# Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday 6 August 2026 at 10.00 am at Online/Virtual

---

| | |
|---|---|
| **PRESENT:** | Councillor Jane Salmon (Chair)<br>Councillor Ruth Bannister<br>Councillor Sunny Lambe |
| **OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:** | Councillor Callum Fowler (observing)<br>Councillor Bill Williams (observing) |
| **OTHER AUTHORITIES PRESENT** | P.C. Mark Lynch, Metropolitan Police Service |
| **OFFICER SUPPORT:** | Debra Allday, legal officer<br>Andrew Heron, licensing officer (item 5) and licensing responsible authority officer (item 6)<br>Ola Owojori, licensing officer<br>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: DOROTHY'S AT THE ST GEORGE'S TAVERN, 14 COLEMAN ROAD, LONDON SE5 7TG

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

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

The licensing sub-committee noted the two representations from the two supporters to the application, who were not in attendance at the hearing.

The licensing sub-committee further noted the representation from one objector to the application, who was not in attendance at the hearing.

The applicants were given up to five minutes for summing up.

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

The meeting reconvened at 10.40am and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application made by DOTS PH&B Ltd for a premises licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Dorothy's at the St George's Tavern, 14 Coleman Road, London SE5 7TG is granted. .

**Hours**

| | |
|---|---|
| The sale of alcohol to be consumed on the premises: | • Monday to Friday from 12:00 to 23:00<br>• Saturday from 11:00 to 23:00<br>• Sunday from 11:30 to 22:30 |
| Opening hours: | • Monday to Wednesday from 12:00 to 23:00<br>• Thursday and Friday from 12:00 to 23:30<br>• Saturday from 10:00 to 23:30<br>• Sunday from 11:30 to 22:30. |

**Conditions**

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

**Reasons**

This was an application made by DOTS PH&B Limited for a premises licence to be granted under the Licencing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Dorothy's at the St George's Tavern, 14 Coleman Road, London SE5 7TG.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicants who stated the application was for a pub which served both alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages for the lesbian and sapphic community in South-East London.

Having conciliated with the responsible authorities resulting in a number of conditions being agreed. The applicants had met with local residents at a recent street party, in addition to the local vicar and discussed how the premises could work with them to encourage the local community to utilise the venue. The applicants were hopeful that residents agreed with what the applicants were trying to achieve in the community and had addressed residents' concerns when the premises when it was under previous management.

The applicants were conscious that there was a local primary school, St. George's School, in the immediate vicinity and assurances had been given that the school wouldn't be disturbed or disrupted by the premises. The premises management plan detailed that no one would be permitted drinking and/or smoking outside, until17:00 hours which covered school hours and would ensure the school was not disturbed, which included school pick up. Prior to 17:00 hours smokers were permitted to smoke at the back of the premises in the pub's garden which was private.

The applicants were also mindful that as a queer venue, residents may be touchy, so the premises would not be an outwardly queer venue like those seen in Soho. The premises would have a tasteful environment.

A safeguarding plan had also been devised to ensure child safety within the premises, ensuring that there wouldn't be anything outwardly concerning to children or parents.

As a queer establishment, members raised concern that the premises may receive objection, so asked from a promotion of public safety perspective, how they were prepared for potential issues if they were challenged on their right to exist or to trade and whether there were proper mechanisms to ensure that both staff and customers felt safe should anything arise. It was explained the general ethos was a mix of education and enforcement. In the first instance it was hoped staff could address such issues educationally, encouraging people to be accepting, and ensure the issue didn't escalate. If the safety or security of anyone was felt compromised, then police would be immediately contacted.

It was also explained, on busier evenings SIA registered door supervisors would be on the door and would manage disruption. The Applicant was in the process of drafting a plan that would detail conflict issues and the triggers when police presence would be required.

It was noted that from the conciliated conditions with licensing as a responsible authority that in the event of a resident complaining, the applicants would provide a direct telephone number for the manager at the premises would always be publicly available the premises was open.

The applicants stated there was an open dialogue with the local vicar and governor of St George's School. They had also met with the neighbourhood residents' committee, in addition, they were also now members of the community WhatsApp group. As soon as the lease to the premises was signed and the licence granted, the Applicant would post an introductory message to residents and local businesses on the WhatsApp group.

The licensing sub-committee noted the three representations from the responsible authorities namely, Metropolitan Police Service, trading standards and the licensing authority had conciliated, with the applicants agreeing conditions.

The licensing sub-committee also noted the two representations from the two supporters to the application, who were not in attendance at the hearing.

The licensing sub-committee further noted the representation from one objector to the application, who was not in attendance at the hearing.

In considering this application, the licensing sub-committee noted the only outstanding representation was from the one objector whose representation raised concern of outdoor live and recorded music and the potential impact it would have in a quiet residential area for nearby residents.

