



NORWICH
City Council

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Date of Hearing: 8th September 2017

Licence Type: Application for the grant of a Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence

Name of Applicant: Romina (Management) Ltd

Name of Premises/Postal address of Premises: Platinum Lace, 15 Dove St,
Norwich NR2 1DE

Persons present: Members of Committee Councillors Button (chair), Woollard (vice chair following election), Bradford, Jones (B), Jones (T), Malik, Maxwell, Price, Raby, Thomas (Va) and Wright; Mr Daz Crawford, Mr Simon Goodings (both present for Sugar & Spice) Mr T Grover representative for B52, Mr Les Pierce, Mr Matthew Phipps, Solicitor, Councillor Lesley Grahame, Mr Tony Shearman, Environmental Protection, Licencing and Markets Manager, Mr D Lowens, Clerk, Alex Hand, Senior Committee Officer.

The committee agreed to receive late representations. There were no declarations of interest save from Cllr Maxwell.

SUMMARY NOTES OF HEARING:

Following Mr Shearman presenting the report, Mr Mathew Phipps, solicitor on behalf of the applicant, presented their application to committee. He was supported by Les Pierce, the chief operations officer of the group, and Lisa Dunne, who had eleven years of experience at Platinum Lace.

The applicant mentioned that the activity was lawful and legitimate if conducted properly within parameters. The premises had been operating for eleven years. The premises had only ever traded as a striptease venue.

The applicant noted the objection from Helen Dawson and asked committee to consider whether there were any matters of substance or relevance contained in respect of the specific application. The applicant viewed the objection as being directed to Prince of Wales Road and the premises were in Dove St. The applicant noted the Norfolk Constabulary had not objected to the application and confirmed that the applicant was applying for what they currently carried out. The applicant suggested nothing in this objection was relevant to the application premises. There was not a single observation about the operation of the unit itself

The applicant then noted the representation of Councillor Grahame. Whilst legitimate to consider the representation, relevance was important. It was noted the form used was not designed to deal with sexual entertainment venues (SEVs) but instead was dealing with premises licenses. Matters under the Licensing Act 2003 objectives were not material considerations. Policies mentioned relate to other local authority areas and other parts of the UK, and it was suggested these passages do not help inform the council's decision. It was noted there was a reference to 'opposite Sugar & Spice' and the applicant again queried whether the representation was relevant to the applicant premises. Each application should be considered on its individual merits and the representation should be about the individual application. The applicant suggested Councillor Grahame's representation was a generic predisposition objecting to this activity. The applicant noted that the Edinburgh and Newquay studies preceded SEV legislation.

The applicant noted that the application was for the same layout and hours that the premises currently operated. The applicant is a national operator, the formalities are satisfied. While no photographs of the interior of the premises were available, this was because until four days ago, no objection had been received to the application. The premises was the most discrete of all these proposed SEV premises in Norwich and the applicant confirmed there was no line of sight from the street into the area where licensable activities took place, there was no chance of anyone entering the premises by accident due to door staff and committee was provided with a copy of the rules and regulations governing the premises.

The applicant requested changes to the generic conditions, suggesting that in respect of Condition 20, requiring a dedicated CCTV operator, would not be proportionate to the risks and the applicant referred to the proposed amended conditions contained in their application.

Regarding the area, the applicant noted that the premises was positively regarded in the locality, and this was borne out by representations received before the committee from some local businesses in support of the application.

Councillors raised questions relating to the proposed amendment to the standard conditions. The applicant responded, noted that, regarding hours, they had not sought longer than the council's policy suggested.

Numbers of bar staff and dancers were discussed, which varied between days of the week from 7 to 18-22 dancers in busy periods.

The committee heard other applications before making their decision.

DECISION OF COMMITTEE

The application was granted, with amended conditions.

