

From: Tahir, Sarah
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 9:11 AM
To: Cryan, Stephanie; Whittam, Kath; Williams, Bill
Subject: RE: RE: LeadBelly's Bar and Kitchen, "Unit C, Montreal House", Surrey Quays Road - LDO = 27/06/2017, 859021
Importance: High

Please note that the LDO is in fact 23/06/2017.

On 5 Jun 2017, at 12:10, Cryan, Stephanie <Stephanie.Cryan@southwark.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Sarah

Can you take my comments from the previous application as my reasons for objecting are the same.

Many thanks

Stephanie

CLlr Stephanie Cryan
Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing
Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward.

Tel: 020 7525 0247
Mob: 07985116251

From: Williams, Bill
Sent: Monday, June 05, 2017 12:13 PM
To: Cryan, Stephanie
Cc: Tahir, Sarah; Whittam, Kath
Subject: Re: LeadBelly's Bar and Kitchen, "Unit C, Montreal House", Surrey Quays Road - LDO = 27/06/2017, 859021

Hi Sarah

My reasons have also not changed from my original objection submission.

Regards

Councillor Bill Williams
Chair of Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Community Council
Assistant Whip
Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward

07985-114-352

Sent from iPhone

From: Cryan, Stephanie stephanie.cryan@southwark.gov.uk

Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 12:10 PM

To: Jerrom, Charlie; Whittam, Kath; Williams, Bill

Subject: RE: Major Variation for Tasti, Unit C, Montreal House

Dear Charlie

I wish to make an objection in respect of the change of licensing hours for Leadbelly's. At the original licensing hearing representations were made by local residents and ward councillors which resulted in a reduction of licensing hours and this application appears to try and redress the decision of the original Licensing sub committee.

The premise is underneath a residential building and there is no precedent of any other shop units in this residential block having opening hours past 7pm. The extension of licensing hours would increase the possibility of noise nuisance and disturbance and is out of keeping within a predominantly residential area. The original hearing took this into account and granted a licence with reduced operating hours. Leadbelly's has only been operating for a few months and the impact of noise in the summer months has not yet been assessed.

I would therefore ask that this application to extend the hours be declined.

Cllr Stephanie Cryan
Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Housing
Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward.

Tel: 020 7525 0247

From: Williams, Bill bill.williams@southwark.gov.uk
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Cryan, Stephanie; Jerrom, Charlie; Whittam, Kath
Subject: RE: Major Variation for Tasti, Unit C, Montreal House

Hi Charlie

I also wish to make an objection in respect of the change of licensing hours for Leadbelly's. At the original licensing hearing representations were made by local residents and ward councillors which resulted in a reduction of licensing hours and this application appears to try and redress the decision of the original Licensing sub committee.

The premise is underneath a residential building and there is no precedent of any other shop units in this residential block having opening hours past 7pm. The extension of licensing hours would increase the possibility of noise nuisance and disturbance and is out of keeping within a predominantly residential area. The original hearing took this into account and granted a licence with reduced operating hours. Leadbelly's has only been operating for a few months and the impact of noise in the summer months has not yet been assessed.

I would therefore ask that this application to extend the hours be declined.

Regards,

Councillor Bill Williams
Chair of Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Community Council
Assistant Whip
Labour Member for Rotherhithe Ward

NOTICE OF DECISION

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE – 27 SEPTEMBER 2016

LICENSING ACT 2003: UNIT C, MONTREAL HOUSE, SURREY QUAYS ROAD, LONDON SE16 7AQ

1. Decision

That the application made by Paul Graham for a premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Unit C, Montreal House, Surrey Quays Road, London SE16 7AQ is granted as follows:

Licensable activity	Hours
Sale & supply of alcohol (on and off premises)	Sunday to Thursday from 09:00 to 22:30 Friday and Saturday from 09:00 to 23:30
Regulated entertainment (recorded music)	Sunday to Thursday from 09:00 to 22:30 Friday and Saturday from 09:00 to 23:30
Operating hours	Sunday to Thursday from 09:00 to 23:00 Friday and Saturday from 09:00 to 00:00

2. Conditions

The operation of the premises under the licence shall be subject to relevant mandatory conditions, conditions derived from the operation schedule highlighted in Section M of the application form and the following additional conditions agreed by the sub-committee:

1. That the capacity of the premises shall be limited to 160 patrons at any one time.
2. That all sales of alcohol for consumption off the premises shall be in sealed containers only.
3. That no more than five smokers shall be permitted to smoke outside at any one time.

3. Reasons

The reasons for the decision are as follows:

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant who informed the sub-committee that there had been a previous licence at the premises but this had been surrendered. They provided a copy of the previous licence for the sub-committee to consider.

The applicant sought to rely on their extensive experience of operating another premises in the area, namely the Mayflower. The designated premises supervisor assured the sub-committee that her six years managing the Mayflower equipped her with the necessary knowledge and experience of the licensing objectives and the local area which would ensure that this was a well run premises.

The applicant acknowledged the representations from the responsible authorities, the ward councillors and the local residents and sought to address these by reducing the hours for which they were applying. They also dealt with concerns raised regarding noise nuisance by explaining to the sub-committee that both deliveries and refuse would be dealt with in the basement car park resulting in minimal noise disturbance. They confirmed that the rear courtyard would not be used at any time and that the exits leading to the courtyard would only be used in emergencies.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer representing the council as a responsible authority. They set out concerns regarding the lack of information provided by the applicant as to how the premises will operate and why the extended hours are necessary for the restaurant and bar. The licensing officer was especially concerned to address this in light of the fact that the hours fall outside of the recommended hours set out in the borough's licensing policy. The officer asked for the sub-committee to consider limiting the hours of supply of alcohol to finish before the terminal hour to allow time for patrons to finish their drinks before they are asked to leave.

