

LICENSING COMMITTEE

17 January 2011
9.30 am - 5.20 pm

Present: Councillors Rosenstiel, Saunders and Znajek

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

11/5/lic To appoint a Chair for the meeting

Councillor Stuart chaired the Bun Shop and Greene Room hearings, and Councillor Rosenstiel chaired the Cyprus Kebab House hearing.

11/6/lic Declarations of Interest**11/7/lic Licensing Sub-Committee Procedure****11/8/lic Application to vary Premises licence: The Bun Shop, 1 King Street, Cambridge**

Attending for applicant

For TLT solicitors – Sarah Le Fevre, Counsel

The Business Relationship Manager for Punch Taverns Ltd

The Partner/DPS for the Bun Shop

A representative of LAP Architects

Officers

Yvonne O'Donnell – Environmental Health Manager

Christine Allison – Licensing Manager

Carol Patton – Solicitor

Martin Whelan – Committee Manager

The Licensing Manager presented her report and outlined the application. She stated that the Council, as the licensing authority had received an application for a variation of the Premises Licence for “The Bun Shop” 1 King Street, Cambridge

The Hearing was to consider one interested party's representation. The Licensing Manager advised the Panel of the decision-making options available

to them. The Sub-Committee were also advised the premises were located in a Cumulative Impact Area.

The Licensing Manager explained that the interested party was not attending the hearing. The Licensing Manager advised that interested party had submitted a response in writing, which was circulated with the agreement of all parties, and outlined concerns regarding building works and installation of televisions/speakers on the party wall.

The Licensing Manager advised that the planning department had confirmed that any changes to the exterior of the building would require planning permission. In response to a question from the sub committee the applicant confirmed that they had received planning permission for the installation of the external food lift.

The representative of the applicant addressed the committee and outlined the nature of the proposed changes. The sub-committee were advised that it was intended for the venue to focus on food and real ale. The applicant confirmed that no televisions, speakers or similar equipment would be installed on the party wall.

The sub-committee made the following comments to the applicant

- i) Clarification was sought on the location and relationship with the passageway next to the venue. The applicant confirmed its location and relationship to neighbouring buildings.
- ii) It was suggested that the increased floor space could arguably result in an increase cumulative impact. The applicant challenged the suggestion in relation to the venue, but accepted that it could be argued.
- iii) The nature of the first floor was questioned. The applicant confirmed that the first floor would be for dining only, with a single ground floor bar.
- iv) The applicant was asked whether a challenge 21 or challenge 25 policy would operate. The applicant advised that it was Punch Tavern policy to operate a challenge 21 policy.

Following a discussion on the accuracy of the plans submitted with the agenda papers, all parties agreed to use the plans supplied by the applicant.

The Licensing Manager advised that the mandatory conditions would also be added to licence if granted.

All parties were given an opportunity to sum up and the meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:19 am.

Resolved

The Sub Committee resolved to grant the variation to vary the interior layout of the premises for the following reason,

- i) The Sub Committee decided to grant the application because the variation will not add to the cumulative impact in the area and will only vary the internal layout in order to shift the focus of the business to food and dining. No representations were received from the police or interested parties regarding the cumulative impact of the application and the Sub Committee decided that there was no basis for refusing it.

11/9/lic Application for a new Premises licence: Cyprus Kebab House, Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge

PRESENT FOR THE HEARING

ATTENDING FOR APPLICANT

Adem Ozkurtulus

Mr O Ugur

ATTENDING FOR INTERESTED PARTIES

Roger Crabtree – Chair, Rustat Neighbourhood Assn & also representing Rathmore Rd and Cherry Hinton Road Residents Association

Officers

Yvonne O'Donnell – Environmental Health Manager

Christine Allison – Licensing Manager

Carol Patton – Solicitor

Martin Whelan – Committee Manager

The Licensing Manager presented her report and outlined the application. She stated that the Council, as the licensing authority had received an application for a variation of the Premises Licence for “Cyprus Kebab House, Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge”.

The Hearing was to consider representations from interested parties and responsible authorities. The Licensing Manager advised the Panel of the decision-making options available to them. The Sub-Committee were also advised the premises were located in a Cumulative Impact Area.

In response to a question from the sub-committee, the Licensing Manager reminded members that planning and licensing operated independently from each other.

The applicant addressed the committee in support of his application. The applicant agreed to accept all conditions suggested by the Police and Environmental Protection. The applicant highlighted the reasons for applying for the variation and confirmed that he understood that the planning permission didn't permit opening later than 11:30pm.

