Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday 10 September 2026 at 10.00 am at Innovation Space, Ground Floor, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

PRESENT:	Councillor Jane Salmon (Chair) Councillor Andy Higson Councillor Bill Williams
OTHER AUTHORITIES PRESENT:	P.C. Mark Lynch, Metropolitan Police Service
OFFICER SUPPORT:	Debra Allday, legal officer Jayne Tear, licensing officer Paul Nwman, environmental protection 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.

1. 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

The chair agreed that supplemental agenda No.1 would be allowed to be considered.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

5. LICENSING ACT 2003: SE5 LOUNGE (FORMERLY KNOWN AS PLANET NOLLYWOOD), 319 CAMBERWELL ROAD, LONDON SE5 0HQ

The legal advisor for the applicant made a preliminary point about the admissibility of evidence provided by the police.

The legal representative for the Metropolitan Police Service responded to the points raised by the applicant's legal representative.

The meeting adjourned at 10.45am for the members to consider the points raised by the legal representatives.

The meeting then reconvened at 10.58am. The chair advised that the sub-committee had agreed to hear the evidence from the police.

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

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.57am for a comfort break. The meeting reconvened at 12.10pm.

The chair allowed the legal representative for the applicant to ask questions of the police.

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

The chair allowed the legal representative for the applicant to ask questions of the environmental protection team officer.

The sub-committee then heard from the other persons objecting to the application. Members had questions for the other persons. The chair allowed the legal representative for the applicant to ask questions of the other persons also.

The sub-committee then heard from an other person supporting the application. Members had questions for the other person.

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

The meeting adjourned 12.27pm for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 2.07pm and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Adejumo Adekunle for a premises licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as SE5 Lounge (Formally Known As Planet Nollywood), 319 Camberwell Road, London SE5 0HQ is refused.

Reasons

This was an application made by Adejumo Adekunle for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as SE5 Lounge (formerly known as Planet Nollywood), 319 Camberwell Road, London SE5 0HQ.

The licensing sub-committee heard submissions from the applicant's legal representatives on a preliminary issue, regarding the documents the police submitted on 24 August 2026it was contended amounted to a new representation made outside of the 28-day consultation period, which was unlawful. The Police submitted its representation on 11 May 2026 (Agenda pages 59-60; pages 25-26 Supplementary Agenda).

On 14 May 2026 the applicant's legal representative had requested information about the representation concerning the history of hate crime the letter referred to, or whether the police had provided all the information the police wanted to rely on.

The police stated they would consider the request as a Freedom of Information request. Although it was permittable to serve additional information to amplify what an objector had already written (Regulation 18 The Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005), the extent of amplification of a representation was a matter of fairness and procedure. That information wasn't forthcoming from the police in May.

The police then served documents on 24 August (Appendix B1, Agenda pages 64-102; pages 25-26 Supplementary Agenda) which, it was suggested, amounted to a further representation. The letter of 24 August described itself as an "Additional Representation", which it was argued, was a full separate representation, not an additional amplification of the first. As a matter of law, there was only 28-days to make a representation (Section 18 Licensing Act 2003; Regulation 25 Premises Licences and Club Premises Certificates Regulations 2005) and therefore out of

time to serve a new representation. The police letter was dated outside of the 28-day consultation period and should not be accepted as a matter of law (Royal Albert Hall v Corporation of the Hall of Arts and Sciences v The Albert Court Residents' Association [2011] EWCA Civ 430) which made it clear that after 28 days new representations could not be accepted.

The legal representative for the police agreed with the law but asserted the applicant's position was not founded. The representation dated 24 August was not a fresh representation. It raised the same issues at the heart of the representation dated 11 May which noted the application exceeded the recommended hours in Southwark's Statement of Policy 2026-2031 (SoLP) referred to the premises had a history of anti-social behaviour, crime and disorder, referred to the February 2026 incident and the revocation.

