

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meetings held on;
Monday, 22 January 2024 at 12.00 pm on MS Teams, and;
Monday, 5 February 2024 at 9.30 am on MS Teams.

MINUTES

Present: Councillor Patsy Cummings (Chair);
Councillors Nina Degrads and Danielle Denton

PART A

1/22 Appointment of Chair

It was MOVED by Councillor Denton and SECONDED by Councillor Degrads and RESOLVED, to appoint Councillor Cummings as Chair of the meeting.

2/22 Disclosure of Interests

There were none.

3/22 Urgent Business (if any)

There were no items of urgent business.

4/22 Licensing Act 2003 - Application for a Variation To a Premises Licence at 83-84 High Street, South Norwood, SE25 6EA

The Chair outlined the procedures for the Licensing Hearing in line with the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's protocol. The applicant Thomas Kering, the applicant's agent Robert Sutherland and the two parties who had submitted representations Faith Oswell-Jones and Jenny Patel were all present. The Licensing Officer advised the Sub-Committee the application was for a variation to a premises licence at 83-84 High Street, South Norwood, SE25 6EA. The process for a variation application and the ability for responsible authorities and 'other persons' to raise representations was summarised.

The Sub-Committee was advised that the application sought an extension to the current premises license which had been granted in late 2022. The application was for an extension to the terminal hours for the playing of recorded music, the provision of late-night refreshment and the sale by retail of alcohol, Sunday to Thursday 11.00pm to 12.30pm, Friday and Saturday until 2.00am and each bank holiday, the day preceding a bank holiday, Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve until 2.00am. It was noted there had been an amendment by the applicant following discussions with the police licensing officer to attach the conditions detailed in Appendix A3, this included a reduction to the permitted hours sought. The conditions attached to the current premises license would remain in effect if the variation was granted. In response to questions from the Committee, officers advised a licence at the address had been revoked previously however the applicant had not been the premises licence holder at the time.

The first objecting party was given the opportunity to speak. Faith Oswell Jones advised:

- They were a local resident living close to the premises.
- The premises had previously been a Natwest bank and Oceanic Bar.
- They believed whilst the licence holder was now different there had been an overall presence of the same person, who could not be on the site of the Jungle Bar during licensed hours.
- They had not had sight of the amended application with conditions.
- There had been a number of incidents with people blocking the pavement outside the Jungle bar with patrons holding drinks outside and smoking.
- There was an alley way to the rear of the premises utilised as a smoking and parking area.
- These issues had been raised with the police licensing team.
- There was music and lighting in the upstairs areas of the premises which had been allocated as being a dining area.
- There was regular loud music which could be heard from outside the premises.
- The upper floors of the premises were residential.
- They did not feel the current license was working well.
- They had had email correspondence with the police about the noise complaints and felt they did not have capacity to deal with the issues.
- The Council's noise pollution team did not have an out of hours service. The complaints were therefore made via email and required residents to submit photographs/videos.
- The premises had blocked the pavement by roping off areas for queues.
- Laughing gas cartridges and smashed bottles and cans were littered outside the premises and around the neighbourhood.
- People leaving the premises caused noise disturbance when returning to their vehicles parked nearby.
- Parking on the high street outside the premises caused traffic congestion.

- The area was residential and the aftermath and litter was having an impact on the local community.
- They believed the current licensed hours were being flouted. There had been previous events advertised as going on until 2.00am with alcohol packages available for purchase.

The Sub-Committee queried whether there had been any differences in the management of the premises since 2022 when the current license was granted. The objector stated there had been no change and the issues cited were in relation to the current license holder. There had been no engagement with the current license holder and residents. Other residents living closer to the premises were impacted by noise nuisance.

The second objecting party Jenny Patel was given the opportunity to speak and described their support for the objections already raised. Their main concerns were regarding the broken glass and laughing gas canisters littering the area. They felt the 2.00 am licence would worsen the situation and the noise pollution due to patrons congregating in the residential roads nearby. Whilst they were supportive of businesses in South Norwood, the night-time venues were impacting local families with young children.