However, the sub-committee noted that the environmental protection team had not submitted an objection to the application, suggesting they had no concerns of potential public nuisance. Furthermore, during the conciliation process, the applicants reduced the operating hours and withdrew all regulated entertainment. The sub-committee were therefore satisfied that the premises did not pose a risk of causing a noise nuisance. It was also of the view with the suite of conditions on the premises licence, the licensing objectives would be promoted.

The members of the licensing sub-committee wished the applicants their very best with the venture for the future.

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**

The appellant may appeal against any decision:

a. To impose conditions on the licence; or
b. To exclude a licensable activity or refuse to specify a person as premises supervisor.

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

a. The licence ought not to have been granted; or
b. That on granting the licence, the Licencing authority ought not to have been having 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 this 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 Magistrate's Court within the period of 21 days, beginning with the day on which the appellant was notified by the Licencing Authority of the decision appealed against.

## 6. LICENSING ACT 2003: TITO'S LATIN CLUB, BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR, 4 - 6 LONDON BRIDGE STREET LONDON SE1 9SG

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

The applicant and their legal representative addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the applicant and their legal representative.

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.33am for a comfort break.

The meeting reconvened at 11.42am.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.47am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 12.05pm and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application made by Maria Crisanta Zahouani, Fernando Ramos and Jawad Zahouani to vary a premises licence to Tito's Latin Club, Basement and Ground Floor, 4 – 6 London Bridge Street London SE1 9SG be refused.

**Reasons**

This was an application to vary the premises licence for Tito's Latin Club at 426 London Bridge Street, London SE1 9SG. The application sought an amendment to condition 308, to restrict last entry to the premises to 02:00 hours on Thursday to Saturday, to 03:00 hours Wednesdays to Saturday. The application also sought to extend the hours for licensable activities Wednesday to Thursday from 04:30 until 5:00 hours

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant's representative who advised Tito's Latin Club, was a long-established Latin American venue in London Bridge, having operated for many years without complaints reported by the licencing authority. The premises was in the Borough and Bankside Cumulative Impact Area and the applicant recognised the policy position.

The applicant was not asking the sub-committee to disregard those concerns, but to look at the premises as it currently operated and the evidence presented. Police incidents span several years and related to the wider London night- time economy. It was the applicant's view that the premises didn't demonstrate that it was poorly managed, nor that extending operating hours would undermine the licencing objectives. The premises had never been subject to a review, suspension or closure order, nor were there any complaints of noise nuisance.
The premises sat in one of the busiest parts of central London and the applicant was willing to strengthen dispersal arrangements, smoking controls and waste management.

Regarding conditions, the applicant would engage constructively with responsible authorities and was willing to accept an extensive suite of police proposed safeguards, enhanced TV, body worn, video, method detector searches, crime scene prevention training, ask for Angela, vulnerability policies, incident logging and drinks to be served only in plastic containers or glasses.

Regarding security, on busy nights there were at least four SIA door supervisors, including a female officer. On quieter nights, few would be deployed, but there would always be sufficient SIA staff present, to ensure security levels would be proportionate and effective.

The applicant resisted a condition proposed by the police (That all drinks shall be sold in cans or plastic bottles or will be decanted into recyclable polycarbonate (or a similar material), or cardboard drinking receptacles. Glass drinking receptacles would not be used at the premises at any time), which would prohibit the sale of spirits by the bottle during DJ led or live music events.

The premises attracted the Latin American community and ordering drinks by the bottle was a normal cultural practice when drinking in a group and an important part of the social experience. There was no evidence that the bottle service had caused crime or disorder at the premises and the extensive conditions the applicant was accepting already provided strong safeguards. A blanket prohibition was unnecessary and disproportionate.

The premises was a well run establishment with no complaints, with no enforcement history, and a willingness to adopt robust conditions. The evidence did not show the variation would add to the cumulative impact nor would it undermine the licencing objectives.

During members' questions, it was noted that the applicant had utilised a number of temporary event notices (TENs) until 05:00 hours and whilst there had been no serious incidents, the applicant was asked the reason for the variation.

In response, the applicant explained the Latin American community tended to stay out longer, which meant on occasion, the club was still full at closing time with patrons arriving sometimes at 02:00 to 03:00 hours. It also ensured a manageable dispersal, that avoided the SIA supervisors being overwhelmed at the end of a

night, and it was felt there would be a benefit in extending the club hours. The applicant mentioned its sister clubs, Mira Flores in Southwark Street and Vauxhall that had a similar steady dispersal. The economic benefit was also acknowledged.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the police, whose objection was based on the prevention of crime and disorder licencing objective which impacted on the cumulative impact area and the burden placed upon emergency services.

The officer explained that the hours sought by the applicant substantially exceeded those recommended by the Southwark statement of licensing policy 2026-2031 ("SoLP") for premises located within the Borough and Bankside area.

