



Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Tuesday 2 June 2026 at 10.00 am at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT: Councillor Jane Salmon (Chair)
Councillor Sunny Lambe
Councillor Renata Hamvas

OTHER AUTHORITIES PRESENT: P.C. Mark Lynch, Metropolitan Police Service
P.C. Tom Cooke, Metropolitan Police Service

OFFICER SUPPORT: Debra Allday, legal officer
Jayne Tear, licensing officer
Andrew Heron, licensing officer
Esther Jones, licensing responsible authority officer
Justin Miller, trading standards officer
Paul Gander, trading standards officer
Charlie Jerrom, trading standards 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: PRINCE ALBERT, 111 BELLENDEN ROAD, LONDON SE15 4QY - REVIEW

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

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

The licensing sub-committee then heard from other persons, namely local residents, who supported the premises. Members had no questions for the other persons.

The representatives for the premises then addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the representatives for the premises.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.12am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 11.46am and the chair advised everyone present of the decision.

RESOLVED:

That the council's licensing sub-committee, having considered an application made under s. 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 submitted by an other person for the review of the premises licence issued in respect of Prince Albert, 111 Bellenden Road, London SE15 4QY having had regard to all relevant representations has decided to take no further action.

Reasons

This was an application made by an other person for the review of the premises in respect of Prince Albert, 111 Bellenden Road, London SE15 4QY.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer who presented her report. In the review application the applicant had referred the incident of 2 April 2026 to the police (CAD number 9205/02Apr26 refers).

In view of this, and the fact that the police had not submitted a representation, the officer was asked whether there had been any contact from them. The officer informed the sub-committee that inquiries had been made, and the police had confirmed the crime report had been closed due to the applicant not wishing to pursue the matter, which was accepted by the applicant.

It was also confirmed that although the applicant had stated in the review application that the designated premises supervisor (DPS) was required to be on the premises at all times. The officer stated that this was not the case and that condition 101 provided "Every supply of alcohol under the Premises Licence must be made, or authorised by, a person who holds a personal licence". The night time economy team had inspected the premises on 10 April 2026 and found the premises to be fully compliant with the terms and conditions on the licence.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant who brought the review under the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety licensing objectives in that a direct threat of violence had been made by the manager which was an offence under the Public Order Act 1986. The applicant had also undermined the public safety licensing objective for doing the same.

The applicant gave the details of the incident. The bar manager made the threat in response to a private conversation the applicant had with another customer, which the bar manager had considered racist. The bar manager threatened "If you're racist, I'll shoot your dog". This was then repeated to the applicant's partner. The applicant later telephoned the pub and sought clarification, which the bar manager dismissed, stating the threat was a "joke" and then called the Applicant a "f****ng clown" and a "fruitcake".

As a result, the applicant reported the incident to the police. The applicant confirmed he encouraged local residents not to drink at the Prince Albert due to the incident in a post he had made on the online forum Nextdoor.com. The Applicant did not consider his comment as racist and if it had offended anyone, he apologised.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from other persons 1, 2, 4, 6 who supported the premises. The other persons were all regular customers, and each spoke highly of the pub, stating it was well managed run community pub, that often ran charitable events raise money for good causes. The applicant agreed with this.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the director of Town Centre Inns Limited who was the premises licence holder, in addition to the company secretary and Operations Manager and DPS. The company operated twenty community pubs, six of which were located in Southwark and community was at the heart of the Company's business model and ethos. As part of the company's recruitment

process for all publicans, candidates were subject to a vetting procedure, including background checks and the verification of references. All the company's pubs were equipped with fully maintained CCTV systems, which were monitored periodically remotely. The company and each of the premises carried out their duties in accordance with the four licencing objectives.

The DPS stated they attended the premises at least three times a week and regularly visited the premises during both opening and closing hours to speak with the public and also staff regarding operational issues and training matters that may arise. The DPS had also carried out an investigation about the incident, and it was accepted the comment made by the applicant was racist. The bar manager confirmed that his response to the remark was actually "If you had a black dog, would you shoot him?".