The applicant's agent Robert Sutherland was given the opportunity to speak and advised:

- They refuted the allegations made by the objector regarding the operation of the premises breaching the current licence. Regular meetings with the police and noise pollution team had taken place since 2022 and there had been no operation of the premises outside of the licensed hours.
- The premises licence had been granted previously to establish the premises would be operated in line with the licensing objectives and there had been Temporary Event Notices (TEN) granted for many weekends from July 2023 onwards.
- There had been no objections from the police or noise team regarding this application due to their satisfaction with the licence holder's compliance and there had been no concerns raised by the noise pollution team regarding noise escape from the premises.
- The applicant was in regular contact with their direct neighbours.
- There was a dispersal policy in place which was followed.
- Smoking did not take place outside and drinks were not allowed outside.
- 2-3 smokers were permitted in the smoking area near the alleyway.
- The ground floor was used for table service only.
- Music was played until 11pm unless a temporary event notice was in place. The music was played at level to allow for conversations.
- There had been compliance with the terms of the licence and conditions.
- There were not queues outside the premises.

In response to questions the applicant's agent advised the last regular meeting with the Police Licensing Officer took place in September 2023, these meetings were regarding the operation and compliance of the premises.

The Sub-Committee queried whether there was regular contact between the licence holder and their neighbours. The applicant's agent advised there was contact with the neighbours located above and next door to the premises. These were not structured and the applicant's agent suggested the applicant could set up more formal communications.

The Sub-Committee noted the presence of glass and bottles outside the premises cited by the objectors and queried the premises' cleaning operations regarding this. The Sub-Committee also asked what noise reduction measures were in place at the premises beyond the signage. The applicant advised they were a community establishment and encouraged cooperation between noise team, police and neighbours above. No drinks were allowed outside the premises and security staff monitored this. Before opening the premises, outside in front of the premises was tidy and clean. There were notices at the exits requesting patrons to leave quietly and mind the neighbours, staff and the applicant advised they go outside to regulate noise. There was no loud music or dance floor on the ground floor.

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee the applicant advised:

- The premises was quiet during the week, preparation before opening included cleaning and ensuring the cameras and drinks were operating.
- Parties were only operated when the premises had applied for a TEN until 2.00am, additional security staff were present and the premises worked closely with the party organisers. Events would start closing down at 1.30am-1.45am to encourage people to start leaving.
- Security staff manned the doors at weekends and names were taken for a record of attendees.
- Business during the week was quiet and it was the staff's responsibility to monitor patrons not taking drinks outside. At the weekends two security staff were positioned inside and outside, the smoking area was small and monitored by the inside security staff.
- Food was only consumed on the premises at present, the business was intending to develop its delivery offer until 11.00pm.
- The ground floor of the premises had soundproofing in the ceiling.
- Security cameras installed at the premises had been used to assist the police with an incident in the vicinity of the premises.
- There had been no recorded incidents at the premises since 2022.
- The alleyway was not controlled by the premises and closed at 10.00pm. There was a security camera covering the smoking area.
- Interactions with the police had been in region of 10-12 interactions over the past year regarding compliance and the TENs.

Parties to the hearing were invited to make final comments.

The Licensing Officer confirmed there had been 14 TENs at the premises over the past year. Faith Oswell-Jones advised there had been a noise complaint made in October 2023 by another local resident to the police licensing officer and the email thread indicated this was an issue for the noise pollution team. They had concerns about the numbers of staff and queried the

extension to 2.00 am if food would only be served until 11.00pm. Jenny Patel reiterated concerns around noise nuisance and litter.

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee the applicant confirmed the variation sought to extend the playing of recorded music applied to the basement of the premises only.

The applicant's agent commented that there had been good practice since the original premises license had been granted in 2022. 14 TENs had taken place over the last 12 months where the premises had operated to a later time without concerns from the police or noise team. There had been regular contact with the both the police and noise team and the applicant had met informally with direct neighbours.

The applicant offered a condition to ensure that any litter was swept from outside the premises at the end of each day.

After the hearing the Sub-Committee withdrew to the virtual deliberation room and **RESOLVED to GRANT** the variation to the premises licence. The reasons for this decision are set out in the Statement of Licensing Sub-Committee decision as follows:

LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYDON STATEMENT OF LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE DECISION

The Licensing Sub-Committee considered the Application for a Variation to a Premises Licence at **83-84 High Street, South Norwood, SE25 6EA** and the representations received as contained in the report of the Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery.

