

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, 12 NOVEMBER 2021

Councillors Present: Billy Drummond, Rick Jones and Claire Rowles

Substitute:

Also Present: Beth Varcoe (Solicitor), Gillian Steele

PART I

10 Election of the Chairman

It was agreed prior to the meeting that Councillor Rick Jones would chair this sub-committee meeting.

11 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest received.

12 Application No. 21/00786/LQN - Pinchington Hall, Crookham Hill, Thatcham, RG19 8DQ

Councillor Rick Jones, Chairman of the Sub-Committee, welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the hybrid meeting process. Those participants who had joined the meeting via Zoom confirmed they had heard and understood the introduction.

The Sub-Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 3) concerning Licensing Review Application 21/00786/LQN in respect of Pinchington Hall, Crookham Hill, Thatcham, RG19 8DQ.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Brad Timm (Licensing Officer, West Berkshire Council) and Mr Nigel Bryant (Applicant), addressed the Sub-Committee on this application.

Councillor Simon Pike (Thatcham Town Council), Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter (Ward member for Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham), Mr Peter Thompson (Local resident) and Jodie Wilson (Environmental Health) addressed the sub0committee in support of the review.

Ms Linda Beechley-Smith (License holder) and her representative Ms Joanna Maule addressed the sub-committee as objectors to the review.

Mr Timm, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- The Licensing Authority had accepted an application from Mr Nigel Bryant on behalf of residents of Wellingtonia Drive and the surrounding area for a review of the premises licence in relation to Pinchington Hall, Crookham Hill, Thatcham, RG19 8DQ on 17th September 2021 under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003.
- The grounds for review were all of the licensing objectives:
 - Prevention of Crime and Disorder
 - Public Safety
 - Prevention of Public Nuisance
 - Protection of Children

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- The 28 day consultation period ran from 18th September 2021 to 15th October 2021. The Responsible Authorities, Ward Members and Parish Council had been informed.
- The application was advertised in accordance with the regulations and the required blue notices had been placed at the premises and had been checked by an Officer from the Public Protection Partnership.
- During the consultation period, the Licensing Authority received representations to support the review application from Jodie Wilson (Environmental Health) and from Thatcham Town Council.

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Brad Timm.

Councillor Billy Drummond enquired why the temporary event license was not checked against the conditions of the premises license. Mr Timm was unsure but noted licenses for events are usually treated as a stand-alone application.

Councillor Simon Pike referred to the requirement for two noise management plans under paragraph 17 of the premises license and asked if any had been provided. It was confirmed that no noise management plans had been submitted.

Mr Bryant, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- That he was speaking on behalf of several residents of Wellingtonia Drive and the surrounding area.
- That the housing was a new development and that residents had been told that Pinchington Hall was being let out as a Bed & Breakfast with no mention of large events being held there. Residents had become aware that it was a licensed premises following a loud event in April when 20-30 young men were staying at Pinchington Hall making noise until 2am. Residents looked up the Hall online to contact the owners and it was then they found out about the license and that the property was managed by a company called Phoenix.
- On another date, when the loud noise went on until 2am, residents contacted the police and were told to contact Environmental Control. Environmental control were not available over the weekend.
- Loud events were a frequent occurrence at Pinchington Hall up until the issuing of a noise abatement notice in August.
- There was an application to get the hall license for weddings, but this was turned down due to noise, concerns over fire safety and the lack of public transport to the area.
- There have been issues of refuse building up outside the hall, which attracted rats.
- With reference to the licensing objectives, Mr Bryant noted the following:
 - Prevention of Crime & Disorder – While Mr Bryant had not personally witnessed drug use on the premises, he had observed small metal canisters associated with drug use littered in the area.
 - Public safety – The building has been refurbished as a residential property and does not meet the necessary fire safety measures for large gatherings e.g. there is only one exit from the cinema area in the basement.
 - Prevention of Public Nuisance – There have been frequent loud gatherings and events which disturb local residents.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- Protection of Children – A stone was thrown at a resident's child by a guest at the hall in June.
- Residents do not believe restricting events to indoors would solve the issues,

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Nigel Bryant.

