

Minutes

Licensing Committee
Tuesday, 17 March 2026



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Committee members present

Councillor Paul Fellows (Chairman)
Councillor Robert Leadenham (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Pam Bosworth
Councillor Helen Crawford
Councillor Jane Kingman
Councillor Philip Knowles
Councillor Rhea Rayside
Councillor Elvis Stooke

Officers

Chris Clarke, Licensing Officer
Elizabeth Reeve, Licensing Officer
Kim Robertson, Legal Advisor (LSL)
Lucy Bonshor, Democratic Officer

1. Apologies for absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Patsy Ellis.

2. Disclosure of interests

None disclosed.

3. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2026 were proposed, seconded and agreed.

4. Exclusion of the Press and Public

It was proposed, seconded and agreed to exclude the press and public during consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it is likely, that

if they were present, there would be disclosed to them exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100(A)4.

5. Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) ACT 1976

Decision

The Committee considered the nature of the offence and the information provided to them by the driver and concluded that the drivers' conduct fell below the standard required and, in this instance, resolved to provide the driver with a strict warning.

The Chairman introduced those present and confirmed the name of the driver before the Committee.

The Licensing Officer then presented their report and stated that the driver before the Committee had held a Dual Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Drivers Licence with South Kesteven District Council since May 2024.

The Licensing Team had been notified by Lincolnshire Police in September 2025 about a Road Traffic Collision (RTC) which involved a SKDC Hackney Carriage licensed vehicle and further details in respect of the vehicle and driver were received in October 2025. In October the driver attended the Council Offices to discuss the RTC and stated that they had yet to speak to the Police.

In November 2025 a Common Law Police Disclosure was received regarding the RTC following this SKDC penalty points were issued to the driver due to the defects found.

The driver had also failed to maintain their DBS on the update service and the driver was requested to complete a new DBS application. On receiving the completed DBS, it indicated that the driver had been summoned to court and in February 2026, the driver had emailed a copy of the court documents advising that they had been convicted, a copy of these documents were appended to the report at Appendix 5.

The driver then made their representation to the Committee. The driver apologised for what had transpired and gave details of the RTC. The driver indicated that since the RTC they had checked the vehicle every day and they knew that it was their responsibility to carry out these checks.

Members questioned the driver about when checks had been carried out, the state of the vehicle and whether the driver owned the vehicle. It was confirmed that the vehicle was owned by a company, but the driver kept the vehicle on their drive when not in use and it wasn't used by other taxi drivers. The driver had

their own car for personal use. The driver stated that they were aware that the vehicle was their responsibility.

The Licensing Officer then gave their closing statement. When making their determination the Committee must have regard to all relevant policies including any representations made by the driver, the Council's Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy and the Department of Transport Standards and relevant guidance. Any decision made must ensure that the Council met its obligations in that holders of hackney carriage or private hire driver's licences are a fit and proper person to hold such a licence. Pursuant to Section 51 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 in relation to Private Hire Drivers and Section 59 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 in relation to Hackney Carriage Drivers.

(10:20 the Licensing Officers and driver left the meeting)

Members discussed the driver before them, having regard to the representations made and all relevant policies and guidance. One Member highlighted the fact that the vehicle appeared to be solely used by the driver, although they didn't own the vehicle, but that there was no excuse for the checks not to be carried out by the driver. Reference was made to the late DBS check being updated and that it was evident that daily checks hadn't been undertaken for some time. Members discussed the possible consequences of not checking the vehicle and what could have happened.

An in-depth discussion followed on what sanction should be applied to the driver and it was suggested that perhaps a course would be advisable. Members questioned what course would be available, and it was requested that the Licensing Officer be asked to return to the meeting to answer Members' questions.

(10:33 – 10:40 the Licensing Officer returned to the meeting and answered Members questions in relation to driving courses)

Further discussion on possible sanctions followed and the Chairman suggested various sanctions to gauge the consensus amongst Members with comments being made by the Legal Advisor. Following further debate it was proposed, seconded and agreed to issue a strict warning to the driver.