The Sub-Committee also considered representations made on behalf of the Applicant by their representative, and representations made by two objectors during the hearing.

The Sub-Committee, having reference to the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, the Revised Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (the Statutory Guidance) and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy 2023-2028, **RESOLVED to GRANT** the Application on the basis that the Sub-Committee were satisfied that it would be appropriate to promote the licensing objectives to do so. The Sub-Committee considered that in particular, the objective of the prevention of public nuisance was relevant in relation to the consideration of the matter.

The reasons of the Sub-Committee were as follows:

1. In respect of the prevention of public nuisance objective, the Sub-Committee noted the importance of focussing on the effect of the licensable activities at the specific premises on persons living and

working (including those carrying on business) in the area around the premises which may be disproportionate and unreasonable, as is recommended by the Statutory Guidance. In this regard the Sub-Committee considered the concerns raised relating to loud music being played regularly on all floors at the premises, breaches of licence conditions, broken bottles, gas canisters and beer cans littering the pavement outside the premises, increased noise levels from customers leaving the premises, and driving away from the premises, and customers blocking the pavement outside the premises. It was suggested by the objectors that complaints had been made in relation to these concerns, and the Sub-Committee noted a complaint had been made to the Police on 20 October 2023, and this had been passed to the Council's Noise Pollution Team, however no representations in relation to the Application had been made by Environmental Health.

2. The Sub-Committee also considered representations made by the Applicant's representative denying any breaches of the licence conditions, and making reference to regular meetings with the Police and the Council's Noise Team, and to a number of Temporary Event Notices in respect of the premises from July to December 2023. The Applicant's representative said that the Applicant was not aware of any concerns about noise, and that the Council's Noise Team had not received any complaints about noise. The Applicant's representative said that the Applicant was in regular contact with residents and neighbours, that there was no smoking and drinking by customers outside at the front of the premises, that a single spinning light had sometimes been used at the ground floor of the premises, and that the sound system was the equivalent only of a domestic music system. There had been unstructured contact with neighbours above and to the sides of the premises, but the Applicant was happy to arrange a more formal meeting, if that was helpful. The sub committee recommends that this takes place and includes local residents beyond the tenants upstairs and to the sides, to help relations with the community.
3. In response to questions by members of the Sub-Committee, the Applicant said that staff and security ensured that customers did not go outside the front or the back of the premises with drinks, that any broken glass was cleared from the front of the premises on a daily basis, and that staff went outside the premises periodically to check that noise levels were appropriate. The Applicant said that there was sound-proofing in the ceiling on the ground floor of the premises. The Applicant said there had been no incidents, and no issues as regards underage drinking. There had been an incident in the High Street and the Police had requested access to camera footage, but this incident was not directly outside the premises. The Applicant's representative said there had been regular, informal contact with the Police, with 10-12 interactions over the last 12 months.

4. The Sub-Committee noted the confirmation from the Licensing Officer that there had been 14 Temporary Event Notices in relation to the premises in 2023. The Sub-Committee also noted an additional licence condition was offered by the Applicant in relation to a daily litter pick in the immediate vicinity of the premises at closing-time.
5. The Sub-Committee were aware and had reference to the Statutory Guidance which provides that, beyond the immediate area surrounding the premises, noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour etc. are matters for the personal responsibility of individuals under the law. An individual who engages in antisocial behaviour is accountable in their own right.
6. The Sub-Committee noted there was no objection to the Application from Environmental Health, which is the main source of advice in relation to the public nuisance licensing objective. The Sub-Committee also noted that no representations had been received from residents living above, and to the sides of the premises.
7. The Sub-Committee noted that there was no objection to the Application from the Police, and noted also that in accordance with the Statutory Guidance the Police should usually be the licensing authority's main source of advice on matters relating to the promotion of the crime and disorder licensing objective. The Sub-Committee also noted that following discussions with the Police Licensing Officer, the Applicant had amended their application to have the conditions attached at A3 of the report placed on the licence if the Application is granted, and also to reduce the extension of the terminal hour for the licensable activities sought by the Applicant.
8. The Sub-Committee also noted there had been a number of Temporary Event Notices in relation to the premises, and no evidence had been provided of any complaints resulting from those events.
9. Having regard to all of the above matters, the Sub-Committee concluded it would be appropriate to promote the licensing objectives to grant the Application.
10. The Sub-Committee wished to thank all participants for engaging with and supporting the hearing.