Councillor Claire Rowles enquired about the frequency of the loud events and the period they occurred over. Mr Bryant stated that the loud noises were almost daily and that there had been approximately four large events in the time he had been living in Wellingtonia Drive. He noted there had been no issues since the noise abatement notice had been issued. Mr Bryant added that residents were never given any written warning of large events and attempts to contact the license holder had been unsuccessful.

Councillor Rowles asked how close the residences affected were to Pinchington Hall. There were thirteen new homes on Wellingtonia Drive, as well as two lodges close by, the closest of which was just 1.5 meters from the boundary of Pinchington Hall. The Houses are close to the boundary on three sides and on the fourth is a hospital.

Mr Peter Thompson added that his property shared 15 meters of the boundary with Pinchington Hall and is just 20 meters from the licensed outdoor area with the bedrooms of his house facing the hall directly. He confirmed that there had been a loud event all through the first weekend he moved in and that even indoor events could be heard from his home.

Councillor Billy Drummond asked if records had been kept of the disturbances. Mr Thompson said that he had kept a log and the disturbances were almost daily.

Councillor Rowles asked for more detail about the internal layout and whether Mr Bryant had seen inside the building himself. Mr Bryant confirmed his comments on the safety of the layout for large groups was not based on personal experience of the building but observations of the plans and discussions with a developer.

Councillor Rick Jones asked for clarification of whether the formal complaint of Public Nuisance related to the daily noise level or just the large events. Mr Bryant reiterated that the noise levels were unbearable several times a week and other nuisances such as cigarette butts being thrown over the fence.

Councillor Jones asked who had taken the photographs provided as evidence. The photos were a mix of pictures taken by local residents and pictures found online which had been posted by people at the events. The pictures of the metal canisters and overflowing bins were taken by Mr Bryant himself.

Councillor Jones asked if the canisters were linked to a particular event. Mr Bryant said he was not certain but could find out, he suspected they fell out of the bins when they were put out for collection. Mr Bryant noted that he sent copies of the pictures to Environmental Health the day he took them.

Mrs Beechley-Smith, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- No weddings were held at Pinchington Hall as it does not have the necessary license. The events held there have all been private hires, including some wedding receptions. Ms Beechley-Smith was not aware of any stag parties or large groups of men booking the hall. Bookings were made through Airbnb, who require information about the number of people to be present. The events never exceeded 30 people on site at one time.
- A baby shower event was inspected by Phoenix, as more people than expected arrived towards the end.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- The wedding reception in August had a TEN licence, which Environmental health issued to the caterers directly without anyone informing the owners. The wedding party were informed that the property rules meant music had stop by 11pm.
- There were two video shoots, which were non-licensable events.
- Mrs Beechley-Smith had tried to arrange a meeting with local residents to discuss the best use for the property and stated that she is easily contactable 24/7 if they need to speak with her about any issues.
- Large events always had a member of Phoenix's staff present to manage things.
- It was difficult to handle complaints effectively when residents took their complaints to Airbnb and the council rather than directly to Mrs Beechley-Smith herself.
- The majority of the bookings are family groups; some of whom have complained about residents filming their children over the gates.
- Regarding the overflowing bins; she acknowledged there had been an issue but has already applied for commercial bins which are now in place with bi-weekly collections.

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Linda Beechley-Smith.

Councillor Billy Drummond asked whether the conditions of the licence were adhered to for all events. Mrs Beechley-Smith answered that the license conditions had not been applied because there had been no licensable events. Those using the property for private events were asked to follow the rules set out by Phoenix and Airbnb regarding noise levels etc. But as there was no provision of alcohol or catering by the license holder, the licensing conditions did not apply. She said that she understood why people were complaining but could not understand why the residents had gone to the council and not directly to herself. She added that there was in fact a fire escape from the basement and that they were working to put in place the recommended measures given to them after a recent fire inspection. Security cameras are also being installed to allow easier monitoring of events.

Councillor Rowles asked for clarification about the holding of weddings on site. Mrs Beechley-Smith confirmed that there had been wedding receptions but no actual weddings on site.

Councillor Rowles asked why the event with the TEN license was not held using the premises license. Mrs Beechley-Smith answered that nobody had approached her about using her license for the event.

Councillor Rowles asked why no noise abatement plan had been submitted to environmental health. Mrs Beechley-Smith answered that, as there had been no licensable events held, there had been no requirement to submit a plan. While she does have a license, she cannot do anything with it until there has been planning approval for using the venue for large events. She had been surprised by the granting of the TEN.

