

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Licensing Sub-Committee** held in the Conference Room,  
Riverside, on **Friday, 05 April 2024 at 10:00 AM**

**Members of the Committee present:**

Councillor Alan Green, Councillor Sarah Plummer, Councillor Keith Robinson

**Officers present:** Teresa Bailey (Senior Licensing Officer), Katy Cassidy (Democratic Services Officer), Martin Clarke (Licensing Manager and Housing Lead Lawyer), Leonie Houlton (Licensing Officer), Jemima Shaw (Lawyer), Alli Stone (Democratic Services Officer)

**Others present:** The Applicants, the Applicant's representative, four objectors

---

**1 Election of a Chair**

On the proposition of Councillor Plummer, seconded by Councillor Green it was

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor Robinson be elected as Chair of this meeting of the Sub-Committee.

**2 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Thompson.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying**

There were no declarations of lobbying.

**5 New Premises Licence - The Mayfair, 18 Broad Street, Bungay, NR33 1EE**

The Sub-Committee received report ES/1911 of the Senior Licensing Officer, which related to a new premises licence for The Mayfair, 18 Broad Street, Bungay NR35 1EE to permit live and recorded music, dance, films and late-night refreshments, all indoors only and on and off sales of alcohol.

The Licensing Manager outlined the procedure to be followed and there was a short adjournment for the applicant to view additional video evidence from one of the objectors.

The Licensing Officer summarised the report and advised that a hearing was required as twenty-nine relevant representations had been received, twenty-five were in support of the application and four were against. The Sub-Committee was told that the applicant had been provided with the representations and had subsequently provided a supported document outlining the measures that would be implemented and that the applicant had confirmed that the Licence times would also be amended. The Licensing Officer advised that this information had been provided to the relevant responsible authorities as well as those that had objected and as representations had not been withdrawn the hearing still needed to go ahead.

The Sub-Committee was requested to determine the application by either granting the application subject to any mandatory conditions and to those consistent with the application, granting the application subject to the same conditions but modified to such extent as the Sub-Committee considered appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives, or by rejecting the application. The Senior Licensing Officer advised that the Sub-Committee must state its reasons when announcing its decision.

The Chair invited questions to the Licensing Officer. There was a discussion regarding late representations from two objectors. The Legal Advisor confirmed that it was a matter for the Sub-Committee to consider and clarified that as at least one representation had been made within the time limit they had the discretion to allow late representations. The Chair confirmed that in the interests of fairness and openness the Sub-Committee would be considering the late representations.

In response to a question from the Legal Advisor, the Licensing Officer confirmed that if a licence was granted it was completely separate from planning and whichever one was more restrictive would take priority.

There being no further questions for the Licensing Officer, the Chair invited the Applicant to make their representation.

The Sub-Committee heard from Mr Rayner, the Applicant, who advised them that the Mayfair was a social meeting house, coffee shop, gift shop, café and bar. They added that following the Christmas opening they had discovered there was a huge demand

for their premises, having sold lots of gifts and hot drinks and had 300 children visit their Santa's grotto, attracting visitors from Norwich. The applicant told the Committee that the Mayfair was not a music venue, they already ran a music festival and theatre and were not trying to replicate the work that they were already doing. Given the success of the venue at Christmas and the twenty-five positive representations and thirty-seven letters of support to the Town Council, the applicant felt it was necessary to find a way to operate that didn't cause unnecessary and unreasonable disturbance to neighbours and other representations. The applicant told the Sub-Committee that they had no intention of running an irresponsible activity and that a lot of work and effort had been put into the venue's management plan aimed at mitigating any disturbances, they added that should any activity cause issues, it would be paused and not repeated until successful mitigation was found. The applicant understood the positions of some of the objectors and noted that Christmas was a unique time of year and was not representative of a usual week in week out situation. The applicant recognised the effects on the neighbouring objectors and noted that this was the reason for the management plan, the reduced operating times to 11pm, the Listed Building Consent for the new disabled access and for not using the space below the objector's premises in the evening. The applicant concluded that they had a solid plan in place, backed up by Environmental Protection to move the application forward.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Applicant's representative, a consultant specialising in live music. The applicant's representative told the Sub-Committee that they were experienced in dealing with the issues of public nuisance and licensing and were here to support the exciting re-use of the Mayfair. The applicant's representative noted that the public nuisance was the main concern from the immediate neighbours and the applicants had given a commitment to work with their neighbours collaboratively and demonstrate management derived from their good practice guide and their experience as venue operators and licensees.