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representation from the public health authority officer who sought further information from the applicant as to why the application required off sales of alcohol. They also made representations regarding the extended hours, citing reasons relating to public safety and public nuisance to refuse such early starting times and late finishing hours. They recommended a start time as 11:00 each day and suggested end times in line with Southwark's licensing policy.

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representations from the two ward councillors objecting to the application, who also made representations regarding the long hours. They each stated that the area was a residential area and that whilst they welcomed the application for a restaurant, that concerns relating to noise nuisance coupled with the late hours were of concern. They suggested earlier end times and later opening hours would be a way of limiting the impact on local residents.

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representations from two other persons objecting to the application who stated that they lived in close proximity to the proposed premises. They also stated that they were concerned regarding the lack of information as to how the premises would operate, though the concerns were focused on the long operation hours. They discussed the likely effect of increased anti-social behaviour, noise nuisance and that fact that this is the only operation of its kind in a predominantly residential area.

The licensing sub-committee considered all of the oral and written representations before it and were of the opinion that the applicant sufficiently addressed the licensing objectives and the concerns raised. They were reassured by the applicant's professional record and the information provided about the future business. The licensable hours agreed are in line with the borough's licensing policy.

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

4. Appeal rights

The applicant may appeal against any decision:

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

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

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

may appeal against the decision.

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

Issued by the Constitutional Team on behalf of the Director of Law and Democracy.

Date: 22 Sept 2016

From: Nigel Carter
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 11:33 AM
To: Cryan, Stephanie
Cc: McArthur, Wesley
Subject: Premises Licence variation - Leadbelly's Bar & Kitchen. Unit C, Montreal House, Surrey Quays Road Ref: 859021

Dear Councillor Cryan

I represent Mr Paul Graham, the premises licence holder at the above address, and the applicant for this premises licence variation.

I am writing to you in regards to your representation to this application, on the grounds that the proposed later hours would 'increase the possibility of noise nuisance and disturbance and is out of keeping in a predominantly residential area'. I also note your concerns in relation to the summer months.

Can I start by saying that, since opening in December 2016, there have been no complaints of noise nuisance/disturbance in relation to these premises. Both Mr Graham, and his DPS - Ms Annmarie Barwick - are experienced operators of licensed premises; with Mr Graham still being the premises licence holder for The Mayflower in Southwark (where there have been no issues relating to noise nuisance or disturbance); and Ms Barwick spent 6 years as DPS at [REDACTED] following 10 years working for the [REDACTED] Group of licensed premises.

There have been no objections received from any residents, in particular those living above and adjacent to the venue, and the Police Licensing Officer - PC Graham White 288MD - states in his representation (copy attached) that 'With regard to the opening hours, these sit within that recommended in Southwark's statement of licensing policy.....the applicant has offered a number of additional control measures to counter the possible impact these hours would have on the licensing objectives. **I am satisfied it contains sufficient control measures for the promotion of the licensing objectives**'.

I have also attached a copy of my client's Dispersal Policy, which is already in use, and which demonstrates their commitment to promoting the licensing objective of 'preventing public nuisance'.

In light of the additional control measures we have proposed; the fact that there are no objections from the Police or residents, my client asks if you would consider withdrawing your objection to this application?

If you feel that there are further control measures which should be included, my client would be more than happy to consider any suggested conditions.

Kind regards

Nigel

Nigel Carter
Licensing Consultant

From: Nigel Carter
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 11:35 AM
To: Williams, Bill
Cc: McArthur, Wesley
Subject: Premises Licence Variation - Leadbelly's, Unit C Montreal House, Surrey Quays Road Ref: 859021

Dear Councillor Williams

I represent Mr Paul Graham, the premises licence holder at the above address, and the applicant for this premises licence variation.

I am writing to you in regards to your representation to this application, on the grounds that the proposed later hours would 'increase the possibility of noise nuisance and disturbance and is out of keeping in a predominantly residential area'. I also note your concerns in relation to the summer months.

Can I start by saying that, since opening in December 2016, there have been no complaints of noise nuisance/disturbance in relation to these premises. Both Mr Graham, and his DPS - Ms Annmarie Barwick - are experienced operators of licensed premises; with Mr Graham still being the premises licence holder for The Mayflower in Southwark (where there have been no issues relating to noise nuisance or disturbance); and Ms Barwick spent 6 years as DPS at [REDACTED] following 10 years working for the [REDACTED] Group of licensed premises.

There have been no objections received from any residents, in particular those living above and adjacent to the venue, and the Police Licensing Officer - PC Graham White 288MD - states in his representation (copy attached) that 'With regard to the opening hours, these sit within that recommended in Southwark's statement of licensing policy.....the applicant has offered a number of additional control measures to counter the possible impact these hours would have on the licensing objectives. **I am satisfied it contains sufficient control measures for the promotion of the licensing objectives**'.

I have also attached a copy of my client's Dispersal Policy, which is already in use, and which demonstrates their commitment to promoting the licensing objective of 'preventing public nuisance'.

In light of the additional control measures we have proposed; the fact that there are no objections from the Police or residents, my client asks if you would consider withdrawing your objection to this application?

If you feel that there are further control measures which should be included, my client would be more than happy to consider any suggested conditions.

Kind regards

Nigel

Nigel Carter
Licensing Consultant