
LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Meeting held in the Council Chamber, Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, ME10 3HT on Thursday, 31 July 2025 from 10.01 am - 11.09 am.

PRESENT: Councillors Derek Carnell (Chair), Carole Jackson and Tony Winckless.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Mohammad Bauluck, Philippa Richardson and Helen Ward.

256 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair outlined the emergency evacuation procedure.

257 NOTIFICATION OF CHAIR AND OUTLINE OF PROCEDURE

The Chair opened the meeting and asked those present to introduce themselves.

258 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No interests were declared.

259 NEW PREMISES LICENCE UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003

The Licensing Officer introduced the report which asked Members to consider an application for the grant of a new premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 at The Bank, 44 – 45 Court Street, Faversham ME13 7AP.

The Licensing Officer introduced the application as set out in the report and highlighted as below:

- The sale of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises between 12:00 - 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 12:00 - 22:30 Sunday; and
- Opening hours from 08:00 – 23:00 Monday to Saturday and 09:00 – 22:30 Sunday.

The Licensing Officer referred to Appendix III on page 31 of the report which set out the list of conditions proposed by the Applicant and those agreed with Kent Police. He also reported that valid representations had been received, and these were set out from page 35 of the report.

The Chair asked the Applicant to present his case. The Applicant outlined his vision for the premises where premium food and beer would be sold; the drinks included locally brewed Kentish beer; experienced and highly trained staff would work at the premises; inclusivity was important to the company and both families and professionals were welcome; the building would be restored to its previous heritage; and his company had a commitment to the community. The Applicant acknowledged the concerns that some local residents had, and although some had been general in nature, steps had been taken to mitigate potential pre-empted

issues. In terms of any noise issues, he said that the proposed opening hours were shorter than other nearby licensed premises; there was no rear egress onto Middle Row; there would be low level background music; acoustic insulation would be installed; signage would be placed to request that customers left the premises quietly; they were investing in a listed building; and he respected the neighbourhood. The Applicant considered the new premises license would be a real asset to Faversham.

The Chair invited the Sub-Committee to ask the Applicant questions.

In response, the Applicant explained that there were assistance railings to help customers whilst using the stairs, however there were currently no toilet facilities for disabled customers; jobs would be offered to local people; soft drinks would be available, as well as a variety of locally made drinks; the price range was considered to be accessible and suitable for the local market and also reflected the quality of the drinks for sale. In terms of door staff, the Applicant said a full risk assessment had been carried out, and he considered this type of drinking establishment did not warrant the need for door staff and the venue was not likely to be pushed to full capacity. In response to concerns about the adjoining alleyway, the Applicant said that staff at the venue would manage this on dispersal of customers and CCTV would be installed in that area.

The Senior Lawyer sought confirmation that the only external customer areas were at the front of the premises and not the rear. The Applicant confirmed that this was the case.

The Chair invited the witness of the Applicant to speak.

The witness explained that he owned the building where the proposed licensed premises would be located, and lived close by, so was aware of any issues and also of maintaining a space where residents could live alongside a commercial use. He explained that there were three car parks relatively near to the premises, with no parking permitted in Middle Row in any case, and parking restrictions were in place near the premises. The supporter spoke on the new use of the building and his investment and improvements to the property and that it was a positive move that the building was being put in use, rather than remaining empty, and he considered this would enhance the local environment and create vibrancy. The supporter referred to the concerns regarding noise and confirmed that new sash windows would be installed and the windows to the rear, along Middle Row would not be opened. He said there used to be a public house near this location in the past and there had always been a mix of residential and commercial.

An objector was invited to speak. She questioned the inclusivity of the proposed licensed property as it was not accessible to wheelchair users. The owner of the property acknowledged her concerns but highlighted that the building was listed and there were limitations on what could be done to modify it internally. At this point, the Senior Lawyer acknowledged the importance of considering discrimination, but she reminded the Sub-Committee that they were considering the premises licence based on the licensing objectives.

The objector raised concern with rubbish that might accumulate if the licence application was approved. The owner of the property and supporter of the application advised that rubbish accumulated would be dealt with the same as all commercial rubbish in the vicinity. The Applicant added that there would be CCTV in operation and there was space within the building to store rubbish if necessary. The objector sought confirmation that the windows to the rear of the property would remain closed at all times. The Applicant confirmed they would remain shut, with new sash windows to the front. He added that if there was an issue, temporary air conditioning units would be brought in.

The Chair invited final statements and closing words.

The objector raised concern with any potential noise issues, especially as the previous use of the building had been a bank.

The Applicant said they were a conscientious company, open to communication and wanted to add vibrancy to the town centre. In response to a question from the Senior Lawyer, he confirmed that he was happy with the conditions set out on pages 31 – 33 of the agenda pack and welcomed the objector approaching them if there were any issues.

Members of the Sub-Committee adjourned at 10.53 am to make their decision. Members of the Sub-Committee and the Senior Lawyer (Contentious) returned to the meeting at 11.09 am and the decision was announced.

The decision notice is attached to the online version of the minutes.

Resolved:

(1) That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out on the decision notice.

Chair

Copies of this document are available on the Council website <http://www.swale.gov.uk/dso/>. If you would like hard copies or alternative versions (i.e. large print, audio, different language) we will do our best to accommodate your request please contact Swale Borough Council at Swale House, East Street, Sittingbourne, Kent, ME10 3HT or telephone the Customer Service Centre 01795 417850.

All Minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the Committee/Panel