

## Minutes

### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

21 May 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre, High Street,  
Uxbridge UB8 1UW



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Darran Davies Barry Nelson-West Peter Smallwood</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Chantelle McLeod, Legal Officer Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Sheikh Sheraz Ahmed – Applicant Chris Lucan, The Licensing Guys – Applicant’s Representative Nick Semper, The Licensing Guys – Applicant’s Representative Mohamed Hassan, Premises DPS</p>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
3.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
4.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
5.	<p><b>RESUMED HEARING: APPLICATION FOR THE VARIATION OF A PREMISES LICENCE: PRINCE OF WALES, 1 HARLINGTON ROAD, HILLINGDON, UB8 3HX</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Lois King, Senior Licensing Officer at the London Borough of Hillingdon, introduced the report relating to the application to vary the premises licence for the Prince of Wales, 1 Harlington Road, Uxbridge, UB8 3HX. It was confirmed that an application had been</p>

made to extend the hours of licensable activities as detailed at paragraph 3.3 of the agenda pack. The conditions being offered by the applicant were set out in a separate operating schedule which was attached as Appendix 2 to the report.

It was noted that, whilst the operating schedule submitted with the application had included a significant number of conditions from the current premises licence which could be found in Appendix 3 on page 45 of the report, there had been several omissions, mainly in relation to conditions designed to uphold the prevention of public nuisance. These were highlighted in paragraph 3.6 on page seven of the report. It was confirmed that, on the 26th of March 2025, the applicant's agent had advised that there was an error in the wording of two of the conditions in the operating schedule submitted with the application in February 2025. These had been highlighted in paragraph 3.7 on page seven of the report, along with the advice that was given. It was confirmed that the application before the Sub-Committee was the one which had been submitted in February 2025 complete with the errors.

It was reported that two representations had been received from interested parties, namely Ward Councillors Ekta Gohil and Roy Chamdal.

The Sub-Committee was invited to determine the application, considering all submissions both verbal and written.

## **APPLICANT**

The applicant's representatives from The Licensing Guys, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the applicant.

It was noted that the premises was a pub and Mediterranean restaurant with shisha smoking in the garden, offering food, entertainment, and belly dancing. The application sought to extend licensable activities and the closing time by an hour, with dance performances both indoors and outdoors until 23:00. The variation was considered modest in scope.

It was confirmed that the reason for the additional hours was to remain competitive with nearby establishments like the Red Lion Hotel and The Vine. A comprehensive operating schedule with 51 conditions had been proposed to ensure the licensing objectives were promoted and not undermined. The premises had been operating under new management for two years, and the application should be judged on its own merits.

It was noted that the burden was on the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed operations would promote the licensing objectives. Opposing representatives were required to provide evidence that the premises would undermine these objectives. Section 182 guidance mandated that determinations be evidence-based.

The Sub-Committee heard that there was no empirical evidence of disorder, noise complaints, or other concerns involving the premises or the applicant. The Police, Environmental Protection Team, Trading Standards, Children's Services, Public Health, Planning, Environment, and Highways departments had raised no objections. Moreover, it was noted that historic issues were irrelevant to the current application.

Concerns about noise and parking had been addressed with a proposed dispersal policy. A statement from a nearby neighbour supported the current management and described the noise as not excessive. The hearing focused on whether the variation

would undermine or promote the licensing objectives, with a mechanism for addressing future problems provided by a premises licence review.

Fear and speculation were deemed inadmissible, as determinations were required to be evidence-based. There was no history of problems with the premises, and the proposed conditions were considered sufficient to address potential issues.

During Member clarification questions regarding crime and disorder, it was noted that there had been only one incident recorded in the locality every fortnight which was well below average. It was explained that crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) data were geolocated, and the relevant data had been gathered for the cul-de-sac opposite the premises in question. Over the preceding six months, a comprehensive list of incidents at that specific location had been compiled. The report also included a breakdown of incidents at that location and a broader overview of crime across the Hillingdon Borough Command Unit (BCU), demonstrating that the Borough was not considered high in crime. It was confirmed that the primary purpose of the document was to illustrate that the location in question was comparatively free of incidents. During the tenure of the current manager, the applicant was unaware of any incidents or issues related to the premises which the police or any responsible authority had been required to address.

## **INTERESTED PARTIES**

Ward Councillor Roy Chamdal had submitted a representation in objection to the application and was in attendance to address the Sub-Committee.

Councillor Chamdal noted that he represented local residents living near the premises and described the situation as reminiscent of previous concerns. After canvassing the neighbourhood, he reported a 60/40 split in opinion, with the majority expressing dissatisfaction with the proposal due to disturbances caused by late operating hours, particularly on weekdays. These disturbances affected families with young children and individuals working night shifts, primarily due to noise, bright lighting, and a lack of available parking on Harlington Road.

Councillor Chamdal acknowledged that the proposed hours were a reduction from those in a previous application but maintained that they remained excessive, especially during the week. While some neighbours adjacent to the premises did not consider it a nuisance, others living only a few houses away strongly disagreed, citing the impact on their children and daily routines.

Despite these concerns, it was recognised that the establishment was a valued local business offering quality food and Councillor Chamdal expressed a desire for its continued operation. However, he emphasised that residents living in close proximity experienced the consequences of its operations daily. Moreover, he questioned whether the pursuit of business profit should come at the expense of community well-being and advocated for responsible business practices and neighbourly conduct.

Councillor Chamdal raised concerns about the potential for increased disturbances if licensing hours were extended, referencing past issues during similar periods. It was felt that such changes could attract problematic crowds, as had occurred previously. Staggered closing times among local establishments were suggested to prevent large groups dispersing simultaneously, which could exacerbate public nuisance.

The Sub-Committee was encouraged to consider the broader impact of the proposed

licensing variation on the local community.

During Member clarification questions, Councillor Chamdal expressed his objections on behalf of local residents, asserting that the proposed licensing hours were excessive and unnecessary. He opposed any extension of weekday hours, noting that the premises were situated in a residential area rather than a town centre or entertainment district, and questioned the type of clientele that extended hours might attract. The impact of late-night noise on residents was highlighted, particularly those seeking rest during the week.

Councillor Chamdal observed that the noise nuisance stemmed from both the premises and patrons congregating outside, particularly when leaving in taxis. He cited specific instances where noise had been audible at nearby residences during weekends and reiterated that the combination of music and late-night activity had a detrimental effect on the local community.

## **DISCUSSION**

The below key points were noted during the discussion stage of the hearing.

- The DPS would be the main point of contact for residents and was present at the premises most days. He was in touch with most of the local residents and invited them to the premises once a month to discuss any issues.
- The Director of the premises had an office approximately half a mile away and regularly visited the premises hence he was also available if residents had any issues they wished to discuss.
- It was confirmed that the resident in support of the application – Ms Jan Hopper – was an independent witness.
- A number of Temporary Event Notices (TENs) had been in place at the premises and, to the knowledge of the applicant, no issues had been reported or complaints received.
- As explained in the report, the Licensing Officer had received an email from the previous agent notifying them of an error, but it had arrived with only two days remaining in the consultation period. The advice to the agent had been to restart the consultation as the proposed changes were considered material. It had been considered fair and reasonable to restart the consultation to allow all responsible authorities and interested parties to assess the changes. The alternative would have been to proceed with the application as it stood and for the applicant to later submit a variation to change the two conditions.

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

There were no closing remarks from the Licensing Officer. The Ward Councillor reiterated his desire for a favourable outcome for residents.

The applicant's representative clarified that the premises themselves had not committed any offences; rather, any failures to uphold licensing objectives were personal. He emphasised that the applicants had no record of failing to promote licensing objectives. Noise complaints appeared to stem from garden activities rather than indoor operations, where ambient noise levels were low, and TVs were set to display a fireplace after 23:00.

The team had visited the nearest neighbour again that morning and noted a tall hedge that blocked visibility and likely sound. They suggested that any noise concerns should

be directed to the environmental health and noise nuisance team.

It was claimed that staggered closing hours would reduce street congestion, and it was noted that the premises operated primarily as a restaurant. Past temporary event notices had resulted in no complaints. Licensing guidance requiring decisions to be evidence-based and proportionate was cited.

The dispersal policy was read aloud, detailing how security staff would manage patrons' exit to minimise disruption. It was noted that no responsible authorities had raised objections, and any concerns were speculative. The applicant's representative requested approval of the licence variation, supported by 51 conditions, including those addressing public nuisance and a detailed dispersal policy.

### **COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

All parties were asked to leave the room while the Sub-Committee considered its decision.

The decision of the Licensing Sub-Committee was announced on the Council's YouTube Channel: Hillingdon London.

### **THE DECISION**

The Sub-Committee listened to all representations made both oral and written. In addition, the Sub-Committee welcomed the extra conditions together with the dispersal policy offered by the by the Applicant and their willingness to commit to the licensing objectives at all times.

The Sub-Committee considered all relevant evidence made available to it and in doing so took the following into account:

- Licensing Objectives, Licensing Act 2003
- Hillingdon's Licensing Policy
- Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under s.182 of the Licensing Act 2003

The decision of the Sub-Committee is to **GRANT** the application as follows:

Recorded Music (indoors and outdoors), Late Night Refreshment (on & off premises) and the Sale of Alcohol (on & off premises) Sunday to Thursday shall be between 1000 hours and 0000 hours and on Friday's and Saturdays shall be between 1000 hours and 0100 hours.

Live music (indoors and outdoors) 7 days a week shall be between 1000 hours and 2300 hours.

Performance of dance (indoors) Sunday to Thursday shall be between 1000 hours and 0000 hours and (outdoors) shall be between 1000 hours and 2300 hours.

Performance of dance (indoors) Friday's and Saturdays shall be between 1000 hours and 0100 hours and (outdoors) shall be between 1000 hours and 2300 hours.

The operating hours of the business shall be between Sunday to Thursday between 1000 hours and 0000 hours and on Friday's and Saturdays between 1000 hours and 0130 hours.

The new premises licence will be subject to the 51 conditions (two of which have been revised) as set out in their application together with the approved dispersal policy.

Condition 17 has been revised as follows:

“All patrons entering the premises from 21:00 hours on Fridays, Saturdays and UK Bank Holidays shall be required to have their identity verified via the ID scanner machine”

Condition 34 has been revised as follows:

“No patrons shall be permitted to use the external area of the premises after 00:00 hours between Sunday to Thursday and 01:00 hours on a Friday and Saturday”

## **REASONS**

The Sub-Committee considered all submissions made by the applicant and their representatives in addition to the submissions made by the interested parties.

The Sub-Committee reflected on the points outlined by the ward councillors in relation to issues raised by residents in their respective wards particularly in relation to noise nuisance however, determined that many of the points raised were speculative in nature and could not be substantiated with any tangible evidence. The Sub-Committee noted the absence of any representations made by the responsible authorities who are the appropriate bodies designated to provide expert and insightful information concerning any given application.

In relation to noise nuisance, the Sub-Committee took into consideration that during the Christmas and New Year period of 2024 the premises had the benefit of two Temporary Events Notices (TENs). Both events extended licensable activities, including regulated entertainment until 0200 hours and appeared to have run without incident apart from the New Year event receiving an anonymous complaint to the noise team. Whilst there had also been a noise complaint submitted at 4.30pm on 8th March 2025, the complaint was not witnessed by the noise team nor was the out of hours team required to attend the premises during this time.

The Sub-Committee noted that there had been improvements in the running of the premises since new management had taken control of the business.

Having listened carefully to the submissions by the applicant, the Sub-Committee were confident that the proposed operating schedule, robust conditions and added dispersal policy would serve to promote the licensing objectives and mitigate any potential issues that may arise in the future.

Having considered the late submission by the applicant to reduce the terminal hour by half an hour, the Sub-Committee welcomed this proposal and felt that this adjustment struck a fair balance and acceptable outcome going forward.

Based on all the information put before it, the Sub-Committee were satisfied that the Applicant would comply with the licensing objectives.

## **Right of Appeal**

	<p>The relevant applicant for the premises licence or any other person who made relevant representations to the application may appeal against the Council's decision to the Justices Clerk at the Uxbridge Magistrates Court. Such an appeal may be brought within 21 days of receipt of this Notice of Decision.</p> <p>No decision made by the Council will have effect during the time period within which an appeal may be brought and until such time that any appeal has been determined or abandoned.</p> <p>The Sub-Committee advises as a comfort to residents and a warning to the licensee that the licence may be reviewed and could potentially be revoked if licence conditions are not adhered to and/or if the premises are managed in a manner which does not uphold the licensing objectives.</p> <p>You will be deemed to have received this decision letter, two days after the date on the accompanying letter, which will be posted by 1st class mail.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 10.00 am, closed at 12:11 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services - email: [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making; however, these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**