- 1) The committee did not agree to remove Condition 10, feeling whilst marketing for custom was not inappropriate for Prince of Wales Rd, marketing for custom in Dove St was not appropriate to the nature of that locality

- 2) Regarding Condition 20, the words 'by a dedicated member of staff or security personnel at all times' was deleted
- 3) Committee agreed the proposed amendment to Condition 23 "A Fire Risk Assessment will be undertaken at the premises and a customer capacity limit set. Such capacity limit shall be complied with at all times. A copy of the Fire Risk Assessment will be made available to council and police officers on request".
- 4) Committee agreed to remove 'the external doors shall be fitted with a device to ensure their automatic closure and such devices shall be maintained in good working order' from Condition 38.
- 5) The committee agreed to delete Condition 39,
- 6) The committee agreed alterations to condition 42 (adding "with the exception of minor alterations to the interior layout of the premises that would not add to the capacity of the premises")
- 7) Amendments to condition 54 were agreed as proposed by the applicant, with the additions of the words "unless in areas as may be agreed in writing with the council" to condition 54(5) and "or as otherwise may be agreed in writing with the council" to condition 54(1) and 54(2).
- 8) New condition 62 was agreed to be inserted as proposed by the applicant: "A customer code of conduct shall be prominently displayed and clearly visible throughout the premises, advising patrons of the rules as to how the striptease will be performed".
- 9) Committee amended condition 53 to delete "(this excludes the toilets as performers must not use the public toilets whilst open to the public)".

REASONS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S DECISION

The premises were well run with acceptable controls and policies, to which the above proposed changes to the standard conditions would assist. The nature of the locality was that of the City Centre Leisure Area excluding the Late Night Activity Zone, being predominantly retail and leisure in character. Committee noted that the police had made no representation regarding the application, and it was accepted that the police had no objections to the proposal, nor to the way the premises had been run. The committee reviewed the grounds under paragraph 12 of schedule 3 of the Act and noted that a decision to refuse a licence must be relevant to one or more of those grounds. The committee after considering these, felt that, on the evidence provided, no reason to refuse the application had been made out. The committee noted that the licensing policy of Norwich City Council did not contain a stated number of SEV establishments for this locality, and also proceeded on this basis. The committee considered Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, the Home Office guidance and its own statement of policy.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL – The applicant has a right of appeal in respect of the decisions of committee, to be exercised within 21 days of being advised of the decision appealed against. The right of appeal is at first instance to the Magistrates' Court.

DatedNovember 2017

Signed.....Chair



NORWICH
City Council

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Date of Hearing: 8th September 2017

Licence Type: Application for the Grant of a Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence

Name of Applicant: Code Red Promotions Ltd

Name of Premises/Postal address of Premises: Lace – 75 Prince of Wales Road,
Norwich, NR1 1DG

Persons present: Members of Committee Councillors Button (chair), Woollard (vice chair following election), Bradford, Jones (B), Jones (T), Malik, Maxwell, Price, Raby, Thomas (Va) and Wright, Ms Sarah LeFevre; counsel for the applicant, Ms Nicky Cockrill; Operations Manager for Lace, Mr Steve Strange; Manager for Lace, Ms Lesley Grahame; Councillor, Mr Matthew Phipps; Solicitor for Platinum & Lace, Les Pierce; Applicant for Platinum & Lace, Mr Andrew Sinclair; Press, Mr Tony Grover; Bar 52 representative, Mr Gavin Tempest; representative for Sugar & Spice, Mr D Crawford; Applicant for Sugar & Spice, Mr Simon Goodings; Applicant for Sugar & Spice, Lisa Dunn of Platinum Lace, Mr Anthony Shearman; Environmental Protection, Licensing and Markets Manager, Mr D Lowens; Clerk, Alex Hand senior committee officer.

The committee agreed to receive late representations. There were no declarations of interest save from Cllr Price.

SUMMARY NOTES OF HEARING:

Mr Shearman presented the report.

