

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF A MEETING of the Licensing Sub-committee held on Thursday, 4 May 2017 at 9.30 am in the executive meeting room, floor 3 of the Guildhall, Portsmouth

Present

Councillors Hannah Hockaday
 Ken Ellcome
 Steve Pitt

39. Appointment of Chair.

Councillor Hannah Hockaday was appointed Chair of this hearing.

40. Declarations of Members' Interests.

No interests were declared.

41. Licensing Act 2003 - Application for grant of a premises licence Becketts Southsea Ltd, 10-11 Bellevue Terrace, Southsea PO5 3AT.

Present

Peter Baulf, Legal Advisor
Jason Parker, Applicant
Jon Wallsgrove, Solicitor for the applicant.
Derek Stone, Principal Licensing Officer

Interested parties making deputations

Mr Jason Bentley
Mr Mike Stone
Mr Arthur Wrigglesworth
Mr Michael Wrigglesworth
Mr John Hughes
Mr Andrew Parsons (representing himself, Ms Bevis and a number of other residents)
Mr Hamed Ammari
Ms Barbara Ford

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the fire procedures in case of a fire alarm. She asked everyone present to introduce themselves. With the approval of the chair, Mr Parsons circulated a summary table showing the existing, original proposed and amended hours of operation to the committee.

The Principal Licensing Officer introduced the report. He added that following engagement with environmental health some additional conditions on the licence had been agreed with the applicant. These had been circulated to the committee before the meeting. The condition agreed was that other than for

access and egress, all doors and windows are to remain closed whilst regulated entertainment is being provided. In response to questions from members the following points were clarified:

- The premises is already operating as an extended business under their current licence however the Principal Licensing Officer was unsure as to when this commenced.
- The Principal Licensing Officer had checked the previous day with the Environmental Health officer with regard to noise complaints and they had receive no new noise nuisance complaints about the premises.
- The amenity license for the premises states that tables and chairs need to be removed from the highway by 21:00 and must be directly outside no.11 Bellevue Terrace.

Mr Wallsgrove had no questions for the Principal Licensing Officer.

In response to questions from Mr Parsons the following points were clarified:

- The Principal Licensing Officer was satisfied that the notice of the application had been displayed correctly. It had been moved three times after a local councillor requested the notice to be moved for greater visibility. The notice in all the locations had however still been visible and able to be viewed and had therefore been displayed lawfully.
- The committee's legal advisor suggested that due to the number of people present at the meeting today and the number of representations received that advertising of the application had occurred. It was the discretion of the committee today whether they felt that sufficient advertising of the application had occurred.

Mr Wallsgrove said that it was wrong to assume that there would be more people making representations to the application if the notice had been displayed in another location and supported the licensing officers in that the application had been advertised properly. He said there were photos to show where the notice was displayed and the fact that there might have been a better location for the notice was irrelevant to today's hearing.

Mr Stone, one of the interested parties, said that most of the residents had only known about the application due to a local councillor informing them of this.

The committee's Legal Advisor advised the committee to adjourn the meeting to make a decision as to whether to proceed with the hearing today based on the two submissions from either side that had previously been heard.

[The committee and the legal advisor adjourned for 5 minutes]

The committee returned and the chair advised that they had taken into account the comments made by all parties and the advice from the legal advisor and had decided to proceed with the hearing today. To adjourn the committee to a later date to re-advertise the application would not be appropriate and the committee felt that all concerned would no doubt wish a decision to be made sooner rather than later.

In response to further questions from Mr Parsons the following points were clarified:

- The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that he was not aware of any previous issues with a premises operating late at night in the area as referred to in one of the written representations on page 58 of the reports pack. Councillor Ellcome explained that the Principal Licensing Officer was not in post at this time therefore he would not be aware of this. Mr Wallsgrove said that this was not relevant to today's appeal.

