



CITY OF WESTMINSTER

# MINUTES

## Licensing Sub-Committee (4)

### MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of a meeting of the **Licensing Sub-Committee (4)** held on **Thursday 21st July, 2016**, Rooms 5, 6 & 7 - 17th Floor, Westminster City Hall, 64 Victoria Street, London, SW1E 6 QP.

**Members Present:** Councillors Jean Paul Floru (Chairman), Jan Prendergast and Shamim Talukder.

#### 1 MEMBERSHIP

1.1 There were no changes to the membership.

#### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Mr Wroe, Policy Adviser, declared that he had attended joint Council business meetings at the premises in the last 12 months, however he did not consider that he had a prejudicial interest in the application and remained present at the hearing.

#### 3 SMITH & WOLLENSKY, THE ADELPHI, 1-11 JOHN ADAM STREET, WC2

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE No. 4

*Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016*

Membership: Councillor Jean-Paul Floru (Chairman), Councillor Jan Prendergast and Councillor Shamim Talukder.

Legal Adviser: Barry Panto  
Policy Officer: Chris Wroe  
Committee Officer: Toby Howes  
Presenting Officer: Heidi Lawrance

Relevant Representations: Environmental Health and 19 local residents.

Present: Mr James Rankin (Barrister, representing the Applicant Company), Mr Nathan Evans (Operations Director and Designated Premises Supervisor,, Applicant Company), Mr Richard Brown (Solicitor, Citizens Advice Bureau Licensing Advice Project, representing local residents Dr V Bhalla, Ms Malu

Halasa, Mr Luke Hughes, Mr Alun Jones, Ms Jane Jones, Ms Sue Mahony, Ms Caroline Nuttall, Mr John Nuttall, Mr Gordon Sutherland, Mr Russell Taylor and Mr Kenneth Tyrrell) and Ms Malu Halasa (local resident).

Declarations of Interest: Mr Wroe, Policy Adviser, declared that he had attended joint Council business meetings at the premises in the last 12 months, however he did not consider that he had a prejudicial interest in the application and remained present at the hearing.

<p><b>Smith &amp; Wollensky, The Adelphi, 1-11 John Adam Street WC2 16/03451/LIPV</b></p>	
<p><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Variation of Condition</b></p>
	<p>To delete condition 31 attached to the premises licence and replace it with:</p> <p>“Notwithstanding condition 18, alcohol may be supplied and consumed in the basement bar area (designated on the plan) to a maximum of 40 patrons at any time between the hours of 17:00 and 20:00 on Mondays to Saturdays only.”</p>
	<p><b>Amendments to application advised at hearing:</b></p> <p>During the course of the hearing, Mr Rankin indicated that the intention was to actually retain condition 31 which allowed alcohol to be supplied and consumed prior to their meal in the ground floor bar area by up to a maximum at any one time, of 14 persons dining at the premises. This application was to seek a further concession in the basement bar area which would allow alcohol to be consumed by up to 40 patrons without the need for that to be ancillary to any food or table meal.</p>
	<p>Decision (including reasons if different from those set out in report):</p> <p>The Sub-Committee was informed that Mr Sutherland, a local resident, had requested an adjournment of the application on the morning of the hearing as he was not able to attend. The Chairman sought further clarification for the reasons for the adjournment request. Mr Brown, Solicitor, Citizens Advice Bureau and representing a number of local residents, explained that Mr Sutherland had requested the adjournment as he and a number of other residents could not attend the hearing due to work commitments or because they were on their summer holidays. In reply to a question from Mr Panto, Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee, Mr Brown stated that the adjournment request had not been made earlier as it had taken a while to ascertain that a number of residents who had made representations would not be able to attend the hearing. Further to a question from the Chairman, Mr Brown confirmed that he was representing Dr V Bhalla, Ms Malu Halasa, Mr Luke Hughes, Mr Alun Jones, Ms Jane Jones, Ms Sue Mahony, Ms Caroline Nuttall, Mr John Nuttall, Mr Gordon Sutherland, Mr Russell Taylor and Mr Kenneth Tyrrell.</p>

Upon considering the request for adjournment, the Sub-Committee noted that Mr Brown was representing a number of residents including Mr Sutherland. In addition, the Sub-Committee had read all the written representations made by the residents and Ms Halasa and Environmental Health were also in attendance to put forward their representations to the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee therefore felt on balance that it was reasonable and in the public interest for the application to be determined in the absence of some local residents.

