



## RECORD OF DECISION

***To be completed and signed before Members return to open session to announce their decision.***

## **RECORD OF DECISION: APPLICATION UNDER LICENSING ACT 2003**

Premises Licensing Sub-Committee  
Date: 15<sup>th</sup> September 2025

Members:

1. Cllr Moore
2. Cllr Lokhmotova
3. Cllr Blackburn-Horgan

**Cllr Moore was elected as Chair.**

To consider the application of **Golden Direction Property Limited** dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2025 in regards to the premises **The C Bar, 1A Devonshire Road, Cambridge, CB1 2BH** for a licence to provide the following licensable activities:

Supply of Alcohol (for consumption on the premises)  
- Monday to Saturday between the hours of 11:00 and 22:30.

We heard representations from the following persons:

Cambridge Constabulary

- Application is of poor quality and does not allow responsible authorities to make an informed decision.
- Alex Beebe, a licensing officer, emailed on 6<sup>th</sup> June, asking for further information. He did not receive any reply.

- It is also unclear what the applicant wants to do with the premises. Application states premises is a wine bar, but the plan does not reflect this.
- It has been confirmed that part of the premises is within the CIA.
- Limited conditions have been offered and does not demonstrate how it would uphold the licensing objectives or not add to the cumulative impact of the area.
- There is no dispersal policy proposed, or consideration as to minimising the cumulative impact.

#### Public Health

- The view of public health is that the application sits within the CIA area.
- CIA policy; rebuttal presumption.
- There has been no consideration of the CIA and cumulative impact.
- The Application fails to provide sufficient conditions to promote the licensing objectives.
- There have been no further representations or consideration of the cumulative impact.
- Latest data: 74 licensing premises already in the area.
- Objection principally on CIA area.
- Following a question from Cllrs, expanded to confirm that the expectation for such an application would be a much fuller proposal including conditions. There is no confidence in their knowledge or competence as a licence holder.
- Following a question from Cllrs, noted the expectation that there should have been engagement from the Applicant with responsible authorities prior to the sub-licensing committee meeting. This is aggravated by the adjournment in which no communication has been received.

Environmental Health did not make representations but agreed conditions with the applicant.

The reason you appeared before the Sub-Committee:

You applied for a premises licence, on the 21 May 2025, pursuant to section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003. That application required determination by the Licensing Sub-Committee due to representations received by two Responsible Authorities: Cambridge Constabulary and Public Health (Cambridge County Council).

The Sub Committee had to decide whether to grant your application for a premises licence, and if so whether to impose conditions.

In making our decision we considered the following:

*List:*

*Statutory provisions (Licensing Act 2003)*

*Statutory Guidance*

*Cambridge City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy*

## *Reports*

*Advice from Legal Officer*

*Representations from Public Health and Cambridge Constabulary*

*Evidence from Applicant (written), Cambridge Constabulary (written and oral) and Public Health (written and oral).*

We found the following facts: **(give full and detailed reasons)**

- The Application did not provide sufficient detail for the licensing authority to be able to determine the application.
- The Plan provided does not provide sufficient detail or reflect the application; there is no established licensable area or bar area.
- The Applicant does not demonstrate sufficient skills, knowledge or competence to uphold the licensing objectives.
- The addition of a licensed premises would add to the cumulative impact of the area.
- The Application is not supported by Cambridge Constabulary or Public Health.
- The Premises falls within a cumulative impact assessment area. Despite the address of the application being on Devonshire Road, the main door to the premises is on Mill Road and we therefore consider the premises to fall within the Cumulative Impact Assessment area.
- There has been minimal engagement by the Applicant with the Environmental Health team. There has been no engagement or response to Cambridge Constabulary, despite clear knowledge of the requirement to do so. Further, we found that a telephone call had been received from the Applicant to the Licensing Officer acknowledging the expectation that they would engage prior to the adjourned hearing taking place. This demonstrates, in our mind, a lack of appreciation for the importance of the licensing objectives and this procedure. This is compounded by the Applicant's lack of engagement with this application and demonstrates a poor approach adopted by the Applicant and is not conducive with the mindset we expect of licence holders.

Our reasons for this are:

We carefully considered the written and oral evidence before us and placed weight on the evidence which could be tested. The Applicant's failure to attend the hearing meant that we could not clarify, expand or challenge any aspect of their evidence. As such, we placed lesser weight upon it.

The evidence provided by the Police and Public Health demonstrates that the area has a significant number of licensed premises already in situ and their evidence (which was unchallenged by the Applicant) was that this would add to the cumulative impact.

The minimal engagement was established via questions to Licensing Officers and Responsible Authorities.

The Application is particularly light and does not address fully any of the Licensing Objectives or the CIA.

Our decision is as follows:

**That the application be refused.**

Our reasons for reaching the decision are as follows: **(give full and detailed reasons)**

- There was insufficient detail provided in the application to allow us to properly consider granting it on paper, with or without conditions.
- The Plan provided did not include sufficient detail to allow the licensing authority to determine the application.
- The Applicant failed to engage with the Licensing Authority and Responsible Authorities (notwithstanding the agreed conditions proposed with Environmental Health). This included, where a further adjournment allowed additional time for engagement.
- The Panel feel that on the evidence, the Applicant is demonstrated as not possessing the required skills, experience or competence to uphold the licensing objectives.
- There is insufficient evidence to satisfy the Panel that the granting of this application would promote the licensing objectives. We felt that there were no conditions proposed to protect children from harm and no engagement with the conditions proposed by Public Health. For example, there is no challenge 25 and no proposed control measures for children in the premises (particularly, when noting the current plan and building structure). In addition, we felt that there was no evidence provided to promote any of the licensing objectives, including prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.
- The premises is within the Cumulative Impact Assessment area and is subject to the rebuttal presumption. The onus is on the Applicant to demonstrate that their application will have no impact on the promotion of the licensing objectives and will not result in an increase in the

cumulative impact of the area. We are not satisfied that the Applicant has demonstrated in their operating schedule that the grant of the application will not result in an increase in the cumulative impact of the area.

- We note that the Police and Public Health did not support the application.

*Signed Councillor R Moore, 15/09/25*  
*Councillor N Lokhmotova, 15/09/25*  
*Councillor I Blackburn-Horgan, 15/09/25*

The applicant or those who made a relevant representation has the right of appeal to a Magistrates Court within 21 days from the date of this decision notice by contacting:

Cambridgeshire Magistrates Court, The Court House, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1ED.

This page is intentionally left blank