Mr Wallsgrove was then invited to present the applicant's case. He included the following points in his representation on behalf of the applicant:

- The premises had increased in size and work was ongoing in terms of the guest bedrooms on the upper floors and the area at the rear of no. 10. The extension meant an additional 30 covers.
- The rear will be a lounge area for people who are staying in the accommodation and in the evening it will be used as an overflow for the restaurant. The additional space will not create any 'vertical drinking space'. It will be for additional tables for people to have a meal.
- With regard to the live music, the applicant is only requesting an additional 1 hour for Monday - Saturday. Under the Live Music act premises can have live music up to 23:00 anyway so are just asking for an additional hour until 00:00.
- For recorded music the applicant has reduced the hours.
- For late night refreshment the applicant is asking for the hours to be extended by 30 minutes Monday - Saturday.
- For the supply of alcohol asking for 1 additional hour Monday - Thursday and an additional 2 hours Friday and Saturday.
- With regard to the supply of alcohol, the applicant had decided to amend the original proposal and move this back to 23:00 on a Sunday rather than 00:00. Restaurants are able to sell alcohol until 00:00 anyway under the Act so there is not a huge amount of difference between current hours.
- Becketts has had a licence for over 30 years. Mr Parker bought the premises in January 2016 and has extensively renovated it. The premises re-opened in summer 2016.
- The nature and character of premises will not change. It is not a bar and young people will not use it as a drinking establishment as there is not room. The average age of patrons is 35 years. The primary purpose is for people to enjoy a meal and a drink and 70% of their business is on the food side. There has never been drunken behaviour at the premises.
- The application to extend hours is for the existing customers who want to stay longer than 23:00. The trend now is for people to go out for dinner later, often around 21:00 and the applicant has had several customers asking if they can stay for a drink after their meal in a relaxed environment without feeling pressurised to leave.
- The extended hours if granted would not cause additional noise nuisance and the customer base of Becketts will not change as a result of this.
- Pubs and clubs in Guildhall Walk and Gunwharf all have a closing time of 03:00 so there is a mass exit of people at that time. There is a maximum of 80 covers in Becketts however in reality there will never be 80 people

leaving the premises at the same time. There will be a gradual dispersal of people as they will be arriving and leaving at different points in the evening.

- The drinks pricing of Becketts reflects the upmarket nature of the restaurant to attract young people. The premises is not on a route to Gunwharf or Guildhall Walk so will not attract people coming who want a drink before going on to another pub.
- The applicant has spared no expense in ensuring a sympathetic restoration of the buildings and account has been taken of neighbours' concerns particularly on noise. Measures have been taken to ensure noise is contained in the building and sound attenuation is in place including panelling on the walls and ceilings. The front door of the premises has been fitted with a closer to minimise noise and the extraction system installed for the kitchen was chosen following advice from the environmental health team.
- It is not in the applicant's interest to have loud music as it will disturb guests staying at the premises.
- Anyone can apply for the review of a licence so if there are issues it can be brought back to committee for consideration as opposed to the committee rejecting the application due to fears of what might happen.
- With regard to live music the reality is it will only be once or twice a week 85% of this is with a solo artist. The style of music will not change to what currently takes place.
- There have been no complaints relating to the live music. The music is already contained in the building so the extension of hours won't change this.
- The recorded music is essentially background music. Already have 24 hours but the applicant has agreed to cut this back.
- The applicant has agreed a condition with environmental health to have windows and doors closed whilst regulated entertainment is provided and environmental health had no adverse comments to make on the application. This will ensure music is contained in premises. Lots of comments have been received from residents about noise travelling however the greatest weight should be given to the environmental health professional.
- The extension of hours for the supply of hours does not equate to people drinking to excess. The social strategy of people going out for a evening has changed. The early evening trade is not there and people are eating later in the evening.
- The police have set out conditions that they want the applicant to adhere to. The existing premises license does not have any conditions other than the mandatory ones so the conditions from the police and those from the environmental health officer makes this licence better regulated therefore they ask that weight be given to that.
- With regard to concerns about the outside seating area, the applicant agrees there will be the potential for noise however this will only be until 21:00. After that there is no reason for patrons to be outside other than to smoke. Drinks will not be allowed outside so this will limit patrons congregating outside. There have been no noise complaints about people sitting outside.

- With regard to the photographs in one of the representations showing several people congregating out the front of the premises, this was during a function held in the afternoon. Functions will only be held during the day as the applicant does not want to lose the evening restaurant trade.
- There will be a gradual dispersal of people leaving the premises. The premises is on a main road which is busy late into the evening so people leaving the premises will not be heard over the existing traffic.
- Invite the committee to impose the condition imposed by the environmental health officer to keep windows and doors closed.