The applicant's representative advised that a noise risk assessment had been conducted during the Temporary Event Notice period; there were fourteen days of activity and significantly less control than was apparent from the proposed operating schedule of premises license. Having carried out the noise risk assessment, the applicant's agent told the Sub-Committee that a management plan had been created which balanced the concerns from the neighbours with the operational business needs. The Sub-Committee was told that the mitigation measures included proposals for acoustic walls along with changes to the operation schedule and how the venue would be used. The applicant's representative described the layout and history of the building and advised the Sub-Committee that it was celebrated as part of the Better in Bungay business events, already fitting with the town's unique offer as a place to visit for food and drink.

The applicant's representative noted that music levels were barely audible at neighbouring residential properties and they proposed regular noise checks of the perimeter of the building, they reinforced that it was not a music venue and was not designed for gigs or ticketed events, the music was incidental with the plan being to

audibly talk to each other without shouting over music. The applicant's representative noted that there was no need for a licence for this, however the applicant took its neighbours representations seriously and had submitted a management plan to mitigate any potential nuisance. The applicant's representative advised that Brandy Lane would become a managed space with the use of CCTV and referred the Sub-Committee to the Better in Bungay initiative which encouraged change of use for cafes and drinking establishments. They noted that Bungay had higher than national average empty units and the support from the local community was very strong. The Mayfair was seeking to enhance the daytime and night-time economy and followed reports from East Suffolk and the Town Council regarding revitalisation of the town centre offer. The applicant's representative felt the Mayfair would enhance the offer for locals and tourists and the applicants had the same aims as the Licensing Authority.

Referring to the video shared earlier in the Sub-Committee and the sound spillage into the property above, the applicant's representative expressed disappointment that previous renovations hadn't included sound proofing. They commented that noise was more intrusive into the evening and noted the concession to change the midnight closing to 11pm, other premises on Broad Street had 12:30 and 2am closing times. They were confident that the mitigation had been put in place and had committed to continuing to work without causing disturbances that was audible in other people's homes.

To conclude the applicant's representative noted the management plan had been agreed by all of the responsible authorities, and active work was taking place with Environmental Health and further work would take place with Planning, they were open and welcoming of any additional conditions. They added that 42% of Bungay was under 40 and their needs weren't necessarily met within the town with only four places to go out to in the evenings, in a recent survey carried out 55% felt building change of use for pubs, restaurants and cafes should be encouraged.

The Chair invited the Sub-Committee to ask questions of the applicant.

Councillor Plummer commented that the applicant had appeared to have taken on board the comments made in the representations to mitigate local concerns and the applicant confirmed that they would continue communications with their neighbours and would stand by their commitment to not do anything that was unreasonable or cause a negative effect.

Councillor Green referred to the ground floor plan and asked what would prevent people moving not the old café space post 6pm. The applicant confirmed that this would be a physically different space with which would be locked and not lit.

The Chair asked how the outside space would be policed to minimise mess. The applicant referred to their management plan and the planned use of CCTV and lighting.

There being no further questions from the Sub-Committee the Chair invited the objectors to ask questions of the applicant.

In response to a question from Bungay Town Council, the applicant confirmed they would not be an outside venue, drinks would not be allowed outside of the venue and there would be no outside tables or seating.

There was a discussion between the objector and the applicant's representative regarding residential/non residential status of the surrounding area of the Mayfair. The objector referred to the applicant's agent's comment regarding lack of soundproofing in their building and confirmed it was an antiques shop for a number of years and outlined how the space was used previously. The objector noted the applicant's comment that they attracted more footfall than expected during the temporary opening in December and asked for a comparison against the planned proposed use and impact.

Following discussion the Legal advisor confirmed that the purpose of the sub-committee was to discuss the licensing objectives and consider whether the licensable activities were capable of promoting the four licensing objectives adding, even if approved, the application would need to be addressed at planning prior to opening. In response the objector confirmed that the point they were making was relevant to the licensing objectives as it concerned the potential noise coming from the building and how the number of people using the building at one time would affect that noise.