The sub-committee asked the following questions

- i) Would the Kebab House be offering a delivery service? The applicant advised that they wouldn't.
- ii) How long had the venue been opened? The applicant confirmed that the venue had only been open for 3 months.

PC Sinclair addressed the sub-committee on behalf of the Chief Constable and outlined the concerns of Cambridgeshire Police. The concerns were summarised as

- i) The operating schedule was insufficient to negate the concerns which had been outlined in the representation.
- ii) The location and proposed opening hours of the store would potentially act as a beacon for intoxicated members of the public.
- iii) The proximity of residential properties and the potential for disturbance
- iv) Problems associated with late night refreshment venues.

The sub-committee asked the Police whether they could supply specific evidence of problems related to late night refreshment venues. PC Sinclair advised that due to the way that the statistics were collected this was not possible, but PC Sinclair provided generic information about the problems associated with late night refreshment venues.

Mr Crabtree addressed the committee on behalf of the Cherry Hinton & Rathmore Road and Rustac Road Residents Associations as an interest party and made the following comments.

- i) Support was offered to the position of the Police.
- ii) Substantial concerns were raised about the potential problems which could be associated with late night opening.
- iii) It was noted that the majority of venues in the area closed at 11:30pm. Mr Crabtree also made reference to a recent planning inspectorate decision, which had highlighted the implications on the local community of opening later.
- iv) The committee were encouraged to reject the application.

The sub-committee asked the interested party the following questions

- i) Would there be a different view if the premises operated as a restaurant. Mr Crabtree acknowledged that it may mitigate a number of the concerns raised.

Following a discussion regarding the application form and the definition of "indoor" and "outdoor" the committee agreed to proceed.

All parties were given an opportunity to sum up. The sub-committee adjourned at 11:00 am and reconvened at 11:25 am.

Resolved

The Sub Committee resolved to grant the licence for the hours 23.00 to 23.30 every night subject only to the conditions agreed by the police, environmental protection and the applicant as follows:

The Prevention of Crime and Disorder

1. A digital CCTV system with appropriate recording equipment will be installed, operated and maintained throughout the premises internally to cover all public areas with sufficient numbers of cameras as agreed with Cambridge Police. Images shall be retained for 31 days and made available to the police or authorised officer on reasonable request. The

CCTV images will record and display dates and times, and these times will be checked regularly to ensure their accuracy with GMT.

2. Glassware or bottles are not to be supplied to customers.
Public Safety
3. An incident book is kept on the premises and staff are trained in the completion of this. Incident reports containing the names and details of offenders will be passed to the City Cambac manager.
4. Regular health and safety risk assessments are carried out.
5. Patrons will be asked to leave in the event of a greater number of people congregating within the premises than is conducive to public safety.
6. Patrons will be actively discouraged from congregating outside the front of the premises.
7. Escape routes and exits shall be maintained to ensure that they are clearly identified and are not obstructed.

The Prevention of Public Nuisance

8. All doors and windows will be kept closed at night to prevent noise nuisance.
9. Music will not be played within the premises.
10. Prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at the exit, requesting patrons departing to respect the needs of local residents and to leave the premises and the area quietly. Staff shall monitor exits from the premises at closing times and shall remind any noisy customers to respect the needs of local residents and to be quiet.
11. The licence holder shall provide and maintain a suitable litter bin, within the public area of the premises.
12. If a delivery service is provided delivery drivers are to be instructed to enter and leave their vehicles quietly and considerately, and not to leave engines running, and to park considerately.

13. Patrons who frequent the premises and behave in a disorderly manner or regularly leave in a noisy fashion will be banned.

The Protection of Children from Harm

14. Any children that frequent the premises during the hours when late night refreshment is provided must be in the company of an adult.

The Sub Committee decided that the hours and conditions are necessary to meet the licensing objectives.

