



Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday 2 October 2025 at 10.00 am at Online/Virtual

PRESENT: Councillor Margy Newens (in the chair)
Councillor Andy Simmons
Councillor Ellie Cumbo (reserve)

OFFICER SUPPORT: Debra Allday, legal officer
Charlotte Precious, legal officer
Andrew Heron, licensing officer
Jayne Tear, licensing officer
Raymond Binya, environmental protection officer
Maria Lugangira, constitutional officer

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

The clerk opened the meeting.

In the absence of the chair, Councillor Margy Newens was nominated by Councillor Andy Simmons to chair the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Ellie Cumbo.

2. APOLOGIES

This was a virtual licensing sub-committee meeting.

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

There apologies for absence from Councillor Dora Dixon-Fyle.

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: BUSSEY BUILDING, 133, BLOCK A, BUSSEY BUILDING, COPELAND ROAD, LONDON SE15 3SN

The licensing officer presented their report. Members had questions for the licensing officer.

The applicant's legal representative addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the legal representative.

The officer from the environmental protection team addressed the sub-committee. Members had no questions for the officer.

The sub-committee then heard from other persons objecting to the application. Members had questions for the other persons.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.40am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 12.05pm and the chair advised the attendees of the decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Copeland Park Partnership (Jonathan Leslie Wilson and Lorelie Daphne Wilson) for a premises licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Bussey Building, 133, Block A, Bussey Building, Copeland Road, London SE15 3SN be granted.

Hours

The sale by retail of alcohol (on the premises):	Sunday to Wednesday: 09:00 to 23:00 Thursday: 09:00 to 02:30 the following day Friday and Saturday: 09:00 to 06:00 the following day
--	--

Regulated entertainment in the form of: plays; films, live music, recorded music, performance of dance, anything similar to live music, recorded music and performance of dance (indoors):	Sunday to Wednesday: 09:00 to 23:00 Thursday: 09:00 to 02:30 the following day Friday and Saturday: 09:00 to 06:00 the following day
Late night refreshment (indoors):	Thursday: 23:00 to 02:30 the following day Friday and Saturday: 23:00 to 06:00 the following day
Opening hours to the public:	Sunday to Wednesday: 09:00 to 23:00. Thursday: 09:00 to 02:30 the following day. Friday and Saturday: 09:00 to 06:00 the following day
<u>Seasonal and non-standard timings:</u>	
Plays, films, live music, recorded music, performance of dance, facilities for making music and facilities for dancing:	During New Year's Eve and August Bank Holiday weekends, the premises will be open no later than 06:00 (August BH) and 06:00 (New Year's Eve).
Late-night refreshment:	During New Year's Eve and August Bank Holiday weekends, the premises will be open no later than 06:00 (August BH) and 06:00 (New Year's Eve).
Sale or supply of alcohol:	During New Year's Eve and August Bank Holiday weekends, the premises will be open no later than 06:00 (August BH) and 06:00 (New Year's Eve)
Opening hours:	During New Year's Eve and August Bank Holiday weekends, the premises will be open no later than 06:00 (August BH) and 06:00 (New Year's Eve)

Conditions

The operation of the premises under the licence shall be subject to relevant mandatory conditions and conditions derived from the operation schedule

highlighted in section M of the application form. The sub-committee also agreed the following additional condition(s):

1. That the licensing authority will be provided with 28 days notice when the premises will operate under this licence.

The licensing sub-committee also made the following recommendations

- That the Environmental Protection Team review and advise (where necessary) on the provision of toilet facilities at the premises.
- That a copy of the fire evacuation plan for the Copeland Park site will be provided to the licensing authority within 28 days of the issue of this notice of decision.

Reasons

This was an application made by Copeland Park Partnership (Jonathan Leslie Wilson and Lorelie Daphne Wilson) for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as Bussey Building, 133, Block A, Bussey Building, Copeland Road, London SE15 3SN.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the representative for the applicants who highlighted there had been no objections from the police or licencing as a responsible authority.

The environmental protection team (EPT) had submitted a representation, but there had been no objection from the planning authority, although the applicant would comply with all planning permissions, particularly concerning conditions regarding noise works. It was also pointed out that there were other premises in close proximity, in addition to local residents none of whom had submitted objections.