Councillor Rowles asked for Mrs Beechley-Smith to respond to the photographic evidence provided. Mrs Beechley-Smith noted that it is impossible to confirm the times when the pictures were taken by looking at them and it is hard to solve an issue after the event or if people do not contact her to let her know.

Councillor Rowles asked for a response to the claims that residents were unable to contact the License holder when there were problems. Mrs Beechley-Smith stated that the advertised number for her team is set to get hold of herself or a member of her team 24/7.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Rowles asked if Mrs Beechley-Smith had made any attempt to reach out to the local residents. She confirmed that she had tried to arrange through Environmental Health but the invitation was declined. She added that 90% of the issues had not been brought to her directly.

Councillor Rick Jones asked what the Airbnb rules were regarding noise and disturbances. It was clarified that the rules state that outside playing of music must stop at 10pm and that there is a notice in the reception room reminding guests to close the doors after 9pm.

Councillor Jones asked what measures were in place to ensure compliance with the rules. Mrs Beechley-Smith said that she makes sure all guests are told the rules but isn't sure what more can be done without being intrusive on their stay. She felt the installation of security cameras would help monitor activity.

Councillor Rowles asked if any changes had been put in place in response to the reported issues beyond telling guests what the rules were. Mrs Beechley-Smith explained the rule about closing the doors after 9pm was in response to the issues. She felt the only real way to enforce was by attending events as often they don't know there is an issue until afterwards; when informed of problems during events she or a member of her team have attended to keep an eye on things. She added that it is a difficult line between enforcing the rules and intruding on the enjoyment of the property.

Councillor Rowles asked if there was a log of the complaints received. Mrs Beechley-Smith said there was but they couldn't log complaints that weren't put through to them. She was unsure how many complaints she had logged.

Councillor Billy Drummond asked for clarification about the action taken on potential fire safety issues. The local fire authority had inspected the property as an Airbnb letting and provided the owners with a list of recommendations, which are being put in place.

Councillor Jones asked Mrs Beechley-Smith what measures she would put in place to ensure compliance with the license conditions if she were to hold a licensable event. It was explained that for such an event, a member of staff would be present on site for the duration and a caretaker would be employed full-time to manage the site.

Councillor Rowles asked whether Mrs Beechley-Smith intended to continue with the current use of the site if her planning application is unsuccessful. The plan was to continue as an Airbnb but Mrs Beechley-Smith will be checking with guests in future as to whether they are arranging a TEN for their event and may choose to refuse such bookings.

Mr Peter Thompson noted that the circumstances around Pinchington Hall have changed since the license was originally granted and asked how Mrs Beechley-Smith justified keeping a license that she doesn't use. Mrs Beechley-Smith explained that the license cannot be used until planning permission has been granted; the application process was delayed due to covid.

Mr Nigel Bryant challenged the statement that nobody had informed the license holder of the issues; he himself had made several attempts. Mrs Beechley-Smith insisted that the number on her website was answered 24/7 and that she had asked Mr Bryant not to contact her via her Husband but to call her directly instead. Mr Bryant said that he had called her husband because he had given him a number which he said to call if there was a problem.

Mr Bryant also challenged the assertion that it was mostly family groups using the site saying that from his observations it was often groups of young adults having parties. Mrs Beechley-Smith said that all groups must give details of who is staying when booking, although it is not always possible to control whether extra people turn up.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter noted that he was present for the original license hearing and recalled that Mrs Beechley-Smith had committed to manage noise by having an on-site caretaker. He asked how successful they had been in putting those measures in place. Mrs Beechley-Smith explained that the rules guests are given only allow for a domestic sized speaker system. She felt the main issue was that nobody was contacting her to say when there were problems and that she was happy to go out to the site and check on things if she got a call. Otherwise she felt she had to take it on faith that guests were following the rules when she was not present.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter reflected that the Airbnb rules don't seem to allow for much enforcement and seem to rely heavily on the goodwill of the guests to follow the rules set out and that owners could only react after the problems occur. He asked for Mrs Beechley-Smith's thoughts on that assessment. She said that they do carry out spot checks on bookings and that she hoped the installation of security cameras would help with ensuring rules are followed and that the numbers of guests resent matches the bookings. Councillor Ardagh-Walter felt that it wasn't ideal to have a system geared to responding to issues rather than preventing them. Mrs Beechley-Smith added that all parties are met by staff when they arrive so she does have an opportunity to see that the groups match the bookings.