The representation summarised the police concerns that the application was likely to undermine the crime and disorder licensing objective. The letter/statement of 24 August states the substance is very much an amplification and refers to the same two licensing objectives of crime and disorder and public safety. It also refers to the history of operation of the premises. The Exhibits MAL/1-MAL/8 all go to this history showing that the premises undermined the crime and disorder and public safety licensing objectives.

On the preliminary issues, the licensing sub-committee determined that the police were not advancing a materially different case. They were building upon their 11 May representation. Members were satisfied that it was appropriate to provide supporting evidence so members could determine the application. The documents were sufficiently probative of whether the licensing objectives would be undermined by the grant of this application.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the licensing officer, who outlined the application. The officer pointed out at the review hearing on 6 June 2011 the licensing sub-committee decided that the designated premises supervisor (DPS), Mr Adejumo, be replaced immediately. A series of DPS' were in place between 2011 and on 23 July 2021 a DPS variation saw Mr Adejumo appointed.

The officer was asked about where the other persons (objectors and supporters) were based, and it was confirmed of the 49 other persons objecting, 48 lived in the SE5 area and one lived in W4. Of the 53 other persons supporting the application, there was a broad range across London which was not unusual for a nightclub although it was noted 13 supporters came from the SE5 area.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the legal representative for the applicant, who confirmed that SE5 Lounge was a late night premises. It already had the benefit of a premises licence, albeit revoked, but subject to a Magistrates' Court Appeal. The revoked premises licence allowed licensable activities until 03:00 hours Monday to Thursday and 05:00 hours Friday to Sunday.

The applicant submitted the premises licence application on similar terms and conditions that mirrored the revoked licence. The applicant's expert, Adrian Studd, recommended a terminal hour of 03:00 hours, which the applicant adopted, albeit reluctantly.

The applicant's legal representative suggested that the police did not object to a new license being granted to the applicant, but they did object to the premises being a late-night venue/nightclub operating in the early hours of the morning. Only seven incidents had arisen since 2025 and some of those referred to by the police had been driven by the premises refusing entry due to refused searches, finding prohibited items on patrons etc. There had been very little crime and disorder at the premises since 2005.

The sub-committee were advised at the hearing on 3 March, the police officer in attendance stated the levels of crime and disorder at the venue were not out of the ordinary for a late-night premises operating as a nightclub.

The applicant's legal representative also stressed at the hearing on 3 March, Licensing as a responsible authority (LRA), confirmed there had been no enforcement action in the previous two years. There had been one complaint, which had been investigated and concluded as unwarranted. The LRA had also concurred with the Police that the levels of complaints were no greater than any other comparable nightclub. Regarding the current application, the LRA had not submitted any representations, asserting the LRA under a duty to look at the SoLP and the cumulative impact policy and if they objected, the LRA were under a duty to submit a representation in objection.

Concerning the environmental protection team (EPT) objection, the applicant's legal representative stated that their representation submitted for the March review hearing had been presented by the same officer, but on the grounds of public safety. During that hearing, the officer confirmed he wasn't supporting the review application on the grounds of public nuisance, nor was he aware of any investigation, or any concerns of public nuisance in the preceding two years.

EPT were therefore left opposing the premises licence application based on the residents' complaints. It was accepted a large number of resident objectors (49) opposed the application, but the complaints didn't reflect the reality, there had been no nuisance complaints made to EPT. Also, many of the objectors were not in attendance at the current hearing, therefore, little weight should be attached to their evidence (Licensing Justices for East Gwent ex p. Chief Constable of East Gwent [2001] LLR 693).

The applicant's legal representative turned his attention to the 2023 resident review was based on public nuisance, stating the sub-committee didn't uphold the review due to public nuisance. Even in the early hours of the morning, the area was very busy, with a Transport for London garage that operated 24 hours a day. This meant customers congregated across the street during the night.

There was also mention of a hot food vendor selling food on the Green which, the applicant alleged, the council and the police both had historically been informed of but taken no enforcement action.