Mr Wallsgrove summed up by saying:

- The only objections from residents were on the extension to the hours.
- Suitable conditions already agreed by the police.
- There is no evidence of public disorder from patrons.
- No objections from environmental health have been received and no complaints, yet live music already takes place in the premises.
- The protection for the residents is that the licence can be reviewed after a period of 6 weeks. If things changed in future residents can review matter and bring back to committee and additional conditions added, revoked, suspended etc. Government put this in place to allow committees to adopt a flexible approach and this is acknowledged in the high court decision reference in the pack.
- The aim of the Licensing Act is to encourage more diverse premises such as this. The applicant wants to provide facilities for existing customers who do not want to use the city centre bars for excessive drinking.

In response to questions from the committee the following points were clarified:

- The capacity of premises is carried out under fire regulations. Essentially it would be 80 seated and up to 10-15 people in the bar area on stools. There will not be people standing drinking.
- The applicant does not want crowds of people coming into the premises for a late night drink which is why the pricing is important. There is no expectation that they will get a transient crowd coming to the premises looking for a drink after leaving other licensed premises nearby. The licensee has discretion to refuse entry so will do this if people arrive looking for a late drink on their way home. The applicant wants to retain the ambience for diners. It would not be in his interest to allow patrons in for drinks who had come from another licensed establishment that had closed earlier looking to have a last drink on their way home as this would disrupt the experience for the other customers. The principal licensing officer confirmed that the White Horse has a licence to sell alcohol until 01:00 and is open until 02:00.
- With regard to sound proofing, it was explained that the floors have sound attenuation with effectively four layers of materials between the ground floor and first floor. The building is a Grade II listed building so there are limitations on having double glazed windows and doors. The sash windows at front only open fractionally.

- There has been one complaint regarding noise from music on a Sunday. The applicant did not believe the music was at a substantial level but agreed to turn the music down.
- There is a requirement by law that premises do not have drinks promotions that will lead to excessive consumption. Becketts did previously run a 2 for 1 promotion between 17:00 and 19:00 to try and encourage customers in earlier. This has now stopped. The only current promotion is the £10 for a bottle of prosecco offer on a Wednesday which does not encourage excessive drinking. The premises will only have offers such as this and the previous beer and a burger for £10 offer which will not lead to excessive drinking.
- The occasion shown in the photographs in the papers was a wedding reception and guests were dispersing and saying goodbye out on the pavement. Some had taken their drinks outside which is contrary to Beckett's policy however no issues occurred and it was a one off occasion.
- There is air conditioning in the premises so having windows and doors closed in the summer months will not be an issue.
- It is the intention that last orders for food will be taken up to 23:00.
- The application is asking for the supply of alcohol from 09:00 for the flexibility of the business. An example might include people who have stayed overnight in the accommodation wanting a bucks fizz breakfast/brunch for a special occasion.
- The applicant's current intention is that functions will not be held in the evening as this will take away from the evening trade.
- Operators must now self-assess for fire risk. A fire risk assessment is in place and this is checked by a fire officer. The fire officer does not issue a fire notice with a maximum occupancy on this. At the request of a committee member the committee's legal advisor confirmed this. The capacity and fire risk is to do with how quickly the premises are evacuated in the event of a fire. The capacity of the premises from a fire risk point of view will be higher than the 80 diners as could get more people in there that could get out safely.
- The layout plans attached to the papers are to scale and show the location and size of the fire exits. Exits are at the front and rear of premises in both no.10 and no. 11. There have been no objections to plans from the fire authority.
- The X Factor open mic night was held during the early stages of the business and was a one off event used as a marketing strategy.

In response to questions from the interested parties the following points were answered by the applicant:

- It was confirmed that if at any time residents have concerns about a licensed premises that they can speak to their ward councillor to ask that a review of the licence take place.