(11:05 the Licensing Officers and driver returned to the meeting)

The Legal Advisor read out the Committee's decision. The Committee had met to consider whether the driver remains a fit and proper person to hold a Dual (Hackney Carriage and Private Hire) Driver's Licence under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

The Committee heard directly from the driver regarding the circumstances of their recent conviction. In their submissions, the driver acknowledged the error was their fault and gave their apologies. The driver advised that they were ensuring

that they were taking care of everything and it was their responsibility. The driver also advised that the tread on the tyre on the outside was fine, but it was the inside tread that was worn. The driver acknowledged that at the time they had not checked the tyres for approximately 3 weeks. The Licensing Officer advised the Committee that the vehicle in question was not the drivers but a company vehicle whilst it is sat with the driver, it is the company's responsibility to replace tyres. The driver also confirmed they didn't use the vehicle for their own personal use.

In reaching its decision, the Committee was mindful that the Council's primary duty is the protection of the public. Licensed drivers are entrusted with the safety of passengers and other road users, and they are therefore expected to uphold the highest standards of driving and conduct at all times.

The Committee considered the nature of the offence and the information provided to them. The Committee concluded that the driver's conduct fell below the standard required and, in this instance, resolved to provide the driver with a strict warning.

Meeting back in public session

6. Pulse and Cocktails, A1 Southbound, Stoke Rochford, Grantham, NG33 5EW

Decision

That the Licensing Committee approve the renewal of the application for a Sex shop Licence as applied for in accordance with Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 (as amended by the Police and Crime Act 2009).

The Licensing Officer present report ENV929 which concerned a renewal application for a Sex Establishment Licences for Pulse and Cocktails on the A1 Southbound, Stoke Rochford.

The Policing and Crime Act 2009 amends Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 to permit the Licensing Authority to license Sex shops.

A Sex Shop means any premises, vehicle, vessel or stall used for a business which consists to a significant degree of selling, hiring, exchanging, lending, displaying or demonstrating –

- Sex articles;
- Other things intended for use in connection with, or for the purposes of stimulating or encouraging –
- Sexual activity; or
- Acts of force or restraint which is associated with sexual activity

The applicant had run a Sex Shop at the premises since April 2009 and there had been no complaints about the premises during this time. The renewal application was received in February 2026 and no objections were received during the 28 day consultation period from either the Police or any member of the public.

The renewal application did not vary the licence in any way from that previously applied for. The opening days and times for the premise remained the same:

Monday – Sunday 09:00 to 22:00hrs (including Bank Holidays)

Reference was made to the Committee visiting the premise and the Licensing Officer confirmed that they had visited the premise the previous year and a site visit for Members of the Committee could be arranged.

Each application should be determined on its own merits and applications may only be refused on certain defined mandatory or discretionary grounds as outlined within the report.

When determining the application, the Committee should have regard to:

- The authority's sex establishment procedures
- The Human Rights Act 1988
- SKDC's regulations prescribing standard conditions
- Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982

The options open to the Committee in respect of the renewal were:

- To renew the application as applied for
- To renew the application with modifications and/or additional conditions
- Refuse the renewal, if having considered the renewal application the committee decides to refuse it, it must provide the applicant with the reasons for the decision in writing

(11:15 the Licensing Officers and press left the meeting)

Members discussed the renewal application before them having regard to the report and all relevant guidance and procedures. Members noted that no complaints had been received from either the Police or members of the public in relation to the premises and it was therefore, proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed to grant the licence as applied for.

(11:17 the Licensing Officers and press returned to the meeting)

The Legal Advisor read out the Committees decision. The Committee had read all the paperwork before them noting there were no objections or representations to the renewal. They also noted there had been no complaints regarding the premises and the licence was a renewal and was not being varied in any way.

The Committee having considered all options available to them decided that it was appropriate to renew the application as applied for.

7. Any other business which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent.

There was no urgent business.

8. Close of meeting

The Chairman thanked Members for attending and closed the meeting at 11:18am.