Councillor Ardagh-Walter noted that the promotional material for Pinchington Hall includes special events and weddings and felt the current management model made control impossible.

Councillor Rowles asked whether Mrs Beechley-Smith had a commitment to an on-site presence during events. Mrs Beechley-Smith said the obligation was only for licensable events, of which there had been none. She had ensured there was someone present to oversee the event with the TEN license.

Mr Bryant queried Mrs Beechley-Smith's comment that there could be no licensed events as planning had not yet been approved. He revealed that a colleague had submitted an application for Pinchington Hall and been provided with a price list which included the provision of a bar service, which he felt contradicted her statement. Mrs Beechley-Smith answered that the quotes given were conditional on planning being approved before the date of the event.

Ms Jodie Wilson, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- That there had been a number of complaints submitted relating to Pinchington Hall.
- The photos and map provided on the website are out of date and give the impression that Pinchington Hall is a more remote location than it really is and so more likely to attract people planning larger events.
- The marketing material also lists the Hall as a licensed venue, which infers that parties are welcome.
- The majority of complaints related to the holiday lettings.
- On the 19th August 2021 a TEN was granted to the caterers at an event for the sale of alcohol. This was for a marquee event and Environmental Health raised concerns that it would cause a nuisance to neighbours. The music on the day was audible from adjacent properties and analysis of recordings confirmed the levels were intrusive. A noise abatement notice was served as a result, this is being appealed. The mediation process between residents and the license holder was cancelled following the issuing of the notice.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

- Environmental Health feel that marketing the hall as a licensed venue attracts inappropriate events for the setting.

Councillor Rowles asked about the impact on the nearby hospital. Jodie Wilson responded that they likely were impacted but no complaints had been received from the hospital.

Councillor Drummond asked if Environmental Health had been able to confirm that the sound system was domestic rather than professional. Ms Wilson's opinion was that they were not concert speakers, but certainly high-powered for a domestic sound system.

Councillor Rowles asked if the issue with overflowing refuse and rodents was an ongoing issue or a one-off incident. Ms Wilson said that complaints about the rubbish were received in August, she was unable to confirm the presence of rats. During the Environmental Health visit on the 19th there were insufficient bins visible during the event. A few weeks after the event they received pictures of bins which had been left uncollected for some time by the road.

Councillor Jones asked Ms Wilson what the recommendation from Environmental Health would be in this situation. Ms Wilson felt that the location was not suitable for a licensed venue. She thought it might be better if events were restricted to inside the building but this is hard to enforce.

Mr Bryant asked why the bins were left uncollected for so long. Ms Wilson was unsure but had referred the issue on to the Waste management team. She was unsure if the Licence holder was using residential collections or paying for commercial collections.

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Jodie Wilson.

Councillor Simon Pike, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- Councillor Pike identified himself as the chairman of the Thatcham Town Council Planning and Highways committee and he was speaking in support of the review.
- He noted that the event for which the TEN was issued was a licensable event under section 100.1 of the Licensing Act 2003.
- That the licensing objective to prevent public nuisance should mean a focus on prevention, not simply reacting once a problem occurs.
- He noted that even outside of licensable events, some responsibilities remain under sections 140 and 177a of the Licensing Act 2003.
- He did not feel it was clear that the issues could be effectively managed on the site and suggested noise restrictions could be put in place for outside activities.
- He noted that car-parking was also an issue and that the space used did not have planning permission and seemed insufficient in size for large events, visitors parking off-site represented a road hazard.
- He referred to the rejected application to operate as a wedding venue on the grounds that the site was not considered appropriate and that weddings and events use for this site is not considered to be compatible with the character of the area given the proximity to the neighbouring properties, the levels of noise emanating from the site and the anti-social hours associated with this are considered to have a severely harmful impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- A statement was read out on behalf of Councillor John Boyd, who was unable to attend. The statement expressed concerns that, despite the license holder's reassurances, the concerns the Town Council had over the original license had

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

been realised. When letting out a property of that size and nature, it is almost certain to attract large parties. He also noted that local residents do not trust the License Holder to manage the disruptions.