Counsel for Lace, Ms Sara LeFevre, addressed committee regarding the application. Counsel mentioned that the activity is perfectly lawful and appropriate in this location, and that morals were irrelevant to the committee's determination. Counsel suggested that, generally, sexual entertainment venues (SEVs) do not give rise to issues of crime and disorder, and this is a view shared, she said, by the Norfolk Constabulary. Counsel suggested this was also a view shared by police in the London Borough of Camden. The reason for the lack of connection between SEV's and crime and disorder was that the business model was not driven by encouraging drinking to excess or loud music. Visitors to the premises would leave calm, sober and controlled. The premises operates with a small number of customers and there is a high proportion of staff to customers, and lots of supervision via CCTV. The safety of performers was given high priority and the applicant knew of no case where performer safety had been threatened. The

premises were subject to regular inspections when a SEV regime was in place, premises were subject to extensive conditions and an annual review of the license. For all these reasons, counsel suggested that SEV premises were atypical and Lace exhibited all these characteristics. The premises were well established, being at the current site for ten years trading to date, and had an excellent working relationship with the police. No representations had been received from local businesses.

The applicant mentioned that, on average, there would be eighteen visitors in the premises and an average throughput of 55 customers. 35 CCTV cameras were covering the premises. Managers were equipped with ipads and could, via these devices, keep an eye on matters shown on CCTV cameras at all times. Three SIA registered staff were available at any one time, and, should an incident occur, the premises can call upon SIA staff at the premises beneath and opposite, in Prince of Wales Road. There were, in total, 9/10 door staff and other staff present, thus being a one to two ratio with customers. The premises were typical with similar well-run SEVs and were not associated with crime. Dancers had a panic button available, but the applicant noted this had never been operated.

The applicant described the visibility of the premises from the street, noting that, behind the door, there was an anonymous entrance lobby with stairs leading upwards. There was no visibility of relevant entertainment and it was a very easy entrance to control and manage.

The applicant suggested, in respect of the proposed standard conditions, that condition 20 was not necessary if it required a dedicated member of staff to be employed to check CCTV, the managers already carrying out this option and supervising. The applicant suggested the condition was unnecessary and disproportionate, as the problem was already solved. In respect of conditions 38 and 39, these are designed to avoid visibility of the relevant entertainment from the street, and the circumstances cannot pertain to these premises due to their layout. The spirit and intent of the conditions were already achieved by the layout of the premises and the proposed conditions were unnecessary.

In respect of condition 54(1), the applicant suggested that 'against the back of the booth or seat' should be deleted, as not all booths had a back.

The applicant suggested that these minor departures were safe, due to the premises having operated like this for many years.

The applicant had no concerns regarding the remaining conditions.

The applicant was questioned regarding the reference to 'bedroom' on the plans and said these should be removed from the plans. This was a booth area. The applicant, in response to a question as to operating hours, stated these were Thursday to Saturday, 21:00 to 04:00 hours but the application was for 24/7, as flexibility was sought, and it was noted the current licence under the Licensing Act 2003, was a 24 hour license.

In response to a question regarding advertising, the environmental protection, licensing and markets manager confirmed that the advertisement was not placed on

the Council's website, as there was no statutory obligation to do so. The Licensing Act 2003 matters were advertised, as there was a duty to keep a public register of those applications.

The applicant responded regarding the level of training being 2/3 days, mentioned there was a minimum of 8 dancers and 150 persons were permitted by fire regulations. In response to a question from a councillor suggesting a dedicated person needed to check the CCTV, the applicant noted that the CCTV viewing was already in the hands of those empowered to respond immediately to a problem and it was thought to be the best operational way of responding to issues that might arise. Managers were constantly reviewing the licensed area, walking the floor. The applicant disputed with the councillor that the best response would be from a dedicated person checking CCTV systems only.

Regarding equality, the applicant noted the premises were open to all members of the public. Male dancers could be employed but this issue had never been raised.

