

Name and address:

Contact Details:

Representation: As the owners of the flat above the premises we object to this licence application on grounds of public nuisance. The internal walls and ceilings separating the restaurant and the living premises do transfer noise between the two and an increase in alcohol consumption will lead to an increase in noise. There are two bedrooms directly above the restaurant, only separated from it by regular internal ceiling insulation. One bedroom is directly above the entrance to the restaurant, so drunk people leaving could be an issue, as are any loud customers using the outdoor seating at the front. We do understand that in the case of no licence being granted, the owners could allow customers to bring their own alcohol. We would consider this preferable for several reasons: * If the restaurant sells alcohol, customers are more likely to have a drink or two after finishing their meals thus increasing alcohol consumption and potentially noise. * If a licence is granted, this could be transferred to another party at a later stage. We understand that a condition in the licence could prevent this, but how would this be enforced? La Cucina de Nonna was incorporated in February 2025 and it would be very easy for the owner to pass on the company and therefore the licence to another person.

Name and address: [REDACTED]

Contact Details: [REDACTED]


Representation: RE: OBJECTION TO PREMISES LICENCE APPLICATION – TASTE OF SICILY, 106 CHERRY HINTON ROAD, CB1 7AJ Note: I request that this representation is not publicly published. I request that my personal details are kept confidential and not made publicly available. I am writing to formally object to the Premises Licence application for Taste of Sicily, located at 106 Cherry Hinton Road, CB1 7AJ, as I am a resident living [REDACTED]. My primary concern lies with the potential increase in noise levels, public nuisance and disturbances resulting from the granting of a Premises License to the property. The noise which transfers between the premises of 106 to [REDACTED] already leads to considerable noise disturbance from music and from staff/customers onsite. [REDACTED]. Prior to renovation of the premises at 106 in 2023 (when Sunset Lounge took over operations at the premises) I experienced much less noise disturbance. However, since these renovations were carried out noise disturbance has significantly increased: if there has been any attempt at all to sound proof the premises it is very ineffective. The renovation and illegal extension of the property also led to large extractor fans being placed outside [REDACTED] and has been the source of intolerable noise. As such, disturbance is already occurring before any licence has been granted and this is likely to be exacerbated with the granting of the license with music and alcohol sales (associated with likely raised or rowdy voices) having a very detrimental impact on the ability to live restfully in any of the rooms in the flat above the premises. [REDACTED]. Furthermore, it is my belief that there may be connections between the new operators of Taste of Sicily and the previous owners of Sunset Lounge. This is certainly a concern, given the ongoing issues that myself and other residents endured whilst Sunset Lounge was in operation and the businesses lack of engagement with the Council and residents and disregard for issues raised including noise complaints and legal operations. During this time, Sunset Lounge frequently operated outside of their permitted hours. This had an extremely significant negative impact on the well-being of local residents. I think it is very important that the Council takes this into consideration and prevents further intolerable behaviour at 106 Cherry Hinton Road, including the refusal of a Premises License to the property. Continuing alcohol sales and the granting of a Premises Licence to the premises is likely to exacerbate the existing problems, further compromising my quiet enjoyment of my residence. The association of alcohol with increased noise levels and potential unruly behaviour poses a direct threat to my well-being and that of local residents in a mostly residential area. In light of these significant and ongoing concerns, I strongly urge the relevant decision makers to not grant a Premises licence to Taste of Sicily due to the detrimental effects outlined above.

Name and address: Councillor Karen Young

Contact Details:

Representation: Dear Council, I would like to object to this licensing application. The residents in the properties to the rear of this property are extremely concerned about the possible noise coming from the premises directly to their gardens. None of the concerns previously raised relating to a previous licensing application at the same premises appear to have been addressed and therefore the problems remain. This this application is directly in contravention of the licensing objective of protecting the health and wellbeing of the public.

Name and address: Councillor Blackburn-Horgan

Contact Details: 

Representation:

Application for license - Number 288124 - 106 Cherry Hinton Road Cambridge CB1 7AJ

Objection – Cllr Immy Blackburn-Horgan

An objection to this license is raised within the 4 licensing areas and outlined within the Licensing Act 2003, and sits alongside Cambridge City Councils own Licensing policy and planning regulations due to change of use of this premises with the restaurant with alcohol use creating a mixed use at the property which requires planning permission as may not fit with its registration as was Class E and has this been amended and approved?