The Applicant's representative confirmed that sound proofing and acoustic screening would be provided to mitigate any noise and the areas where there was noise leakage to Mr Crowley's property would not be used in the evenings, it was reiterated that it was not going to be a music venue. The applicant referred to the noise mitigation of the management plan and acknowledged that the Mayfair was committed to making further improvements once operational should any of the elements applied not be successful. The applicant's representative added that they were excluding a third to a quarter of the venue, which resulted in a loss of capacity and trading, however they were prepared to do this until a satisfactory agreement was reached with the neighbours and they were comfortable with improvements and lack of noise disturbance.

In response to a question from Mr Crowley, the applicant confirmed they had operated a festival for eight years in Suffolk, having received one complaint, they put measures in place which satisfied the hearing and continued to operate for a further five years without any issues. They were now operating in the Breckland area and despite being 800 metres from a housing estate there had been no breaches and it was in its third year.

In response to a question from Mr Crowley, the applicant confirmed that this was a new licence application with a plan in place to mitigate the differences. Mr Crowley, raised concerns about the access from Brandy Lane, in response the applicant noted that they were aware of the concerns regarding people leaving the building, however there were already three buildings that affected this overspill and they did not feel The Mayfair would be adding anything extra to what was already going on.

In response to the objector's questions regarding demand and the survey carried out, the applicant's representative clarified the detail of the survey and the potential impact on any planning applications. The Legal Advisor confirmed that this was not relevant to the Licensing Objectives.

In response to a question regarding social media, the applicant confirmed that they put the Town Council objection information regarding the Mayfair onto social media and gave people an opportunity to agree or disagree with it. The Chair interjected and asked that the questions asked remained pertinent to the licensing objectives.

In response to a question from Mr Kingsley, objector, the applicant confirmed that they had dedicated a section of the management plan to mitigating the effect on Brandy Lane and this included shutting one entrance on Broad Street and opening on Brandy Lane. There was a discussion between the town council and the applicant which clarified the proportion of business and residential use in Broad Street and Brandy Lane.

In response to the Legal Advisor, the applicant confirmed that the proposed closing time was 11:00 PM and that they were aware of the limitation factors of planning and licensing.

The Chair invited the objectors to make their representations.

Mr Kingsley limited the objection to Brandy Lane and the conditionality regarding that point, noting the issues for residents with large volumes of people congregating in a small thoroughfare. In response to Councillor Plummer Mr Kingsley stated there were a lot of people congregating there during the temporary event notice period. The applicant disputed that, stating he wasn't personally made aware of any issues in Brandy Lane at the time, and as they hadn't yet applied their management plan and operating schedule they would reserve judgement and review it.

The Sub-Committee heard the Bungay Town Council's representation which outlined their position. Bungay Town Council had their regular planning meeting in March, at which they received the application for the Mayfair, they noted that it was advertised in the usual way with a public agenda and notification, it was agreed at that meeting

that they would submit their response for the Licensing application. The main concerns centred around Brandy Lane as there was no outside area for people to smoke etc. Bungay Town Council were positively encouraging change of use of derelict building, but felt it had to be in the right place, they noted that they were not against the idea but felt there were more suitable venues. They commented it was interesting to see the sound-proofing proposals as they were not available when they first reviewed the application. They noted that there was no historical evidence ever of onsite sales of alcohol, having checked previous records there was only offsite sales.

The Legal Advisor clarified that the history of onsite sales was a planning and not licensing matter and the Chair confirmed that the purpose of the Sub-Committee was to look at the four licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee heard from Mr Crowley, objector, who read out his detailed representation outlining his objections and concerns. Mr Crowley told the Sub-Committee that he lived in the property attached to the Mayfair with his partner and their garden adjoined the building. They moved to Bungay in 2020 to a home and community that they love. Mr Crowley advised that he wanted to be in a position to recommend approval subject to conditions, however to get to that position, he was promised a full acoustic assessment, sound proofing and was advised that the applicant was working with Environmental Protection for a management plan. Regrettably no full acoustic assessment had been undertaken and no soundproofing had been offered and in their opinion the management plan could not resolve the issues and they could not judge that they would not see a recurrence of harms, therefore Mr Crowley believed that the best outcome was to reject the application in its current form, adding the best outcome would be to reject and find alternative suitable premises.