The applicant confirmed that no safety issues for the performers had arisen and, in response to a concern from a councillor, relating to a possible underage person accessing the premises, the applicant noted that at any time the premises were operational, the door would be guarded, and when not operational, the door would be closed, and is lockable.

Photographs of the interior of the premises (not taken during trading hours) were produced and distributed to committee.

The applicant noted the locality of Prince of Wales Rd was a busy commercial road with a lot of licensed premises contained on it. Reference was made to the fact that the Norwich City Council policy has not adopted an appropriate number of SEV's, that is the context in which the applicant makes the application, by comparison to other councils which had adopted a policy of nil before determining any application. The applicant also noted the premises were long-established in the area, was trading successfully for many years, and the application was, in summary, to permit what was already being done. Committee was invited to grant the application with minor amendments.

(The committee heard other SEV applications before determining the application in respect of 75 Prince Of Wales Road, Norwich).

DECISION OF AND REASONS OF COMMITTEE

The licence for a sexual entertainment venue was granted, and the following amendments were made to the standard conditions.

- 1) The words 'by a dedicated member of staff or security personnel' is deleted from Condition 20
- 2) Conditions 38 and 39 are deleted
- 3) Condition 54(1) is amended to insert 'where reasonably practicable' after 'upright position'

- 4) Condition 10 was amended as follows, committee noting that other SEV premises in Prince of Wales Road had been treated similarly:

it was agreed that the following words would appear 'apart from promotional flyers for the premises, which shall not include the following;

- a) Any depiction of full nudity
- b) Any depiction of partial nudity (including the display of breasts, buttocks or genitalia)
- c) Any description of sexual or violent images, or any other images which may give rise to concerns in respect of public decency or protection of children or vulnerable persons from harm.

Committee imposed a condition that promotional flyers may only be distributed during the hours the premises are acting as a sexual entertainment venue, and may only be distributed in Prince Of Wales Road, Norwich.

Committee also inserted a new condition, namely that 'the premises shall not be open for sexual entertainment venue business between close of business and 18:00 hours on any day'. The reason for this imposition was to avoid any possible conflict between customers of the premises and persons attending the local school.

Committee considered the appropriate locality and its character. The committee was of the view that the relevant locality was the late-night activity zone and the character of that locality was predominantly retail and leisure uses.

Committee noted that the premises were long-standing, appeared well-run with satisfactory policies and that the police had made no representation regarding the application, and it was accepted that the police had no objections to the proposal, nor to the way the premises had been run. The committee reviewed the grounds under paragraph 12 of schedule 3 of the Act and that a decision to refuse a licence must be relevant to one or more of those grounds. The committee after considering these, felt that, on the evidence provided, no reason to refuse the application had been made out. The committee noted that the licensing policy of Norwich City Council did not contain a stated number of SEV establishments for this locality. The committee considered Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, the Home Office guidance and its own statement of policy.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL – The applicant has a right of appeal in respect of the decisions of committee, to be exercised within 21 days of being advised of the decision appealed against. The right of appeal is at first instance to the Magistrates' Court.

Dated this.....November 2017

Signed.....Chair



NORWICH
City Council

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Date of Hearing: 8th September 2017

Licence Type: Application for the grant of a Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence

Name of Applicant: Bar 52 Ltd

Name of Premises/Postal address of Premises: Bar 52, 52 Prince Of Wales Road,
Norwich, NR1 1LL

Persons present: Councillors Button (chair), Woollard (vice chair following election), Bradford, Jones (B), Jones (T), Malik, Maxwell, Price, Raby, Thomas (Va) and Wright; and Mr Tony Grover, representing the applicant; Mr Petrit Vladi; Lauren Hendrik, Daz Crawford, Gavin Tempest and Simon Goodings from Sugar & Spice; Tony Shearman, Environmental Protection, Licensing and Markets Manager; David Lowens – Clerk, Alex Hand senior committee officer.

The committee considered and agreed to receive late representations. There were no declarations of interest.

SUMMARY NOTES OF HEARING

Mr Shearman presented the report.

Mr Grover, on behalf of the applicant, presented his application, noting that the premises were already in operation, the application was made in accordance with the regulations and properly submitted. The premises opened three years ago. This was a well-managed and safe venue and the police had only been called once to the premises. The premises were not operating at the time of application as a sexual entertainment venue, but if the application was granted, would be refitted as the same.

The applicant noted he would be obtaining an experienced supervisor for dancers and additional management control will be via conditions of employment introduced by a new manager when in post. The premises would have a lobby with separate doors, it would be impossible to see inside from the street, and when open entry will be monitored by door staff. Door staff would ensure compliance with stated house rules and CCTV systems will be constantly monitored by a dedicated member of staff via tablet showing all CCTV images. The applicant sought amendments to standard conditions.

Regarding the latterly received objections, the applicant suggested that the councillors concerns were directed towards old studies, and there was no evidence to show these concerns were in effect in Norwich. Noting the locality, the applicant stated Bar 52 would not be open when the school/church were open and nothing at the exterior would indicate it is a sexual entertainment venue.

Discussion ensued regarding business cards and the giving of these to dancers. Discussions also took place regarding acceptable smoking areas. The applicant noted that door staff would be present at the front of the premises to ensure control and to ensure that no soliciting took place. The applicant was keen to have a clear net curtain on the booths that could be seen through and thus supervision maintained. Dancers would maintain compliance with the code of conduct.

Discussion took place regarding controls via CCTV and it was noted by the applicant there would be CCTV in each booth.

Discussion took place regarding safety of performers and the applicant confirmed that performers would be escorted to their mode of transport. This was not yet entered in the policy but would be in due course.

Committee considered other applications before making a decision in respect of Bar 52.

DECISION OF COMMITTEE

The application was granted with amended conditions. The following amendments were made to the standard conditions.

- 1) Regarding Condition 10, as to soliciting custom, it was agreed that the following words would appear 'apart from promotional flyers for the premises, which shall not include the following;
 - a) Any depiction of full nudity
 - b) Any depiction of partial nudity (including the display of breasts, buttocks or genitalia)
 - c) Any description of sexual of violent images, or any other images which may give rise to concerns in respect of public decency or protection of children or vulnerable persons from harm.

Committee imposed a condition that promotional flyers may only be distributed during the hours the premises are acting as a sexual entertainment venue, and may only be distributed in Prince Of Wales Road, Norwich.

- 2) Condition 31 is amended to delete 'at no time shall a performance or persons working in the premises be visible from outside the premises, with the exclusion of door supervisors', replacing these words with 'performers may only go outside the premises in the presence of a door supervisor and when fully dressed'.

- 3) Condition 43 is amended to start 'the inside of all booths, cubicles or VIP areas must be visible to direct supervision from outside the booth', deleting 'and must not have closing doors, curtains or coverings of any description'.
- 4) Committee did not agree to amend the wording of Condition 50, for reasons of dancer safety.
- 5) Condition 53 is amended by deletion of '(this excludes the toilets as performers must not use the public toilets whilst open to the public)'.
- 6) Current Condition 54(3),(4) and (5) are deleted, and Condition 54 rewritten in accordance with the proposal of the applicant contained on page 245 of the agenda:

The licensee must ensure that during the performance of a table dance:

- (1) Customers must be seated in an upright position against the back of the booth or seat with their hands by their sides before a dancer can start a dance
- (2) Customers must remain seated during the entire performance of the dance

The licensee must ensure that during the performance of a lap dance:

- (1) For a seated performance, customers must be seated in an upright position with their hands by their sides or, for a performance on a bed, customers must be lying with their hands by their sides or behind their head, before a dancer can start a dance.
 - (2) Customers must remain seated or lying down during the entire performance of the dance.
 - (3) There shall be no physical contact from the customer to the Performer except for the placing of money/tokens in a garter or in the hands of the Performer at the beginning or conclusion of the performance or for payment of drinks.
 - (4) Performers may only touch the customer with their hands for the purpose of restraint.
- 7) Condition 55(3) 'performers may not intentionally touch a customer at any time during the performance unless absolutely accidentally or due to a third party' is deleted, as not necessary due to other conditions.