IAS (2023) wants to see licensing support diverse, inclusive and sustainable communities, without undermining local areas and putting undue pressure onto the public sector. Alcohol is used and enjoyed by many, but it can also be the cause of significant social and personal problems; licensing should have a key role to play in addressing and preventing many of these problems.

A leaseholder can submit a planning application to vary planning conditions for Council consideration.

Due to outstanding planning enforcement actions on the premises should this not been completed prior to a licensing application and decision?

I am raising an objection to the application for an alcohol license to 106 Cherry Hinton Road because the licensing objectives including preventing crime and disorder and public nuisance do not appear to be demonstrably met.

I am raising an objection to the extended opening hours to 11 pm as the premises sit underneath and within a residential area and does not appear to provide mitigation to ensure public safety and the protection of children from harm.

[the prevention of crime and disorder](#)

How many table covers does the restaurant have, ensuring appropriate limits on the maximum capacity of the premises and to be economically viable and not to attract any crime and disorder?

Is there balanced adequate lighting to keep those leaving safe with increased comings and goings whilst not to be so bright as to disturb residents and cause light pollution?

Residents are concerned that failure to consider the wider circumstances of this application places risk on residents to deal with the noise and nuisance consequences of this venue operating in a residential area, overspill of people, noise, cars until 11pm with flats situated above this restaurant. That it does not fit within the purple flag accreditation for safety of visitors and residents.

Is smoking allowed on the premises if not will this overspill happen in the residential streets, could this impact on public safety?

Do residents many families and elderly vulnerable not have the right to quiet enjoyment of their home?

The opening times on the application do not relate to the previous hours at these premises, was there a reason why 10pm was enforced? If yes, is this still applicable?

- *Planning permission reference C/94/0056, which restricts the opening hours of the above premises to between 0700 and 2200 hours.*

It is also not clear why, in a residential area, that additional hour of operating 7 days a week has been requested. As previous licensing recognised the negative impact on the area and potential risks to harm for children and families living near by.

IAS (2023) states "Late night opening has spread crime and disorder back into the early hours, causing significant problems for the police. Most police forces had to rearrange their shift patterns and allocate increased resources to the night time economy to address this change."

Parking is a key creator of Anti-Social Behaviour in Cambridge and with this venue abutting and within residential roads attenders of the premises are likely to choose to park on the residential roads not the main road where there is limited legal parking, creating late-night noise and risks to residents (there is evidence of these ASBs by another new business on CH Rd, by the Rathmore Club and at the previous business at this address where a Police inspection and raid was undertaken, fly tipping occurred, broken glass was found outside and in the streets).

[public safety](#)

How is the premises ensuring appropriate access for emergency services such as ambulances with this current frontage and no access at the rear due to building under a demolition order?

How is the premises ensuring the safety of people when leaving the premises (for example, through the provision of information on late-night transportation) and not using the residential areas for this disturbing young child in the vicinity?

What other measures are being taken to aid the prevention of crime and disorder, to ensure public safety, to prevent public nuisance and to put in place measures for the protection of children in this residential area from harm? By extending the hours M-Sun 7 days a week could extend the public nuisance concerns of families living near by with young children.

How is the applicant resourcing, implementing and reviewing their impact on the neighbourhood and how effective are their plans/procedures?

If the business is open 11-11pm when will deliveries and other business-related tasks take place, will staff leave later than 11pm and what impact might this have on the residents and their children living nearby?

How will appropriate and frequent waste disposal be put in place, particularly of glass bottles without causing parking stress? There is serious issue at another business nearby due to parking stress overspilling onto the pavement and Cherry Hinton Road, being addressed currently, one would not want 106 CH Rd to exacerbate this further.

How is it planned to demolish the extension whilst operating as a business, and what risk assessments have been carried out and is a project plan in place to mitigate for noise and disturbances to the neighbourhood?

Do the floor plans of the current application involve the extension or is it only covering the legally allowed section of the building?

Therefore, how will it be ensured that the to be demolished section is not used at all?

How will it be ensured that no restaurant goers will use the external land behind the to be demolished extension and ensure no disturbances at any time to nearby residents and their young children?