11/10/lic Application for a new Premises licence: Greene Room, 42 Hobson Street, Cambridge

Present for Hearing

ATTENDING FOR APPLICANT

James Anderson – Solicitor Poppleston Allen
Stephen Thomas, Director, No Saints Ltd
Lucy Herlihy, Operation Manager, No Saints Ltd

ATTENDING FOR RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES

Jeremy Phillips – Legal Counsel
Insp M. Nichols
Ch Insp D. Sargent
Mr Vincent Chan

Robert Osbourn – Team Leader, Environmental Protection

ATTENDING FOR INTERESTED PARTIES

Keith Willox, Domus Bursar, Sidney Sussex College,
Liam Agate, SSCSU president, Sidney Sussex College
Roger France, Chairman, King St Neighbourhood Assn

Officers

Yvonne O'Donnell – Environmental Health Manager
Christine Allison – Licensing Manager
Carol Patton – Solicitor
Martin Whelan – Committee Manager

James Goddard – Committee Manager

The sub-committee reconvened at 11:40 am after a 15-minute break.

The Licensing Manager presented her report and outlined the application. She stated that the Council, as the licensing authority had received an application for a new premises licence for the Premises Licence for “The Greene Room” 21 Hobson Street, Cambridge

The Hearing was to consider 11 interested party’s representation and 2 responsible authority representations. The Licensing Manager advised the Panel of the decision-making options available to them. The Sub-Committee were also advised the premises were located in a Cumulative Impact Area.

The Licensing Manager advised that there were four documents to circulate. The sub-committee adjourned until 12:50 pm to read the circulated documents.

Applicant

The applicant addressed the sub-committee in support of the application and displayed a large scale plan of the venue. In support of the application the applicant made the following points

- i) The proposed venue would result in £1.6m investment in the city to provide a high quality cabaret style venue, unique in Cambridge aimed at an older clientele.
- ii) The layout of the proposed venue was explained to the sub-committee. It was confirmed that the art deco frontage would be retained.
- iii) An overview was provided on the arrangements for serving drinks and management of the venue. It was noted that the majority of the seats would be pre-booked over the internet, the majority of drinks would be served via waiter/waitress services and that smoking would be made available in the outside areas on the 3rd and 5th floor.
- iv) It was noted the premises had an existing premises licence which could allow the applicant to trade without a new licence, but which would be surrendered on the grant of this application. The reasons for applying for a new licence were explained to all parties. It was explained that the proposed new conditions were significantly stronger than the existing licence.
- v) It was also noted that the venue would operate with a capacity of 350, which was significantly lower than its previous use as a Bingo Hall.

- vi) The applicant also highlighted and explained the drinks policy and the dispersal policy. It was noted that the applicant was confident that the majority of patrons would turn right out of the venue and away from Sidney Sussex and Sussex Street, or would arrange for taxi pick up and wait inside. Entertainment would finish at 12-12.30 and there would be gradual dispersal from 11.30 onwards. The applicant took the view that if their customers were shouting, they would be moving away from the interested parties' locations, and that they were unlikely to use Hobson's passage or Sussex Street.
- vii) The applicant offered as a condition that no happy hour/irresponsible drinks promotions would operate in the venue.
- viii) It was noted that discussions had been entered into with the Police but that no resolution had been achieved, but the applicant highlighted a number of number of suggested changes
 - a. The venue would predominantly operate as a live cabaret venue
 - b. Removed reference to off sales
 - c. No activity which is predominantly customer dancing after 9pm
- ix) The applicant confirmed that there would be 300/350 seats with seats provided for 100% of the customers.

Mr Thomas addressed the sub-committee. The sub-committee were advised of his history in operating a substantial number of entertainment venues and his connection to Cambridge. Mr Thomas made a number of additional points in support of the application

- i) The proposed ethos and operational arrangements for the venue.
- ii) The sub-committee were advised of the access arrangements including the use of bar-codes sent to mobile phones.

The sub-committee asked the applicant the following questions

- i) Would more than one event be scheduled per evening per floor? The applicant explained the dispersal policy and confirmed that not more than one event per night would operate on each floor.
- ii) Clarification was sought on the early evening programme. The applicant advised that the early evening programme would be an AV show, showing music and pictures associated with Cambridge 5 and 10 years ago.
- iii) Will drinks be permitted on the smoking terraces? The applicant advised that following discussions with the Environmental Protection team the layout of the terraces had been altered to prevent noise escape, and that they would trial drinks but only in poly-carbonate glasses. The applicant

confirmed that if there was any issue, drinks would not be provided, immediately.

