

MINUTES

ALCOHOL AND ENTERTAINMENT LICENSING COMMITTEE TUESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2010



COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Pam Bosworth (Chairman)
Councillor Christine Brough
Councillor Mike Exton
Councillor Reginald Howard

Councillor Mrs Margery Radley
Councillor Bob Russell
Councillor Frank Turner (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Graham Wheat

OFFICERS

Assistant Solicitor (Paul Rushworth)
Licensing Officers (Peter Harrison, Richard Etherton)
Committee Support Officer (Lucy Bonshor)

12. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Chivers and Councillor Mike Williams.

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

14. LICENSING ACT 2003: APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE SEVEN SINS, 5 CHEYNE LANE, STAMFORD, LINCOLNSHIRE

Decision:-

That the application for a Premises Licence, in respect of Seven Sins, 5 Cheyne Lane, Stamford be approved as applied for.

The Committee had before them report ENV511 for an application for a Premise License under section 54 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Assistant Solicitor clarified the names of the applicants, Mr & Mrs Hurrell and the objectors, Mr & Mrs Heesom and Mr Heath who was representing Mrs Horvath and introduced the Committee.

The Licensing Officer informed the Committee that 56 representations had

been received although 53 had been discounted due to their location (South Witham, Bourne) and that some did not include an address and therefore could not be validated. The premises had been going under renovation and as a joke a notice had been displayed asking lap dancers to apply within. This had generated concern over the type of entertainment and activities to be offered in the premises but Mr Harrison confirmed that this application was for a premises licence only. Representations had been made by the police about the CCTV and storage of tapes however, before the hearing the police and applicant had agreed on a set of conditions and the police's concerns had been addressed.

A question was asked about advertising of the hearing and the Licensing Officer replied that the Government specified that people were notified in two ways by a site notice and advertisement in the local paper.

The applicants then put their case indicating that there are doormen stationed on the door at all time who did not allow anyone to take bottles out side; an ash tray was placed for smokers, but was removed when the club closed as the previous receptacle had caught fire, they were not asking for any increase in hours and strived to run a "tight ship". They had a good relationship with the police and had only one incident to which the police had attend. Unfortunately problems such as urinating in the street were something that they had no control over.

The Licensing Officer then asked for clarification about the door supervisors to which the applicant replied.

A Member asked how the premises license differed from the previous one to which the applicant replied that it didn't, they were still asking for the same opening hours. Further questions were then asked by Members about how the club was accessed and what sound proofing had been carried out to which the applicant replied.

The objectors then put their case. The chief concerns being the extended opening hours although those asked for were the same as the previous premises licence, the noise generated by the late opening and the opening and closing of doors to admit patrons together with the removal of band equipment late at night and the disposal of rubbish and people smoking. It was suggested that perhaps some conditions could be attached to the premise licence when equipment was collected.

The applicants then gave a closing statement in which they gave assurances that every step would be taken to try and minimise the noise generated, although they stated that only one band had been to the premise and the equipment had been collected the next day and rubbish was taken to their own vehicle and disposed of.

The Licensing Officer then gave his closing statement and reminded the Committee of their duty to promote the four licensing objectives, namely:

1. the prevention of crime and disorder
2. public safety;
3. the prevention of public nuisance;
4. the protection of children from harm.

(10. 50 am - the applicants, objectors, Licensing Officers and public then left the meeting)

The Committee then discussed the points raised by the objectors and the advice given by the Assistant Solicitor. As there appeared to be no evidence linking the noise generated late at night to the patrons of that particular premise it was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to grant the premises licence as applied for without any conditions.

(10.55am – the applicants, objectors, Licensing Officers and public returned to the meeting)

The Assistant Solicitor advised the applicants that the licence had been granted as applied for and that there was a right of appeal to the Magistrates court within 21 days of the date of the written notification.

15. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 11.00am.