It was also explained the stress arising from the applicant's complaint had a considerable impact on the bar manager's well-being, who felt he had been unfairly vilified and subjected to harassment both immediately after leaving the premises and during the days and weeks following the allegations made when the applicant bombarded the pub with phone calls, once screaming down the phone, and then in the end he just put the phone down.

Matters involving one's pets was always an emotive and the perceived threat clearly caused an acute reaction from both the Applicant and his partner. This was most unfortunate given the Applicant's partner indicated a wish to return to the pub.

On the balance of probabilities, the sub-committee was of the view that either one or both of the parties directly involved in the incident on 2 April had misheard or misunderstood what was said.

The options available to the sub-committee are:

- i. **Revoke the licence.** The revocation of any licence is the draconian of measures available to the sub-committee and is warranted in the most serious of cases. This was not one of these occasions and it would be inappropriate to revoke this licence.
- ii. **Exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence.** The only licensable activity on could be excluded would be with the exclusion of the sale of alcohol or the late-night refreshment. The sub-committee viewed that this incident did not relate to the late night-night refreshment, nor was it alcohol fuelled. It was decided that the exclusion of any licensable activity was therefore not reasonable.
- iii. **Remove the designated premises supervisor.** Both the Applicant and the other persons stated during the hearing that the premises was well managed. Therefore, the sub-committee concluded that the DPS should not be removed.
- iv. **Modify the conditions of the licence.** The incident on 2 April 2026 did not

demonstrate that any of the licensing objectives had been undermined that needed rectifying by a modification to the licence.

- v. **Suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months.** The sub-committee was of the view nothing would be gained by the licence being suspended, apart from denying regular customers being able to socialise in their local pub.
- vi. **Do nothing.** The Licensing Sub-Committee unanimously concluded that the review does not require it to take any further steps appropriate to promoting the licensing objectives.

In reaching its decision, the licensing sub-committee had regard to all the relevant considerations, its equality duties and four licensing objectives and the National Licensing Policy Framework for the hospitality and leisure sectors England and Wales (November 2025) and considered that this decision was appropriate and proportionate.

Following the hearing the chair of the licensing sub-committee urged the parties to attempt to resolve the issues between them. To this the applicant informed the sub-committee that he had apologised to the premises, and the parties had shaken hands.

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 justices' clerk for the Magistrates' Court for the area within the period of 21 days beginning with the 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.

6. LICENSING ACT 2003: NUNHEAD EXPRESS (ALSO KNOWN AS NISA), 2 KIRKWOOD ROAD, LONDON SE15 3XX - REVIEW

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

The trading standards officer, the applicant for the review, addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the trading standards officer.

The representatives from the Metropolitan Police Service addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the police.

The officer representing licensing as a responsible authority addressed the sub-committee. Members had no questions for the officer.

The licensing sub-committee heard from an other person (a local resident), supporting the premises. Members had questions for the other person.

The meeting adjourned for a lunch break at 12.55pm. The meeting reconvened at 1.44pm.

The premises licence holder (assisted by a translator) and their legal representative addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the premises licence holder and their legal representative.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2.56pm.

The meeting reconvened at 3.23pm and the chair advised everyone present of the decision.

RESOLVED:

That the council's licensing sub-committee, having considered an application made under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 submitted by Trading Standards for the review of the premises licence issued in respect of Nunhead Express (Also Known as Nisa), 2 Kirkwood Road, London SE15 3XX having had regard to all relevant representations has decided to revoke the premises licence.