REASONS FOR THE COMMITTEE'S DECISION

Committee noted the premises appeared well run as a bar, with well written policies and the police had made no representation regarding the application and had no objections to the proposal. The committee, noting the grounds on which the application could be refused, and after considering the nature of the locality (the late-night activity zone) and feeling that the character of the locality was predominantly retail and leisure use based, considered on the evidence provided, that they had no reason to refuse the application. The committee noted the licensing

policy of Norwich City Council did not contain a stated number of SEV establishments for this locality and proceeded also on that basis. The committee considered Schedule 3 of the (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, the Home Office Guidance, and its own statement of policy.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL – The applicant has a right of appeal in respect of the decisions of committee, to be exercised within 21 days of being advised of the decision appealed against. The right of appeal is at first instance to the Magistrates' Court.

DatedNovember 2017

Signed.....Chair



NORWICH
City Council

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

Date of Hearing: 8th September 2017

Licence Type: Application for the grant of a Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence

Name of Applicant: Dazmonda Ltd t/a Sugar & Spice

Name of Premises/Postal address of Premises: Sugar & Spice, 39 Prince Of Wales Rd, Norwich NR1 1BG

Persons present: Members of Committee Councillors Button (chair), Woollard (vice chair following election), Bradford, Jones (B), Jones (T), Malik, Maxwell, Price, Raby, Thomas (Va) and Wright; Mr Gavin Tempest, representing the applicant; Lauren Hendrik, Simon Goodings and Daz Crawford – all from Sugar & Spice; Mr Andrew Sinclair, Press; Mr Tony Shearman, Environmental Protection, Licensing and Markets Manager; Mr D Lowens, clerk, Alex Hand, senior committee officer.

The committee agreed to receive late representations. There were no declarations of interest

SUMMARY NOTES OF HEARING:

Mr Shearman presented the report.

Mr Tempest, representing the applicant, noted his previous experience as Chief Inspector in charge of community safety and the night-time economy, and mentioned, in his view, that the police hold the venue in high regard. There were no representations from the police to be considered by committee. The premises has an extensive code of conduct and this was described further by Daz Crawford.

Mr Crawford addressed committee. He gave details of the way Sugar & Spice operated and noted it was the only proposed SEV club which can accommodate wheelchairs. The premises had a number of regular customers. Capacity was discussed and it was noted that the capacity was 200 persons. On a busy Saturday, 100 persons could be present, but likely to be less. 48 CCTV cameras were present. In respect of controls, the applicant noted they have a Challenge 25 policy in force, a breathalyser was used and in the last three months they had probably turned 150 persons away from the premises. The application was fully in accordance with procedures and policies. Panic buttons were present but in seven and a half years, the applicant thought they had been pressed less than ten times. Planning conditions did not permit smoking at the back of the premises, screens were see-through to ensure controls and CCTV was anyway in each booth.

Regarding conditions, all venues in Norwich have lying down areas and this premises is included.

Dancers were not allowed to accept phone numbers or contact numbers of any sort. Reference was made to condition 42 and minor renovations/decorations which will not affect capacity.

Regarding the locality, the applicant mentioned there were places of worship and education nearby, but the premises were in the late-night activity zone and would not be open whilst the school was open. The Muslim Faith Centre was in a separate location. The premises were already operating and had operated successfully for seven years and were well thought of by the police. Advertising would not refer to sexual matters and indeed, granting the operating license requested would have no practical effect, as no change was proposed to the way the premises were already running. In conclusion, the applicant noted this was a lawful activity, fully compliant with SEV policy statements and a very well-run premises.