Regarding the representation from the other person, the applicant's representative stated that the objection was vexatious and/or not relevant. None of the matters raised in the objection had not been raised by responsible authorities. The other person did not live nearby and would not be affected with any noise, smell etc. The objection was based on a landlord-tenant dispute and the Applicant had to protect itself by having a shadow licence in the event the current licence were not surrendered.

On the substantive points raised in the other person's objection, there wouldn't be any noise breakout. Noise limiters were in place and complied with. There had been fire that triggered the sprinkler system, that couldn't be isolated, causing a flood and refurbishment works undertaken.

Some of the sound attenuation works had not yet been reinstated, but the sub-committee were assured that all necessary works would be reinstated attenuation

works before the premises became operational. Members were however, reminded that the council's health and safety team did not raise any objection.

The applicant's representative then addressed the fire safety issues raised in the other person's objection and stated that a fire risk assessment had been undertaken to the satisfaction of the London Fire Brigade (LFB) and the applicant was under a duty to comply with the Fire Safety Order 2005 (FSO). The suggestion that the fire escape(s) were not be fully accessible because of obstruction was disputed. There were no obstructions anywhere within the building. The fire risk assessments had been carried out; there was the duties under the FSO, in addition to a duty of care to other businesses/tenants and local residents. The LFB had also not raised any objection to the application.

For enforcement purposes, members queried whether there would be any objection to add a condition requiring the applicant 14 day notification period if the shadow licence were operational. The applicant's representative urged members not to make the licence conditional upon the tenant's surrender of the licence as this would mean the applicant would be held to ransom. However, the applicant would be agreeable to provide one month's notice of the intention to activate the licence.

The applicant was also asked about the toilet provision within the premises. It was confirmed that there would be maximum capacity of 1050 with sufficient toilet facilities for all. However, if an adjustment was required, then a minor variation would be submitted.

The applicant's representative advised that he was happy for EPT to make any recommendations about toilet provision and that the applicant would follow the recommendations.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the representative from EPT who confirmed EPT was not objecting to the application but wanted to highlight that the hours sought exceeded those recommended in the statement of licensing policy 2021-2026. The officer also accepted that although licensing and planning were two separate regimes, conditions 4 and 6 from planning permission 12/AP/1160 were relevant to noise insulation and containment (conditions 372-379 of the current premises licence) and internal ventilation systems (condition 380 of the current licence) which the officer wanted to ensure were reflected on the new (shadow) licence if granted.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the other person who stated that the concern raised were not vexatious. He had written the premises policies and procedures when the premises licence had initially been applied for in 2011 and again, when the licence was varied in 2016.

Since 2016 numerous other premises has opened: Peckham Audio (300 patron capacity), Jumbi (300–400-person capacity), the Rooftop Cinema Club (300 patron capacity) and The Warehouse (1000-person capacity). This would total an

approximate overall capacity of 3000 all of whom would utilise the existing fire route, trying to exit the Copeland Park site with a 1.5 metre/70-foot corridor onto Rye Lane. The escape route had been identified solely for the CLF Arts Café patrons.

There was also the courtyard was also used to allow patrons to cool down. However, the courtyard was now 50% full of furniture for another business that operated out of the back of the venue. The other person suggested that a fresh application should be submitted with a fire route for the entire of Copeland Park based on the 2025, not how the site was in 2011.

Block A was large, and the other person also raised concern as to the interrelationship between the different businesses within the block, knowing who was where, the systems each business had in place, the search procedures carried out by the various business in the Block and whether patrons had access to other businesses etc.

The representative for the applicant responded to the other persons points and confirmed that the applicant was the landlord for the entire Copeland Park site and there was a fire risk assessment for the whole site, this was irrelevant for the purposes of the current application as the London Fire Brigade, being the lead responsible authority for fire safety matters had raised no objection to the application.

If there were a fire, only the dispersal plans for an affected building would be necessary, not the whole of the Copeland Park site. Patrons would leave any one of the site's buildings into fresh air. Block A had its own fire risk assessment, with its own emergency dispersal plan that lead away from a fire, towards fresh air. The applicant agreed to provide the emergency dispersal plans to the licencing authority.

At the start of the hearing, members were advised by the licensing officer that the representative for the applicant challenged the validity of the other person's representation, stating that it was irrelevant to the licensing objectives and/or frivolous or vexatious.

