Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Tuesday 4 August 2026 at 10.00 am at Ground Floor Meeting Room G02B - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT:	Councillor Jane Salmon (Chair) Councillor Sunny Lambe Councillor Margy Newens
OTHER AUTHORITIES PRESENT:	P.C. Zoe Garrod, Metropolitan Police Service P.C. Mark Lynch, Metropolitan Police Service (obseving)
OFFICER SUPPORT:	Toyin Calfos, legal officer Wesley McArthur, licensing officer Esther Jones, licensing officer representing licensing as a responsible authority 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: SHIP AGROUND PUBLIC HOUSE, 33 WOLSELEY STREET, LONDON SE1 2BP - REVIEW

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

The Metropolitan Police Service officer, the applicant for the review, addressed the sub-committee. Members had no questions for the police officer.

The officer representing licensing as a responsible authority addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the officer.

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

The meeting adjourned at 10.31 for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 10.44am and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

RESOLVED:

That the council's licensing sub-committee, having considered an application made under Section 53C of the Licensing Act 2003 by the Metropolitan Police Service for the review of the premises licence issued in respect of the premises known as Ship Aground Public House 33 Wolseley Street, London SE1 2BP and having had regard to all relevant representations has decided it necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives to revoke the premises licence

Reasons

This was an application made by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) for the expedited review of the premises licence issued in respect of the premises known as Ship Aground Public House, 33 Wolseley Street, London SE1 2BP.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer. He outlined the nature of the application, explaining that MPS was requesting that the licence be revoked following an intelligence-led police raid on the premises. He confirmed that the other parties to this matter, comprising the property owners, had no objections to the licence being revoked. He further confirmed that the licence holder, who was also the designated premises supervisor, had now been contacted and had voluntarily surrendered the licence. The officer confirmed that the licence holder was in the process of surrendering the lease.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the MPS, the applicant for the review. The officer advised that the premises had been the subject of police intelligence. The officer stated that, when police executed a warrant on 8 July 2026, officers attending the premises recovered a firearm and a small quantity of Class A drugs from a safe within the licensed area. The officer explained that the warrant had been obtained as a result of intelligence linking the premises to the use and storage of firearms and involvement in serious crime and disorder, including concerns regarding controlled drugs. The officer stated that forensic examinations were still ongoing and that two arrests had been made. Of those arrested, one male was found to be in possession of the keys to the premises.

The officer submitted that very serious criminal activity, going to the heart of the licensing objectives, had taken place and that the current designated premises supervisor and licence holder had not been in control of the premises for over a year. Following the loss of control, the police were not afforded any opportunity to carry out intelligence checks on the new managers, as they had not been informed that the licence holder had relinquished control.

Finally, the officer submitted that lesser measures would not suffice in this instance, as lessor measures would not address the concerns held by the police. The premises had an established association with criminal activity in circumstances where the licence holder had relinquished responsibility. Revocation was the only appropriate and proportionate action and, the officer submitted, the interim measures should remain in place.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer representing licensing as a responsible authority.

The licensing authority officer stated that they had no confidence in the licence holder and designated premises supervisor to promote the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, and public safety. The officer noted that the licence holder had not been uncontactable initially, but in the weeks following the police raid. The police learned that he had relinquished control of the premises over a year before to an unknown person without informing either the licensing authority or the police.

On that basis, the licensing authority supported the police's application for the premises licence to be revoked.

After summing up, the licensing sub-committee retired to consider the evidence before it and deliberated.

The licensing sub-committee was aware that all interested parties to this application favoured revocation on the basis that it would promote the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, and public safety.

It also noted that, since the last hearing, it had learned:

1. Further details of the police investigation.
2. The licence holder had given up control of the premises a year earlier without informing the responsible authorities or the Licensing Unit.
3. The licence holder had surrendered his licence and was in the process of relinquishing the lease of the premises.
4. The responsible authorities shared the view that revocation was necessary to uphold the licensing objectives.
5. All relevant parties wanted the licence to be revoked.

In the absence of contrary information, the licensing sub - committee determined that revoking the licence would promote the licensing objectives in this instance. It went on to consider the interim measures and determined that the licence should continue to be suspended, as there had been no material change since the last hearing.

In reaching its decision, the licensing sub-committee had regard to all relevant considerations, including the Licensing Act 2003, section 182 Guidance, the National Licensing Policy Framework (November 2025), its equality duties and the four licensing objectives. The licensing sub-committee considered that this decision was appropriate and proportionate.

Appeal rights

This decision is open to appeal by either:

a. The premises licence holder
b. 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 District Judge's 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 the licensing authority of the decision appealed against.

Review of interim steps pending appeal

At the conclusion of the review hearing the licensing sub-committee reviewed the interim steps to determine which interim steps were appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives, pursuant to section 53D of the Licensing Act 2003 were appropriate: that the premises licence be suspended.

The licensing sub-committee were satisfied that these interim steps are appropriate and proportionate to promote the licensing objectives to modify the interim steps, as detailed above and there had been no change in circumstance since the sub-committee suspended the licence as an interim step on 10 July 2026

The interim steps are open to appeal by:

a. The chief officer of police for the police area in which the premises is situated.
b. The holder of the premises licence

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.

Meeting ended at 10.46am.

CHAIR:

DATED: