

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**2 June 2005 (10.30am –11.10am)**  
**10 June 2005 (11.00-12.30pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS:**

**Residents' Group** Malvin Brown (Chairman)  
Owen Ware

**Labour Group** Harry Webb

Mr Cannon (the applicant's legal representative), Mr Leonard (Havering Police), Paul Campbell (Licensing Officer), Penelope Thorp (Legal advisor to the Sub-Committee) and Garry Chick-Mackay (Clerk) were present at the 2 June meeting. Approximately fifty members of the public were also present.

Mr Phillips (the applicants legal representative), Sergeant Edwards (Havering Police), Mr Leonard, Paul Jones (Licensing Officer), Penelope Thorp, Garry Chick-Mackay and approximately 100 members of the public were present at the 10 June meeting.

The Chairman advised Members and the public of action to be taken in the event of emergency evacuation of the Town Hall becoming necessary.

**THE DRILL HOTEL, BRENTWOOD ROAD, GIDEA PARK - OPPOSED VARIATION TO A PREMISES LICENCE**

Before the commencement of the hearing, the Chairman heard a request from the applicants' representative. The applicants' representative requested that the hearing be adjourned. It was noted that the applicant had not received the ten days notice of the hearing which were required by regulations. As such, it was suggested that the applicant had not been given sufficient time to put together their case, or to consider the issues raised in representations.

The Sub-Committee adjourned for 20 minutes to consider the applicant's request. On reconvening, the Chairman announced that the hearing would be adjourned, and would reconvene on 10 June 2005.

On reconvening on 10 June, the committee allowed a request for the police to explain their position in relation to the application. The police representative explained that the application posed no greater problems than other pubs in the Borough. If the licence were to be granted, the police would monitor the premises for crime and disorder, and take action if necessary. However, the

**Licensing Sub-Committee, 2 June 2005 and 10 June 2005**

police had no reason to object at this time. In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, it was explained that should the licence be granted with later hours, the police would anticipate an increase in disorder, which would present an increased strain on police resources.

The Licensing Officer presented the report. It was explained that the premises were situated at a roundabout where six roads met, five of which were main roads. The premises currently traded from 10.00am to 11.00pm Monday to Saturday, and from 12.00pm to 10.30pm Sunday. The new hours applied for were for the premises to be open Monday to Thursday until 12.30am the following day, on Friday until 1.30am the following day, on Saturday until 2.30am the following day and on Sunday until 11.00pm. The application requested hours for the sale of alcohol and for live and/or recorded music, until 30 minutes before closing on each day.

The Sub-Committee heard the representations of local residents. Residents explained to Members that the premises had a young clientele, and that residents experienced vandalism, litter including broken glass, and public urination from people leaving the premises. It was argued that the premises sat within a highly residential area. An increase in hours was expected to lead to an increase in public disorder, putting increased pressure on the police. Noise from within the premises was disruptive to some residents who lived closest to the venue, and the noise of car doors slamming and car radios was considered a nuisance which would be made worse if patrons were leaving the premises at a later hour.

Concerns were raised that members of the youth congregation of the nearby Methodist Church had previously been the subjects of attack from patrons of the premises. It was expected that these attacks could increase if the hours of operation were extended. Concerns were also raised that music from the premises would be heard within the church, and would disrupt worship.

The applicants representative announced that, in light of the objections made, the applicant wished to amend the proposed hours of operation so that the terminal hour for Fridays and Saturdays would be 1.00am the following day. In response to residents concerns, it was noted that there were no alterations requested to Sunday trading, so the impact on Sunday worship would not change. It was suggested that as the premises was positioned at a busy roundabout, there was a constant level of background noise from traffic, and so noise from the premises could not reach most residents. It was noted that there had been no representations made by Environmental Health Officers on the grounds of noise disturbance, nor was there a formal police objection.

It was noted that the current licences had been in place for a year, and many of the problems raised by residents were from the previous licences. It was noted that the current licences had received no complaints from the police, or from local residents. It was suggested that the problems raised had not been resolved because of a lack of dialogue between the premises and the residents, and that if the Sub-Committee were minded to grant the licence,

**Licensing Sub-Committee, 2 June 2005 and 10 June 2005**

they could add a condition that the premises hold a quarterly meeting with residents to help resolve such issues as they arose.

At this point the Chairman adjourned the meeting to allow the Sub-Committee to consider its decision. On reconvening, the Chairman explained that having considered the oral and written submissions of the applicant, and of objectors, and taking into account the four licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of nuisance, the Sub-Committee did not feel it was appropriate to grant the variation of hours.

As such, it was **resolved**

**That the transfer of the existing licence be approved, but that the variation of hours requested be refused.**

---

CHAIRMAN

Date \_\_\_\_\_