The to be demolished extension directly abuts residential family housing and is surrounded by residential properties.

A previous HM Planning Inspectorate report into a proposed late-night takeaway use for this property refused the application, concluding:

"Residents of the area should be free from unnecessary disturbance at times when they should enjoy a greater degree of peace and quiet." Has a subsequent planning application been submitted and approved?

[the prevention of public nuisance](#)

The "alcohol boundary" on the plans, how will it be ensured that the to be demolished section is not used at all?

Do the plans submitted with the demise of the property require further review?

What is the ramp at the front and room this leads into?

As are the toilets and store room within the original demise of the property or are they contained in the extension to be demolished?

Are the premises and toilets accessible to those with disabilities or wheelchair bound?

I also cannot see the fire exit or fire extinguishers on this plan please advise.

The plan should be 1:100 yet is submitted 1:50 which makes the demise of the restaurant in this license application unclear.

How will it be ensured that no restaurant goers will use the external land behind the to be demolished extension to drink alcohol, smoke, be in groups hanging out creating disturbances at any time to nearby residents and their young children?

How is this extension to be blocked off and how will this not be used?

How is the "alcohol boundary" going to work in practice?

What resources are being put in place to ensure all the above is upheld and review its effectiveness?

The policy also requires that measures are followed for example:

Applicants should consider to control noise nuisance from the premises and will there be no music disturbances from the recorded music e.g.

- should include sound limitation devices

- should include acoustic lobbies

- should include acoustic double glazing

- should include noise insulation

- should ensure non-amplified allowing only acoustic music.

Where in the application have these required measures been demonstrated?

The key licensing objective is to preventing public nuisance.

What measures are being taken?

[the protection of children from harm.](#)

The application for an alcohol license is in a premises that intends to run up to 11pm Mon - Sun .

This is inappropriate as it has flats above, is adjacent to and in a predominantly residential area with many family homes with young children.

Cambridge City Council outlines protections it applies for residents in its licensing policy

'Stricter conditions on noise control are likely to be imposed in the case of premises that are situated in predominantly residential areas.'

This business abuts a family residential property and sits within a family residential area, a license for alcohol until 11pm weekdays does not support the Councils Community Safety Partnerships aim to work proactively to stop Anti-Social behaviour and nuisance noise.

IAS (2023) states "There is a need to protect wider environment in which alcohol is licensed, so it does not unduly undermine society and lead to health and social hazards."

Name and address: Upper Rock Road Residents Association

Contact Details: [REDACTED]

Subject: Formal Objection to Licensing Application on Grounds of Public Nuisance

We submit this formal objection to the licensing application for the premises in question on the grounds of public nuisance. The concerns outlined below substantiate why no licence should be granted under the present circumstances.

We also strongly object to the late modification of the licence application, giving no chance for the residents to respond.

We also know that the council and the police have been trying to contact the freeholders- without success.

The police cannot fully assess the prevention of crime and disorder until this has been done.

Given the above, we would like to formally request a postponement of the decision to allow us sufficient time to revise our response and for the police to have time to make a full assessment.

Summary of objections on the grounds of public nuisance.

Non-Compliance with Planning Conditions

The licensing application does not align with the planning conditions set for the *entire* premises. A copy of these conditions, which govern the entirety of the premises and not merely the extension, is attached for reference. Planning restrictions are in place, forbidding opening beyond 10 pm. The Council's policies are unequivocal in stating that licensing decisions must not contradict planning decisions:

We appreciate your recent correspondence stating that the application has been amended to comply with existing planning constraints.

It would be inappropriate to consider a licence application that violates planning laws, and the applicants should be informed in advance that such an application would be dismissed.

The following text comes from your guidelines in this matter.

<https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/alcohol-and-entertainment-licence-guidance>

Planning considerations

*Please identify the current lawful use of the premises in planning terms and any relevant conditions attached. A licensing application must only be made if the premises is or will be operating lawfully in planning terms and all conditions imposed on a permission or planning obligation have been or are being complied with. **In particular, hours must not exceed those authorised by planning permission.***

If you are applying for a licence which would be in variance with a planning condition or planning obligation, for example, a change in opening hours, you would need to contact the planning department with a view to obtaining planning permission to vary or remove the original condition or to seek a variation in a planning obligation.

