

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

12.30pm 5 JUNE 2026

VIRTUAL

DECISION LIST

Part One

1 TO APPOINT A CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

Councillor Sykes was appointed Chair for the meeting.

3 CAMELFORD ARMS - LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS

Ward Affected: Queen's Park

Licensing panel hearing held virtually via Teams on Friday 5th June 2026, in respect of the Temporary Event Notice in respect of The Camelford Arms, 30 – 31 Camelford Street, Brighton BN2 1TQ.

The Panel has read all the papers including the report, objection notice and appendices, and all additional information. It has listened carefully to all the submissions made today. The panel has had regard to the Statutory Guidance and the Statement of Licensing Policy where appropriate.

This is a notification of a Temporary Event Notice (TEN) for the time period 31st July to the 3rd of August 2026 (Pride Weekend). Full details are in the papers before the panel.

Objection notices were received from the police and environmental protection (EP) but the objection from EP was subsequently withdrawn.

The police, through their barrister, and in person, clarified that their concerns related specifically to the off sales element of the TEN during the extended hours, that this could lead to proxy sales and the consumption of alcohol in uncontrolled spaces such as the beach, where persons could be victims or perpetrators of crime thus undermining the licensing objectives. It was stated that there was a direct correlation between the reduction of the number of crimes in general during last year's Pride weekend and the prohibition of off sales for Pride TENs which had been instigated by the police in 2025. There was also an increase in incidents on the beach. Due to the lack of control over

off sales and the risk involved, the police wanted the premises to confine their sales to on the premises only during the extended hours in line with other premises during Pride. It was accepted that the premises was a good operator and that no crimes were attributable to the Camelford Arms.

The applicants made several arguments to support their case including as follows: Each application had to be considered on its own individual merits and not as part of a blanket policy in relation to Pride. The police case relied on speculation and not evidence. They had a long history of operating successfully during Pride since 2010, there had been regular police and council visits and no complaints or issues. FOI requests showed no recorded proxy-sale offences connected to Pride. Their off sales were typically for customers to stand and congregate on the street close to the pub and drinks were only sold in open plastic cups. Their customers were generally older and did not wander off with their drinks. They had 3 security staff to supervise the area. They were good operators in line with the new policy.

The panel has considered whether to issue a Counter Notice in this case. It appreciates how carefully the police plan for Pride each year. However, while the wider context of Pride is relevant, the panel must consider each case on its individual merits. The panel did not find the police case very strong in terms of the evidence presented. The arguments made regarding the statistics presented were very tenuous and did not link in any way to the Camelford Arms or necessarily to off sales in general. While the premises could not benefit from a presumption of grant as good operators under new the policy as this applied to variations not TENS, it was still relevant that they fitted the definition and had not caused any problems during a long period of TENS during Pride. The panel could not apply what was in effect a blanket policy approach to off sales to this individual application when there was no evidence or likelihood of it undermining the licensing objectives. The panel did not consider that off sales from the Camelford Arms was likely to lead to drinking in uncontrolled spaces. It had heard from the applicants that their off sales were supervised by door staff and largely limited to an area directly outside the pub; drinks were unlikely to be taken to the beach. The panel has thus decided not to issue a counter notice in this case which means the event can go ahead.