- iv) How would be entry/exit onto Hobsons passageway be managed? The applicant confirmed that the door would be an alarmed fire door and only used in emergencies.
- v) Clarification was sought on disabled access. The applicant confirmed that the venue was fully accessible, and that a wheelchair lift was “cut” into the external stair to allow entry and exit to the venue.
- vi) Had the taxi collection point been agreed and how would it operate? The applicant confirmed that it would be organised with a taxi firm where they would pick up from. They understood the concerns and would resolve to the benefit of residents.
- vii) The applicant noted the proximity of residential properties including Sidney Sussex and Christ’s College to the proposed venue.
- viii) Clarification was sought on the likely nature of indoor sporting events. The applicant explained that events such as “evenings with” involving a prominent sports people were being proposed.
- ix) What is the size of the dance floor? The applicant reminded the sub-committee of the proposed condition in relation to dancing, and confirmed that the dance was 18sqm. Dancing would occur on ground and second floors. The applicant expressed caution about setting a minimum floor size, in case there needed to be minor changes once the building work was completed.
- x) The arrangements for events other than cabaret were requested. The applicant advised that there was very limited opportunity to significantly reconfigure the interior for different events, but that the application sought flexibility so that events such as private parties could be offered. It was also noted that the basement meeting rooms could be hired out.
- xi) In response to a question regarding challenge 21, the applicant confirmed that a challenge 25 policy would operate if the licence was granted. The applicant emphasised that the venue would be open to under 25s, as long as they met the entrance requirements although it would not be marketed to this age group. The applicant also confirmed the proposed arrangements to prevent under 18s from entering the venue.

A discussion followed regarding the proposed wording of the conditions, specifically 3 and 6. The applicant confirmed that the venue would only be configured to manage a maximum of 350 customers.

The Police asked the applicant the following questions

- i) It was confirmed by the applicant that whilst proposed conditions had been discussed, there had not been an agreement between the Police and the applicant.
- ii) The representative for the Police challenged the assertion that the venues previously managed by Luminar had been free of problems. The applicants advised that he was no longer the owner of the venues mentioned, but outlined the strong working relationship which had existed between his venues and the Police during the period of ownership by Luminar. The Police representative highlighted that in 2008 the venues mentioned, were in the top 6 venues for reported crimes.
- iii) The applicant was questioned on the business model for the venue, particularly how reliant on “wet sales” the model was. The applicant explained that the ticket sales were intended to cover the cost of acts and that the rest of the costs would be covered largely by wet sales. The applicant emphasised that by removing vertical drinking many of the problems associated with other venues, would be removed as it was acknowledged as being a major flashpoint.
- iv) The applicant was questioned on the process for removing licences in the event of problems. The applicant noted the difficulties in removing licences.
- v) The Police questioned the applicant on the reluctance to accept a condition on the age of customers. The applicant emphasised that it was not in his interest for the venue to attract young people aged 18-24.
- vi) The applicant was asked about the long term model for the venue, particularly if the current appeal of burlesque diminished. The applicant advised that he was committed to the venue for the long term.
- vii) The Police queried the difficulty of enforcing some of the conditions principally C2, C3 and C4. The applicant responded to the concerns. The Police representative submitted that the Police were vehemently opposed to the application and that the Sub Committee could only deal with the application before them. The applicant submitted that according to their survey people over 30 were not looking for loud music, and would prefer to enjoy conversation and some “dad dancing”.

. The Police asked the applicant the following additional questions

- i) How often would other activities such as film be offered? The applicant advised that every night they open there would be a show such as sing-along “Sound of Music” or “Breakfast at Tiffanys”.
- ii) What would happen after the cabaret ended? The applicant advised that many of the customers may choose to leave at this point, but facilities for

dancing would also be provided. The applicant confirmed that the music would be at a level to allow conversation.

- iii) The Police questioned the policy of pre-booking, and the reluctance to accept pre-booking only as a condition. The applicant advised that many of the events would sell out in advance, but that they wished to be able to offer to non pre-booked customers. The applicant also Stated that mobile phone numbers would be taken, and phoned and therefore the police could identify anyone attending off the street.
- iv) The Police sought clarification on the charging policy for the venue. The applicant advised that the charging policy would vary on the act, with the cost of the act split between the number of tickets available to calculate the entry price.
- v) The Police asked about the business plan and the % of wet sales. The applicant advised that the business model was based on,
 - a. 26-34% - Admission costs
 - b. 5% - Cloakroom
 - c. 66-74% - most of this revenue would be alcohol related, some food
- vi) The Police questioned the applicant on whether they acknowledge that the business model was very different to the previous use and that the Bingo Club was less of a problem than the applicant's. The applicant disagreed and said that for at least 2/3 years bingo operators had tried to get a younger audience in.