The Extension and Associated Disturbance

The extension is directly relevant to this application. For instance, the extraction equipment installed as part of the extension has been a persistent source of intolerable disturbance. This issue was a matter of serious concern in the previous licensing committee deliberations. The equipment remains operational and continues to violate legal planning and building control regulations.

Opaque Business Relationships and Licensing Risks

The Council's planning team has confirmed the clear linkages between Sunset Lounge (Roxanna Lounge Ltd) and Taste of Sicily. Both businesses share social media accounts, and Sunset Lounge staff are frequently at the site in an apparent operational capacity. Furthermore, Roxanna Lounge Ltd sublets the premises lease to Taste of Sicily despite being in the process of a winding-up order from Companies House.

There is a significant risk that once a license is granted, the interconnected nature of these businesses will become evident—at which point, revocation will be substantially more challenging.

The current leaseholders, Roxanna Lounge Ltd, have demonstrated a history of regulatory and legal non-compliance, including police raids, illegal alcohol sales, noise disturbances, and unauthorised late-night activities. This track record offers no assurance to the Council or residents that public nuisance will not persist should a license be granted.

Reference to email correspondence from Paul Ryder, Environmental Health and Licensing Support Officer.

We want to make the following points where we disagree strongly.

The suggestion that granting a licence to a premise that does not sell alcohol will lead to less public disturbance is highly concerning.

It is also extraordinary to think that granting an alcohol licence will improve compliance with regulations.

As noted in the previous application, the previous applicants - linked to the current applicants as confirmed in detail by Alistair Furge at planning - appeared to show scant regard to imposed conditions or regulations.

Were a licence to be granted - in the future hours, of course, may be changed in further applications - a Rubicon has been crossed.

Not having a licence would mean that they would rely on a corkage fee - it does not logically mean that alcohol consumption would be less regulated or more of a disturbance to local residents.

On the contrary, granting a licence is highly likely to increase alcohol consumption.

There should be an explicit prohibition on the sale and consumption of alcohol in the rear outdoor space.

As noted previously, planning has informed us that residents must police any activity on site and record any breaches and be prepared to appear in court (we can forward this email if required). This is unacceptable.

We remain firmly of the opinion that the Council **should not grant an alcohol licence for this premises without a thorough and appropriate consultation** process. As was the case during the previous licence application for this site, representations were made at a public meeting to assess the potential implications of granting such a licence.

You have stated: *"We are more than happy to propose additional conditions should they be requested."*

In response, we would like to raise the following points for consideration:

1. Licence Transfer Restrictions

We would urge the licensing authority to consider imposing a condition that, should a licence be granted, it must not be transferrable in the event that the applicant ceases trading. In such a case, the licence should automatically lapse. We understand that this may fall within the provisions of Section 47 of the Licensing Act 2003 relating to Interim Authority. This section stipulates that a premises licence remains in effect only while the licence holder continues to operate the business. In cases of death, mental incapacity, or insolvency, an interim authority may be granted for up to two months to allow licensable activities to continue while a transfer is arranged.

Nonetheless, a clear, non-transferability condition should be applied in this case to avoid future ambiguity or misuse.

2. Control of Recorded Music Under the Music Act

We understand that recorded music is permitted under a premises licence to sell alcohol, but specific conditions can be imposed to restrict this. There are precedents in the city of licensed premises located in residential areas where conditions prohibit the playing of music entirely. We strongly support the inclusion of a condition preventing any recorded or live music at the premises, given the proximity to residential dwellings.

3. Use of Outdoor Space

We also agree that a condition should be imposed preventing the use of the rear outdoor area for any purpose related to alcohol consumption or music (live or recorded). This is a critical measure to ensure the residential amenity of neighbouring properties is preserved.

4. Planning

The extractor fan issue is relevant to the licence application and is not just a planning issue; it is a public nuisance issue. To quote from the principal compliance officer:

"The direct action proposed involves the demolition of all the rear extensions which were constructed without planning permission, this includes the single storey rear extension containing the new toilets and the extractor flue. Following demolition, I would imagine that the premises would be unable to operate until replacements had been approved and constructed."

These are part of the boundary and drawings for the licence application; therefore, this is relevant to our objection.