The applicant's case relied heavily on the proposition that the premises was an established venue and that there had been no formal licence reviews, together with the absence of complaints recorded by the licensing authority.

Members were invited to exercise caution before attaching significant weight to this assertion; the absence of a premises licence review was not evidence of good management. A review application was a measure of last resort, pursued when other interventions proved ineffective. The licensing objectives may be undermined long before the threshold for review proceedings was reached; it didn’t demonstrate the premises was not contributing to crime and disorder. Rather, it indicated only that enforcement action of that nature has not been taken against the premises.

The relevant question for members was whether the application undermined the licensing objectives. The evidence presented by the police demonstrated longstanding concerns regarding crime and disorder associated with the premises and its immediate vicinity. Police records disclosed a range of incidents, including assaults, robberies, thefts and incidents involving intoxicated patrons. While such incidents may be characteristic of the wider night-time economy, the evidence demonstrated that the premises operated within an environment already experiencing significant crime and disorder issues.

The applicant's submissions effectively invited members to attach limited weight to crime associated with the operation of a late-night, alcohol-led venue on the basis that such crime was common within the area. Members were invited to reject this suggestion. The prevalence of crime and disorder within the locality did not diminish the relevance of evidence demonstrating the impact of further late-night alcohol-led activity on the licensing objectives.

The applicant's contention that the police had failed to establish a direct causal link between the proposed additional hours and future crime and disorder was also disputed. Cumulative impact policies were founded on a well-established relationship between extended alcohol-led trading, increased levels of intoxication, heightened demand on police and emergency services, and an increased risk of crime and disorder. It did not preclude Members from drawing reasonable inferences when assessing the likely impact of granting an application.

The measures proposed to the applicant were standard control measures expected for a responsibly operated nightclub. They were not exceptional safeguards and but were those expected in normal industry practice.

The officer concluded that it was also notable the applicant had not proposed any additional controls proportionate to the significant increase in trading hours. Instead, the primary change appeared as simply more hours later admissions and later dispersal.

The police confirmed they objected the entire application and urged the sub-committee to reject the application in its entirety.

They were satisfied the police reports of cited on pages 133 to136 of the agenda were incidents that either occurred within or outside the premises with patrons. The officer confirmed following the reports in 2024, the police had tried working with the premises and proposed a number of conditions and advised the applicant to submit a minor variation to add the conditions to the licence.

The applicant did submit the recommended minor variation, but due to an issue, the applicant failed to pursue it, which resulted in further incidents occurring. As a nightclub in a CIA, the conditions were no more than those police expected a nightclub to have, regardless of it being in a CIA.

The licensing sub-committee heard from licensing as a responsible authority, whose representation related to all the licensing objective, but in particular, the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder.

The officer stated that licensing's objection was reflective of the objection made by the police. The sub-committee were reminded that the premises did sit within the Borough and Bankside CIA, which the Licensing Committee had installed and maintained. The premises already had the benefit of hours beyond those recommended within the SoLP and the Applicant wished to extend further still, which the officer described as excessive and that the Applicant had not satisfied the rebuttable presumption.

The lack of recorded Licensing complaints did not negate evidence of crime and disorder. Further, the application was not for a modest variation. The premises already benefitted from hours far beyond those generally recommended by the SoLP.

The applicant had argued that as an existing venue (rather than a new premises), concerns of cumulative impact should carry less weight. This suggestion was opposed. Existing premises were not exempt from the cumulative impact policy. The test remained whether the variation sought was likely to add to the cumulative impact and undermine the licencing objectives. Extending alcohol sales and entertainment later into the early morning increased that potential.

The premises known as Tito's Latin Club is located on London Bridge Street, running from London Bridge Station towards Borough High Street and located in the Borough and Bankside CIA. The recommended closing time for nightclubs (with 'sui generis' planning classification) in the SoLP are Monday to Thursday is 01:00 and for Friday and Saturday 03:00 and for Sunday 00:00.

For completeness, at the date of the hearing, the closing hours on the premises licence were Monday to Wednesday to 00:30; Thursday and Friday to 03:30; Saturday to 04:00 hours and Sunday to 02:00.

The applicant sought the variation of its premises hours with proposed closing hours of Monday to Tuesday to 00:30; Wednesday to Saturday to 05:00 and Sunday to 02:00. The variation application also sought a variation of condition 308 so that the last entry time be extended from 02:00 to 03:00. In turn, the sub-committee therefore recognised the premises already benefitted from hours exceeding the recommended SoLP hours.

The question the licensing sub-committee had to ask was whether the applicant demonstrated a clear and positive promotion of the licencing objectives? Although the applicant knew the premises was in a CIA, they failed to propose any additional control measures to mitigate the problems associated with late-night venues; nor had they approached responsible authorities.