Reasons

This was an application made by trading Standards in respect of the premises licence to Nunhead Express (Also Known as Nisa), 2 Kirkwood Road, London SE15.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer who presented his report. He explained the application had been postponed by the sub-committee to allow the licence holder to obtain legal representation. The officer was asked whether there was a representative from the Nisa brand was present and it was confirmed that the premises licence holder was no longer in business with Nisa

and the shop had been de-branded due to the trading standards review process.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the officer from trading standards, the applicant for the review, who submitted the application in respect of all four of the licensing objectives. The officer clarified several details in the application and addressed matters disputed by the licence holder in the supporting documentary evidence served the day before.

The trading standards officer questioned the veracity of supplier letters that had been provided by the licence holder's representative. Four letters had been provided by Prime Cash and Carry London Limited, EMP Wholesale Ltd, QDOWA Limited and Saj Trade Limited. The wording in each of the letters appeared very similar and in some, the wording was identical (e.g. Prime Cash and Carry London Limited and EMP Wholesale Ltd).

It was the officer's impression that a template had been provided to the companies. None of the letters were dated. EMP Wholesale Ltd and Saj Trade Limited, although two separate companies, had the same contact telephone number. Also, rather than provide the registered company address, the Prime Cash and Carry London Limited letter provided a trading address, suggesting these were not standard company letters, but letters the licensee may have asked them to produce.

The officer further explained under the Tobacco Products and Nicotine Inhaling Products (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020 the ban on single use vapes came into force on 1 June 2025, yet the lead in period for the ban was significant, particularly considering the requirements for new products came into force on 1 January 2021. Reputable companies were fully aware of the requirements, so it was highly strange reputable companies had provided customers in the full knowledge in January 2021 the ban was imminent and stranger still, they had yet to replace stock from its retailers in July 2025.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the Metropolitan Police Service who supported the review application. The police raised serious concerns about the management and the licensee's suitability to run the premises. Openly selling illegal cigarettes, tobacco, and vapes, demonstrated a clear and deliberate disregard for the law. The police also discovered several small snap bags containing cannabis behind the counter, a snap bag containing cannabis in the storeroom that was priced and ready to sell. The snap bags were associated with class A and class B drugs and demonstrated the sale and supply of illegal drugs. In addition, over 100 nitrous oxide canisters were in the premises. The officer stated that nitrous oxide was a commonly used illegal recreational drug and the quantity stored in small supermarket suggested misuse and unlawful intent.

The licensee had been offered a police conditional caution for the drug offences for the possession with intent to supply class B drugs which was refused and the Police were therefore, seeking to prosecute the offences (crime report

01/7384746/26 refers)

The licensing sub-committee heard from the officer representing licensing as a responsible authority who supported the application for review based on the findings of trading standards and due to the serious and persistent nature of the offences, suggested that the premises licence issued in respect of the premises be revoked.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the representative for the premises who informed the members that the statement included in the agenda papers had been drafted by the previous licensing agent and it was not accurate and it was agreed that it would be disregarded.

The licence holder was the sole director of the company Nunhead Express. He initially had been the company secretary in 2017 and then took over the business as director in April 2021. He had been employed in the licensing trade for in excess of 20 years. Prior to 2025 the licensee had passed all inspections undertaken by licensing, police and the council's food safety team. There had never been an issue with underage sales and successfully passed at least four test purchases. He was unaware of any complaints made in connection with the premises.

The licence holder employed nine staff, which included himself. One other member of staff had a personal licence. It was unintentional that there was no personal licence was present during the inspection on 10 July 2025. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the other personal licence holder had failed to turn up to work that day. As a result, an additional two members of staff were in the process of obtaining personal licences.

Concerning the non-compliance, the licence holder accepted mistakes had been made for which he apologised. Lessons had been learnt and he assured the sub-committee there would be no repeat and was determined to be more vigilant in the future. However, the licence holder continued to dispute a number of points.

It was disputed that a covert test purchase took place on 20 June 2025 and any non-duty paid imported cigarettes on the premises were for personal use only.

Concerning the matters raised on 10 July 2025, he contended that the illicit vapes were all in the staff only area and were waiting to be collected by various reps over a period of months. Letters had been provided from the vape suppliers confirmed the position regarding the vapes and the return of products. It was denied that they vapes were for sale.