- Councillor Pike added some information about the hospital. It is a private psychiatric hospital and is situated 71 meters from the boundary with Pinchington Hall.
- Councillor Pike noted that in an online photograph, posted by the caterers of the 19th August event, there is a large PA system clearly visible facing the seating area which does not appear to be a domestic sound system.

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Councillor Simon Pike.

Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter, in addressing the Sub-Committee, raised the following points:

- Councillor Ardagh-Walter introduced himself as the ward member for Thatcham Colthrop & Crookham.
- He noted that when the original license was granted the committee was assured that the noise levels would be managed, this has not happened.
- It is the nature of the type of business being conducted at Pinchington Hall for things to get loud.
- The area is a quiet, rural setting; this was part of the reason for locating the hospital there. The hospital did raise objections to the original license application as the feared it would disturb their residents.
- Councillor Ardagh-Walter expressed support for the revoking of the license.

Councillor Rowles and Councillor Jones noted that the License holder was not legally obliged to manage the noise at non-licensable events and so the private events were not covered. Councillor Ardagh-Walter accepted this but noted that those living close by do not distinguish between whether they are being disturbed by a licensed on non-licensable event.

Councillor Rowles asked if Councillor Ardagh-Walter had received any complaints from the hospital. He said that he had not.

Mrs Beechley-Smith felt it worth noting that lack of complaints from the hospital as evidence that the issue being raised by local residents were not as severe as was being portrayed. Councillor Ardagh-Walter felt that there was a potential risk to patients but conceded that no serious incidents had happened thus far.

Councillor Pike asked if the hospital had been contacted about the review hearing. He felt that their absence cannot be interpreted as meaning they have no complaints if they did not know about the review. Julia O'Brien from Licensing commented that the hearing had been advertised but that the hospital was not directly contacted so it is possible they are unaware of the proceedings.

All parties confirmed they had heard the presentation by Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter.

Mr Bryant was given an opportunity to respond to the comments made. He felt that most things had been covered and stated that the main issue is that the Hall is so close to a residential area and he doesn't see things improving.

Mrs Beechley-Smith was given an opportunity to respond to the comments made. She clarified that she does not believe the license gives her free reign to do as she pleases with the property. She was happy to discuss the most appropriate use for the building with local residents but felt that the situation had escalated beyond legitimate complaints.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

She added that an incident where a guest was aggressive towards residents had arisen because a local resident was filming the guest's children through the gate and to they felt provoked.

The Sub-Committee retired at 12:10pm to make its decision.

NOTICE OF DECISION

The Licensing Sub-Committee of West Berkshire District Council met on 12 November 2021 and considered **Application No. 20/00786/LQN** made by Mr. Nigel Bryant for a review of the Premise Licence issued in respect of premises known as Pinchington Hall, Crookham Hall, Crookham Common, Thatcham, RG19 8DQ and resolved to revoke the Premises Licence.

In coming to their decision, the Sub-Committee had regard to the four licensing objectives, which are:

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

They also considered the Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (April 2018) and West Berkshire District Council's Statement of Licencing Policy.

The Sub-Committee heard oral representations made by:

1. The Applicant: Mr. Nigel Bryant and witness Peter Thompson
2. The Premise License Holder: Mrs. Linda Beechey-Smith who was represented by Joanne Maule
3. The Responsible Authority: Ms. Jodie Wilson and Mr. Russell Davidson (attending as observer), representing Environmental Health
4. Supporting the review: Councillor Simon Pike, Thatcham Town Council, who also read out a written statement from Councillor John Boyd
5. Ward Member: Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter

The Licensing Sub-Committee also considered the written representations made by the Premises Licence Holder, Environmental Health and Thatcham Town Council.

Having taken those representations into account, the Licensing Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** that further to the **Application No. 20/00786/LQN** the Premise License be revoked.

Reasons

The Sub-Committee noted that the Premises Licence was issued on the 22 May 2020 and this Application for a review of the Premises Licence was brought by Mr. Nigel Bryant on behalf of the local residents of Pinchington Hall.