The sub-committee were not satisfied the applicant had rebutted the refusal presumption it. The police demonstrated the premises had a history of crime and disorder associated. While the applicant spoke of extending its operating hours to assist with the dispersal of the premises, the police crime reports demonstrated it was not currently managing to properly dispersal of its customers. Extending the operating hours was therefore counter-productive; extending the hours meant customers could still be admitted when they should be dispersing, showing the later operating hours was little more that permitting intoxicated patrons entry with later hours.

The sub-committee found the crime reports presented compelling. The police evidence of incidents involving the premises contained a range of incidents including assaults, robberies, thefts and incidents involving intoxicated patrons, in particular, the following serious incidents:

**Theft - 12/05/2024**. The victim had been in the premises and stood outside as a crowd left the club, talking to suspect 1 who the victim believed had just left the club same as him. The victim took his mobile phone out and suspect 1 signalled to suspect 2 who was sat on a pedal cycle. Suspect 2 rode past the victim quickly and snatched his phone out of his hand and rode off. Suspect 1 then changed his tone and walked off in the same as suspect 2. When the victim asked for the return of his phone, the first male threatened to stab him. Crime Report 01/331582/24 refers.

**Affray - 25/12/2025 at 02:50 hours** – Affray involving a “massive” fight of bar patrons outside who had allegedly been taking part in a fight. Approximately 100-150 people were loitering outside the premises. The SIA security staff were unable to say to police exactly what the patrons had done, with a number of patrons who couldn’t be described and having left the vicinity. CCTV could also not be accessed with staff untrained to access it. They were unable to say when someone would be able to access it and were unwilling to provide statements regarding what happened, stating they only wanted assistance to help clear the patrons away from the venue. Crime Report 01/8359055/25 refers.

At 03:00 hours officers were alerted to a fight in progress outside the premises with various people stating that they had been the victim of various offences by the same group. The three main offenders were all arrested. Whilst dealing it was ascertained that one victim had been hit in the head with a bottle and two females had been sexually assaulted. Crime Report 01/8214123/25 refers.

**Assault - 01/02/2025 at 01:30 hours**. The victim had been in the premises and was approached by the suspect who threw a drink in her face, security informed no Action would be taken. Crime Report 01/7114680/25 refers.

**ABH - 19/10/2024 at 23:24 hours**. Police were called by LAS who stated that they had a male at the above venue who was bleeding from the head and who was unconscious. Police arrived shortly afterwards where there were multiple LAS units already on scene. Officers were led down to the basement level of the premises, where the male was found, unconscious on the floor, receiving first aid from paramedics. Whilst speaking with staff at the venue to ascertain what had happened, officers were approached by the DJ of the floor, who stated he had been in the DJ booth when the victim approached him and started arguing over the music being played. This became heated and the victim threw wine over the suspect, whilst he was still in the booth. In response the DJ came out of the DJ booth and punched in the back of head twice in quick succession, knocking the victim unconscious. Crime Report 01/7155014/25 refers.

The sub-committee also noted that the applicant relied heavily on the TENs as a justification for the extension of its operating hours. TENs operate under a separate regime compared to standard full licensing applications under the Licensing Act 2003 and are a light touch process that Applicants utilise designed for small, one-off or temporary events. They should not be indicative of a licensing application being granted.

Paragraph 1.18 of the s.182 Home Office Guidance (February 2026) and similarly, page 7 of the National Licensing Policy Framework for the Hospitality and Leisure Sectors England and Wales (November 2025) recognises the value of economic growth, investment, employment and thriving communities, but the application provided no evidence how an additional two hours would deliver anything meaningful or benefit in those respects. In contrast, is a clear and foreseeable risk that extending the operating hours of operation will result in further incidents of crime and disorder, increased levels of intoxication, and additional demands on the

already stretched, overstretched police and other emergency services. The licencing objectives are the paramount consideration. In this case, the potential harm to the prevention of crime and disorder objective substantially outweighs any speculative economic benefit.

The applicant has failed to rebut the presumption to refuse this premises licence application. The sub-committee were referred to R (on the application of Westminster City Council) -v- Middlesex Crown Court [2002] EWHC 1104 in which HHJ Baker adjudicated "*Notwithstanding the applicant being a fit and proper person and the premises would be well run a licence could be refused on the sole ground that the area was already saturated with licence premises….and the cumulative effect of the existing premises was impacting adversely on the area to an unacceptable level*". This premises has a questionable history. In the circumstances since the premises is located in the Borough and Bankside CIA, this application is refused.

If the applicant is determined on extending its operating hours, the sub-committee highly recommended they submit the minor variation as recommended by the police in 2024/2025. This would provide an on-going commitment to address crime and disorder and the promotion of all the licensing objectives, rather than reliance on the TENs regime with its limited consultation requirements.

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**

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 12.07pm

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**