

## Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Tuesday 16 May 2023 at 10.00 am at Online/Virtual: please contact [andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.weir@southwark.gov.uk) for a link to the meeting and the instructions for joining the online meeting

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Margy Newens (Chair)  
Councillor Sunny Lambe  
Councillor Jane Salmon

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Debra Allday, legal officer  
Jayne Tear, licensing officer  
Andrew Weir, constitutional officer

### 1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

The clerk opened the meeting.

Councilor Sunny Lambe nominated Councillor Margy Newens to be the chair for the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Jane Salmon.

### 2. APOLOGIES

This was a virtual licensing sub-committee meeting.

The meeting opened at 10.05am.

The chair explained to the participants and observers how the virtual meeting would run. Everyone then introduced themselves.

There were no apologies for absence.

**3. CONFIRMATION OF VOTING MEMBERS**

The voting members were confirmed verbally, one at a time.

**4. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

There were none.

**5. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

There were none.

**6. LICENSING ACT 2003: ORU SPACE LTD, 20-22 LORDSHIP LANE, LONDON SE22 8HN**

The licensing officer presented their report. Members had no questions for the licensing officer.

The applicant addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the applicant.

The licensing sub-committee heard from one other person, a local resident objecting to the application. Members had questions for the other person.

The licensing sub-committee noted the representation for one other person who was not present at the hearing.

Both parties were given up to five minutes for summing up.

The meeting adjourned at 10.52am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 11.23am and the chair advised everyone of the decision.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application made by Oru Space Ltd to vary a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Oru Space Ltd, 20-22 Lordship Lane, London SE22 8HN be granted:

- To add the sale of alcohol to be consumed off the premises:
  - Monday to Wednesday 11:00 to 22:30
  - Thursday to Saturday 11:00 to 23:45
  - Sunday 11:00 to 17:30
- To change the sale by retail of alcohol (on the premises) to:
  - Monday to Wednesday 11:00 to 22:30
  - Thursday to Saturday 11:00 to 23:45
  - Sunday 11:00 to 17:30
- To amend the opening hours to:
  - Monday to Wednesday 07:00 to 23:00
  - Thursday and Friday 07:00 to 00:00
  - Saturday 08:00 to 00:00
  - Sunday 08:00 to 18:00.

### **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, the conditions agreed with the Metropolitan Police Service and the following additional conditions agreed by the sub-committee:

1. That a direct telephone number for the manager at the premises shall be publicly available at all times the premises is open. This telephone number is to be made available to residents in the vicinity.

### **Reasons**

This was an application made by Oru Space Ltd for the variation of a premises licence in respect of the premises known as Oru Space Ltd, 20-22 Lordship Lane, London SE22 8HN.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant who was the director and founder of Oru Space Ltd. The sub-committee was advised that the premises was located at the north end of Lordship Lane. It provided a mixed use community focused workspace, which included a café for both members and public and private office and studio spaces where well-being classes were held. The concept of Oru was very much community based. Not only did the company provide a reduced cost services in their workspace, any excess food from the café/restaurant was donated to food banks and charities and 10% of the company's revenue was given to good causes.

The applicant wanted to utilise the building and facilities it offered in the evening by operating a Sri Lankan restaurant, open to the public. This would very much be a food led operation, and the premises would not become a late night bar. The applicant leased the premises from the London Borough of Southwark and were subject to a management agreement, and regularly met with officers and councillors of the council.

The licensing sub-committee noted that the Metropolitan Police Service had submitted a representation which had been conciliated.

The licensing sub-committee heard from one 'other person' who was also a neighbour to the premises. The other person stated that the premises was in very close proximity to their home. They initially raised concerns that a later operation of the premises would produce noise from music and patrons, both inside and out causing noise pollution that would interfere with the enjoyment of their home. There was particular concern of the use of the roof terrace. The sub-committee heard that the parties had engaged in useful conversation and the other party was satisfied that there would be no disruption from the premises.

The licensing sub-committee noted the representation for one other person who was not present at the hearing.

The licensing sub-committee noted that the applicant was a "profit with purpose" company that was already subject to both a lease and a management agreement with the council. The sale of alcohol previously was approximately one percent of sales. The applicant advised that with the opening of the restaurant this would now increase to 60% food and 40% alcohol through the restaurant and would stabilise the business as a whole.

There was only one outside area and this was the roof terrace and patio. This was utilised by members of the building who wanted the use it as a quiet space. The roof terrace/patio would not be used as part of the restaurant or an outside bar as it did not work operationally.

The applicant had utilised the roof terrace and patio during Orufest, which was largely held within the building. The roof terrace was open to a maximum of 40-50 people, but it had closed at some point between 19:30 and 20:00. The applicant had notified neighbours of the festival, which was confirmed by the other person and there had been no complaints. There was no smoking even on the roof terrace/patio and smoker were directed to smoke away from the premises.

The sub-committee were satisfied that the applicant was a responsible operator, who was mindful of its neighbours and were content to grant the application, with the single additional condition added to the licence.

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.

## **Appeal rights**

The applicant may appeal against any decision to modify the conditions of the licence; and

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

- a) That the variation ought not to have been made; or
- b) That, when varying the licence, the licensing authority ought not to have modified the conditions of 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.

The meeting ended at 11.27am.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**