents in the area that patrons of other premises had allegedly urinated in resident's gardens. In order to ensure that the premises and the residents do not experience similar difficulties, the sub-committee make clear their recommendation that at least one more toilet be made available to patrons at the premises.

The sub-committee reviewed the written representation made by a local resident alongside the representations made by the applicant and the conditions conciliated with the responsible authorities. They felt that the licensing objectives had been adequately addressed in the conciliated conditions and went as far as possible to remove the risk of incidents such as those raised by the resident in their representations.

In reaching this decision the sub-committee had regard to all the relevant considerations and the four licensing objectives and considered that this decision was appropriate and proportionate.

## **Appeal rights**

The applicant may appeal against any decision:

- a. To impose conditions on the licence
- b. To exclude a licensable activity or refuse to specify a person as premises supervisor.

Any person who made relevant representations in relation to the application who desire to contend that

- a. The licence ought not to be granted; or
- b. That on granting the licence, the licensing authority ought to have imposed different or additional conditions to the licence, or ought to have modified them in a different way

may appeal against the decision.

Any appeal must be made to the Magistrates' Court for the area in which the premises are situated. Any appeal must be commenced by notice of appeal given by the appellant to the justices' clerk for the Magistrates' Court within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the appellant was notified by the licensing authority of the decision appealed against.

## **6. LICENSING ACT 2003: KAYCEES, 92 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD, LONDON SE1 4TP**

It was noted that this item had been withdrawn by the applicant.

The meeting ended at 10.38am.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**