

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING (HEARING) SUB COMMITTEE

HELD ON 29 October 2013

APPLICANT: ALLHALLOWS TRADING LTD. LOOSE CANNON

PREMISES: LOOSE CANNON 13-15 ALLHALLOWS LANE LONDON
EC4R 3UL

PRESENT

Sub Committee:

Kevin Everett CC (Chairman)
Marianne Fredericks CC
Graham Packham CC

In attendance:

City of London Officers:

Xanthe Couture - Town Clerk's Department
Paul Chadha - Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Peter Davenport - Markets & Consumer Protection Department

Applicant:

Mr Soner Osman, Director Allhallows Trading Ltd Loose Cannon
Mr Ewan Johnston, Director Allhallows Trading Ltd Loose Cannon

Representation of objection:

Mr John Hall, City of London Police Licensing Officer
Hector McKoy, Police Licensing Team

Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005

- 1) A public Hearing was held at 11:00 am in the Committee Rooms, Guildhall, London, EC2, to consider the representations submitted in respect of an application for a variation to a premises license for the premises known as Loose Cannon at 13-15 Allhallows Lane, London EC4R 3UL.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Current Licence</u>	<u>Proposed Licence</u>
Sale of Alcohol	Sun-Sat 11:00 – 02:00	Fri-Sat 11:00 – 06:00
Live Music/Recorded Music/Performances of Dance	Sun-Sat 11:00 – 02:00	Fri-Sat 11:00 – 06:00
Plays/Films/Indoor Sports Events/Making	Sun-Sat 11:00-02:00	Sun-Sat 11:00-02:00 (No Change)

Music		
Late Night Refreshment	Not currently licensed.	Fri-Sat 23:00 – 06:00

The sale of alcohol was for 'on' sales only.

The Sub Committee had before them a report of the Director of Markets and Consumer Protection, which appended copies of:-

- Appendix 1: Copy of Application
- Appendix 2: Current Licence
- Appendix 3: Conditions consistent with Operating Schedule
- Appendix 4: Possible new conditions consistent with the operating schedule
- Appendix 5: Representation from Other Persons (City of London Police)
- Appendix 6: Map of subject premises, together with other licensed premises in the area and their latest terminal time for alcohol sales.

- 2) The Hearing commenced at 11 am.
- 3) The Chairman opened the Hearing by introducing himself, along with the other Member of the Sub Committee, the officers present and the nature of the application.
- 4) The Applicant sought a variation to extend the permitted hours as set out in paragraph (1) above and requested that the name of the application should be referred to as Allhallows Trading Ltd Loose Cannon.
- 6) The Chairman invited Mr Hall and Mr McKoy to present their objections; submitted on behalf of the City of London Police Licensing Team.
- 7) Mr McKoy stressed that his concerns centred around the fact that, should the variation be granted as sought, the venue would be used for "promoted events" on Friday and Saturday nights. Mr McKoy detailed the crime and disorder issues that had been encountered at other late night licensed premises which ranged from crimes of violence to drug related offences.
- 8) The Panel noted the potential public safety issues raised by the City of London Police relating to the dispersal of patrons. It was confirmed by the Panel that Upper Thames Street was considered a busy thoroughfare with significant traffic movement at all times of the day and

night. There were no questions from the Applicant relating to Mr McKoy's statements.

- 9) The Panel queried if there had been concerns with the premises use of past use of TENS, to which the City of London Police advised that there had been no past incidents and the premises was considered quiet and not a late night venue. The situation discussed in the email from Mr Hall (Appendix 5i), relating to the submission of TEN applications in the past by the premises, which had been withdrawn, had been resolved with the Applicant.
- 10) The Applicant (Mr Johnston) opened their case by stating he had been running late night venues for the past 15 years in London, of which many had been shut down for redevelopment. The Applicant had no desire to create a club, and the variation was being sought to ensure the premises could compete with other top end corporate event spaces to provide promoted events operated by the venue. The Applicant stated the premises would not host urban music promoted events, which he felt were a major factor in recorded instances of crime and disorder at promoted events and would operate a last entry policy of 03:00 or 03:30. The Panel clarified that discounted alcohol and bottle service would not be offered.
- 13) The Applicant advised that it would be their intention to employ 3 stewards to marshal patrons across Upper Thames Street and have further stewards situated on the riverside walkway directing patrons towards London Bridge. There would be 4 to stewards in total including staff and security guards. A mini-cab service would park on Duke's Hill and provide transportation for patrons to ensure taxis would not create traffic jams on Upper Thames Street and public transport could be used. Stewards would provide a line of sight and minimise the possible noise nuisance or risk to their safety caused by patrons leaving the premises late at night and crossing a potentially busy road.
- 14) In respect to alterations to the venue, the Applicant would include a CCTV system, an enhanced ID system as well as provide notification for any events on weekends to the City of London Police.
- 15) The Applicant and the City of London Police Licensing Team discussed the availability of parking at the premises and the Applicant advised that there were two parking lots located nearby and variations to the hours of the premises for promoted events were only expected to be sought on weekends, or two nights a week. The Panel was informed the premises would have no bottle or table service. The Police Licensing Team expressed concern that the variation to the hours would attract the after-party scene and there was no control over who would be allowed into the premises. The Applicant replied that it was essential the premises be granted a variation for 03:00 mid-week, 05:00 on Friday, 06:00 on Sunday in order to reach the corporate event market and was confident

that with their experience in this industry, they were able manage late night events and had a targeted audience in mind.

- 16) In response to a query from the Panel on the specifics of the dispersal policy which had not been received in a covering email as stated by the Applicant had been provided, the Applicant advised that the dispersal policy would be staged with the assistance of stewards to avoid many people outside the premises at once. It was clarified the premises could hold up to 499 people at one time, and patrons could only be asked leave quietly as they were no longer the responsibility of the premises once outside. The Applicant advised they were confident in the management of their dispersal policy and had operated a smoking area on residential streets without noise complaints.
- 17) The Chairman and the Applicant discussed the nature of the premises being located in an area where no residents lived. With regards to other late night premises that the Applicant had operated, he explained they had developed a positive relationship with Police and licensing teams. He advised that in the structure of Allhallows Trading Ltd, he owned and operated venues. In the past when noise nuisance concerns had existed with other premises, this could be pinpointed to the music policy which attracted a certain kind of clientele and event promoter companies that had caused any concerns were not contracted in the future.
- 18) In response to a query from Mr Hall, the Applicant advised that the Designated Premises Supervisor was experienced in operating large events. The Panel was informed that roughly 30 to 40 per cent of tickets for promoted events would be sold online ticketed online and not through event flyers.
- 19) The Panel and the Applicant discussed the number of door staff the premises would employ and the Applicant advised there would be 1 door person for every 75 people. The Panel queried as to why it was necessary to have the capacity to operate until 06:00 rather than 03:00 and the Applicant explained it would allow the premises to reach a different market and a different closing time would not affect the operation of a successful dispersal policy.
- 20) There were no more questions, and having put their cases and answered questions from the Panel, the Objector and Applicant were invited to make closing statements.
- 21) Mr McKoy explained there had been issues with other late night licensed premises and any problems with this premises would fall on Licensing Officers to deal with. He was not convinced that the role of stewards would be successful in minimising risks to public safety or crime and disorder and was concerned over the risk of crowds congregating outside the premises.

- 22) The Applicant summarised that a considerable investment would be made in the premises only if the variation to the premises license was granted. The extension of hours of licensable activities was not being sought to establish a night club atmosphere, but was required to ensure the full commercial potential of the premises was achieved in a climate where business rates and rent were increasing. He added that if issues were caused by the variation to hours of licensable activities, then a review would be required.
- 23) Members of the Panel withdrew to deliberate and make their decision, accompanied by the representatives of the Town Clerk and the Comptroller and City Solicitor.
- 24) Upon conclusion of the Panel's deliberation, the Town Clerk advised those present at the Hearing that due to the need to ensure the conditions of the premises license would ensure minimal risk of crime and disorder and public nuisance, a full decision would be circulated in due course. All parties were thanked for attending the Hearing.

Contact Officer: Xanthe Couture
Tel. no. 020 7332 3113
E-mail: xanthe.couture@cityoflondon.gov.uk