5/22

**LICENSING ACT 2003 - Application For a Premises Licence at 6
Beddington Terrace, Mitcham Road, Croydon, CR0 3HG**

An adjournment to the Licensing Sub-Committee hearing was requested by Miss Crossfield, of Counsel representing a party who had made

representations. Miss Crossfield stated she had been instructed directly, and that there was an ongoing police investigation of a matter which was connected to the Premises Licence Application. Miss Crossfield said this matter had arisen very recently, and that her client intended to appoint a solicitor, but had not yet done so due to shortness of time. The Sub-Committee heard representations from the Applicant's representative on this request, who requested that the hearing should proceed.

The Licensing Sub-Committee RESOLVED, to adjourn the meeting to 5 February 2024 as it considered this to be necessary to facilitate the receipt of additional information regarding the police investigation, and consequently the full and proper consideration of the representations made by the party concerned, whilst minimising any prejudice to the Applicant arising from the delay in determining their Application.

The meeting ended at 3.05 pm.

The following minutes are from the reconvened meeting of Licensing Sub-Committee on 5 February 2024 at 9.30 am.

Present: Councillor Patsy Cummings (Chair), Councillors Nina Degrad and Danielle Denton.

The Chair opened the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee and advised that it was a continuation of the adjourned Licensing Sub-Committee meeting held on Monday 22 January 2024. It was confirmed that the membership of the Licensing Sub-Committee remained unchanged. The Chair outlined the procedures for the Licensing Hearing in line with the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's protocol.

The applicant Mr Seelan, their agent Mr Nira Suresh, the other parties who had made representations (objectors) Mr Sinnathamby and Mr Shabanathan and Mr Raj Boodhoo legal representative of Mr Sinnathamby were all present. The objecting parties were accompanied by a translator.

The Mr Boodhoo requested an adjournment to the hearing. They advised an update from the Licensing Team had been requested via email regarding the police matter raised at the hearing on 22 January. The Licensing Officer advised the adjournment had been requested on 22 January by Mr Sinnathamby's legal representative due to an allegation that a threat had been made. The adjournment had been granted and the Licensing Team had requested that the objecting party submit any additional information in relation to the matter for consideration by the Sub-Committee in preparation for the hearing on 5 February. The Licensing Team had received an email from the police on the matter and if required this could be discussed in private session.

The Sub-Committee was advised that it was not the role of the council to investigate or provide an update on the allegation made.

The Chair invited the applicant to make representations on the request for an adjournment. The applicant's agent commented that the allegations were false and the applicant had no relationship with the objecting parties. The previous adjournment was noted and they did not wish there to another.

Mr Boodhoo advised the grounds for the adjournment request were that it appeared there was an ongoing police investigation into the allegation and the licence application should not therefore be considered until the matter had been resolved.

Officers advised whilst there had been an update received from the police on the matter, the objecting party who had made the allegation should also have been aware of the status of the matter.

The Licensing Sub-Committee withdrew to a virtual deliberation room to consider the request for an adjournment.

On return to the virtual Licensing Sub-Committee hearing the Chair advised parties present that the Sub-Committee had determined there would not be any further adjournment. The Sub-Committee had already adjourned from 22 January and had received an update from the police that there was no ongoing investigation.

It was not the responsibility of the Licensing Sub-Committee to investigate police matters. The Sub-Committee could only adjourn a hearing where this was "necessary" for their consideration of representations made by a party, and that was not the case here. It was noted that the police as a responsible authority had not submitted representations on the application and that even if the application were granted, the police were able to request a review of a premises licence in certain circumstances.

The right of all parties to appeal a Licensing Sub-Committee decision was noted.

The Licensing Officer advised the Sub-Committee of the process for submitting representations by responsible authorities or other persons (objectors) in relation to the four licensing objectives. The application for consideration was for a premises licence at 6 Beddington Terrace, Mitcham Road, Croydon, for the sale by retail of alcohol off premises Monday to Thursday 8.00am to 11.30pm and Friday and Saturday 8.00am to 12.00am. Following discussions with the police licensing officer the applicant voluntarily amended the application to include the conditions detailed within Appendix A2, this included a reduction to the terminal hours initially sought.