The sub-committee asked the following additional questions

- i) It was suggested that customers should be recommended to use the toilet prior to leaving. The applicant welcomed the suggestion.
- ii) The applicant confirmed that the ownership of a mobile phone was not essential for entry to the venue.

Police Representation

Mr Jeremy Philip introduced the Police representation.

The representative of the Police summarised the statement of Chief Inspector Sargent and Sergeant Drury. The Chief Inspector made the following points

- i) The Community Safety Partnership was expected to make tackling alcohol related violent crime for the next 3 years as part of its community plan.
- ii) The problems associated with the city centre, particularly "pre-loading" and licensed premises were attracting the 18-25 community in large groups. There was an increase on Friday and Saturday nights and

Monday night was now a significant pressure for the Police due to the “international student night”.

- iii) The Chief Inspector was not satisfied that the venue would not have an impact on the area. It would be another venue of 350 people and he could not see how opening another venue would reduce the level of crime and disorder.

The sub-committee highlighted the difficulty of attributing problems to particular venues, and requested the view of the Chief Inspector on this issue. The Chief Inspector outlined the methods employed by the Police including the “last drink” approach and the close collaboration between the Police, A&E and the Licensing section of the Council. The sub-committee also noted the difficulty of quantifying the levels of low level nuisance if they were not report.

The applicant questioned the Police on their representation, and made the following comments

- i) The distinction between alcohol related issues and alcohol related violence was questioned, particularly they as related to separate types of issues. The Chief Inspector explained that the statistics were generated from incident reports, and were the same thing.
- ii) It was suggested that the increased level of policing may result in an enhanced level of incidents being reported, and therefore giving a false impression on the extent of the problem. The Chief Inspector noted the comment, but explained that the offenders would still “be out there”
- iii) The Chief Inspector confirmed that the statistics presented related to the city centre element of the cumulative impact zone, following a request for clarification. There was a discussion regarding crime and incidents. The Chief Inspector noted that whilst the overall number of incidents had increased alcohol related violent had decreased.
- iv) The applicant challenged the assertion that everyone entering the city centre for an evening had the sole intention of getting drunk. The Chief Inspector highlighted the challenges of policing in the city centre, but acknowledged that the comment in the statement was perhaps too strong.

Mr Philips introduced Mr Vincent Chan, and summarised his role and statement. Mr Chan confirmed that he had no further information to offer the sub-committee. The applicant sought clarification on the mapping arrangements.

The sub-committee requested clarification on the methodology for mapping incidents not attributed to a particular address or venue. Mr Chan confirmed

that any incidents without an address would be assigned to the middle of the relevant street. Following discussion it was confirmed that incidents in Hobsons Passage were assigned to one of the neighbouring streets.

Mr Philips introduced Inspector Marcia Nicholls, confirmed her role and summarised her statement. Inspectors Nicholls made the following comments in responses to questions from the Counsel for the police.

- i) Reservations were expressed as to whether the proposed dispersal policy would have the desired effect.
- ii) The Inspector also highlighted that the application did not acknowledge the unique demands on the Police in Cambridge.

The sub-committee requested clarification as to whether the Police could supply evidence of conflict between customers waiting to enter premises in the Market Ward. Insp Nicholls confirmed that there were problems, the Police were already working with the relevant management, but they do have a problem tackling it.

The applicant questioned the assertion that anyone entering the city centre at night, was likely to become a victim of crime. Inspector Nicholls explained that the problems would arise due to the high concentration of licensed premises in the city centre, and that it was not possible to assume that there would be no negative impact. The Inspector confirmed with the applicant that the concept of his application was for customers to be seated and served by waitresses, possibly served with alcohol for 6-7 hours with only canapés to soak up the alcohol, and then customers would leave the premises. There was nothing in the applicant's operating schedule which would mitigate the effects of that arrangement on the city centre. It could not be a mandatory condition of the licence that customers could only depart in prebooked taxis, the Inspector mentioned that there was a lot of disorder currently in the city centre when door staff at premises had to turn hopeful customers away. The Inspector commented that Hobson Street was too narrow for it to be feasible for taxis to pick up customers, and that customers waiting inside the premises would still impact on local people.

The applicant challenged the Police regarding the suggestion that the proposed arrangements for taxis, would result in criminal activity.