The illicit tobacco was located in the staff area only and was for the personal use of staff. A box of singles was ordinarily kept in the licence holder's office. These cigarettes had been provided by friends and customers who had been abroad and didn't want them. It was denied that single cigarettes were being sold. To prevent a re-occurrence of the situation, staff had been instructed to never break packets into singles.

It was also suggested that no conversation took place with trading standards regarding product labels not being in English. However, to ensure there was no further issue with product labels, the licence holder refused to purchase items from the wholesales unless items were correctly labelled. Regardless, whenever the licence holder met with officers, they were offered all supporting documentation, which had not accepted by them.

Credit was only ever permitted to a regular customer purchasing essential items only. No credit was ever permitted on non-essential items such as cigarettes or alcohol, which had to be bought in full at the point of sale.

The cannabis in the office had been given to the licensee some time previously. He was unable to explain why he still hadn't disposed of it.

The CBD items had been obtained for a regular supplier and the licensee mistakenly believed that since they didn't contain THC, they were legal to sale. Customers also would specifically requested Viagra Gold Honey although it was unclear how customers would be aware that it was sold, since it was not advertised, nor were the products displayed for sale in the shop. He had been unaware they were unlawful in the UK and he had not purchased them again since July 2025.

The nitrous oxide was used for catering supplies to customers. It was a brand his customers didn't like. The licence holder had arranged for it to be returned to the supplier and waiting to be reimbursed before doing so.

The licence holder stated was also unaware of the requirement to display the licence in the premises.

In all the meetings the licence holder had with trading standards, he had offered documentation to officers and on each occasion, it was declined.

The representative for the premises concluded that the sub-committee should do no more than an appropriate and proportionate to address trading standards and police's concerns and suggested the licensing objectives could be properly promoted by a modification of the licence.

This was a review application made by the trading standards in respect of Nunhead Express (also Known as Nisa), 2 Kirkwood Road, London SE15 3XX.

The premises licence holder had been employed in the licence trade for in excess of 20 years during which time he had gained considerable experience, having operated several other licensed premises in the past including: Centre Supermarket in E8 (2004-2013) where he was the owner and DPS; London Food Centre 2013-15 where he was director and manager; Costcutter MH Limited where he was a manager (2015-2017). In July 2017 he became the owner and DPS of Nunhead Express (also Known as Nisa). It was

claimed by the licence holder there had been no enforcement action against him in respect of any of these premises.

With this in mind, the sub-committee found the catalogue of offences and non-compliance identified during the investigation unacceptable for a businessman that held himself to be so experienced. The sub-committee unanimously preferred the evidence from the Applicant and responsible authorities and took the view that licence holder excuses demonstrated an overall systematic failure of the management of the premises.

In determining this review application, the Licensing Sub-Committee makes no finding of guilt in respect of any criminal offences but on the balance of probabilities, makes a number of findings of non-compliance with legislation that undermines the promotion of the crime prevention objective (paragraph 11.24, s.182 Guidance):

20 June 2025

A covert test purchase for illicit tobacco was conducted at the premises which showed an offence under Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016 and the Trade Marks Act 1994. The licence holder disputed that this occurred on the basis that no evidence had been produced. The sub-committee was unhappy there was any direct evidence regarding the inspection but noted on page 3 of Trading Standards additional evidence a photograph of an evidence bag containing "1 x 20 Marlboro Touch, £5 cash", seized 20/06/2025, 16:05 from Nisa Local, 2 Kirkwood Road".

10 July 2025

Of note, no personal licence holder was present when trading standards and police officers attended the premises on this date and despite this, alcohol was displayed for sale. Further still, a sale of alcohol took place in the presence officers. This was a breach of condition 336 of the premises licence that no personal licence holder shall be present on premises when alcohol was available for sale. The licence holder explained that this was due to unforeseen circumstances. The sub-committee was surprised an employee who had not been fully trained, had not been informed that he had no authority to make any sale of alcohol (in the absence of either personal licence holder), which should have been a fundamental part of training that should be given the first day of employment for all staff.

