Licensing Sub-Committee

MINUTES of the OPEN section of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday 17 September 2026 at 10.00 am at Online/Virtual

---

PRESENT:	Councillor Jane Salmon (Chair) Councillor Ruth Bannister Councillor Andy Higson
OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:	Councillor Patrickson Obanya (observing)
OTHER AUTHORITIES PRESENT:	P.C. Mark Lynch, Metropolitan Police Service
OFFICER SUPPORT:	Debra Allday, legal officer Andrew Heron, licensing officer / licensing responsible authority officer Ola Owojori, licensing officer Mark Prickett, environmental protection officer Andrew Weir, constitutional officer

1. APOLOGIES

This was a virtual licensing sub-committee meeting.

The chair advised that there had been a request to vary the order of business. However, as there were a number of parties involved in the meeting, the meeting would proceed in the order in the agenda.

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

It was noted that additional information from other persons in relation to item 7 had been circulated prior to the meeting.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

5. LICENSING ACT 2003: WALWORTH LIVING ROOM, ALL SAINTS HALL, SURREY SQUARE, LONDON SE17 2JU

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

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

The licensing sub-committee heard from the other persons objecting to the application. Members had questions for the other persons.

The meeting adjourned at 11.35am for a comfort break. The meeting then reconvened at 11.40am.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11.51am for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 12.14pm and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Pembroke College Settlement for a premises licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as Walworth Living Room, All Saints Hall, Surrey Square, London SE17 2JU is granted.as follows:

Hours

The sale by retail of alcohol (on sales only):	• Sunday to Wednesday from 11:30 to 21:00 • Thursday to Saturday from 11:30 to 22:00
Opening hours:	• Sunday to Wednesday from 09:00 to 22:00 • Thursday to Saturday from 09:00 to 23:00.

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, conditions agreed with the Metropolitan Police Service, licensing as a responsible authority the environmental protection team and the following condition:

i. That there will be no playing amplified music permitted in the outside courtyard at anytime.

Reasons

This was an application made by Pembroke College Settlement for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as Walworth Living Room, All Saints Hall, Surrey Square, London SE17 2JU.

The Licensing Sub-Committee heard from the Executive Director of Pembroke House, the operating name for the of the charity Pembroke College Settlement in addition to the Facilities Manager and proposed Designated Premises Supervisor.

It was explained that the venue Walworth Living Room was located in All Saints Hall on Surrey Square.

They advised that the aim of the Living Room was to provide a space for the diverse communities of Walworth to come together in an area where lots of spaces for people to gather and to build connections have been lost. The aim of Pembroke House, as a neighbourhood organisation that had been in Walworth for over 140-years, was to provide opportunities for residents to meet one another, to build relationships and to strengthen the neighbourhood and community bonds. The applicant was governed by its charitable objectives.

It had opened in 2018 as an extension of the charity's operations. Most of the operations were carried out in their main building, in Pembroke House on Tatum Street. As that space was taken up with activities, they identified the Living Room as another site, took a lease of All Saints Hall, which was formerly the church hall on Surrey Square Terrace.

Since 2018, the Living Room site developed and evolved a regular programme of community events and activities, with a programme based on interest from local community members. There was currently a four-day a week drop-in programme funded by the National Lottery Reaching Communities programme and the Esme Fairburn programme.

Many of the residents who utilise the Living Room came from more vulnerable members of the community. The Living Room provided space for and safe sanctuary for people who need this type of community space. A range of statutory services, health provision and council meetings also took place at the Living Room.

The venue had a programme of community activities, providing a crucial space for people to come together. Staff undertook regular community engagement and door knocking to try and engage with local networks meeting residents and try and extend the programme out onto the streets.

Many residents comment that the Living Room sounded good but were unable to access the programme in its existing hours due to work etc. By way of response, the applicant had trialled a programme of evening or weekend activities, such as supper clubs, drop in music nights and on Saturday, they launched a Farmers Market.

The applicant wanted to build on that momentum, with some of the activities offered being permitted to supply alcohol. A bring your own bottle of alcohol was previously allowed and governed under the charity's policies and procedures. The offer of alcohol would allow the applicant to serve and control alcohol at those events, as part of another opportunity to bring people together and extend a supper club, with another element.

