

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

**10.00am 29 APRIL 2026**

**VIRTUAL**

# **DECISION LIST**

## **Part One**

---

### **Licensing Act 2003 – Licensing Panel Hearing Notification of the Determination**

**Licensing panel hearing held via Teams on Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2026 in respect of the application for a new premises licence in respect of premises known as Islingword Local, 80 Islingword Road, Brighton BN2 9SL.**

The panel has considered all the papers, including the addendum and Applicant's bundle. It has listened carefully to all the points and submissions made. In reaching its decision, it has had due regard to the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy (SOLP) and section 182 guidance.

The application is for a new premises licence, authorising the sale of alcohol off the premises every day, 08:00 to 23:00 hours. The premises falls within the Special Stress Area (SSA) which, as detailed in the statement of licensing policy, is deemed an area of special concern in terms of the relatively high levels of crime and disorder and public nuisance experienced within it.

A matrix approach has also been adopted in the policy which indicates that an off-licence in the SSA would not be supported save in exceptional circumstances subject to consideration of the individual merits of the application.

5 representations were received from Sussex Police, the Licensing Authority, local business and a local resident. The representations raised the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, the protection of children from harm and cumulative impact.

The police are concerned about further increasing the availability of alcohol in an area already suffering from relatively high levels of crime and disorder, and many existing licensed premises. There was no pre-consultation by the applicant. They are concerned that an additional licence will add to problems of

street drinking, underage sales and antisocial behaviour. They see no exceptional circumstances to depart from the Matrix. They were requesting refusal but had put forward a set of conditions if the panel were minded to grant.

The licensing authority expressed similar policy concerns acting as guardians of the policy and invited the panel to consider if there were any exceptional circumstances. Concerns were raised about the applicant's compliance history involving a breach of condition at his premises in West Street involving inadequate door supervision.

The barrister representing the business objectors also emphasised the importance of the policy context and that the police are the primary source of evidence concerning crime and disorder. It was incumbent on the applicant to prove they were an exception to the policy. He also pointed to the breach of condition by the applicant which had come to light and was of concern when many conditions were being put forward. The area was also saturated with off licences and convenience stores.

The applicant's legal representative addressed the panel. He said the breach which had been raised was unfortunate but has been rectified by his client, and otherwise he has traded without issue and has relevant experience. The intention is for the premises to trade primarily as a convenience store with alcohol ancillary to that. The clientele would be local residents not street drinkers. It was primarily a residential area. Detailed conditions were offered as per the Bundle submitted, notably 5.5 alcohol maximum strength, no single cans, alcohol labelling for traceability. It was contended that these would mitigate risk and could justify departing from the policy. The applicant was also willing to reduce the sale of alcohol hours to 22:00 and 22:30 hours. The licensing consultant spoke to the report in the bundle and confirmed the assessment of the area as residential and the applicant's intentions.

The panel and other parties were able to question the applicant and his representatives and did so concerning whether the application was exceptional, and the detail and practicalities of the proposed conditions and other measures.

The panel has carefully considered this application on its merits and in light of the concerns raised by the responsible authorities, those making representations and submissions on behalf of the applicant. The panel is mindful of the location of these premises in the SSA and the policy context. The panel does recognise that the applicant has, through his agent, put forward a number of conditions which may offer some mitigation in terms of the area and risk involved. However, ultimately, the panel can see nothing exceptional about the application as it is proposed to be a convenience store like many others in the area who sell groceries alongside alcohol. The conditions proposed are not, the panel considers, exceptional in themselves. The area is saturated with licensed premises, and the panel shares the concerns of the responsible authorities that increasing the availability of alcohol in this area is likely to undermine the licensing objectives. The panel does not consider that exceptional circumstances have been shown in this case. The application is therefore refused.

