



Agenda Item No: 4C

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Licensing (Hearings) Sub-Committee**  
Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2015 at 12.30 pm

---

**Members Present:**

Councillor William Payne, Councillor Steve Pearce and Councillor Ron Stone (Chair) (for Councillor Davies).

**Officers in Attendance:**

Pauline Powell - Legal Advisor, Carl Knights - Licensing Policy Advisor, Norman Cornthwaite - Democratic Services

**1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Davies; he was replaced by Councillor Stone.

**2. Election of Chair.**

Councillor Stone was elected as Chair.

**3. Declarations of interest.**

None were made.

**4. Public Forum.**

Nothing was received.

**5. Housekeeping, introductions and procedure to be followed for hearings.**

The Chair explained the procedure that would be followed.

**6. Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982  
Application for the Renewal of a Sexual Entertainment Venue  
Licence made by Nightlife Clubs Limited in respect of  
premises trading as Urban Tiger, 4 Broad Quay, Bristol, BS1  
4DA.**

The Applicants and Representatives were in attendance as follows  
- Philip Kolvin QC, Julia Palmer, Chris Knight, David Jones,  
Matthew Jones and Jim Treherne.

The Licensing Policy Advisor introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He drew attention to replacement page no. 51 and the report from the Independent Licensing Investigator. He advised that a site visit had been made to the premises just prior to the Meeting but no discussion on the application had taken place during the visit. He summarised the four grounds for refusal of the application. He highlighted the concerns about recent website advertisements (Appendix J) and that as a result of these concerns an additional Condition is proposed – this Condition is contained in paragraph 10 at the bottom of page 20 and the top of page 21 of the papers. It reads as follows: *“Relevant entertainment shall not include any word, action or imagery that endorses or depicts, or might reasonably be taken as endorsing or depicting, or be promoted as including, any conduct which, if taking place in reality, would amount to a criminal offence; for the avoidance of doubt this imposes a prohibition on any performer being clothed in a school uniform or otherwise attired or presented as being a school student or a child or being promoted as such in any media.”*

Philip Kolvin put the case for the applicant. He reminded everyone of the grounds for refusal and summarised them in respect of the applicant.

Mandatory Grounds (paragraph 14) – None of these apply to the applicant.

Discretionary Grounds – No concerns have been raised about the applicant. He is a very experienced operator who has employed the same managers. The rules of the club are strictly enforced for both customers and dancers. Since 2013, a Compliance Manager has been employed whose job it is, is to ensure compliance by everyone in the club.

Referring to the advertisements which appeared were published in error and it was never the intention of the club to hold the type of events portrayed. He apologised on behalf of the applicants.

Referring to the locality of the club and its impact on the locality, he stated that the premises are low key with no interior visibility. There are never any approaches in the street, no leafleting and no billboard advertising.

With reference to incidents reported to the Police, he noted that there was no objection from the Police or any of the club's neighbours. Other objections have fallen from 66 to 11.

Some of the statements made in the objections are not accepted and there is no evidence to support some of the allegations made. The applicant does intend to offend people opposed to lap dancing clubs.

The layout, character and the condition of the premises has been changed and improved following the refurbishment of the premises. There is a calm and respectful environment, and the premises are easier to supervise. The CCTV has been improved with new cameras. There is no suggestion that the layout of the premises is inappropriate.

There are no grounds for refusal of the application for renewal.

He confirmed that the applicant is willing to accept the Condition proposed in paragraph 10 - *“Relevant entertainment shall not include any word, action or imagery that endorses or depicts, or*

*might reasonably be taken as endorsing or depicting, or be promoted as including, any conduct which, if taking place in reality, would amount to a criminal offence; for the avoidance of doubt this imposes a prohibition on any performer being clothed in a school uniform or otherwise attired or presented as being a school student or a child or being promoted as such in any media.”*

In response to questions from Members the following answers were provided:

- The Compliance Manager is usually upstairs and can see most of the club; there are also CCTV cameras
- Dancers put their clothes on after each dance
- The smallest area of the club adjacent to the entrance is not usually used for dances
- There is no privacy in the dance areas; rules are made clear to all customers; customers are required to sit back in the specifically designed seats when dances are taking place; the ground floor is wheelchair accessible
- All incidents are recorded in the incident book whether or not they relate directly to the club

Philip Kolvin summed up the case for the applicant.

All parties left the room.

The details of the Committee's findings and reasons for the decision are set out below.

Members considered very carefully all of the written and verbal evidence presented to them.

They considered fully each of the Objections that were submitted.

They noted that the premises have been refurbished and improved including new CCTV.

They noted that there have been no problems with the premises and that the Police have not objected to the renewal of the Licence.

Members agreed that the Condition suggested in paragraph 10 of the report should be added to the Licence.

Members agreed that there were no grounds to refuse the renewal application and therefore granted the Licence with the Conditions previously attached to it along with the following new Condition at paragraph 10 of the report.

All parties returned to the room to hear the decision of the Committee.

**Resolved – that the Licence be granted with the Conditions previously attached to it along with the following new Condition attached *“Relevant entertainment shall not include any word, action or imagery that endorses or depicts, or might reasonably be taken as endorsing or depicting, or be promoted as including, any conduct which, if taking place in reality, would amount to a criminal offence; for the avoidance of doubt this imposes a prohibition on any performer being clothed in a school uniform or otherwise attired or presented as being a school student or a child or being promoted as such in any media.”***

Following the announcement of the decision relating to this application, the Chair advised everyone that a review of the Council’s SEV Policy may soon take place. He also expressed a personal opinion that any review of the SEV Policy is unlikely to result in a change in numbers of the SEVs permitted in the City.

**(Meeting ended at 2.25 pm.)**

**Chair**