

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee (Statutory)

Meeting held 15 October 2024

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Mike Drabble and Maroof Raouf

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 There were no apologies for absence.
- 1.2 Councillor Talib Hussain attended the hearing as a reserve Member but was not required to stay.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

- 2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LICENSING ACT 2003 - THE ANVIL, 106 STANNINGTON ROAD, SHEFFIELD, S6 5FN

- 4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application made under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the grant of a premises licence for The Anvil Inn, 106 Stannington Road, Sheffield, S6 5FN (Ref. No. 134/24).
- 4.2 Present at the meeting were Pav Sharma (Applicant) of Ei Group Ltd, Alex Green (Solicitor for the Applicant), Jayne Gough (Licensing Strategy and Policy Officer), Samantha Bond (Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee) and Joanne Cooper (Democratic Services).
- 4.3 Samantha Bond outlined the procedure which would be followed during the hearing.
- 4.4 Jayne Gough presented the report to the Sub-Committee, and it was noted a representation had been received from 14 interested parties who had been invited to attend the hearing but were not present. The objection was attached at Appendix 'B' to the report.
- 4.5 Ms Gough also reported that during the consultation period, the applicant had agreed conditions with the Environmental Protection Service, Sheffield Children's Safeguarding Partnership, and South Yorkshire Police. The agreed conditions were attached at Appendix 'C' to the report.

- 4.6 Councillor David Barker, Chair of the Sub-Committee asked the Licensing Officer to confirm if there had been any previous issues at the premises which had been reported to the Licensing Service. Ms Gough confirmed that there had been three in total, but two of these were around five years old. The third was from June 2023 and concerned a group of youths using Nitrous Oxide in the pub car park, over one weekend.
- 4.7 Councillor David Barker, Chair of the Sub-Committee, invited the applicant to state his case. Alex Green spoke on behalf of the applicant, and stated that:
- The reason that the hearing was taking place was because the premises were owned by the Stonegate Group, who owned a large group of tenanted pubs. In the summer of 2024, the previous tenant had gone into administration, but this had not been properly reported, so no premises transfer was submitted and the licence lapsed. This meant an application for a virtually identical licence had to be submitted in order to re-licence the premises.
 - With regards to the licensing objectives, the previous conditions had been updated and new ones agreed with the Environmental Protection Service, Sheffield Children's Safeguarding Partnership, and South Yorkshire Police. This meant that the conditions were more extensive than they had been previously.
 - Regarding the representations, none had been received from any of the responsible authorities. One letter had been received with the names of several local residents. It seemed this group were under a misapprehension and believed that an extension to the opening hours was being requested, when in fact the licensed hours would be the same as was previously the case. The new tenant was very experienced, and the premises had been there since the early 1900's. The agreed conditions would prevent any noise nuisance.
- 4.8 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, Mr Green and Mr Sharma stated:
- Regarding whom was responsible if the conditions were not adhered to, the tenants were vetted and then became the licensee and usually the Designated Premises Supervisor, so they would be the ones who were responsible, however clauses in the lease regulated the tenant's approach, and their adherence was monitored. Officially checks had to be made every 12 weeks but this would be more frequent at first.
 - In the last 7 years, Mr Sharma, as regional manager, had had to remove 3 or 4 publicans from premises in his region.
 - The new tenant lived very locally and was very experienced and knowledgeable. They had spent money to decorate the premises to give them a broader appeal.
 - The best way for residents to address any complaints would be to deal directly with the tenant, by visiting the premises.
 - Challenge 21 had originally been listed on the application rather than Challenge 25 as the applicant was not sure which the prospective tenant would sign up to, but it had subsequently been confirmed that it would be Challenge 25.

- Conditions numbers 6 and 7 on page 34 of the report, would be enforced by the pub staff and this was a standard approach.
- The premises had been owned by the Stonegate Group for 20 years.

4.9 The Chair of the Sub-Committee invited the applicant to sum up his case.

4.10 Mr Green advised that regulations stated that any objections to the licence application must be evidence based. There had been no objections from the expert authorities and only one letter received from residents who had misunderstood what was being applied for. The proposed conditions were robust, and the new tenants were experienced and had been running the pub on a temporary basis with no problems reported.

4.11 Jayne Gough outlined the options available to the Sub-Committee.

4.12 **RESOLVED:** That the public and press and attendees involved in the application be excluded from the meeting, and the webcast be paused, before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, if those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

4.13 Samantha Bond reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.

4.14 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the public and press and attendees, and the webcast re-commenced.

4.15 **RESOLVED:** That, in the light of the information contained in the report now submitted, the representations now made and the responses to the questions raised, the application for a premises licence in respect of The Anvil Inn, 106 Stannington Road, Sheffield, S6 5FN (Ref no. 134/24) be granted in the terms requested and to include the conditions agreed with the Environmental Protection Service, Sheffield Children's Safeguarding Partnership, and South Yorkshire Police, attached at Appendix 'C' to the report.

(NOTE: The full reasons for the Sub-Committee's decision will be included in the Written Notice of Determination).

5. LICENSING ACT 2003 - RUMKEG, 238 ABBEYDALE ROAD, SHEFFIELD, S7 1FL

5.1 This item was withdrawn from the agenda as the outstanding representations had been resolved.