Regarding the complaints of the resident objectors, the applicant relied on the agent of change principle, where the responsibility for mitigating impacts from existing noise-generating activities or uses, rested with developers of new build properties/estates or the residents themselves; existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. (paragraph 14.67, Section 182 Home Office Guidance). The premises didn't negate the requirement not to cause a statutory noise nuisance, but since there had been no noise complaints, the noise complained of was de minimis.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the legal representative for the Metropolitan Police Service who explained that the police maintained its objection. The police did not agree to the terminal hour of 03:00 hours, recommending a terminal hour of Sunday to Thursday 00:00 hours and Friday and Saturday 01:00 hours as set out in the SoLP. The Police did not object to a premises license per se but the premises operating as a late nightclub.

The premises sat within the Camberwell cumulative impact area (CIA). The applicant accepted the severity of the harm caused due to the 1 February 2026 incident (being the trigger to the review application) due to indisputable crime and disorder, which caused grievous bodily harm with life changing injuries to five individuals. The Police updated the sub-committee that several individuals were awaiting trial relating to this event. The 1 February incident also demonstrated a complete failure on the applicant's part in management and operation of the premises.

The applicant had identified the failings from the 1 February incident and further identified measures to prevent recurrence. The identified controls were stated to be targeted and effective, and sufficient to warrant another chance. The police position was that the findings from the review undermined the confidence members could have in the venue at the time. The 2026 decision (Agenda, page 251) referred to the applicant's "**flagrant disregard of the licensing conditions", "…the venue had extremely limited control and a total disregard for licensing conditions intended to protect patrons and staff and the licensing objectives"** which prompted the robust decision to revoke the licence.

Although the applicant had identified a limited number of police incidents since 2025, the incident on 1 February and the decision to revoke the licence in March 2026 flowed from a litany of breaches of licensing conditions. A new premises licence with alleged stringent conditions could be questioned, given the applicant had demonstrated an inability to comply with conditions in early 2026, thereby, undermining the licensing regime. In view of the recent decision to revoke the licence in March 2026, it was reasonable for the sub-committee to require a sufficiently material change before they departed from the previous position.

The police suggested the sub-committee air caution when weighing whether the current application amounted to a sufficient material change. The legal representative for the police went through the conditions proposed by the applicant.

Concerning the applicant's independent expert (Adrian Studd) the legal representative for the police questioned the expert's experience and independence since he had also provided evidence in the March 2026 review hearing. The Members were invited to question what the proposed changes were since the revocation decision.

The police concluded that six months was an insufficient passage of time to warrant reliance on the applicant's position. A new DPS and new security company was said to be appointed. Since the applicant was the common thread to appointment of both, it was questionable whether the applicant could promote the licensing objectives if a fresh licence were issued.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the representative for the environmental protection team who accepted that his representation in the March 2026 hearing concerned public safety. His current representation opposing the licence application concerned the public nuisance licensing objective and the impact the premises would have on residents in the vicinity.

The officer also accepted no complaints of public nuisance made directly to EPT, or the noise and nuisance team, which operated independently. The officer stated residents had enjoyed a period of six months with the premises being closed and they were now familiar with the new noise climate. In the small hours of the morning, residents generally expected activity to be lower and expect a higher standard of amenity than in normal daytime hours.

Residents had voiced their concerns of the new application, having enjoyed the absence of the premises operation for a period of time. Members were therefore invited to give weight to the residents' objections where they are living in the vicinity of the premises and in terms of assessing whether or not there would be a negative impact on cumulative impact which undermined the licensing objectives.