The sub-committee also found there was a significant number of illicit vapes, pouches of illicit hand rolling tobacco and illicit packets of cigarettes that were seized by officers. These amounted to offences contrary to Regulation 48 Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016, Standardised Packaging of Tobacco Products Regulations 2015 and the Environmental Protection (Single-Use Vapes) (England) Regulations 2024. Knowingly keeping illicit non-duty paid tobacco on the premise was an offence contrary to s.144 Licensing Act 2003. Whether the tobacco was for personal use or not, it was a strict liability offence for such items being on the premises.

A snap bag of cannabis (class B drug) was found in the staff room and two snap bags of hashish were found by the till contrary to s.5(1) and s.5(3) Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. No reasonable businessman would possess Class B drugs on a business premises, and no satisfactory explanation was given regarding its presence.

There large number of nitrous oxide cannisters indicated to the police that the premises was concerned in the offer to supply nitrous oxide (class C drug) contrary to Section 4(3)(c) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. The sub-committee were unimpressed with the explanation provided that until payment from the supplier had been received, the cannisters would not be returned to them. This was an argument with no foreseeable conclusion. On the balance of probabilities, the sub-committee found the police evidence preferable; the number of cannisters gave the impression that nitrous oxide was being supplied to customers for illegal purposes.

In view of the wide range of potential offences, the sub-committee was also satisfied on a balance of probabilities, customers were able to obtain credit for the purchase of all goods, including alcohol in breach of condition 127 of the premises licence. On page 13 of Trading Standards' additional evidence appeared to be a running total of credit provided to a customer, which included £2.49 for balloons. Balloons could not be considered as an essential item. Members of the sub-committee concluded that the assertion credit was provided for essential items was therefore not entirely truthfully.

The licence holder and his legal representative suggested to the sub-committee that since July 2025 the compliance procedures within the business had been strengthened in that staff had been retrained on age restricted sales, Challenge 25 was implemented, refusal logs were maintained and strict stock-checking and record-keeping had been introduced on the including regular internal audits in addition to supplier verification. Since July 2025 the had been no further incidents of no further non-compliance.

14 July 2025

Failure to display the premises licence contrary to Section 57 of the Licensing Act 2003. The licence holder claimed he was unaware of the requirement to display the licence in the premises. Given he has worked in the licensing industry for more than 20 years, the sub-committee was sceptical with this assertion.

The retail price for Labubu dolls generally range between £15-£50. The licensee stated that he purchased the dolls for £6 plus VAT (as detailed in the invoice on page 135 of the agenda). He sold each doll for £6, being the same price he purchased them for. This was less than the recommended retail price, suggesting he was aware or at least must have been mindful they were not legitimate items. This also amounted to an offence of displaying counterfeit Labubu toys was a Breach of Toys (Safety) Regulations 2011 and Trade Marks Act 1994.

Further, the Perla (7.1% ABV) beer cans did not appear to comply with the Food Information Regulations 2014.

The licence holder and his legal representative suggested to the sub-committee that since July 2025 there had been no further incidents of non-compliance and the compliance procedures within the business had been strengthened in that staff had been retrained on age restricted sales, Challenge 25 was implemented, refusal logs were maintained and strict stock-checking and record-keeping had been introduced on the including regular internal audits in addition to supplier verification. The licence holder also refused to purchase items from the wholesales unless items were correctly labelled.

However, contrary to the licence holder's suggestion, the sub-committee were presented with additional evidence of further non-compliance (post July 2025):

12 December 2025

Perla (7.1% ABV) and Zubr (6% ABV) did not comply with the Food Information Regulations 2014.