DECISION OF COMMITTEE

The decision of committee was to grant the license sought with amended conditions.

The locality is noted to be in the late-night activity zone and the character of that locality was noted to be predominantly retail and leisure uses.

1. In respect of Condition 10, the following words are added; 'apart from promotional flyers for the premises, which shall not include the following;

- a) Any depiction of fully nudity
- b) Any depiction of partial nudity, (including the display of breasts, buttocks or genitalia).
- c) Any depiction of sexual or violent images or any other images which may give rise to concerns in respect of public decency or protection of children or vulnerable persons from harm.

2. In addition, the committee imposed a condition that promotional flyers may not be distributed during times when the premises is not open for the purposes of being a sexual entertainment venue, nor shall flyers be distributed outside Prince Of Wales Road.

3. Condition 11 is to be amended to read as follows ' the licensee shall maintain an up to date register in which shall be recorded the name and address of any person who is to be responsible for managing the sex establishment in the licensee's absence and the names and addresses of those employed in the establishment. There will be a daily register of employees and members of staff on duty, showing who is working. This register is to be completed each day within 30 minutes of the sex establishment being open for business, and is to be available for inspection by the police and by authorised officers of the council.

4. In respect of Condition 20, the word 'dedicated' was removed.
5. Condition 28 is amended to exclude the use of toy handcuffs from controls.
6. Condition 31 is amended to read 'the windows and openings of the premises shall be covered with a material which will ensure the interior of the premises is not visible to passers-by. Performers are to be fully dressed when outside the premises at all times.
7. Condition 42 is amended to include 'with the exception of minor decoration changes, which will not affect capacity', which is added to the end of the first sentence
8. Re Condition 43, regarding booths being visible to supervision, this was redrafted as 'all booths, cubicles or VIP areas used by private dancers must not have closing doors, curtains or coverings such that they are not easily visible to supervision from outside the booth'.
9. Re condition 44, this was amended to "All booths, cubicles, VIP areas used for private dances must be monitored by either a SIA-registered door supervisor, a member of staff who has direct contact with SIA-registered door supervisors working on the premises, or a CCTV operator at all times the booths/cubicles/VIP areas are in use".
10. Condition 46 is amended to read 'performers shall only perform to customers in specified designated areas or in such areas of the licensed premises as may be agreed in writing by the council.
11. The committee did not agree to an amendment of condition 50, which remains as per the standard conditions in order to assist dancer safety.
12. Condition 53 is amended to delete '(this excludes the toilets as performers must not use the public toilets whilst open to the public)'.
13. In respect of Condition 54(5) 'performers must not place their feet on the seats' is deleted. Condition 54 will read 'the licensee must ensure that during the performance of a table, lap, sofa or bed dance;
(1)Customers must be seated or lying with their hands by their sides or behind their head before a dancer can start to dance
(2)Customers must remain seated or lying during the entire performance of the dance
(3)Performers must not sit on or straddle the customer when naked
14. Current Conditions 54(3) and 54(4) are deleted

15. Condition 57 is amended to include in the exceptions 'a social greeting such as a handshake, hug or kiss on the cheek'.

.

Committee considered the appropriate locality and its character. The committee was of the view the relevant locality was the late-night activity zone and the character of that locality was predominantly retail and leisure uses.

Committee noted the premises were of long-standing, appeared well-run, with satisfactory policies and police had made no representation regarding the application. It was accepted the police had no objections to the proposal. The committee were aware of the grounds on which the application could be refused and after considering these, felt that, on the evidence provided, no reason to refuse the application had been made out. The committee noted that the licensing policy of Norwich City Council did not contain a stated number of SEV establishments for this locality. The committee considered Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, The Home Office Guidance and its own statement of policy.

Rights of appeal: The applicant has a right of appeal in respect of the decisions of committee, to be exercised within 21 days of being advised of the decision appealed against. The right of appeal is at first instance to the Magistrates' Court.

DatedNovember 2017

Signed.....Chair

