

West Wiltshire District Council

Minutes

Minutes of the: **Licensing Sub-Committee**
Hearing for The Crown, Timbrell Street, Trowbridge

Held on: **Tuesday 2 August 2005**

Held in: **Council Chambers, Bradley Road Trowbridge**

Present: Cllr M Clegg (Sub-chair), Cox, Mudge

Celina Colquhoun (CC) – Counsel for Punch Taverns, Geoff
Dunn (GD) – Punch Taverns, Beverley Harris (BH) –
Designated Supervisor, Mr. A Aird – Respondant

Officers: Legal Representative (AH), Principal Environmental Health
Officer (CH) and Member Support Officer (JM)

1. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

MC read the hearing procedure and introduced those present.

2. Application

CH informed the meeting that the premises are currently licenced for:

Sale of alcohol (on and off sales)

- Monday to Saturday 1100 to 2300
- Sundays and Good Friday 1200 to 2230
- 1200-1500 and 1900-2230 on Christmas Day
- 1100 New Years Eve to 2300 New Years Day

and went on to summarise the variation which would amend the existing hours for the sale of alcohol (on and off sales) and provide regulated entertainment within those hours in the form of live music (up to 2 performers, unamplified), recorded music and Karaoke, as follows:

- Monday to Wednesday 1100 to 2300 (to permit entertainment but no additional hours for the sale of alcohol)
- Thursday to Saturday 1100 to midnight (an additional hour for the sale of alcohol and to permit entertainment)
- Sunday 1200 to 2230 (to permit entertainment but no additional hours for the sale of alcohol)

Extend entertainment and the sale of alcohol by a further additional hour into the morning following every Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday for each May Bank Holiday, Spring/Whitsun Bank Holiday and every August Bank Holiday weekend.

CC stated that the current licence was not an issue and reminded the committee that they were only seeking an extra hour on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights. CC also referred to the objectives of The Licensing Act 2003 to give "a light touch", she asked that the committee keep in mind Paragraph 5.99 referring to the nature of concerns and need for real evidence.

CC also addressed the issue of car parking stating that as most people were local residents that this was not an issue and was not within the objectives of the Act. Other concerns were of noise and that these were from patrons of other pubs and clubs in Trowbridge.

BH clarified the fact that was a well known local with many regular customer, about 95% of whom do not drive, further that her policy was not to let customers drive home after drinking substantially, saying that her son very often drove customers home in these instances. BH also stated that most of the 'public nuisance' was proven to come from patrons of other pubs and that The Crown's patrons had not been found to cause any public disorder, vandalism or harm to children whilst being patrons.

MC asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

AA asked if the Committee would be taking into account the nuisance caused by noise from patrons of other public houses stating that customers of The Crown could be exacerbating the situation whilst acknowledging the fact that The Crown customers were not wholly responsible for the noise factor.

CC stated that it was unfair to place any limits due to the actions of people from other establishments.

BM asked if the applicant was aware of the Council's policy?

CC stated that they were aware of it.

BM went on to ask what measures there were to prevent noise escaping, what the policy was in relation to doors and windows, air conditioning and if there was any double-glazing.

CC stated that Section Q (page 24) of the Operating Schedule stated that there were 3 air conditioning units, the fabric of the building retained a lot of sound as it has thick and solid walls. Customer departure was monitored, doors kept shut as much as possible, the windows at the front were not opened, although they could be, and the fire door at the back only opened occasionally as people left.

SC further stated that there was an in-house policy to positively manage customers departure and stated that any customers causing a problem were escorted off the premises and, in extreme cases, barred from the establishment.

GC questioned the policy on under age drinking and asked if they were members of Pub Watch

BH said that the policy was to request a valid certificate or show i.d., and as there had never been any problems in the pub did not see a need to become members of Pub Watch.

MC asked how they prevent crime and disorder and for details of their fire fighting equipment, emergency lighting and illuminated signage.

SC replied that the Police had raised no concerns on this issue and reiterated that most of customers were locals and that BH knows most of them, identifies and bars any trouble makers. SC also informed the Committee that the Fire Prevention officer had not raised any concerns and that there was fire equipment in front of, to the rear of and behind the bar, and the same applied to emergency lighting and illuminated signs, also that the premises had a smoking charter.

BM clarified the fact that there was a large beer garden and asked about the policy about it.

SC said that customers were currently required to leave the garden at 11.00 pm and stated that none of the respondents found this a concern.

AA commented that the pub was generally well run and were good neighbours but had concerns about the extended house adding to the existing noise levels.

AC was grateful for AA's comments and reminded the committee that there were a number of residents but that only 4 had made representation and that these mostly refer to noise outside the pub from non-patrons of The Crown, further that there had been no complaints from the police or concerns about safety or any danger to children.

The Committee left to discuss their decision.

MC informed those present that after due consideration they would grant the licence.