Representations had been received and were included in the report pack at Appendix A3. It was noted that after the 28 day submission window further information could be submitted in support of a parties application or representations. Prior to the hearing on 22 January further information had been submitted by Mr Sinnathamby and this information had been shared with all parties. This was distinguished as further information rather than representations.

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee officers advised the police had engaged with the licence application and because of those discussions the applicant had amended the application to include the conditions now attached to the application including the reduction to the operating hours sought. The police had not made representations on the application and were therefore not a party to the hearing.

The first objecting party Mr Boodhoo acting on behalf of Mr Sinnathamby was given the opportunity to speak and advised:

- The further information had been hand delivered on 21 December and by email on 27 December and was therefore not late.
- If the license were to be granted it would increase alcohol consumption, health and safety issues and impact school children.
- There were already sufficient shops in the area and another would have a negative impact on the community.
- There were 15+ off licences locally.
- A petition had been submitted with 174 local people objecting against the new license to be granted along with a map detailing the postcodes of signatories.
- Requested the Sub-Committee not to grant the application.

The second objecting party Mr Shabanatham, supported by a translator was given the opportunity to speak and advised:

- They experienced anti-social behaviour outside their home with people congregating outside, drinking and leaving litter.
- There was a lot of noise disturbance outside and felt granting another licence would increase the issues.
- There were bottles and litter on the pavement which children had to walk through.
- The noise disturbance also impacted children sleeping.

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee Mr Shabanathan advised:

- Following submission of the petition they had received threats and therefore had not reported the litter or noise disturbance to anyone else.
- They had not reported the issues to the Council before the new licence application.
- He lived 50 yards from the premises.
- The issues had been happening for at least a year and had worsened recently.
- They had made a noise disturbance report to the police in June 2023 and was not aware of any other local residents making reports.

The applicant's agent was given the opportunity to speak and advised the applicant would be promoting the licensing objectives and adhering to the conditions agreed with the police including the reduction in hours sought. It was noted no other relevant authorities were present and had not made

representations. They felt the objections were based on business competition. The litter and antisocial behaviour was not caused by the new applicant or premises and the premises had previously been a food takeaway business. The premises was situated on a busy road with shops mostly serving local residents. The application would comply with the licensing policy of the council and had engaged with the police licensing team. Competition was viewed as positive by providing choice to residents.

In response to questions from the Sub-Committee officers clarified that the premises was not situation in one of the council's cumulative impact areas.

The applicant's agent advised the premises had agreed to ensure no beer/lager/cider above 6.5% would be for sale to discourage high alcohol consumption. The premises intended to operate as a local convenience store. The applicant intended to clean the vicinity of the premises for the benefit of residents. The applicant had held a personal licence for a long time had previously managed a retail premises and the police had no objections.

All parties to the hearing were given the opportunity to make final comments.

The Licensing Officer advised the Sub-Committee:

- Commercial need was not something that could be considered under the licensing act.
- All representations must relate to one or more of the licensing objectives. It was noted that public health was not one of the licensing objectives.
- The petition submitted was not considered as relevant representation in relation to one or more of the licensing objectives as there was no text relating to the licensing objectives included on the document. This had been made clear to the objecting party.
- The premises address did not fall within one of the council's cumulative impact corridors and therefore the Licensing Sub-Committee did not have the presumption to refuse. It was noted that even in a cumulative impact area there was a requirement for concerns regarding the licensing objectives to be submitted about an application and for consideration by the Sub-Committee.
- All further information was available to the Sub-Committee for consideration.
- If the licence were granted and the allegation were to be investigated further and a link proven, the police would be able to seek a review of the decision.

Mr Boodhoo stated that both the objectors being present together was not relevant and should not be taken into account. There had been no issue raised previously about the petition signatures. The petition text was read aloud to all parties present and the Sub-Committee was advised that Mr Sinnathamby had submitted the petition as a layman.

Mr Sabanathan advised the photograph of litter submitted as additional information was taken opposite his residence in close proximity to the proposed shop and the litter was still there.

The Chair advised those present a decision would be communicated to all parties within 5 working days.

