

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

**12.30pm 5 JUNE 2026**

**VIRTUAL**

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Councillors: Nann, Parrott and Sykes

**Officers:** Rebecca Siddell (Legal), Sarah Cornell (Licensing), and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

**PART ONE**

**1 TO APPOINT A CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

Councillor Sykes 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 would not be excluded from the meeting.

**3 CAMELFORD ARMS - LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS**

1. Those attending the meeting introduced themselves.
2. The Licensing Officer introduced the report to the panel.

3. There were no questions for the officer.
4. The Sussex Police legal representative stated that the footprint of Pride reduced last year, and the Camelford Arms was the only premises with an off sales license. This was through a misunderstanding. The only objection from the Police is to the 'window bar' selling off sales. Off sales is the issue as evidence shows that removing off sales from other venues across Pride has reduced crime statistics. The licensing statement of policy is for a presumption to grant a variation of licence under a Temporary Events Notice (TEN). The Police objection remains, with concerns regarding proxy sales to minors, as not premises can control off sales after they have been sold. There is no objection to on the premises sales.
5. Following questions, the panel Members were informed that the data referenced was from across the city and there were 77 TENs last year, with 19 withdrawn. Other premises not having off sales was considered impactful last year. The Police want to support the premises but also want to reduce incidents across the city. The Police consider inside sales to be safe. It was noted that the Police considered there were significant increases in crime during Pride. There is no data for other Prides.
6. Following questions the applicant's legal representative was informed that there were no crimes recorded by the Police last year at the Camelford Arms. It was noted the crime statistics were citywide. The Police noted that the difference between off sales and proxy sales was explained via email and at a recent in person meeting. The Police stated they were not trying to control the Pride event or affect usual sales but trying to discourage off sales. The Police considered there was high demand on them during the afternoon, evening and late at night during Pride, so it was not possible to have many officers in the early hours. The Police confirmed they objected to the 'window bar' off sales. The Police stated they were trying to reduce crime, particularly in the early hours and they had no objection to the Camelford Arms. The Police considered it was possible that off sales customers could take drink to the beach and consume it there.
7. The applicant's legal representative addressed the panel and stated that they considered the law was clear, the TEN process is a light touch process, and the onus was on the Police to show why the TEN can not be granted. The Police have visited the premises and confirmed that there are no issues. Each application should be considered on its own merits and not a part of the wider Pride event, and conditions be tailored to the individual premises, avoiding conditions that are burdensome on the venue. Pride is the jewel-in-the-crown of the city, not a headache. The TEN should be granted unless evidence can be shown. No issues have been raised over the last 16 years.
8. The applicant stated that there have been no problems over the last 16 years. From the 2010 to 2026 the TEN has been the same. Customers stand outside the pub and don't wonder away. There is security at the pub and off sales are only for customers to stand outside the pub. Beach issues are not related to the Camelford Arms. The Camelford Arms are a good operator.
9. Following questions the panel Members were informed that the legal representative of the applicant considered the presumption was to grant TENs, and evidence had not

been supplied by the Police to prevent the application being granted. The council lawyer confirmed that the licensing Matrix did not apply to TENs.

10. Following questions the legal representative of Sussex Police was informed that Camelford Street is usually empty by 02.30, there is no loud music outside the premises, and customers are generally over 50 years old, creating a gentle crowd with no underage drinking. It was considered that off sales would not be proxy sales as they would be in plastic slippy pint glasses, there would be 3 security staff, the applicant and one other constantly moving around the crowd.

Summaries

11. The council legal representative was informed that no off sales would be in sealed containers and there was no table-and-chairs licence at the premises.
12. The Licensing Officer summarised the licensing statement.
13. The Sussex Police representative summarised the Police's statement.
14. The applicant's Legal representative summarised their statement.
15. The applicant summarised their statement.
16. The chair closed the public meeting and stated that the panel would now retire to consider the application.

The meeting concluded at 3.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of