

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

10.00am 24 JULY 2026

VIRTUAL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Cattell, Hewitt and Pickett

Officers: Sarah Cornell (Senior Licensing Officer), Rebecca Siddell (Lawyer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services)

PART ONE

1 TO APPOINT A CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

Councillor Cattell 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 CIN CIN ITALIAN BAR AND KITCHEN- LICENSING PANEL (LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS)

1. The Senior Licensing Officer updated the panel on the current situation regarding the application site. They confirmed that panel was being reconvened to understand the current position. There would be no resident or environmental protection officer present.
2. The legal officer invited the applicant to make comments.
3. The restaurant owner stated that there had been no site visit to the restaurant and all the communications with the environmental protection officer had been via phone text. The applicant considered their reputation has been dragged-through-the-mud and no technical support has been offered by the council, which has been frustrating and demoralising. There has been an economic effect on the business. All delays have been down to the council. The process has been a waste of time and cost to the business. A 'No Action' letter should be an end to it. Spurious claims have been made against the business. The restaurant owner felt that if anyone wanted to damage a business competitor, this would be the way.
4. The chair stated that the council were bound legally to hold a review and this should be the end of the matter.
5. Following questions the panel were informed by the restaurant owner that:
 - a. That the noise abatement process was applied with no technical support on how to resolve issues regarding noise
 - b. The original 27 May 2026 licensing panel was held before the applicant could complete any works
 - c. Public records were withheld when a Freedom of Information (FOI) request was submitted
 - d. There was no need for a two-track system
 - e. There has been a loss of revenue due to negative feedback from customers
6. The lawyer stated that they appreciated the owner's frustrations. The original licensing panel hearing was adjourned so works could be carried out.
7. The chair requested details regarding the FOI request and was informed by the restaurant owner they were informed the request was beyond the statutory timeline. The information was not provided.
8. Councillor Pickett was informed that the residents addressed had been attended by environmental protection officers and the restaurant owner was contact by text afterwards.

Summaries

9. The lawyer stated that a letter would be issued within 5 working days.

4 CIN CIN ITALIAN BAR AND KITCHEN- LICENSING PANEL (LICENSING ACT 2003 FUNCTIONS)(EXEMPT CATEGORY 1)

The meeting concluded at 10.30am

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of