The review was brought under all four of the licensing objectives but the Sub-Committee considered it was the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective which primarily was engaged. The Sub-Committee noted that the Fire Authority, Thames Valley Police

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

and the Local Safeguarding Children Board had not made a representation in response to the review and were the experts to comment on such matters relating to fire safety, the prevention of crime and disorder and the protection of children from harm.

The Sub-Committee considered the evidence from the Applicant, who explained that he had experienced issues with noise emanating from Pinchington Hall almost every day since moving into the property on Wellingtonia Drive in April 2021. He described this as a traumatic time for the residents and the neighbours were upset. Mr. Bryant stated that there had been a number of major events at the premises as well as bookings via Air BnB. This included a wedding in Summer 2020 which was reported by other neighbours, a stag party which was at the end of April 2021, a major event in June 2021 where the noise had been until 02:00/03:00am and a "very noisy wedding" on 19 August 2021. Mr. Bryant explained to the Sub-Committee that there had not been any issues with Pinchington Hall since the service of the Noise Abatement Notice on Phoenix Apartments at the end of August 2021.

The Sub-Committee also considered the evidence from the Premise Licence Holder who explained that only private events or bookings through Airbnb had taken place. No licensable activities had taken place under the Premises Licence because the planning application which would have permitted those activities had been made and rejected. This was also the reason why the Noise Management Plan had not been submitted as required by condition 17 of the Premises Licence before any licensable activities could take place. The Premise Licence Holder explained that there had been no weddings because no licence was held. There had been a wedding reception in April 2020 but this had not breached Covid-19 rules and the police had not raised any concerns. In addition, there had been no stag party. There had been a baby shower via an Airbnb booking and more people had been invited in the evening which had led to problems and therefore the Premises Licence Holder arranged for a staff member to attend on site. Mrs. Linda Beechey-Smith explained that she did keep a log of complaints but the Sub-Committee noted that this was not produced and no confirmation could be given as to the number of complaints.




The Sub-Committee also considered the evidence in relation to the wedding on the 19 August 2021. The Sub-Committee noted that a Temporary Event Notice (TEN) had been issued by West Berkshire Council for a wedding to the caterer which permitted the licensable activity of the supply of alcohol. The Premises Licence Holder explained they were not aware a TEN had been issued until they were informed by Environmental Health shortly before the event. It was explained that Environmental Health had been made aware a large group of people were going to attend and had asked the residents to be informed and told the music would finish at 11.00pm. The Premises Licence Holder also said that someone had been on site to manage the event. Ms. Jodie Wilson confirmed Environmental Health had a duty to serve the notice due to the existence of a statutory nuisance and explained an appeal had been made against that notice.

The Sub-Committee considered all of the representations made but in reaching its decision attached the appropriate weight to the evidence of the Responsible Authority, Environmental Health. Ms. Jodie Wilson from Environmental Health explained that the map attached to the Premises Licence and included at page 24 of the agenda pack was outdated and more properties were now occupied and residents were just a few metres from the boundary fence. Ms. Jodie Wilson did not consider the premises were suitable to for a Premises Licence and her recommendation was that the Premises Licence should be revoked. This view was also shared by the Applicant, Thatcham Town Council and Ward Member, Councillor Steve Ardagh-Walter. The Sub-Committee found that

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12 NOVEMBER 2021 - MINUTES

whilst these were private events with one event taking place under a TEN, the issues with noise and the failure of the Premises Licence Holder to proactively manage the problem and enforce the rules provided to guests had been to the detriment of the nearby residents in relation to noise. The Sub-Committee considered that in light of the nature of the site, the history as to how the Premises Licence Holder has been managed, the proximity of nearby residents and the fact a statutory nuisance had occurred on the 19 August 2021 without any licensable activities taking place, the prevention of public nuisance objection could not be promoted if the Premises had a Premises Licence authorising licensable activities.

The Sub-Committee in considering whether any steps were appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives, in particular, the prevention of crime and disorder, concluded that the only step which was necessary and appropriate was to revoke the Premises Licence.


Cllr Rick Jones: (Chairman)

Cllr Claire Rowles:

Cllr Billy Drummond:
Date: 19 November 2021

(The meeting commenced at Time Not Specified and closed at Time Not Specified)

Name

Date of Signature

Name

Date of Signature

Name

Date of Signature