Mr Rankin, Barrister, representing the Applicant Company, was then invited to address the Sub-Committee. Mr Rankin began by highlighting that the premises was not located in a cumulative impact area. The Applicant Company had operated at the premises for about a year and they had obtained their premises licence around two years ago. The reason that the premises opened a year after the premises licence had been granted was due to the Applicant Company undertaking a substantial refit of the premises at a cost of around £6 million. The premises had a total capacity of 370 persons, with a capacity of 110 persons for the ground floor and 260 persons for the basement. Members heard that the average spend was around £100 for dinner and £42 for lunch.

Mr Rankin contended that Mr Taylor's claim in his representation that the Applicant Company had submitted a number of applications to extend licensing activities since the granting of the premises licence was not correct. He referred to the applications history in the report that demonstrated that only a minor variation to alter the layout and an application to vary the designated premises supervisor had been submitted prior to this application. Mr Rankin suggested that Mr Taylor may be referring to the planning applications submitted by the developers of The Adelphi hotel, as they had submitted a planning application for an extension of hours when they knew that the Applicant Company, Smith and Wollensky Hospitality Europe Limited, was going to operate at the premises. Mr Rankin stated that the Applicant Company could not be sure of what the demand would be for the business upon opening the premises, however since it had been operating for a year it had identified an opportunity to boost business that could be achieved by the proposed variation.

Mr Rankin acknowledged that there had been a large number of representations made when the Applicant Company had submitted its application for a premises licence. However, he asserted that Mr Evans, Operations Director for the Applicant Company, had compiled a database of all those who had made representations and had written to them upon submitting the application for variation. Mr Rankin further asserted that all those making representations for this application were new objectors and no-one from the database maintained by Mr Evans had submitted a representation. However, Mr Evans had undertook to write to those making representations on this application too and Mr Rankin drew Members' attention to page 7 and page 9 of the additional documents submitted by the Applicant Company that included details of the letter sent to residents on the database on 23 March 2016 and the letter sent to residents making representations on this application on 21 June 2016 respectively. Mr Rankin added that no residents had attended the monthly residents' meetings arranged by the Applicant Company prior to the 21 June letter.

Mr Rankin advised that Mr Evans had spoken to Mr Nevitt of Environmental Health to seek pre-application advice. Mr Evans had taken on board the advice of Mr Nevitt and had included his suggestions in the proposed amended condition 31 in order to mitigate any impact in the vicinity of the premises. The Sub-Committee noted that the main business of the premises was in food sales, providing fine quality foods at the higher end of the price spectrum, with the best selling product, rib eye steak, priced at £39. Mr Rankin referred to the photographs of the seating areas in the additional documents and advised that the proposals would not lead to a loss of covers. The proposed basement bar would operate as cocktail bar similar to the American bar at the nearby Savoy Hotel and it would not be offering discounted cocktails or drinks. The cheapest 175ml glass of wine was priced at £8 and the average spend on a bottle of wine was £75. Mr Rankin emphasised that there was a large proportion of repeat customers to the premises at both lunch and dinner times. However, 17:00 to 20:00 had been identified as a relatively quiet time and so the proposed basement bar was intended to make good use of this time. Mr Rankin stated that as the proposed bar was located in the basement, it would be shielded from view of those walking past the premises and so would not be attracting casual customers, whilst there would also be no advertising of the basement bar. Furthermore, supply of alcohol in the basement bar would be by waiter or waitress service only, as existed throughout the entire premises.

Mr Rankin concluded his submission by stating that the premises was at the quieter end of John Adam Street. The other end of John Adam Street was a louder area, with patrons from the nearby Gordon 's Wine Bar and Theodore Bullfrog congregating outside, whilst only a maximum of 6 patrons were permitted outside the Applicant Company's premises by way of condition on its premises licence. In addition, as a basement bar was proposed, and the Applicant Company had a reputation as a good operator and had included Environmental Health's suggestions in the pre-application advice, Mr Rankin felt that application would not impact upon the licensing objectives and so he requested that the Sub-Committee grant the variation.

The Chairman asked what kind of clientele the Applicant Company wished to attract to the basement bar and how would it be marketed. He also sought confirmation as to whether the proposed amendment to condition 31 would have the effect of removing the limit of 14 persons consuming alcohol before a meal on the ground floor bar.

In reply, Mr Evans, Operations and Director and Licensee, Applicant Company, advised that it was intended that the basement bar be used by customers for after work drinks or by the pre-theatre clientele and the basement bar would be offering additional services to what was already provided on the premises. He stated that the basement bar would not be heavily marketed and customers would most likely hear of it through 'word of mouth.' Mr Rankin added that the applicant did want to retain the condition for the ground floor bar, noting that it was limited to a maximum of 14 persons who were waiting to dine at the premises. In response to this point, Mr Brown indicated that it was arguable that the existing licence allowed consumption by customers prior to a meal in any event, irrespective of that condition. He did not have a strong objection to it

being retained.

Mr Nevitt of Environmental Health then addressed the Sub-Committee. Mr Nevitt confirmed that he had provided the Applicant Company with pre-application advice and that the total capacity and the capacity for each of the ground floor and the basement of the premises under the proposed variation remained the same. He concurred that by proposing a basement bar, it would not be encouraging casual customers from the street. Mr Nevitt also had no concerns about the proposed hours of 17:00 to 20:00 for supply and consumption of alcohol without food in the basement bar. He felt that the application was in keeping with the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy. Whilst acknowledging the concerns raised by residents in their representations, Mr Nevitt confirmed that Environmental Health had received no complaints about the premises since it had been operated by the Applicant Company.

Mr Brown, Solicitor, Citizens Advice Bureau and representing local residents Dr V Bhalla, Ms Malu Halasa, Mr Luke Hughes, Mr Alun Jones, Ms Jane Jones, Ms Sue Mahony, Ms Caroline Nuttall, Mr John Nuttall, Mr Gordon Sutherland, Mr Russell Taylor and Mr Kenneth Tyrrell who had made representations, then addressed the Sub-Committee. Prior to his submission, in response to a query from the Chairman, Mr Brown confirmed that Mrs Nuttall was Chairman of the Board of the Little Adelphi Freehold Company and that she had made representations both in her capacity as its Chairman and as a local resident. In response to a further query from the Chairman, Mr Brown indicated that some residents making representations on this application did in fact also make representations when the application for a new premises licence was made.

Mr Brown began his submission by asserting that the Applicant Company had made a number of licensing and planning applications. He contended that the licensing history in the report was incomplete, as there had been an additional earlier application for a new premises licence made prior to one in June 2014, however it had been withdrawn following a number of representations being made. Mr Brown remarked that the Applicant Company would still need to submit a further planning application if this application was granted, as under the terms of its current planning permission, alcohol could only be supplied and consumed with food. The application for a new premises licence in June 2014 had attracted a considerable number of representations and Mr Brown contended that 14 of those who had objected had also made representations on the application for variation. He informed the Sub-Committee that residents felt that the Applicant Company was seeking to push boundaries through this variation and the basement bar would lead to an increase in the number of those consuming alcohol only and residents sought such activity.

Mr Brown stated that the original application was granted on the basis that the premises would operate as a high end restaurant. However, proposals that would result in attracting an after work drinking crowd was of concern to residents who did not wish to see a large influx of new customers to the premises. Similarly, residents had a feeling that the application represented a 'thin edge of the wedge' which would lead to further applications over time to extend the proportion of drink led activities at the premises. In respect of the premises not being the source of complaints to Environmental Health since it

had opened, Mr Brown asserted that this endorsed reasons why the premises should continue to operate under the present conditions of its licence, as it was operating effectively.

Mr Brown acknowledged that the premises was situated at the quieter end of John Adam Street, however the area was more sensitive to noise and there were not many similar premises on the street. Although the hours applied for were limited to 17:00 to 20:00, Mr Brown stated that it was still possible for customers to become intoxicated during that period which could result in the licensing objectives being undermined. Mr Brown referred to Policy PD1 in the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and stated that strict criteria applied to permitting a bar in an area where there were a number of residents. He stated that policy indicated that such an application should only be granted where it was in the public interest, however this application had received a large number of objections. He added that the proposals for a basement bar would not promote the licensing objectives.

The Chairman noted that around 90 residents lived in the area and only 19 of them had made representations. He commented that it was impressive that a premises with a capacity of 370 had not been the source of complaints since it had opened and he sought Mr Brown's view on this. He also remarked that the application needed to be considered on its merits. Members also enquired whether residents had visited the premises and had they spoken to the Applicant Company to voice their concerns.

In reply, Mr Brown acknowledged that no complaints about the premises had been submitted to Environmental Health, however residents still had cause for concerns about the premises, and although they had not specifically stated that the premises was the source of noise, there had been an overall increase in noise in recent years. Mr Brown acknowledged that the application needed to be considered on its merits, however residents were responding to a further application from the Applicant Company and consideration should be given as to the implications if this application was granted and would it lead to further applications. Mr Brown stated that he understood that some residents had visited the premises, however he did not know whether they had spoken to the Applicant Company to express their concerns at that time.

In response to one of the concerns raised by Mr Brown on behalf of the residents, Mr Rankin made a clear statement on behalf of the applicant company that it would not be making repeat applications.

Ms Halasa, a local resident, then addressed the Sub-Committee and confirmed that she had lived at her current address since 1994 and had not visited the premises. Ms Halasa stated that she had approached the Applicant Company about noise generated by fans on the roof of the premises, however she had not received a response from them. She had been involved in making representations when the Applicant Company had submitted planning applications and had understood that the proposals were for a high quality restaurant with a low footfall. However, although the variation was to permit supply and consumption of alcohol without food for a small number of hours for a relatively small number of persons, it was still extending the number of

drinkers and would contribute to making what was a quiet neighbourhood louder. In reply to Members' request for further details in respect of the roof fans, Ms Halasa stated that they were on for most of the time and generated considerable noise. She added that she could also smell steaks when they were being cooked on the premises.

The Sub-Committee granted the application for variation, subject to an amendment to the proposed condition so that it reads "The requirement that the supply and consumption of alcohol is only to persons seated and taking a substantial table meal and ancillary to such meals in condition 18 shall not apply to the supply and consumption of alcohol in the basement bar area (designated as the hatched area in the licensing plan) to a maximum of 40 patrons at any time between the hours of 17:00 and 20:00 on Mondays to Saturdays only." The Sub-Committee amended the wording of the proposed condition in order to provide greater clarity and to make it more workable and practical for the Applicant Company to implement and for the Licensing Authority to monitor and enforce. The Sub-Committee also retained the existing condition 31 in order that the maximum number of 14 persons being supplied and consuming alcohol in the ground floor bar area remained in force. The Sub-Committee noted that the works condition no longer applied as a total capacity of 370 persons (110 persons for the ground floor and 260 persons for the basement) had subsequently been set and so a capacity condition would duly replace it.

In granting the variation, the Sub-Committee noted that Environmental Health had not received any complaints about the premises since it had opened and that the proposed hours of 17:00 to 20:00 for supplying and consuming alcohol that was not ancillary to food was well within core hours. The Sub-Committee also acknowledged that the maximum of 40 persons at any one time in the basement area was modest and taken into consideration with the proposed hours, would not unduly impact upon the area. The Sub-Committee noted that the premises was not located in a cumulative impact area and so cumulative impact area considerations and Policy CIP1 did not apply. The Sub-Committee considered that the pre-application advice provided by Environmental Health and taken up by the Applicant Company in the proposed condition would assist the Applicant Company in upholding the licensing objectives (prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, public safety, and protection of children from harm).

The Sub-Committee reminded the Applicant Company of the need to comply with the condition on its premises licence requiring that a direct telephone number of the manager of the premises shall be publically available at all times that the premises is open to the public. The Sub-Committee also informed Ms Halasa that she could approach Environmental Health about the noise from the rooftop fans if it continued to create disturbance.