- There are no technical restrictions in terms of decibel levels put in place by Environmental Health. Under the Environmental Protection Act there is a statutory duty for the environmental health officer to investigate any noise complaints and they will check if there has been any previous history of noise complaints. In response to a follow up question, Councillor Ellcome advised that if the environmental health officer receives noise complaints he can turn up at any time unannounced and take readings of decibel levels to decide if they are at acceptable levels. If it is decided they are above acceptable levels a noise abatement order can be issued.
- There have been no concerns from residents about the extension of the premises just with the proposed extension to hours.
- The applicant has considered the impact of the objections from neighbours and feels that if the amendments to the licensing hours are granted, there will be no adverse effect to local residents. This is because the applicant knows his business and client base and is confident that the clients will not cause disruption with the extended hours.
- Prior to making the licensing application, the applicant did not discuss it with the neighbouring properties however there is no requirement for this and this is the same for every licensing application. Under the Act all licensing applications must be displayed by a public notice and a 4 week consultation period held for people to make comments on the application. The Principal Licensing Officer added that in addition to the public notice, Portsmouth City Council licensing team also notify the relevant ward councillors of new licensing applications which is not a requirement under the Licensing Act.
- With regard to the statement being untrue that the premises will not promote drinking to excess, the chair felt this had already been answered. Councillor Ellcome however added that the applicant had confirmed they may have some promotions in the future however these will not lead to excessive drinking. Mr Wallsgrove confirmed that this was correct and added that for the previous promotions there was no evidence that they did lead to excessive drinking.
- In response to Mr Parsons querying occasions of noise nuisance, Mr Wallsgrove confirmed that there was only the one complaint that has previously been mentioned. The examples of noise nuisance that were included in some of the representations in the committee papers were disputed by Mr Wallsgrove. These residents had not contacted the premises to complain or made an official complaint. Mr Wallsgrove therefore said that these cannot be used. This is a well-managed premises and if the level of disturbance was excessive residents would have brought this to the attention of environmental health or the premises.

- The Wallsgrove said that the applicant was not aware of any concerns about any incidents of noise and when a noise complaint was received the applicant went outside and even though could not hear the music, turned it down. Councillor Ellcome assured Mr Parsons and the members of the public present that the committee had read all the letters of representation and would take these into account when making their decision today.
- The applicant was aware that Rees Hall, which is adjacent to the premises, houses disabled students and their carers and they had been aware of this when they had made the licensing application. They did not believe the extension to the opening hours would cause them any distress however as there would not be any additional noise nuisance. The committee's legal adviser advised that the committee would exercise their discretion and councillor Ellcome said that the committee today was experienced in determining licensing applications so this should give the public some confidence.
- In response to a suggestion that one way of stopping excessive drinking would be for no admissions or re-admissions of customers after 23:00, Mr Wallsgrove said this would not be an appropriate condition. Councillor Ellcome referred to this condition being added onto another premises and said that this is not an advantageous condition to put on a licence. It is more likely to cause a disturbance outside the premises of people getting angry not being able to get in.
- Mr Wallsgrove said that the applicant felt that people who live in a city have different expectations to those living in the country and expect there to be noise. In response to a follow-up question Mr Wallsgrove said that the applicant did not think this was an arrogant statement.
- The applicant did not have the fire risk assessment with him. The fire authority have seen this however and made no representations on this. The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that the fire service is one of the responsible authorities and following a table top inspection had no concerns on the application.

Representations from the interested parties were then heard and their main points are summarised below:

Mrs Barbara Ford (resident and Director of Lingfield Court)

- Pleased to see the sympathetic restoration of the building although objects strongly to the application.
- This is a residential area and many residents are elderly.
- She has no objections to music being played until a reasonable hour (22:30-23:00).
- Extension to the sale of alcohol hours will cause disturbance.
- Bellevue Terrace is reasonably quiet at night and the amended hours will cause disturbance.

- This is a designated non-commercial area and turning Bellevue Terrace into a 'nightclub' area should not be allowed. This is not an area designated for late night entertainment.
- Becketts is already breaking the terms of their current licence by opening after hours and drinking is taking place outside.
- Parking is already difficult in Pembroke Park and this will create an added problem.

Mr Ammari (resident at 5 Bellevue Terrace) then spoke whose points included:

- This area is a designated conservation area.
- His young child has been woken up in the early hours of the morning due to noise from the premises.
- If the licence is granted it will have an unbearable effect on residents.
- Concerned about the business expanding further in the future.
- The buildings in Bellevue Terrace are very old and the walls are very thin so can hear the noise from neighbouring properties.
- The reason residents have not filed formal complaints to environmental health is because they have tried to be neighbourly.
- Think that 00:00 is late enough for the premises to remain open.

Mr Hughes then spoke whose points included:

- He has already submitted a letter of objection which is included in the papers and hoped that the committee have read this.
- Not seen much evidence on risk assessments only have words from applicant to reassure the concerns of residents. No control on how premises is run.