The Chair thanked those present for their attendance and participation.

The meeting ended at 10.50 am.

After the hearing the Sub-Committee withdrew to the virtual deliberation room and **RESOLVED to GRANT** the premises licence. The reasons for this decision are set out in the Statement of Licensing Sub-Committee decision as follows:

LONDON BOROUGH OF CROYDON STATEMENT OF LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE DECISION

The Licensing Sub-Committee considered the Application for a Premises Licence at **6 Beddington Terrace, Mitcham Road, Croydon CRO 3HG** and the representations received as contained in the report of the Corporate Director, Sustainable Communities, Regeneration & Economic Recovery, and also further information submitted by an objector.

The Sub-Committee also considered representations made on behalf of the Applicant by their representative, representations made on behalf of an objector by their representative, and representations made by another objector during the hearing.

The Sub-Committee, having reference to the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, the Revised Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (the Statutory Guidance) and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy 2023-2028, **RESOLVED to GRANT** the Application on the basis that the Sub-Committee were satisfied that it would be appropriate to promote the licensing objectives to do so. The Sub-Committee considered that in particular, the objective of the prevention of public nuisance was relevant in relation to the consideration of the matter.

The reasons of the Sub-Committee were as follows:

1. In respect of the prevention of public nuisance objective, the Sub-Committee noted the importance of focussing on the effect of the licensable activities at the specific premises on persons living and working (including those carrying on business) in the area around the premises which may be disproportionate and unreasonable, as is recommended by the Statutory Guidance. In this regard the Sub-Committee considered the concerns raised relating to noise

disturbance, particularly at weekends, in the vicinity of the premises, people congregating and throwing bottles at neighbouring properties, and broken bottles and glass littering the pavement in the vicinity of the premises. In this respect, the Sub-Committee noted the objectors had not made any complaint to Environmental Health, and that no representations in relation to the Application had been made by Environmental Health. The Sub-Committee also noted that an objector had reported noise disturbance to the Police in June 2023.

2. The Sub-Committee also considered representations made by the Applicant's representative to the effect that whilst anti-social behaviour and littering did occur in the vicinity of the premises, these problems did not emanate from the premises themselves, and that no issues about noise and littering from the premises had been raised previously. In this regard, the Sub-Committee also noted that whilst an objector had provided photographs of littering in the vicinity as additional information, it was not established that any littering was attributable to the premises themselves.
3. The Sub-Committee were aware, and had reference to the Statutory Guidance which provides that, beyond the immediate area surrounding the premises, noise nuisance, anti-social behaviour etc. are matters for the personal responsibility of individuals under the law. An individual who engages in antisocial behaviour is accountable in their own right.
4. The Sub-Committee noted there was no objection to the Application from Environmental Health, which is the main source of advice in relation to the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective.
5. The Sub-Committee noted that there was no objection to the Application from the Police, and noted also that in accordance with the Statutory Guidance the Police should usually be the licensing authority's main source of advice on matters relating to the promotion of the crime and disorder licensing objective. The Sub-Committee also noted that following discussions with the Police Licensing Officer, the Applicant had amended their Application to have the conditions attached at A2 of the report placed on the licence if the Application is granted, and also to reduce the terminal hours for the licensable activity sought by the Applicant.
6. The Sub-Committee noted that the petition put forward by an objector did not contain any relevant representations as it did not relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives, and therefore the petition was considered only as additional information.
7. The Sub-Committee also noted that the "need" for further licensed premises in the area, in the sense of commercial demand or otherwise

was not a matter for a licensing authority in discharging its licensing functions. The Sub-Committee also noted confirmation from the Licensing Officer that the premises were not in an area which was the subject of a Cumulative Impact Assessment.

8. The Sub-Committee also noted there was no further evidence presented to them in relation to threats alleged to have been received by one of the objectors, and also noted confirmation from the Licensing Officer that the Police had indicated their investigation into this matter was closed pending any further information coming to light.
9. Having regard to all of the above matters, the Sub-Committee concluded it would be appropriate to promote the licensing objectives to grant the Application.
10. The Sub-Committee wished to thank all participants for engaging with and supporting the hearing.

6/22 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

This was not required.

The meeting ended at 3.05 pm

Signed:

Date:

.....
.....