It would be part of an experimental programme, based on feedback from residents and based on interest. It would give the flexibility in testing a small and limited number of those types of events.

In advance of the licensing sub-committee hearing, the applicant wrote to everyone in the local area, setting out its intentions and activities, advising that a small number of limited events would then be available while the programme was tested. The applicant stated there was no intention to operate a seven day a week licence as this would be incongruent with their charitable objectives.

A licence was sought for certain evening activities on Thursday, Fridays and maybe Saturdays. A seven days a week licence was sought because the Living Room hired rooms for conferences, public events etc. and alcohol could be offered as part of the applicant's catering. Based on demand, the Living Room operated approximately six conferences each year. Drop-ins at the Living Room operated between three and a half to four days a week due to the limitations of funding and capacity as a team, so licensed events would be strictly limited.

Bring your own (BYO) alcohol was permitted only for specific events, each event being risk assessed. The applicant did not offer the Living Room for private parties, primarily because the space is predominantly for community/public sector or meeting use. Private parties could not be properly risk assessed.

By offering the sale of alcohol as opposed to BYO, the applicant would be able to make a small income that would support other charitable objectives of the organisation. It would also place the applicant in control under the licensing regime, bringing a raft of licencing conditions to comply with.

Under a premises licence the applicant would be subject to stringent controls from local authority, police and environmental protection team measures. The residents' concerns of noise would be more likely under a BYO that under a license, but added to that, the applicant would have less controllable measures in terms of the consumption or the use of alcohol on the premises.

The applicant accepted that it did not have a smokers' policy. Currently, there was no smoking space available and whilst the applicant would prefer to keep this, they accepted they still remain a number of individuals that smoked/vaped. The Applicant stated they would review how smokers could be managed once a licence was granted. The courtyard was not a massive space, but they intended on creating a separate area for smokers within it.

The licensing sub-committee heard a local resident who represented other persons A and C who had lived in Surrey Square for approximately 30 years. Surrey Square was quiet, and almost entirely a residential street.

The resident supported and valued the work of the Walworth Living Room but was of the view that the licence application exceeded what was set out in the applicant's letter to residents in June 2026. The applicant had applied to effectively open a venue for hire, serving food and alcohol seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, using the large courtyard as an integral part of their operation. The application included the right to host up to two large events per week. This would disturb those residents who worked from home. The residents' bedrooms faced directly onto the courtyard and the noise of people in the courtyard drinking and eating would have a material impact on the quality of the residents' lives, regardless of the mitigations in place

Other person A was over 80 years of age and usually went to bed at 21:00 hours. Sleeping would be impossible until much later. The resident mentioned that in May 2026 Walworth Living Room hosted an event that was out of control, causing a serious disturbance. The applicant had failed to explain their admissions and lettings policy and/or whether would accept people off the street. If the Living Room were to gain a reputation, challenging people to keep quiet and asking people to move on (on the street) would not be realistic.

The resident found it difficult to understand the legal basis on which the licencing officer withdrew the environmental protection team's (EPT) objections. The agreed conditions were vague, ill-defined and lacking in measurable parameters as to be unenforceable, which was a key factor in the granting of a license. The application

had caused a huge amount of anxiety to residents with an operation anticipated that would potentially destroy the quiet and calm of the area. It was explained by the licensing officer that the EPT had conciliated with the applicant and it would be unlawful to not accept that conciliation.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person B who also opposed the premises licence application based on the prevention of crime and disorder and also prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives. It was explained that local residents had been misled by the applicant. In a flyer, the applicant put through doors, they were “Applying for an events and activities licence for the building, to serve our cause during limited evening and weekend hours. Once the application is submitted, then you will be contacted by the council”. This was not true.

The council did not contact residents once the application was submitted, resulting in many residents missing the consultation deadline to submit representations. The resident was advised that unlike the planning regime, under the Licensing Act 2003, the council was not under a duty to notify residents of a licensing application.

The applicant was also not candid about its desire to serve drinks and allow the congregation of people in the courtyard, which was raised by the environmental protection team (EPT). The applicant had very recently, installed a specially adapted shipping container with a serving hatch to serve drinks. It was suggested that this was an open-air bar, accessible from the street and directly opposite residents.

The applicant was unable to articulate in a clear and transparent fashion how they intend to use the proposed premises licence. No clear indication of the numbers, whether all events would be ticketed or whether they would allow customers from the street to enter.

The facilities manager, wrote to the council with watered down the conditions suggested by EPT, and made the point that, the premises intended to host community supper clubs, curated dining experiences and other structured social events where the courtyard forms an integral part of the overall event, rather than functioning as an outdoor drinking area. However, it was not clear what this means. The courtyard would be used as part of events therefore, the EPT's concerns of likely breakout of noise remain.

The applicant had also failed to inform the council of several serious complaints about noise and nuances before the application was made. At a virtual meeting on 11 September 2026, this was put to the applicant. The response given was local pubs were empty, so demand would likely be low in any event. The applicant demonstrated no real effort to address the potential for public nuisance.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person D who echoed the issues raised by their fellow residents who made submissions at the sub-committee hearing.

In considering this application the licensing sub-committee was conscious that the Walworth Living Room was a space where the applicant's aims under their charitable objectives, was to build as a community venue that works for the diversity of all with and that including its immediate neighbours which they have always attempted to be a good neighbour to.

Since 2018 there had been three instances the applicant was aware of concerns raised by residents regarding noise, none of which were alcohol related. Private parties do not take place at the premises. On the occasions that residents had raised concern, the applicant responded quickly.

The number of complaints versus the number of activities that had operated demonstrated robust procedures were already in place. During the course of the hearing, the applicant agreed that amplified music would only be played inside the premises to ensure it doesn't cause any noise disturbance

The sub-committee were informed that the closest neighbour, was the warden of Pembroke House, who was also the vicar of St. Christopher's Church. The vicar had a governing role in Pembroke House, so the applicant would be made aware of disturbances. It should act as reassurance to residents that the vicar had held this position in that the well-being of the church's parishioners was paramount.

However, the other persons are also reminded that should residents have serious concerns of the management of the event they have a right to call the premises licence in for a review when ultimately, the licensing sub-committee could revoke the premises licence.

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.

6. LICENSING ACT 2003: THE COTTAGE, 169A BOROUGH HIGH STREET, LONDON SE1 1HR

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

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

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

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

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

The sub-committee noted the written representations of the other persons, who were not present at the meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12.55pm for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 1.32pm and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Colab Charitable Foundation for a premises licence under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the premises known as The Cottage, 169a Borough High Street, SE1 1HR is refused.

Reasons

This was an application made by Colab Charitable Foundation for a premises licence in respect of the premises known as The Cottage, 169a Borough High Street, SE1 1HR.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant who explained it was charitable theatre company and community group that had operated in Southwark for approximately 14 years. They applicant utilised empty buildings earmarked for demolition and created spaces for immersive theatre and art centres.

The Cottage was a premises they intended to take over. It was their intention to provide an immersive theatre and café/cocktail bar. The Cottage was small, in comparison to their previous ventures and would have a capacity of a maximum It would not be a loud or obnoxious venue that give rise to nuisance to the surrounding area.

The applicant had reached out to local residents who were on board with its proposals. To the Applicant's advantage, there was a pub below the premises that had been in existence for almost 100 years, so would have a limited impact. The premises would not be a DJ-led music events space or anything similar.

The reason the applicant sought later hours on the licence was twofold. Financially the applicant would attract greater revenue. Also, currently, the applicant was obtaining funding from the Arts Council invitational theatre, which were for very small scale shows with limited actors. The shows were lengthy in duration and started at midday and were physically taxing on the actor, so later hours provided leeway for new shows requiring late night hours if they were particularly dark or mysterious.

The applicant had conciliated on many issues but needed to fight back on the issue of hours. When pushed on the subject, the applicant stated that they needed the 05:00 hours licence or nothing, although at a push, they would agree 03:00 hours.

Regarding the hours being outside those recommended in the Statement of Licensing Policy (SoLP), the premises would not be an alcohol led space, like many of the venues in the SE1 area.

Customers of The Cottage would primarily be going to watch a show or sitting quietly rather than being loud seeking a party atmosphere. The Applicant was unable to prove they were not going to be a nightclub but sought to give their assurance of it.

During the discussion stage of the applicant's evidence, it was also pointed out that although the application gave a description of a late night café (Agenda, page 94), late-night refreshment was not sought. The applicant explained that late night refreshment hadn't been applied for because they didn't want to serve hot food between 23:00 to 05:00 hours; the kitchen was too small to cater for hot food at those times and preferred to sell snacks or olives. The applicant had not appreciated that hot coffee and tea required a late night refreshment licence.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the Metropolitan Police Service whose representation was based on the prevention of crime and disorder licencing objective and stated that the application sought exceptionally late hours for the sale of alcohol and four hours beyond the recommended hours in the SoLP.

Prior to the hearing, the police did engage with the applicant and visited the premises where discussions took place. As part of the discussions, the police recommended a reduction in hours to bring the application closer to the SoLP. This was considered reasonable given the location of the premises and lack of trading history. Without it, members had no evidence of how the venue would operate in practice. However, the applicant chose to proceed with the application unchanged.

The police identified potential issues such as the concentration of licenced premises and the associated issues of crime, disorder, antisocial behaviour and alcohol related harm linked to the night-time economy and the proposed alcohol sales until 05:00 hours were of particular concern in view of the premises operating substantially later than nearby venues, such as the Blue Eyed Maid, which closed at 00:30 hours and was problematic at the location.

The Officer concluded that granting the hours would keep patrons in the night-time economy long after many other venues were closed which would delay dispersal into the early hours of the morning.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the officer representing licensing as a responsible authority who stated that licencing were concerned the premises was described as a late-night café, but no late-night refreshment had been applied for.

The applicant's verbal submission of a cultural space and not being alcohol led, was not what was currently before the sub-committee. The hours applied for were more akin to a nightclub, albeit very small, and the sale of alcohol hours far exceeded the SoLP. Members could be concerned the premises could become an after-party venue. It was entirely possible there was nothing sinister about the application but members needed to be satisfied that granting hours outside the SoLP would be promoting the licencing objectives.

The licencing sub-committee then heard from the officer representing the environmental protection team (EPT) whose objection was also based on the hours applied for. The officer had met with the applicant and was aware of its previous ventures in the area. As far as EPT were concerned, the applicant was a good operator; there had been no known issues at any of the applicant's previous venues.

EPT had expected more information from the applicant such as a dispersal policy, a noise management plan, visuals of the space etc. in order to agree conditions and hours. Like the police, EPT hadn't provided any proposed conditions/hours because hours would generate different conditions.

The licensing sub-committee noted the representations from two other persons who were not in attendance at the hearing.

In considering the application the licensing sub-committee recognised the applicant previously held premises licenses with Southwark and the there were no reported issues known to the responsible authorities.

The Cottage, however, was located in the centre of the Borough and Bankside cumulative impact area. While all applications before the sub-committee were considered on their own merits, a licence, once granted, could easily be transferred. It was therefore important that the detailed proposals for the premises were known, so that conditions could be properly tailored for the premises.

Due to the fact that the premises was located in the Borough and Bankside cumulative impact area, the licensing sub-committee expected premises in the area to be of an exceptional quality and granted in exceptional circumstances. The application lacked the necessary detail that allowed the sub-committee to make an informed decision to know it was either exceptional (or not), or whether exceptional circumstances could be applied.

The applicant is encouraged to reapply, with a detailed application, having taken on board the concerns raised by the responsible authorities.

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.

7. LICENSING ACT 2003: CHAPTER 72, GROUND FLOOR, 72 BERMONDSEY STREET, LONDON SE1 3UD

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 1.59pm for the sub-committee to take legal advice regarding the outside area.

The meeting then reconvened at 2.12pm.

The other persons objecting the application addressed the sub-committee. Members had questions for the other persons.

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representations of the other persons, who were not present at the meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 2.51pm for the sub-committee to consider its decision.

The meeting reconvened at 3.31pm and the chair advised everyone present of the sub-committee's decision.

RESOLVED:

That the application made by Chapter 72 Ltd to vary a premises licence to Chapter 72, Ground Floor, 72 Bermondsey Street, London SE1 3UD be granted (in part).

Conditions

i. That condition 344 be varied to "The accommodation limit for the outside of the premises be limited to a maximum of 8 patrons who must be seated".

ii. That the area immediately outside the premises shall be monitored to ensure that any litter generated by the premises and/or its customers is regularly cleared.

iii. That a direct telephone number for the management of the premises shall be provided for the residents.

Reasons

This was an application to vary the premises licence in respect of Chapter 72, 72 Bermondsey Street, London SE1 3UD.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the applicant who explained that they had held the premises for approximately 10 years. Chapter 72 was not simply a business that operated within the area. It was part of the local community, serving local residents and working alongside other local businesses and played a positive role in contributing to the Bermondsey Street community. It was accepted that as a local business, there was a responsibility to operate considerately and to maintain good relationships with all its neighbours. They were always willing to listen, engage constructively, and take reasonable steps to resolve any genuine issues.

The applicant spoke of the community work they had operated, such as their Christmas Campaign “Hot Drinks, Mince Pies and Warm Smiles” which involved going out into the community and delivering coffee and mince pies to those who are elderly, alone, vulnerable or simply away from their families.

They advised that they had also won Time Out's most loved local coffee shop in SE1 and Borough, an award based on local communities voting for their favourite place.

Concerning the outdoor seating, the existing pavement licence allowed for two tables and four chairs outside where the consumption of alcohol was permitted.
The applicant applied to vary the pavement licence which was granted in principle around May 2026. The applicant believed this allowed them to serve alcohol there.

On 30 June the Highways Licencing and Enforcement Manager informed the Applicant that it would be necessary to vary the premises license to allow them to do so. Signs on the two additional tables stated no alcohol could be consumed there and the two tables were brought into the shop at night to avoid any confusion. The applicant provided an email from the Highways Licensing Team confirming the same.

The applicant also addressed the concerns regarding noise. They complied with the same rules regarding noise like others on the street. The tables were brought indoors by 22:00 hours and signs erected requesting guests to respect the neighbours and leave quietly. Staff from the premises were also on hand to monitor the outside area and ensure guests were considerate of their neighbours.

Turning to the Bermondsey Street Runners, they were not affiliated to Chapter 72. Initially, the runners asked if they could use the premises as a bag drop-off and they would visit the premises and have a drink when they completed their run. When the Runners first started, there were approximately 10 to 12 people in the group, which has since grown. Once the Applicant became aware the runners were causing a nuisance, they spoke with their organiser and it was agreed that the meeting point for the Runners would be moved to Tanner Park, which was some distance away and would return to Chapter 72 for a post-workout drink.

When asked about the criticism made by residents, that the number of people allowed outside had been regularly exceeded, the applicant stated that the number of people seated hadn't been exceeded. A lot of pictures within the agenda papers showed no evidence of people standing outside with alcoholic drinks in their hands.

The applicant advised that they were able to control patrons that were seated, but they couldn't be expected to control passers-by.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 1 who questioned the legality of condition 343 that was on the current licence and advised that a resident review of the licence was almost inevitable. Other person one highlighted various photos contained in the Agenda papers that demonstrated the daily number of patrons obstructing the highway, both in terms of the footway and the road. The sub-committee were asked to consider the potential impact increasing the number of patrons outside the premises would have on the local community and immediate neighbours.

Other person 1 spoke of their life being negatively impacted, with large groups of people sitting outside their house and interfering with the pleasures of their daily life. Patrons were not quietly sitting having a quiet drink, they were loud and noisy, making it impossible to hear the television properly without turning it up loud. It was no longer possible to have a quiet conversation at home due to the people congregating outside, the volume of patron's voices increasing the more they become intoxicated.

Other person 1 stated that they had reported their complaints to licensing, but due to the attitude of the licencing officers it was felt the best way was reporting the breaches of the pavement license.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 3, who lived immediately next door to the premises. They questioned the applicant's statement that once they had received permission for extra tables and chairs from the Highways Licensing Team on 30 June 2026, stickers were placed on the tables stating that no alcohol could be consumed on them. Other person 3 pointed out that none of the photographs in the agenda papers, showed the stickers. The resident also had never seen the mince pies campaign although they recognised the efforts the applicant made on community event days.

Other person 3 stated they suffered at home with the noise from the premises during the daytime; their ground floor room facing Bermondsey Street was unusable as a home office as the patrons' conversations were a distraction.