The Police also highlighted the following additional points

- i) Other licensed premises may choose to operate less than their licensed hours

- ii) The significant risk of customers leaving the venue and seeking to gain entry (and being refused) to other venues after 2:30 a.m., and the associated problems, which may result as a consequence.
- iii) The lack of evidence to support the suggestion that all customers would exit the premises and turn right.
- iv) The areas of greatest demand and with the greatest risk of alcohol related violent crime.

Following a discussion the prevalence of incidents associated with the taxi ranks, all partners were reminded that the highlighted ranks were outside of the control of the applicant therefore not licensing considerations.

The Inspector also confirmed that the Police did not automatically oppose all applications received within the cumulative impact area.

Interested Parties

4 interested parties addressed the sub-committee and outlined objections to the application.

President of Sidney Sussex College Student Union

The President of Sidney Sussex College Student Union addressed the committee. The representation outlined concerns in relation to

- i) Disturbance for students with accommodation on Hobson Street, there was no specific location for taxis;
- ii) It was hard to accept that all customers would automatically turn right out of the premises.
- iii) The lack of public conveniences and the problems associated with public defecation and urination, likely to increase.
- iv) Queried the presumption that people over 25 would not make a noise;
- v) Incidents involving Sidney Sussex College students being threatened or assaulted were highlighted, and concerns that if the licence was granted the problems would increase.

The Student Union President also acknowledged that the issues also potentially affected students at Christs College.

The applicant challenged the suggestion that one of the entrances, which the interested party had associated with particular problems, was actually currently being used. The Student Union President confirmed that it was in daily use.

Domus Bursar – Sidney Sussex College

The Domus Bursar for Sidney Sussex College addressed the committee. The representation outlined concerns in relation to

- i) Proximity of sleeping accommodation to Hobson Street and the associated potential for problems arising as a result. It was also noted that the college provided accommodation for families with young children. Any differences would make the situation intolerable.
- ii) Public urination, defecation and vomit left in the street/entrances to the college.
- iii) The potential for increased disorder, crime and public nuisance. Potential for problem to arise as a result of issues within and between queues.
- iv) The Bursar declined to accept the suggestion from the applicant that the proposed conditions in relation to noise from customers and taxis were unlikely to be sufficient, he concurred with the views of the Environmental Health Manager regarding noise at the premises, and in relation to noise emitted from the smoking areas he reserved judgement
- v) The Bursar declined to accept the suggestion from the applicant, that the age profile of potential customers would significantly reduce the potential for problems to arise.
- vi) In response to questioning about the alleged prevalence of incidents, the Bursar was questioned on why so few were reported to Police and Environmental Health. He explained that the Police dealt with the top of the pyramid, but there was a whole raft of other issues, low grade, and that as the police were a limited resource it would not be practical to report all incidents, and it would not be an effective use of police time to respond.

The sub-committee adjourned at 3.55 p.m. and reconvened at 4.00 p.m.

Sidney Sussex Head Porter

The Head Porter addressed the sub-committee and made the following representations

- i) The prevalence of existing problems and the potential for increased issues
- ii) The cost of managing the existing issues and the safety implications for his staff and the students of the college. The police were willing to attend but lacked time and resources.

Mr Price

Mr Price addressed the committee on behalf of Mr Roger France and made the following observations

- i) The existing disruption to sleep and the increased levels since the introduction of the Licensing Act 2003.
- ii) High levels of public nuisance including urination, vomiting, and presence of drug related materials and problems associated with motor vehicles.
- iii) Frustration with the current lack of mechanisms to address the problems, and the quality of the advice provided to complainants.

The applicant questioned the level of problems associated with the areas highlighted by the interested party. Mr Price acknowledged the point raised, however highlighted issues with taxis, car radios/doors and other nuisances, which were an issue beyond the immediate vicinity of the premises.

All parties were given an opportunity to sum up.

Resolved

The Sub Committee resolved to refuse the application for the following reasons.

- i) The Sub Committee decided that despite the conditions agreed with Environmental Protection and the further conditions proposed by the applicant, and in light of the relevant representations, which they had read and heard, the application failed to rebut the presumption that the licence should be refused. The Sub Committee decided that if the licence were granted additional cumulative impact would be experienced in respect of two of the licensing objectives, namely the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder.

The Sub Committee decided that the measures proposed by the applicant in the operating schedule together with the suggested conditions, could not guarantee that there would be no additional cumulative impact on one or more of the licensing objectives.

The meeting ended at 5.20 pm

CHAIR