23 January 2026

The premises licence was not displaced in the premises. This was a further breach of Section 57 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The licence holder claimed that no conversation had taken place with trading standards regarding the product labels not being in English. Yet following the 23 January 2026 inspection an officer emailed the licensee on 30 January 2026 at 10:01 hours in which he refers to a discussion about alcohol with no UK labelling for ingredients that had taken place and specifically requested invoices for the Perla and Zubr stock.

The extract of the police interview conducted on 25 July 2025 the licence holder made a number of admissions in connection with matters that arose on 10 July 2026:

- i. Alcohol was sold without a license holder present by a trainee member of staff. Members of the sub-committee were sceptical that training a member of staff took six months.
- ii. The licensee was unaware that the sale of Kamagra oral jelly wasn't lawful and this was an offence under the Human Medicines Regulations 2012.
- iii. The licensee accepted the possession of cannabis (found in cigarette packet), class B contrary to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.
- iv. The licensee accepted his possession with intent to supply the snap bags (found in the till) contrary to the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971.

The licensing sub-committee also found on a balance of probabilities:

- a. The quantity of single use vapes demonstrated they were being offered for

sale – Possession for supply single use vapes. It was implausible a company would collect the vapes in batches over a period of months contrary to Regulation 4 under the Environmental Protection (Single use Vapes) (England) Regulations 2024. – Undermines the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective.

- b. The illicit tobacco allegedly provided by regular customers. No diligent retailer would accept items in such a fashion. It would stand to reason that a diligent retailer would refuse to accept the items and would certainly not hold the quantity on the premises contrary to Section 92 of the Trade Marks Act 1994, Regulation 5 Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016.

The licensing sub-committee were therefore satisfied that there had been multiple serious breaches of licensing, and other regulatory legislation witnessed at the premises, on multiple occasions.

Paragraph 11.20 of the Section 182 of the Home Office Guidance (February 2025) provides that in deciding which of the powers to invoke, licensing authorities should so far as possible seek to establish the cause or causes of the concerns and the remedial action taken should be directed at these causes and be no more than an appropriate and proportionate response to address these causes.

Paragraph 11.27 of the Section 182 Guidance highlights that certain criminal activity that should be treated particularly seriously, which includes the sale and distribution of controlled drugs under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and also, premises involved in the sale or storage of smuggled tobacco and alcohol.

The options available to the sub-committee are:

- vii. **Do nothing.** The sub-committee were satisfied that taking no action would undermine the licensing objectives and taking no action was not an option.
- viii. **Exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence.** The sale by retail of alcohol to be consumed off premises was the only licensable activities on the licence. Excluding this would effectively be a revocation of the licence.
- ix. **Remove the designated premises supervisor (DPS).** The licensee was specified as the DPS. No alternative DPS was suggested in his place. The sub-committee was satisfied that the removal of the DPS was inappropriate, and the licensee would remain the controlling mind of the business.
- x. **Modify the conditions of the licence.** The licensee had seriously undermined the promotion of the crime licensing objective, by failing to observe basic legal business law. The modification of the licence was considered inappropriate.
- xi. **Suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months.** A complete overhaul of the management structure would be required for the sub-committee to feel confident in the continued operation of this premises.

On this occasion, the sub-committee felt a suspension would be punitive and would not promote the licensing objectives.

- xii. **Revoke the licence.** The sub-committee determined a revocation was the only appropriate course of action in the circumstances.

The sale of regulated products requires significant legal responsibility. The premises licence holder has failed to sell these regulated products responsibly. This licensing sub-committee has no confidence in the licence holder's ability to operate the premises and unanimously agreed that the premises licence should be revoked.

In reaching its decision, the licensing sub-committee had regard to all the relevant considerations, its equality duties and four licensing objectives and the National Licensing Policy Framework for the hospitality and leisure sectors England and Wales (November 2025) 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 justices' clerk for the Magistrates' Court for the area within the period of 21 days beginning with the 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 3.25pm.

CHAIR:

DATED: