

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL
LICENSING PANEL (LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS)

10.00am 25 MARCH 2026

VIRTUAL
MINUTES

Present: Councillor Hewitt, Parrott and Thomson

Officers: Rebecca Siddell, Corinne Hardcastle and Shaun Hughes

PART ONE

1 TO APPOINT A CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

Councillor Parrott was appointed Chair for the meeting.

2 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declaration of Substitutes

There were none.

b) Declarations of Interest

There were none.

c) Exclusion of the Press and Public

In accordance with section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ('the Act'), the Licensing Panel considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during an item of business on the grounds that it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press or public were present during that item, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information (as defined in section 100A(3) of the Act) or exempt information (as defined in section 100I of the Act).

RESOLVED - That the press and public not be excluded from the meeting.

3 COSIES LICENSING PANEL (LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS)

3.1 The Licensing Officer introduced the application to the panel.

- 3.2 Following questions the panel were informed by the licensing officer that the application included the front terrace and not the rear yard, and there would be no seating on the highway.
- 3.3 Sussex Police stated the following: this was a new licence relating to sales of alcohol, recorded music and opening times. The venue was located in the special stress area and 40m from the city safety area. It was noted that off sales have been removed from the application. The police would support a café instead of a wet licence premises. Statistics were given to illustrate crimes in the city centre arising from alcohol and it was noted that Regency Ward was top for crimes involving sexual assault and violence. The panel were asked to refuse the application.
- 3.4 Following questions the panel were informed that the Police would prefer the kitchen onsite to be used instead of outside catering. The outside area is not a concern as it is small and already in use. The location of the proposed bar is the main issue.
- 3.5 Following questions the owner was informed that the crime statistics covered day and night, however, the peaks were after 10pm. Shop lifting was not included in the statistics.
- 3.6 The owner stated that they support the application which was more appropriate for the venue than the previous uses that had failed. The application will add to the city without impact.
- 3.7 Following questions the panel were informed by the owner that it was common practice to submit a shadow licence to ensure that the venue was used in some way. The owner also stated that they did not own other bars in Brighton and the former uses of the site were a fish & chip shop, therapy centre, convenience store and café.
- 3.8 The applicant addressed the panel and stated that they were a Brighton resident and had run a bar before and they were engaging with microbreweries, rotating new lines every 4/6 weeks. Food would come from an outside provider. The existing kitchen is functional, and they are intending to work with guest caterers. The applicant wanted to work with Police and local businesses to be part of the solution not the problem. The venue is very small and intimate with no vertical drinking.
- 3.9 Following questions the panel were informed that the applicant had chosen the premises as it was near the city centre, but not too nearby. The high prices are not unusual for craft beers. It would not be possible to offer food until 11pm closing time, however, a later time than 8pm could be looked at. Using an external food provider offers continuity of service. The price of a pint would be between £6 and £7. No external speakers are proposed as the music is for background only, not high volume. There would be table seating with benches.
- 3.10 Following questions the Police were informed that there would be no sports TV, and the food provider was located some 400 feet away from the venue.
- 3.11 Following questions the legal officer was informed that the applicant was happy to have a risk assessment regarding door supervision.

Summaries

- 3.12 The Licensing officer asked the panel to refuse or approve.
- 3.13 The Police stated their objections were based on location only.
- 3.14 The applicant stated they would be a community lead venue and asked the panel to approve the application.
- 3.15 The legal officer considered that any additional conditions had been canvassed and the panel should then deliberate.
- 3.16 The Chair closed the meeting, and the panel withdrew to consider the application.

The meeting concluded at 11.06am

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of