



BY EMAIL AND POST

Southwark Licensing Service

Licensing Team

Regulatory Services,

Hub 1 3rd Floor

PO Box 64529, London SE1P 5LX

Please ask for: Richard Taylor

Direct Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Our ref: RJT / MJM / 098454.26778
#GS3366076

Your ref:

Date: 08 September 2020

Dear Sirs,

Re: Licensing Act 2003 – Review Proceedings

George Canning Public House, 123 Grove Lane, London SE5 8BG

Premises Licence number - 869338

We act on behalf of Ei Group Ltd. Our client is the freehold owner of these premises and we have received a copy of the application for expedited review of the premises licence issued under Section 53A Licensing Act 2003. We understand that a hearing to consider that application and whether interim steps were appropriate was held on Thursday 3rd September and the licence was, at that stage, suspended pending the full review that will be considered on 24th September 2020.

We would be grateful if you would accept this letter as a formal representation on behalf of Ei Group Ltd to that review.

Ei Group Ltd owns around 4000 public houses in England and Wales. The vast majority of these premises are the subject of lease/tenancy agreements through which the tenant operates his/her/its own business out of our client's premises. The lease/tenancy agreement makes it clear that all operational responsibility for the premises lies with the tenant. The George Canning is the subject of a lease in favour of the current premises licence holder, Donal Ennis who has been in operating these premises since March 2011.

Please note we take a wholly neutral stance with regard to the allegations made given that our client has no operational responsibility for the operation of these premises.

We understand that the premises licence holder was not on site at the time of the incident that resulted in the review, the premises instead being under the control of the DPS, Brian Coughlan. We understand that Mr Coughlan has now been suspended by our client's tenant, Mr Ennis.

On the catalogue of incidents provided, it is clear that the licensing objectives could be promoted by the removal of Mr Coughlan as DPS and by a programme of staff training. We respectfully submit that a condition requiring the training of staff with regard to their duties and responsibilities under Licensing Act 2003 should be attached to the premises licence.

On the information that is currently available, the removal of the DPS and imposition a condition requiring staff training would be an appropriate and proportionate response to the issues that resulted in the application for review.

At this stage, we would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this representation. It may be that our client may wish to expand upon this representation if further information comes to light. It may do that either in writing or by appearing before the Committee at the review hearing.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully



GOSSCHALKS