#### **Conditions attached to the Licence**

##### **Mandatory Conditions**

1. No supply of alcohol may be made at a time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of this licence.

2. No supply of alcohol may be made at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or the personal licence is suspended.
3. Every supply of alcohol under this licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.
4.
  - (1) The responsible person must ensure that staff on relevant premises do not carry out, arrange or participate in any irresponsible promotions in relation to the premises.
  - (2) In this paragraph, an irresponsible promotion means any one or more of the following activities, or substantially similar activities, carried on for the purpose of encouraging the sale or supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises—
    - (a) games or other activities which require or encourage, or are designed to require or encourage, individuals to;
      - (i) drink a quantity of alcohol within a time limit (other than to drink alcohol sold or supplied on the premises before the cessation of the period in which the responsible person is authorised to sell or supply alcohol), or
      - (ii) drink as much alcohol as possible (whether within a time limit or otherwise);
    - (b) provision of unlimited or unspecified quantities of alcohol free or for a fixed or discounted fee to the public or to a group defined by a particular characteristic in a manner which carries a significant risk of undermining a licensing objective;
    - (c) provision of free or discounted alcohol or any other thing as a prize to encourage or reward the purchase and consumption of alcohol over a period of 24 hours or less in a manner which carries a significant risk of undermining a licensing objective;
    - (d) selling or supplying alcohol in association with promotional posters or flyers on, or in the vicinity of, the premises which can reasonably be considered to condone, encourage or glamorise anti-social behaviour or to refer to the effects of drunkenness in any favourable manner;
    - (e) dispensing alcohol directly by one person into the mouth of another (other than where that other person is unable to drink without assistance by reason of a disability).
5. The responsible person must ensure that free potable water is provided on request to customers where it is reasonably available.
6.
  - (1) The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder must ensure that an age verification policy is adopted in respect of the



premises in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol.

- (2) The designated premises supervisor in relation to the premises licence must ensure that the supply of alcohol at the premises is carried on in accordance with the age verification policy.
- (3) The policy must require individuals who appear to the responsible person to be under 18 years of age (or such older age as may be specified in the policy) to produce on request, before being served alcohol, identification bearing their photograph, date of birth and either—
  - (a) a holographic mark, or
  - (b) an ultraviolet feature.

7. The responsible person must ensure that—

- (a) where any of the following alcoholic drinks is sold or supplied for consumption on the premises (other than alcoholic drinks sold or supplied having been made up in advance ready for sale or supply in a securely closed container) it is available to customers in the following measures—
  - (i) beer or cider: ½ pint;
  - (ii) gin, rum, vodka or whisky: 25 ml or 35 ml; and
  - (iii) still wine in a glass: 125 ml;
- (b) these measures are displayed in a menu, price list or other printed material which is available to customers on the premises; and
- (c) where a customer does not in relation to a sale of alcohol specify the quantity of alcohol to be sold, the customer is made aware that these measures are available.

A responsible person in relation to a licensed premises means the holder of the premise licence in respect of the premises, the designated premises supervisor (if any) or any individual aged 18 or over who is authorised by either the licence holder or designated premises supervisor. For premises with a club premises certificate, any member or officer of the club present on the premises in a capacity that which enables him to prevent the supply of alcohol.

8(i) A relevant person shall ensure that no alcohol is sold or supplied for consumption on or off the premises for a price which is less than the permitted price.

8(ii) For the purposes of the condition set out in paragraph 8(i) above -

- (a) "duty" is to be construed in accordance with the Alcoholic Liquor Duties Act 1979;

(b) "permitted price" is the price found by applying the formula -

$$P = D+(D \times V)$$

Where -

- (i) P is the permitted price,
  - (ii) D is the amount of duty chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the duty were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol, and
  - (iii) V is the rate of value added tax chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the value added tax were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol;
- (c) "relevant person" means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a premises licence -
- (i) the holder of the premises licence,
  - (ii) the designated premises supervisor (if any) in respect of such a licence, or
  - (iii) the personal licence holder who makes or authorises a supply of alcohol under such a licence;
- (d) "relevant person" means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a club premises certificate, any member or officer of the club present on the premises in a capacity which enables the member or officer to prevent the supply in question; and
- (e) "value added tax" means value added tax charged in accordance with the Value Added Tax Act 1994.

8(iii). Where the permitted price given by Paragraph 8(ii)(b) above would (apart from this paragraph) not be a whole number of pennies, the price given by that sub-paragraph shall be taken to be the price actually given by that sub-paragraph rounded up to the nearest penny.

- 8(iv). (1) Sub-paragraph 8(iv)(2) below applies where the permitted price given by Paragraph 8(ii)(b) above on a day ("the first day") would be different from the permitted price on the next day ("the second day") as a result of a change to the rate of duty or value added tax.
- (2) The permitted price which would apply on the first day applies to sales or supplies of alcohol which take place before the expiry of the period of 14 days beginning on the second day.

### **Additional Conditions**

9. The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system as per the minimum requirements of the Westminster Police Licensing Team. All entry and exit points will be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition. The CCTV system shall continually record whilst

the premises is open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises. All recordings shall be stored for a minimum period of 31 days with date and time stamping. Viewing of recordings shall be made available immediately upon the request of Police or authorised officer throughout the preceding 31 day period.

10. A staff member from the premises who is conversant with the operation of the CCTV system shall be on the premises at all times when the premises is open. This staff member must be able to provide a Police or authorised council officer copies of recent CCTV images or data with the absolute minimum of delay when requested.
11. No noise shall emanate from the premises nor vibration be transmitted through the structure of the premises which gives rise to a nuisance.
12. Notices shall be prominently displayed at all exits requesting patrons to respect the needs of local residents and businesses and leave the area quietly.
13. Notices shall be prominently displayed at any area used for smoking requesting patrons to respect the needs of local residents and use the area quietly.
14. All waste shall be properly presented and placed out for collection no earlier than 30 minutes before the scheduled collection times.
15. No waste or recyclable materials, including bottles, shall be moved, removed from or placed in outside areas between 19:00 hours and 07:00 hours on the following day.
16. No deliveries to the premises shall take place between 19:00 hours and 08.00 hours Monday to Friday, 18:00 hours to 10:00 hours Saturdays and not at all on Sundays.
17. No collections of waste or recycling materials (including bottles) from the premises shall take place between 19:00 hours and 07:00 hours on the following day.
18. Subject to condition 32, the premises shall only operate as a restaurant:
  - (i) in which customers are shown to their table,
  - (ii) where the supply of alcohol is by waiter or waitress service only,
  - (iii) which provide food in the form of substantial table meals that are prepared on the premises and are served and consumed at the table using non disposable crockery,
  - (iv) which do not provide any take away service of food or drink for immediate consumption,
  - (v) which do not provide any take away service of food or drink after 23.00, and
  - (vi) where alcohol shall not be sold or supplied, otherwise than for consumption by persons who are seated in the premises and bona fide taking substantial table meals there, and provided always that the consumption of alcohol by such persons is ancillary to taking such meals.

Notwithstanding this condition, customers are permitted to take from the premises part consumed and resealed bottles of wine supplied ancillary to their meal.

19. Substantial food and non-intoxicating beverages, including drinking water, shall be available in all parts of the premises where alcohol is sold or supplied for consumption on the premises.
20. There shall be no striptease or nudity, and all persons shall be decently attired at all times, except when the premises are operating under the authority of a Sexual Entertainment Venue licence.
21. A Challenge 21 proof of age scheme shall be operated at the premises where the only acceptable forms of identification are recognised photographic identification cards, such as a driving licence, passport or proof of age card with the PASS Hologram.
22. Servicing must only take place from Lower Robert Street and from Savoy Place and from no other locations.
23. At least one door staff shall be on duty at the entrance of the premises at all times whilst it is open for business.
24. All windows and external doors shall be kept closed after 21:00 hours, except for the immediate access and egress of persons.
25. Patrons permitted to temporarily leave and then re-enter the premises, eg to smoke, shall be limited to 6 persons at any one time.
26. A direct telephone number for the Manager at the premises shall be publicly available at all times the premises is open. This telephone number is to be made available to residents and businesses in the vicinity.
27. There shall be no sales of hot food or hot drink for consumption off the premises after 23:00.
28. Patrons permitted to temporarily leave and then re-enter the premises, eg to smoke, shall not be permitted to take drinks or glass containers with them.
29. The number of persons permitted in the premises at any one time (excluding staff) shall not exceed 370 persons with the following local restrictions:  
Ground floor - 110  
Basement - 260
30. The Licence Holder shall enter into an agreement with a hackney carriage and/or private carriage firm to provide transport for customers, with contact numbers made readily available to customers who will be encouraged to use such services.
31. Notwithstanding condition 18, alcohol may be supplied and consumed prior to

their meal in the ground floor bar area (designated as the hatched area on the licensing plan), by up to a maximum at any one time, of 14 persons dining at the premises.

32. The requirement that the supply and consumption of alcohol is only to persons seated and taking a substantial table meal and ancillary to such meals in condition 18 shall not apply to the supply and consumption of alcohol in the basement bar area (designated as the hatched area in the licensing plan) to a maximum of 40 patrons at any time between the hours of 17:00 and 20:00 on Mondays to Saturdays only.

The Meeting ended at 11.07 am.

**CHAIRMAN:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** \_\_\_\_\_