

London Borough of Islington

Licensing Committee - 8 July 2010

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held at the Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 8 July 2010 at 4:00 pm.

Present: Councillors: Wally Burgess, Raphael Andrews, Barry Edwards, Arthur Graves, Tracy Ismail, Marian Spall and Claudia Webbe.

Councillor Wally Burgess in the Chair

5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A1)

Councillors Joan Coupland.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A2)

None.

7 MINUTES (Item A3)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Committee held on the 24 May 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

8 LICENSING POLICY REVIEW (Item B1)

The Service Director, Public Protection gave a presentation to the Committee a copy of which would be interleaved with the agenda.

The Committee noted that the Licensing Policy needed to be reviewed every three years and it was proposed that a comprehensive consultation be undertaken on the proposed new policy.

In the discussion the following points were raised:

- Ideally officers would prefer to limit numbers of off licences across the borough but this may have to be looked at on an area by area basis.
- There were currently no areas of cumulative impact in the borough but officers had identified four areas of special consideration. There needed to be a clear link with policies to support the introduction of such a zone.
- Councillors expressed concern that targeted zones in hotspots would lead to an increase in applications just outside these areas. Officers stated that these areas were unlikely to be suitable for licensed premises.
- Officer support would not be possible for a zone covering the entire borough based on current staffing levels.
- Officers were carrying out cross-boundary work with other boroughs.
- Councillors should pass on the details of any premises they were aware of that had problems with proxy sales. The police could offer support to these premises.
- It would be helpful to have details of any existing planning consent, including the date it was granted, in the officers' reports to Committee.
- The Challenge 25 scheme would be recommended in the new policy.
- Local councillors should look at their own wards to consider any problems that were specific to their area.
- Joint monitoring would be undertaken with other boroughs to look at problems DPPOs may have on Islington.
- Councillors expressed concern that the 2:00am closure time Hackney Council had imposed on bars in Shoreditch was causing customers to migrate into Islington for late night drinking.
- Evidence of migration from a neighbouring area with a DPPO would have to be presented to support the introduction of a zone in Islington on that basis.
- The police were fully involved in the development of the new strategy.

Licensing Committee – 8 July 2010

- Councillors could use evidence from residents to support the refusal of a licence but it must be supported by the licensing objectives.
- If the new government made changes to Licensing legislation it was possible that the policy would be reviewed again.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation and the comments of councillors be noted.

9 LICENSING UPDATE (Item B2)

The Service Director, Public Protection gave a presentation to the Committee a copy of which would be interleaved with the agenda.

In the discussion the following points were raised:

- The Committee noted that the legislation governing Sex establishments was changing and councillors were being asked for their comments on the council's new policy in light of this.
- The number of these establishments could be limited under the new legislation.
- Premises had to have over a certain percentage of their business of a licensable nature before they were classified as a sex establishment.
- Councillors would prefer that the current number of sites stay the same and in the event of premises closing it should not be replaced.
- Premises which were exempt from these provisions but still provided adult entertainment would be subject to strict licence provisions.
- The sale of knives was not licensed but officers did work with the Police to monitor underage sales.
- The Ghost Bar appeal had been rejected by the court, supporting the Council's initial decision. The judge was particularly persuaded by residents' evidence.
- Orleans had appealed the council's decision to the High Court which had turned down the appeal.
- A decision had not yet been issued on the review brought by residents regarding Piya Piya. A decision was expected on 16 July.
- The Costcutter appeal on the revocation of their licence would be heard on 27 July.
- The Committee would prefer to take the practitioner training and have other smaller sessions on topics such as the Gambling Act.
- The Committee still found the 4:00pm start time of meetings problematic and would prefer to have the meetings split over 10:00am and 6:00pm starts.
- Councillors expressed concern over the size of licensing agendas and asked officers to assess whether all of the information currently included was required.
- Councillors would prefer non-redacted copies of the papers.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation and the comments of councillors be noted.

10 URGENT NON-EXEMPT MATTERS (Item C)

There were no urgent non-exempt matters.

11 CONFIDENTIAL/EXEMPT MATTERS (Item D)

There were confidential/exempt matters.

12 URGENT EXEMPT MATTERS (Item E)

There were no urgent exempt matters.

The meeting ended at 6:40 p.m.

CHAIR.