Mr Crowley detailed his dissatisfaction with the following areas:

- Noise disturbance
- Dissatisfaction with noise assessment
- Applicant not using the front section for licensed events
- Acoustic assessment
- No sound proofing to ceiling of the front café area
- Use of social media by the applicant
- Use of Brandy Lane - Proposal to move evening entrance will encourage antisocial behaviour.

Mr Crowley thanked the applicants for their offer of ongoing communication and mitigation in the management plan but suggested it would be more suitable to remove the use of the front section of the building entirely. Mr Crowley stated that the conditions suggested were minimal in likely mitigation and encouraged antisocial behaviour, questioning whether it was realistically possible long term to operate without undermining the licensing objectives.

Mr Crowley told the Sub-Committee that he had reviewed the management plan and listed several clarifications required regarding the management plan and proposed conditions to minimise impact from noise, antisocial behaviour, light, disturbances.

Mr Crowley stated that the applicant had not made contact prior to opening in December and the last substantive correspondence was in February where they shared a draft and submitted a plan one day prior to the deadline. Mr Crowley stated he engaged with good intentions, promoting licensing objectives and had found it stressful and upsetting as he could not judge that there would not be a recurrence of harms. To conclude Mr Crowley asked the Sub-Committee to reject the application and find a more suitable venue.

The Chair invited questions to the objector.

Due to the cross over in the representation between planning and licensing, Councillor Plummer advised that they would only be considering the matters relating to licensing.

With reference to the comments about the applicant's approach on social media, the Legal Advisor informed the Sub-Committee that further evidence would be needed if they were to take it into account. The Chair confirmed that they would not be considering this as it was not relevant to the Licensing Objectives. The applicant confirmed that he just requested comments and feedback on social media and disputed the lack of communication with the objector.

The Legal advisor noted that Environmental Protection were content with the management plan and the agreed police conditions, asking the objector if that dealt with his concerns. In response, the objector still had concerns around Brandy Lane, adding the actions that the applicant can take to mitigate the issues with spill out were difficult to manage due to the surrounding area. The objector noted that initially sound proofing for the ceiling and front section was offered, but it hadn't been addressed in the management plan.

The applicant's representative reiterated the commitment to ensure no noise spillage for the applicant, adding that the risk assessment had been carried out, resulting in non-usage of the room immediately below them and sound proofing of the stud wall between the front and middle sections. It is going to cause too many problems and that is why the activity has been moved.

In response to the objector, the applicant stated that the management plan clearly stated they would not be holding any music events in the front section unless it could be proved that there would be no disturbance. In response to the request for the removal of the front section as a licensable area, the applicant confirmed it would still



be opening as a café and questioned how removing the alcohol licence would make it less noisy, adding that the management plan was compiled on the advice of Environmental Protection and they were open to continuous improvements as necessary.

The objector expressed concerns about the types of activity that could be carried out within the front licenced zone and the risks that they would carry. In particular they queried live music and amplification. The applicant's consultant clarified that the building was class E, allowing for shop, office, restaurant, café, non residential use, assembly or leisure and could change between those classes without application. They added it was a commercial premises that needs to have a viable use, which had been demonstrated with the December events success. The venue was limited by capacity, minimising the over spillage in Brandy Lane. Music was incidental to the purpose of the venue.

Concerns were again raised around the use of Brandy Lane along with the building's intended use and the wider scope that was applied for via the licence. The applicant replied that the management plan was in place with appropriate conditions, adding as much mitigation as possible had been offered included deregulation of a third of the building, which followed good practice and upheld the licensing objectives and the requirements of Environmental Protection.

To conclude the objector asked that the Sub-Committee considered what had been applied for in the application and what had been described as intended use, making sure the two aligned, and added conditions which were more prescriptive and mitigated issues.

The Chair invited Mr Crowley to make the representation on behalf of Mr Barnes. The Legal Advisor clarified that there would not be any questions, purely the representation verbatim.

Mr Crowley read out the representation from Mr Barnes, with the main objections being summarised as:

- They were not in favour of Mayfair Cocktail bar, but applauded the applicants for their ambition.
- There would be considerable antisocial behaviour and disturbance in Brandy Lane.
- The previous disturbances have not been fully addressed by the applicant
- The level of noise and performance is too ambiguous
- Concern over late night disturbances
- Concern over the suitability of the premises
- There is little or no ventilation
- There is no outside space for patrons, meaning they would use public footpaths

and recurrence of public disturbances

- Brandy Lane is overlooked all side by residential properties
- The Lane way is intended to be made as entrance and exit and smells and noise will be present from Laneway
- Applicant will have little or no control of conduct of patrons outside of the property
- Far too many conflicting and optimistic assurances given to enable meaningful conditions to be applied, particularly as no planning permissions given currently
- They concluded, given the history and the likelihood of potential issues, the application should be rejected or in the event it was approved – there needed to be very rigorous and enforceable conditions.

The applicants addressed the concerns raised, adding that the venue could currently open as a café until 11pm therefore the licensing objectives sought would provide the level of control required. They noted that the police and Environmental Protection believed the conditions of the management plan to be suitable and they were not expecting high volumes of people to go in and out of the building.

The Committee heard from a further representative of Bungay Town Council. They advised that the application was heard at their Town Council planning meeting and all of their information was accessed via the East Suffolk Planning portal, noting that the Town Council premises was in very close proximity to the Applicant. They acknowledged the overlap between planning and licensing. The objector clarified the layout of Broad Street, explaining there was a section of residential and a section that was part residential, part business use. The objector stated that their principle reason for refusal was the impact on Brandy Lane, it was a main pedestrian route and was narrow. They added there were significant problems in this area when the business opened at Christmas.

The Chair invited questions to the objector. The applicant noted this was the first time they had applied for a planning and licensing application and was unaware that they needed to attend the Town Council meeting. To conclude the applicant noted that what shouldn't be overlooked was the benefit of the Mayfair opening, the business premise was inspired by the building's history. They had taken on board the points raised and were hoping to have a positive relationship with the town. The applicant noted that they took objection to the term significant antisocial behaviour. The Town Council commented that it was a business that was needed but just in a different building.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited all parties to sum up.

The Senior Licensing Officer stated that there had been a lot of talk of planning and licensing and noted an applicant has to start somewhere, it often comes down to expenditure and this applicant would have to spend significantly more on planning application than licensing. Following comments regarding the applicant's management

plan being submitted one day before the deadline, the Senior Licensing Officer clarified that mattered not - as under the Licensing Act 2003 mediation can take place up until 24 hours before the hearing taking place.

The applicant summed up stating it was a building inspired business which was committed to operating harmoniously, there was no intention of opening The Mayfair in another building. There was a commitment to the neighbours and understood the concern following the Christmas activity, however the management plan was in place and stated that activities would halt should there be any issues. They thanked the Sub-Committee for their time and consideration.

The Sub-Committee adjourned with the Legal Advisor and Democratic Services Officer to consider their decision. On their return the Chair read the following decision notice:

### **DECISION NOTICE**

The Mayfair Bungay Ltd (the applicant) has applied for a new premises licence at The Mayfair, 18 Broad Street, Bungay NR35 1EE, to permit dancing, films and alcohol on and off sales Monday to Sunday 10:00 to 18:00 in the licensed café area and 18:00 to 23:00 in the licensed bar area. The proposed opening hours are the same.

Following a number of objections the applicant has agreed conditions with the police, in addition Environmental Protection have not objected provided that the premises is operated in accordance with the Management Plan and Nuisance Reduction Strategy dated 27/02/24. These conditions did not satisfy all of the objectors' concerns and therefore a Licensing Hearing was required.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Licensing Officer, who summarised the report and confirmed that the hearing had been held as four representations against the application had been received from other persons. The Licensing Officer indicated that some of the concerns were relating to planning issues rather than licensing matters and if there was a conflict between the two, the most restrictive regime would take effect. The Licensing Officer indicated there were twenty-five representations in support.

The Sub-Committee then heard from the applicant and his representative who made it quite clear that there was a demand for this facility as shown by the popularity over Christmas. They understood there had been concerns and in order to deal with these, they had agreed conditions with the Police and Environmental Protection. In order to deal with the concerns of the neighbours they had reduced the operating times and would close the café area at 18:00. They were disappointed that there was not already sufficient noise protection in the premises, however they were prepared to implement noise reduction measures as agreed with Environmental Protection as specified in the management plan with a particular aim of stopping noise from going into the café area and subsequently into the neighbouring properties. In order to achieve this a new

entrance would need to be constructed on Brandy Lane and there would be no need to go into the café area after it was closed at 18:00 as the toilets were at the rear of the premises. Therefore after 18:00 the café area would not be accessed by patrons at all.

In relation to the concerns regarding Brandy Lane, these had been dealt with following discussions with Police and conditions agreed with them.

The applicant indicated that there were no plans to have live music, however under the de-regulation act they would be permitted to do that if they wished to do so. The applicant stated that they felt the support in the community was strong and that this venue would be important for the tourism industry and the Better in Bungay initiative. There were a number of questions from objectors, firstly in relation to Brandy Lane and allowing people to drink outside the venue, the applicant indicated that they would not be allowing people to drink outside the venue. There were concerns regarding the use of Brandy Lane and whether or not this would cause a public nuisance, in particular the noise of people leaving the premises and their behaviour, especially given that some residential properties were adjacent to the lane. The applicant indicated that they would do their best to ensure that there was no accumulation of people leaving and, in any event, given the size of the venue it was unlikely that it would cause concern.

There were also conversations about whether Broad Street was a residential area, the objectors stated that it was mainly a residential area, the applicant said although there were residential areas it was a mixed street with business properties.

The objectors then put forward their case. Firstly, was the owner of the neighbouring business premises who was concerned about accumulation in Brandy Lane and that this part of Broad street was residential. He also indicated that this site was a long way away from the nearest major business which was a printers. The Sub-Committee next heard from two representatives of Bungay Town Council who had concerns again regarding Brandy Lane and that the Lane would not be a suitable place for a licensed premises and that there had not been any history of onsite sales and this constituted a change of use. The Sub-Committee then heard from the objector who lived in the neighbouring property who had concerns regarding noise pollution having produced a video and was concerned that the management plan did not deal with this, in particular the lack of floating ceilings. The same objector also had concerns regarding Brandy Lane and did not consider it to be suitable for an entrance for a licensed premises, in particular the potential for public nuisance from people entering and leaving the premises. He also stated that the café was not part of the original application and read another objector's statement.

The decision of the Sub-Committee

The Sub-Committee, having considered the application, the Licensing Officer's report and the representations received from the applicant and other objectors and

supporters has decided to grant the licence as applied for subject to the amended operating hours, the conditions agreed with the police and in strict accordance with the Management Plan and Nuisance Reduction Strategy dated 27/02/2024 which was to be annexed to the licence.

#### Reasons for decision

In arriving at this decision, the Sub-Committee has taken into consideration the representations of the applicant, objectors and supporters as well as the Licensing Officer's report. The Sub-Committee also considered the Council's own licensing guidance and statement of licensing policy, as well as the Statutory Section 182 guidance, and Human Rights Act 1998.

The Sub-Committee notes that paragraph 9.12 of the Section 182 statutory guidance states that the responsible authorities are experts in their respective fields and great weight should be placed on their representations or lack of. In this case the Sub-Committee is reassured by the conditions agreed with the responsible authorities and is satisfied that these conditions are capable of promoting the licensing objectives in particular prevention of public nuisance and prevention of crime and disorder. The Sub-Committee was reassured that the applicant would be capable of promoting the licensing objectives due to his proactive approach to dealing with the responsible authorities.

The Sub-Committee acknowledges the concerns of the objectors but feels that they can be mitigated by the conditions agreed with the responsible authorities. The Sub-Committee has deliberately required strict adherence to the Management Plan and Noise Reduction Strategy as part of the conditions.

In relation to some of the concerns raised relating to planning matters for example change of use and the location of the door nothing in this decision should be taken as expressing any view as to whether planning permission would be granted and nothing in this decision notice as expressly or implicitly granting planning permission for any works required under the conditions of this licence.

The Sub-Committee would also like to reassure the objectors that this matter could be brought back for review if there was evidence that the premises when operating was in breach of its conditions or if the conditions prove insufficient to promote the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee is therefore satisfied that that licence can be granted as applied for subject to the conditions agreed with the responsible authorities and the amended operating times.

Anyone affected by this decision has the right to appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of receiving notice of the decision.

Date: 5 April 2024

The meeting concluded at 1:55 PM

.....  
Chair