Mr Arthur Wigglesworth then spoke whose points included:

- Considers Bellevue Terrace to be part of Old Portsmouth rather than Southsea. It is not a built up area.
- A number of elderly people live in the area and they often have sleep issues and don't want to be awakened at night. Some also have to take medications at certain points in the night so will go to bed earlier so that they get some sleep before waking up to take medications.
- Becketts used to be a quiet establishment.
- No mention as to whether the applicant will be residents at the premises to ensure order.
- The original licence for Becketts was acceptable however the extension to the hours is too far.
- There is no mention as to advertising of the premises - will there be neon signs eventually?
- Where will the customers of Becketts park and who will control this?

The committee then heard from Mr Michael Wigglesworth who added that this is not a city centre and after hours there is little traffic in the area. There

is also concern that there is no definition of what live music is and concerns that this will get out of control.

Mr Stone then spoke whose points included:

- Referred to the Wirral District Council case in 2008 where the judge was very heavy on evidence. Evidence mean facts and this case is lacking in facts. The facts are that this is a peaceful, residential area and Becketts has been operating for 30 years with no issues. This extension will see more customers and therefore more noise.
- If all goes wrong the police and environmental health officer will be very busy.
- All residents want Becketts to succeed. Suggest that a licence is granted with the current operating hours. The applicant could then later apply for an extension to hours after have had chance to see how it goes and once hard evidence is there to see if there have been any complaints.

Mr Bentley (resident at 14 Jubilee Terrace) whose points included:

- Becketts is a great venue but it should remain as a restaurant.
- As a business owner himself he would hate it if thought he was causing his residential neighbours any grief.
- None of the residents want the amended licensing hours and feel this is a step too far.
- This is a residential area. Becketts has been operating for 30 years with the current hours and think there is no need to extend the hours.
- He uses the premises and has previously been turned away in the evening as there a function inside.
- People do not dine as late in the UK as the applicant is suggesting.

In summing up the Principal Licensing Officer added that Mr Luke James, one of the people who had made a representation, had emailed in to clarify that although he was in support of the application in terms of the redevelopment of the B&B, he does not support the late night licence.

Mr Parsons was then invited to sum up on behalf of the interested parties.

- He referred to his letter of representation at page 109 of the papers and drew attention to page 112. He said the burden on applicant is to say that the 4 key licensing objectives have been met and the fact is that they have not been met. Assurances have been given but there is no evidence or facts.
- The applicant has suggested that there have been no complaints to the current licence but this is incorrect and this is up to the committee to decide as to whether they accept the complaints listed in the representation letters.

- The fact that the University of Portsmouth have objected to the application should be taken into account.
- He suggested that a condition be added that after 23:00 if people go outside to smoke they should not be allowed back in. There is already evidence that the licence holder has not kept control of people drinking outside the premises and there are no assurances to support the criteria for granting a licence.

The applicant's solicitor Mr Wallsgrove was then invited to sum up.

- Consumption of alcohol outside is not unlawful or a breach of the licence.
- Statement made that in this country restaurants only open until 23:00. Since 1964 restaurants have been able to sell alcohol until 00:00. Becketts only permitted to sell alcohol until 23:00.
- No objections to the licence being granted for the entire premises.
- Live music is permitted under the Live Music Act until 23:00 every day.
- There has been live music since it re-opened last summer and there has only been one complaint to environmental health.
- Mr Parsons is incorrect in saying that the burden of proof is not on the residents to prove they have not been promoting the licensing objectives. It is the burden of proof on them to satisfy that their application should be granted and if residents saying breaches of licence, that burden of proof rests on their shoulders to prove on evidence that is the case. The applicant feels that the committee should attach more weight to what the police and environmental health officer say as they have not objected.
- It is clear may grant licence for entire premises at least until current times permitted on the old licence.
- Environmental health do take proactive steps and swift action when receive a complaint and the committee should attach weight to that.
- The premises will not be changing. It will remain as a restaurant and the applicant wants customers to enjoy a later evening.

The applicant, Mr Parker had nothing further to add.

The committee adjourned to make their decision and upon their return the committees' legal advisor read out their decision.

DECISION

In the Matter of the Licensing Act 2003. Application for a grant of a premises licence at Becketts Southsea, 10-11 Bellevue Terrace, Southsea, PO5 3AT.

The Committee carefully considered the application before it for the grant of a

licence and has also considered the representations made in relation to this application, both made orally and in writing. The Committee also heard the comments of the applicants' advocate and further notes the fact that in addition a number of petitions have been submitted together with a number of written objections exceeding 30 in number.

As a preliminary issue it was submitted that there has been a material non-compliance with the Licencing Act 2003 (Premises licences and club certificate) Regulations 2005 in that the application was not appropriately displayed within the remit of the Regulations.

The Committee had regard to the regulations and in particular Regulation 25. The Committee having heard the representations and having had their discretion engaged considered that it would be fair and proportionate to proceed because:

- It is clear from the number of representations that it is obvious that the local community is aware of the application and fully engaged.
- To adjourn would have been inappropriate as the Committee and all concerned no doubt would wish a decision to be made sooner rather than later.
- It was not clear what the material failings with regard to the displaying of the application are in any event. The Committee did not conclude that there was a breach of the Regulations.
- Given that the majority of all representations are based upon the licensing objective with respect to "the prevention of public nuisance" the obtaining of additional representations has no greater probative value than the petitions and written representations which along with the 2003 Act and Portsmouth City Council Policy will be considered by the Committee in due course.

It follows for all the reasons articulated above that the Committee felt fully engaged as to this application and concluded that it would be reasonable expeditious and appropriate to proceed.

The Committee notes that the applicant has amended the original licence application and now agrees to the limitations as stated at page 104 of the Committee paperwork and also outlined in page 3 of the Licensing Officer's report to the Committee. The Committee having considered matters would be prepared to grant a premises licence to no's 10 and 11 as that is not disputed. In terms of the operating schedule the committee would be prepared to accept as follows and outlined as Schedule 1 attached.

The committee accept the weight of comments made by the neighbours as being such that it would be appropriate to amend the schedule as stated above. The area being residential and that the times sought are not consistent with promoting the relevant licensing objectives. The Committee accepts the deputations made as to noise and disturbance having occurred.

Additional Conditions offered by the applicants

In addition to the above, evidence has been given by the operators of the premises that they proposed to take the following additional steps in relation to the premises in order to uphold and promote the licensing objectives, such

steps are offered as conditions applicable to the application grant. They are stated as follows:

- To keep windows and doors fully closed during any performance of live music.

Additional conditions imposed by the Committee:

In addition to these voluntary concessions made by the applicant (as stated above) the Committee imposes the following licensing conditions as the right of the Committee to impose such conditions has been engaged by reason of representations having been made and being satisfied that it is necessary to make such conditions to promote the licensing objectives.

1. Patrons at the premises shall not take alcohol from the premises beyond 21:00 on any day.
2. That if any patron leaves with alcohol before 21:00 they shall remain within the defined area as stated in the amenity licence.

There have been no representations made by any of the relevant Statutory Responsible Authorities. It is of note that no representations have been received from the police relevant to any aspect of the application and due weight was given to this fact.

Given the amendment and additional conditions as proffered and imposed the Committee are prepared to grant the application as amended. The Committee whilst impressed by the number and thoughtfulness of the representations were able to conclude that the majority of comments pertained to the potential licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance being allegedly engaged. Having looked at the comments there is no evidence (save one complaint) to link any incidents to the premises and that the mere "likelihood" of such nuisance occurring in the future is not such as to enable the application to be rejected. Additionally there is no evidence to suggest that the applicants have materially failed to promote any of the relevant licensing objectives indeed the operating schedule shows a level of consideration to the necessary steps being taken to promote on a continuing basis all of the licensing objectives.

In addition and having considered the Statutory Guidance (section 182 of the Licensing Act as amended and enacted in March 2015) the Committee is also aware that any Responsible Authority and indeed any other person may ask this Committee to review the licence because of any matter arising at the premises in connection with any of the licensing objectives.

The Committee can find no reason to decline the licence application as amended with the conditions proffered and imposed as above being proportionate and consistent with respect to the promotion of the relevant licensing objectives.

Schedule 1

Operating Hours	Sunday 09:00 to 00:00 Monday to Saturday 09:00 to 00:30
Supply of Alcohol	Sunday to Thursday 09:00 to 23:00 Friday and Saturday 09:00 to 00:00
Late Night Refreshment	Sunday to Thursday 23:00 to 23:30 Friday and Saturday 23:00 to 00:30
Playing of recorded music	Sunday to Thursday 09:00 to 00:00 Friday and Saturday 09:00 to 00:30
Live music	Sunday to Thursday 10:00 to 23:00 Friday and Saturday 10:00 to 23:30

The meeting concluded at 1.15 pm.

.....

Chair