The applicant's representative was informed, by way of an email from the licensing officer dated 22 August 2025, that it was a matter for the licensing officer to determine whether a representation was frivolous or vexatious (paragraph 9.5 of the Section 82 Home Office Guidance (February 2025) and that paragraph 9.6 stated when a representation was considered borderline, the benefit of doubt should be given for the sub-committee to amplify and clarify matters.

The applicant's representative did not exercise his right to make any further submissions. The licensing sub-committee agreed with the licensing officer's decision and the other person's representation raised matters relevant to promotion of the licensing objectives. The sub-committee were also grateful to the other person who raised some crucial points concerning crime/disorder and fire

safety (health and safety) and gave insight to the Copeland Park site .

However, the application was for a shadow licence, which by its nature, should mirror the existing licence. The licensing sub-committee added conditions to clarify a notice period when the licence should become operative and recommended the emergency fire dispersal plans be provided to licensing authority. Although it is accepted that the applicant was a responsible landlord, both matters could become relevant in the event of the premises licence being called in for review.

Finally, if should there be any changes to plan of the premises, the applicant is reminded to apply for the necessary variation in respect of both this licence and the substantive licence.

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

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 desires to contend:

- a. That the licence ought not to have been granted; or
- b. That, on granting the licence, the licensing authority ought not 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.

7. LICENSING ACT 2003: DOCKLEY ROAD KITCHEN, 1 DOCKLEY ROAD, LONDON SE16 3AF

The licensing officer presented their report. Members had questions for the licensing officer.

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

The officer from the environmental protection team addressed the sub-committee. Members had no questions for the officer.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12.17pm for the sub-committee to consider its decision. The meeting reconvened at 12.25 pm and the chair advised the attendees of the decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Dockley Road Kitchen Limited for a premises licence to be granted under s.17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Dockley Road Kitchen, 1 Dockley Road, London SE16 3AF be granted as follows:

Hours

- Sale of alcohol to be consumed on the premises:
 - Monday to Friday: 12:00 to 22:30
 - Saturday: 10:00 to 22:30
 - Sunday: 10:00 to 21:30
- Opening hours:
 - Monday to Friday: 12:00 to 23:00
 - Saturday: 10:00 to 23:00
 - Sunday: 10:00 to 22:00.

Conditions

The operation of the premises under the licence shall be subject to the relevant mandatory conditions, conditions conciliated with the Metropolitan Police Service and trading standards and any conditions derived from the operation schedule highlighted in Section M of the application form.

Reasons

On 4 July 2025, Dockley Road Kitchen Limited applied under section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as Dockley Road Kitchen.

The licensing officer informed the sub-committee that the Metropolitan Police

Service and trading standards had withdrawn their representations after the applicant agreed to a series of further conditions. There was one outstanding objection by an other person who raised concerns regarding the licensable hours and whether the premises would operate as a bar.

The applicant stated their mission was to provide a safe, relaxed and family friendly restaurant for the local community. They wanted to be a positive addition to the neighbourhood, as a restaurant, not a late night venue. They emphasised that Dockley Road Kitchen was not a bar; it was a small premises with a limited number of tables designed for people who were eating breakfast, lunch or dinner. The service of alcohol would only be supplied alongside food, for which last orders would be at 21:30, and no new customers would be seated after that time. The applicant's priority was to operate the premises in a responsible and community minded way.

Whilst the other person was not in attendance at the hearing, the sub-committee took their written representations into consideration.

Through the conditions agreed during the conciliation process, the hours for supply of alcohol had changed to be in line with other local premises; the sale of alcohol would cease at 22:30 Monday to Saturday, and 21:30 on Sundays. The applicant had also agreed to a condition that the supply of alcohol would only be to a person seated, taking a substantial meal, ensuring the premises would operate as a restaurant and not a bar. Furthermore, patrons were not permitted to use the outside area after 21:00, other than up to five people leaving to smoke.

The sub-committee noted that the responsible authorities had withdrawn their objections. They were satisfied that the conciliated conditions would promote the licensing objectives and address the concerns raised by the other person.

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

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 desires to contend:

- a) That the licence ought not to have been granted; or
- b) That, on granting the licence, the licensing authority ought not 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.

The meeting ended at 12.23pm.

CHAIR:

DATED: