

NOTICE OF DECISION**LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE – 18 DECEMBER 2025****SECTION 53C LICENSING ACT 2003: CANTERBURY ARMS, 2-4 MADDOCK WAY, LONDON SE17 3NH****Decision**

That the council's licensing sub-committee, having considered an application made under Section 53C of the Licensing Act 2003 by the Metropolitan Police Service for the review of the premises licence, issued in respect of the premises known as Canterbury Arms, 2-4 Maddock Way, London SE17 3NH and having had regard to all relevant representations, has decided it necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives, to revoke the premises licence.

Reasons for the decision

This was an application made by the Metropolitan Police Service for the review of the premises licence for Canterbury Arms, 2-4 Maddock Way, London SE17 3NH.

The licensing sub-committee heard from the licensing officer who presented his report and confirmed that the premises licence had been surrendered on 26 November 2025. The officer also informed the sub-committee that a final determination of the Police's review application was required because, if a transfer application were submitted within 28 days from the day of surrender, the licence could be reinstated under Section 50(1)(b) of the Licensing Act 2003. As of the date of the hearing, no such application had been received.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the Metropolitan Police Service, the applicant of the review application. The police officer advised that on 20 November 2025, an incident had taken place spanning both inside and outside the premises, culminating in a customer being fatally injured because of a violent altercation. Both the victim and suspect had been ejected from the premises via a side entrance by a member of the bar staff.

The victim was seen arguing and struggling with the suspect, who then pushed to the victim to the ground. Subsequently, the suspect was observed punching the victim to the head. Bar staff assisted the victim to his feet and led both parties back inside the premises via the same side door. A few minutes later, the victim was ejected from the premises for a second time via the front entrance of the premises, whereby he collapsed to the ground. The police were called to the incident by a local resident and on attendance, found the London Ambulance Service were performing CPR on the victim, who subsequently died.

Attempts were made by the police, the following day (21 November 2025), to collect CCTV from the premises. The officers in attendance found the premises closed and were unable to establish contact with any member of the premises management.

Further enquiries were made by officers and when access to the premises was finally gained, the premises CCTV was found to have been partially dismantled and therefore, was deemed to be of no evidential value to the murder investigation. One member of staff indicated to officers that the person in charge of the premises was avoiding the attention of authorities due to arrears at the premises.

The members of the sub-committee then considered the police request to consider and ask questions on the additional closed material that had not been circulated to the other parties involved with the review application. It was agreed that that the short document that had been circulated to committee members was so sensitive, it was in the public interest for the hearing to go into a closed session (for members, the police, the legal advisor and the clerk to the hearing only) pursuant to Section 100A Local Government Act 1972 and regulation 14(1) of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005.

The licensing sub-committee heard from other person 2, the ward councillor, who supported the application. Since the incident of 20 November 2025, that had resulted in a man losing his life, ward residents had approached him and raised very serious concerns about the operation and management of the premises. However, residents of the Brandon Estate and Maddock Way were keen to maintain a licensed premises in the area, as an empty unit in its place would lead to further crime and disorder.

The licensing sub-committee then heard from the legal representative for other person 3, (the landlord of the premises) and he advised that the landlord supported the police application in its entirety and accepted that the licensing objectives had been seriously undermined.

It was not the landlord's intention to either oppose the police request to revoke the premises licence, nor was it their intention to submit a transfer under Section 50 Licensing Act 2003. The representative confirmed that the landlord would discuss a way forward with the police and licensing; this would exclude all those that were involved in operation of the premises that gave rise to the incident of 20 November 2025.

In the meantime, the landlord would work to ensure that the premises remained closed until such time a fresh premises licence application would be submitted, that promoted the licensing objectives and supported the local community by being a good, safe local hub for residents to enjoy.

The licensing sub-committee noted the written representation from the environmental protection team who were not in attendance at the hearing.

The licensing sub-committee also noted the written representation submitted by other person who supported the review application, but who was not present at the hearing.

The licensing sub-committee raised very serious concerns that the premises had operated for 18 months with a named premises licence holder and designated premises supervisor (DPS), who was under the mistaken belief they had removed their names.

The premises was operating under others' control unlawfully, who had failed to submit either a transfer or a new premises licence application. The premises was therefore operating for 18 months in breach of the Licensing Act 2003 (contrary to Section 3 (failure to notify change of name or address), Section 46 (failure to notify of designated premises supervisor transfer), Section 136 (Unauthorised licensable activities), Section 137 (exposing alcohol for unauthorised sale), and Section 138 (keeping alcohol on the premises for unauthorised sale)). This in itself, would warrant the revocation of the premises licence.

The previous premises licence holder and DPS surrendered the premises licence and at the time of the hearing, no transfer application had been received. At the date of the hearing there was therefore, no operational premises licence. The sub-committee accepted that there remained scope for the licence to be reinstated under Section 50 of the Act and in light of this, a determination from members was required.

Notwithstanding the unlawful operation of the premises for the previous 18 months, the licensing sub-committee was of the view that the premises completely failed to promote the licensing objectives. Allowing the victim and suspect to be ejected from the premises via the same door and then re-entry, particularly for the suspect, was negligent.

Due to the fact that the management for the premises has failed to cooperate with the police in its investigations, it is unknown whether any meaningful basic first aid was provided before the victim was ejected from the premises a second time. No one from the premises contacted the emergency services leaving this to a local resident to do so.

The premises may not have been directly responsible for the death of the victim, but it was the view of the sub-committee that the premises contributed to the events that led to the victim's death. On this basis, it was the unanimous decision of the licensing sub-committee that the circumstances so serious, that the revocation of the premises licence was the only option.

In reaching its decision, the licensing sub-committee had regard to all the relevant considerations, its equality duties and four licensing objectives and considered that this decision was appropriate and proportionate.

Appeal rights

This decision is open to appeal by either:

- a. The premises licence holder
- b. Any other person who made relevant representations in relation to the application.

Such appeal must be commenced by notice of appeal given by the appellant to the District Judge's Clerk for the Magistrates' Court for the area within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the appellant was notified by the licensing authority of the decision appealed against.

Review of interim steps pending appeal

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

The licensing sub-committee were satisfied that these interim steps are appropriate and proportionate to promote the licensing objectives, as detailed above and there had been no change in circumstance since the sub-Committee suspended the licence as an interim step on 27 November 2025.

The interim steps are open to appeal by:

- a. The Chief Officer of Police for the police area in which the premises is situated;
or
- b. The holder of the premises licence

Such appeal must be commenced by notice of appeal given by the appellant to the justices' clerk for the Magistrates Court for the area within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which the appellant was notified by this licensing authority of the decision.

Issued by the Constitutional Team on behalf of the Assistant Chief Executive – Governance and Assurance.

Date: 18 December 2025