At night, noise from the premises permeated through the walls, which meant there was a constant bass thrum through the wall. In the upstairs rooms facing Bermondsey Street it was impossible to have the windows open with the noise of patrons and music. Whilst there were positive things being done for the wider community, the premises remained a nuisance to neighbours.

Other person 3 also claimed that the applicant was slowly encroaching further and further, outside their home, giving examples such as the table and chairs being placed outside other person 3's access door, a dog water bowl in front of the access door, bikes being placed in front of their window etc.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 5 who referred to the complaints made to the licensing unit. Other person 5 also highlighted an incident when a birthday party took place. At 15:00 hours, the music was so loud the television couldn't be heard at all, even with the volume turned up. The applicant was politely asked to turn the music down, which was refused, so the matter was reported to the Noise and Nuisance Team. Officers who assessed that the noise was intrusive and continuous in duration. Members weren't advised whether an Abatement Notice was issued to the applicant.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 8 who stated the section of Bermondsey Street where the premises was located was more residential. Other person 8 also pointed out that the applicant had failed to state in their verbal submissions that they would attempt to improve the issue with the chairs and the tables exceeding doorways.

The licensing sub-committee finally heard from other person 10 who explained that like others, it was the party wall where noise from the premises could be heard. The resident was surprised the applicant believed they were considerate to residents regarding noise, as other person 10 was unaware of any such effort. The resident had resided in the neighbourhood for almost 20 years and had two children. For the last nine years, the resident had to bear the brunt of the noise which disturbed their children's sleep. The resident's bedroom was on the ground floor and suffered from ill-health; on the occasions when noise thumped through the walls, it was unbearable, giving them a headache.

There were two licences being questioned by residents, in play at the premises; the pavement licence and the premises licence. The licence being considered by the sub-committee related to application for a variation of the premises licence only. The pavement licence was concerned a different licensing regime that was beyond the remit of licensing sub-committee.

Condition 343 provides: **"The accommodation limit for the outside of the premises as indicated on the premises plans shall not exceed 4 patrons".**

The four patrons referred to in this condition relates to the sale of alcohol and patrons drinking alcohol in the small outside area outside the front of the premises which forms part of the licensable area of the premises. If more than four patrons were congregating outside the premises with alcohol, it would likely breach the premises license. It may also breach the pavement licence. If more than four patrons were congregating outside the premises without alcohol, it wouldn't breach the premises licence. It may, however, breach the pavement licence.

For completeness, condition 342 provides: "**The accommodation limit for the inside of the premises shall not exceed 30 patrons".** This relates to all patrons, number of patrons specified was likely set in accordance with the Regulatory

Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005/London Fire Brigade.

To allow either the responsible authorities to regulate the licensable area of the premises licence, or the Highways Licensing Team regulate the highway, the Members considered the plans for the premises. It was unanimously agreed to vary the premises licence so the accommodation limit for the outside of the premises be limited to a maximum of 8 patrons all of whom who **must** be seated.

Due to complaints of noise, the sub-committee were not minded to increase the patron number beyond eight. The applicant is urged to vary their pavement licence to permit this only.

The licensing sub-committee is mindful of the residents' complaints but notes the licensing unit only received two of those complaints (on 13/08/2026 and 15/08/2026). It was noted that no representation was received from the Environmental Protection Team (on behalf of the Noise and Nuisance Team), the licensing authority's main source of advice on matters relating to the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective.

In view of the complaints and issues raised by residents, they may consider applying to have the premises licence reviewed which could ultimately, result in a sub-committee revoking the premises licence. If residents resolve to submit such an application, they are strongly encouraged to inform the relevant responsible authorities when they believe there is a statutory noise nuisance, or the if they should believe the premises licence was breached. In doing so, corroborating evidence is available to sub-committee. The Noise and Nuisance Team can be contact on 020 7525 5777 who aim to respond within one hour. The Rapid Response Team operates every day between 08:00 to 04:00 hours.

If residents believe a breach of the pavement licence has taken place, they should contact highwayslicensing@southwark.gov.uk
Because the application being determined by the licensing sub-committee was for the variation of the premises licence, it would be unlawful to consider any of the options available if this were a review application. This notice of decision is not an indication of any future sub-committee's decision.

The licensing sub-committee directs the Licensing Unit to forward a copy of this notice of decision to the Highways Licensing Team.

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 3.34pm.

CHAIR:

DATED: