



## **Licensing Sub-Committee**

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday 30 October 2025 at 10.00 am at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02B - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Renata Hamvas (Chair)  
Councillor Suzanne Abachor  
Councillor Jane Salmon

**OFFICER SUPPORT:** Charlotte Precious, legal officer  
Andrew Heron, licensing officer  
Andrew Weir, constitutional officer

### **1. 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 were no apologies for absence.

### **2. CONFIRMATION OF VOTING MEMBERS**

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

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

There were none.

### **4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

There were none.

**5. LICENSING ACT 2003: N1 BAR, 16 ELEPHANT & CASTLE, LONDON SE1 6TH  
- REVIEW**

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

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representation from the applicant for the review.

The premises licence holder and their representative addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the premises licence holder and their representative.

When it came to summing up, the premises licence holder and their representative confirm that they had nothing to add.

The meeting adjourned at 10.35am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 11.07am and the chair advised the attendees of the decision.

**RESOLVED:**

That the council's licensing sub-committee, having considered an application made under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003, by an other person (local resident), for the review of the premises licence held by Fortune 1 in respect of the premises known as N1 Bar, 16 Elephant & Castle, London SE1 6TH, and having had regard to all other relevant representations, has decided that it is appropriate, necessary and proportionate in order to promote the licensing objectives to modify the conditions of the licence.

**Conditions**

1. That condition 291 be amended as follows:

That one SIA-registered door supervisor shall be employed from 22:00 hours. When the terminal hour is greater than 01:00 hours, the premises shall employ at least two (2) SIA registered door supervisors to control entry and exit to the premises. They should be provided with a mechanical counting device to ensure that the maximum accommodation limit is not exceeded.

2. That condition 840 be removed.

3. That condition 852 be amended as follows:

That between 22:00 hours and 08:00 hours, no drinks shall be permitted outside of the premises.

4. That all relevant staff shall be trained in their responsibilities under the Licensing Act 2003, the promotion of the licensing objectives and the terms and conditions of this licence. Records pertaining to such training ('the staff training logs') shall be kept at the premises, shall be updated every 6 months and shall be made immediately available to responsible authority officers on request. The training logs shall include the trainee's name (in block capitals), the trainer's name (in block capitals), the date(s) of training and a declaration that the training has been received and understood by the trainee. If the staff training logs are a paper hardcopy, then the signature of the trainee, the signature of the trainer shall be included.
5. That signage shall be prominently displayed stating that drinks are not permitted outside after 22:00 hours.

### **Recommendations**

The sub-committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the premises shall invite local residents to quarterly meetings to address any issues that may arise.
2. The premises shall not use single-use plastics where possible.

### **Reasons**

This was an application by an other person (local resident) to review the premises licence in respect of N1 Bar, 16 Elephant & Castle, London SE1 6TH.

The licensing officer advised the sub-committee that the application exclusively concerned the licensing objective of preventing public nuisance. He confirmed that the CCTV system installed by the premises was of a high specification and was no longer of concern to the licensing authority.

The applicant was not in attendance at the meeting but had submitted extensive information in advance, the sub-committee took all of this into consideration.

The premises informed the sub-committee that they had taken the review of their licence very seriously; they had reflected on the issues raised, learned from them and made improvements. They emphasised that a review of a premises licence was a remedial process, not a punitive one. The aim was not to punish premises but to secure compliance through proportionate and sustainable measures.

They recognised that the benches outside of the premises were the cause of several issues raised. The benches were not used by the premises and they had not realised people were using them once they had closed, causing a significant nuisance to the local area. They believed members of the public were purchasing alcohol at nearby convenience stores and consuming them on the benches. In

order to resolve this nuisance, the premises had now permanently removed the benches.

A photo submitted by the applicant showed two people outside of the premises, one of which was holding a drink. The woman was upset and had a glass of water, she went outside to speak with the man, then got into a taxi. The doorman was monitoring the situation and, as it was only water in a plastic cup, he let the woman keep the drink with her.

The premises had introduced a series of further measures and policies, such as putting up signs informing patrons no drinks are permitted outside after a certain time, they had appointed an SIA accredited security officer from 22:00 hours and instigated comprehensive checks before, during and after the premises opened to continuously monitor issues that may give rise to public nuisance.

After reviewing all available information, the sub-committee determined that there was adequate evidence of public nuisance to warrant further consideration. However, they concluded that the severity of the issue did not justify revising the hours for licensable activities. Given that the review was initiated by a single individual, the sub-committee found it would be disproportionate to implement such changes.

The sub-committee considered the premises had demonstrated a sincere commitment to resolving the issues raised by the other person. Members took into account the impact of the premises' operations on the surrounding community and weighed these concerns against the proactive measures proposed by the licensee. They felt confident the additional conditions, coupled with the improvements that had been made, would both address outstanding issues and uphold the licensing objectives.

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**

This decision is open to appeal by either:

- a) The applicant for the review
- b) The premises licence holder
- c) Any other person who made relevant representations in relation to the application

Such appeal must be commenced by notice of appeal given by the appellant to the clerk for the Magistrates' Court for the area within the period of 21 days beginning day on which the appellant was notified by this licensing authority of the decision.

This decision does not have effect until either

- a) The end of the period for appealing against this decision; or
- b) In the event of any notice of appeal being given, until the appeal is disposed of.

The meeting ended at 11.12am.

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**