The officer went on that the premises were located in the Camberwell CIA and regardless, the Applicant still sought a terminal hour of 03:00 hours, which was still a significant departure from the council's SoLP. Due to the proposed high intensity nature of the premises as a nightclub, rather than a bar/restaurant operation, the officer concluded that the application would likely undermine the licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of public nuisance. EPT recommended that the application be refused.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from Councillor Moyes, the ward councillor who represented other persons 1, 32, 33, 40 and 41. In summary, other person 1 complained of disorderly dispersal when the premises was both open, but

afterwards, with patrons congregating in a quiet area, which had a real effect on them. The premises persistently failed to adequately manage the dispersal causing a great general infringement upon the enjoyment of their property, with no confidence in the management of the establishment, stating there remained a threat to a crime disorder, prevention of public nuisance and public safety.

Other person 32 asked the sub-committee to carefully consider the history associated with the premises and refuse the application in the interests of protecting residents and in promotion of the licensing objectives.

Other person 33 complained there was no consideration for residents in the local area. They lived very close to the premises and stated their sleep was frequently disturbed by customers of the venue gathering by the local library, playing loud music, dancing, drinking etc. The premises was a nightclub and not a pub/restaurant which the applicant had alluded to previously, in what was considered a quiet residential area. They express incredulity at a potential terminal hour which had caused considerable consternation with the objectors and others. The Applicant had also failed to consider the premises may have on the sheltered housing at Lomond House,

Other person 40's objection was based on a long-standing, well-documented pattern of anti-social behaviour and their experiences of late-night disturbances, entering, drinking, leaving and congregating around the premises, fighting and shouting. The behaviour spilled out of the premises and the lack of dispersal affected local residents after the terminal hour; the proposals appeared to represent, the same operation under a different name, but practically, would be a continuation of the same style of operation at the same premises by the same owner.

Finally, Councillor Moyes summarised the representation of other person 41 stating the application before the sub-committee was merely a name change and the continued monitoring of the site would take up a huge amount of resources, from the police, the court, the noise team, ambulance, NHS, planning enforcement, street cleaning and waste management.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 4, who opposed the application and stated that his home was one of the closest to the nightclub and had resided there for approximately three years. They explained that on a regular basis, multiple times each month, fights occurred outside their home front door. He would escort his wife to work out the building, scared of the drug and alcohol fuelled groups congregating outside. They witnessed questionable packages being passed amongst the group. Often, they would wait until the group dispersed before leaving their home.

They were of the view that the management to the premises either had zero interest and/or zero ability, in dispersing the groups. Despite being tall, he was intimidated by the premises customers. Other times patrons would disperse from the premises arguing, singing, dancing, fighting. If the customers weren't fighting,

they'd b goading each other and on occasions, chase residents up and down the street, trying to follow them.

Other person 4 was also subject to noise pollution, with music played at a very loud volume. The resident had invested in festival quality earphones and wear them, together with ear plugs to drown out the sound from the venue and they could still hear the sound from the premises.

When asked, other person 4 described the premises had been “bliss” since the licence had been revoked. Their life was no longer dictated by the premises. Their anxiety had decreased, as had the stress and both he and his wife were able to sleep. The combined noise of the buses, ambulances and other traffic noise was considered normal city noise; regardless, the noise from the premises far exceeded this.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 5, who also opposed the application.

Other person 5 had been resident in the area since 1977 by the library. All of their windows which were double glazed faced Camberwell Green and the noise from the premises and because of this, they had no place to escape. Even when the windows were shut, the noise from Planet Nollywood could still be heard. When the premises was previously the Father Redcap pub, it never caused issues with local residents.

Other person 5 would be awoken at 03:00 hours and 05:00 hours consistently, when the customers of the premises were dispersing. As an early years practitioner, other person 5 was able to talk briefly about the public safety impact on being sleep deprived and/or having broken sleep, particularly with regard to young children,

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 15 who resided in a property next to the premises and was not a new build property. Other person 15 represented the other residents from the flats in the same property. The noise from the premises was described as tremendous, which would shake the windows. They echoed what other person 4 had said. The noise affected their mental health, and on occasions, prevented them from going to work. The premises had a negative impact on the whole community.

The licensing Sub-Committee heard from other person 51 who supported the application. Other person 51 undertook charity-based work in the community and had previously lived in the area 10 years ago and regularly frequented the premises. Other person 51 stated that the Applicant had demonstrated a responsible professional approach and understood the importance of complying with all relevant licenses, conditions and regulations. The premises has been used for charity events.

The licensing sub-committee noted the representations from 41 objecting other persons and 52 supporting other persons who were not in attendance at the hearing.

This was an application made by Adejumo Adekunle for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as SE5 Lounge (formerly known as Planet Nollywood), 319 Camberwell Road, London SE5 0HQ.

The applicant's legal representative suggested that the decision should be disregarded due to age, the incident had taken a matter of minutes, and the applicant had not been at fault. This was not accepted by the sub-committee who noted from the decision 6 May 2011 that **"a person entered the premises with 2 loaded firearms. The sub-committee was also satisfied that there had been previous incidents of crime and disorder at or connected with the premises**". In addition, "**there has been a number of serious crime related incidents at the premises in recent months including an incident on 6 May 2011 in which two firearms were found on an individual within the premises. The police therefore submitted that the premises are connected to serious crime and further submitted that the premises had been mismanaged by the current DPS, Mr Adejumo, by allowing such incidents to take place at the premises. The police further submitted that Mr Adejumo had mismanaged the premises and failed to adhere to the conditions attached to his licence**".

The sub-committee further noted from the notice of decision of 6 June 2011 the only mitigation the licensee submitted was that "**The licensee accepted that he was naïve and mismanaged the premises which he claimed was due to inexperience rather than any intentional act**".

The applicant's legal representative diminished the incident that led to the decision of 6 June 2011 when the sub-committee determined that the licence be suspended, conditions were modified with one of the conditions being the DPS, Mr Adejumo, be replaced forthwith. The condition was not time limited, and it was unclear why a DPS variation was submitted to Adekunle Adejumo on 23 July 2021 (ref: paragraph 35 of the officer report in the agenda, 10 September 2026) or why the police didn't object to the DPS vary.

The sub-committee also noted that significant amendments had been made to the licence following the resident 2023 review which was accepted by the Applicant.

In the 3 March 2026 notice of decision, the sub-committee recognised that **"a premises professionally managed could be a valuable asset to the nighttime economy and the local community. However, the sub-committee were satisfied that the management of the premises fell far below that standard required for a premises with such hours**".

The sub-committee agreed with the responsible authorities supporting the revocation of the licence as they did not have confidence with the management of the premises. Importantly, the sub-committee noted "**For the premises to exist**

as a nightclub, there requires a complete change in the premises licence holder and management Team, including the DPS".

It was noted by the sub-committee that relatively little had changed since the March 2026 revocation in so far as:

a. The revoked licence holder remained the proposed licence holder
b. The DPS on the revoked licence was the proposed DPS in the licence application.
c. The first floor on the revoked licence remained in the proposed licence application.
d. The conditions on the operating schedule contained minimal amendments.
e. The applicant had not taken heed of the licensing sub-committee's comments: "**For the premises to exist as a nightclub, there requires a complete change in the premises licence holder and management Team, including the DPS**".

Some of the proposed changes highlighted by the applicant's legal representative had been:

i. A new DPS – However, notwithstanding what the licensing sub-committee stated on 3 March 2026, the premises licence application was submitted by Adekunle Adejumo as the Applicant and named him as the DPS. This licensing sub-committee concluded, that while Adekunle Adejumo there remained a risk he would vary the DPS back into his name which would potentially pose a risk to the public as he had done before. Further, Adekunle Adejumo would remain the directing mind of the club, again, posing a risk to the public.

ii. Universal ID scanning and searching are to apply to patrons, staff, security, DJs and associated personnel, subject only to the tightly defined exceptions proposed.

However, Condition 344 on the previous licence was an identical to ID scanner condition on the proposed licence compelling all persons that enter the premises including all SIA registered door supervisors, patrons, DJs and associated staff to be scanned and have their details recorded on the system.
The identical condition was provided in condition 290 regarding searches of the revoked licence requiring all personnel, including staff to be subject to search with a wand/metal detection units.

iii. No glass bottle or container is to enter a public area, with service through polycarbonate containers or carafes. Condition 841 existed on the revoked licence specified glass was prohibited but ignored.

In considering the evidence in connection with public nuisance, the applicants representative appeared dimmish the evidence submitted from the environmental protection ream, stating that the officer's representation in connection with the March 2026 review was based on public safety licensing objective.

The sub-committee did not accept the applicant's position concerning the EPT evidence. Southwark is a large corporation and the EPT manager who attended the hearing, was one a number managers within the environmental health teams of regulatory services, capable of giving a multi-disciplined approach in respect of public nuisance and public safety licensing objectives.

Further, whilst no reports were held by its sister noise and nuisance team (which also sits within regulatory services), the officer's evidence related to the promotion of the prevention for public nuisance. No statutory noise nuisance needed to be provided, nor the service of any noise abatement notice under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 was required. The level of concern raised by residents previously (in the 2023 review), sufficed in supporting the EPT representation to oppose the premises licence for the promotion of the prevention of public nuisance.

No finding is made regarding licensing as a responsible authority not submitting a representation objecting to licence application. Although there was a duty to notify all responsible authorities of an application, no explanation was provided by the officer and author of the Agenda report for the absence of such a representation. The furthest the sub-committee was willing to accept is no representation was presented.

In considering the evidence presented by other persons 4, 5 and 15 opposing the application, provided compelling evidence. Some of the other persons opposing the application raised detailed representations, demonstrating considerable impact that the premises has had over many years when it operated as Planet Nollywood.

Although the sub-committee accepted the evidence of other person 51 (a supporter of the application), the members were of the view that the evidence of the objectors was more detailed. Mindful of the East Gwent case, the attendance of additional other persons supporting the application, would have allowed the sub-committee to question the other persons, which may have assisted the applicant.

The applicant's submissions effectively invited members to attach limited weight (if any at all) to crime associated with the operation of a late-night, alcohol-led venue. Members were invited to reject this suggestion. The premises was located in the Camberwell cumulative impact area (CIA).

By being located in a CIA, Southwark Council accepted that the premises is located in an area where the number, type or density of licensed premises was high, particularly those selling alcohol or providing late night refreshment. Serious problems of nuisance and disorder may arise outside or some distance from those premises. The prevalence of crime and disorder in and around the premises

impacted late-night alcohol-led activity in the wider locality thereby undermining the licensing objectives.

The legal representative for the applicant's contention that the police had failed to establish a direct causal link between the proposed 01:00/03:00 hours and future crime and disorder was also disputed. Camberwell CIA was 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 applicant had argued that as an existing premises (rather than a new premises), concerns of cumulative impact carried less weight. This was opposed. Existing premises were not exempt from the CIA. The test remained whether the current application was likely to add to the cumulative impact and undermine the licencing objectives. Late-night alcohol led activities by their very nature increased that potential.

Whilst it is accepted a venue already exists, that premises licence had been revoked (but the subject of an appeal). This licensing sub-committee accepts the decision that was made on 3 March 2026. With that in mind, this sub-committee expects for a new premises licence to operate at the same venue it must be of an exceptional quality and granted in an exceptional circumstance.

Being presented with an application for a licence largely identical as the revoked licence, with a few amendments is not exceptional. The applicant was provided copies of the other persons objections once the application consultation closed. Similar objections were raised in 2023. Despite knowing the level of objection from residents concerning noise, no expert evidence from an acoustic consultant was presented to address those concerns. If the applicant had taken heed of the licensing sub-committee's comments in the March 20026 decision and alleviated the noise concerns, this decision *may* have been more positive.

For these reasons, this premises licence application is refused.

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:

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 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 2.09pm.

CHAIR:

DATED: