

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a hearing of **LICENSING PANEL B** held on **THURSDAY, 11TH JUNE, 2026** at 7.00 pm, which was held remotely via Microsoft Teams.

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL PRESENT

Councillors Lotis Bautista (Chair), Matt Cooper and Matthew Kirk

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the hearing. They are subject to approval and signature at the next hearing of Licensing Panel B and any corrections approved at that hearing will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

There was a nomination for Councillor Cooper to be Chair of Licencing Panel B for the 2026/27 municipal year. The nomination was seconded and there were no further nominations.

Therefore, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT Councillor Matt Cooper be elected as Chair of Licencing Panel B for the 2026/27 municipal year.

2. GUIDANCE ON REMOTE MEETINGS HELD UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 AND ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

RESOLVED –

THAT the guidance on remote meetings be noted.

3. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

4. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA

There were no such declarations.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Webcasting

The Chair announced that the meeting was being broadcast live to the internet and would be capable of repeated viewing and copies of the recording could be made available to those that requested them. Those participating in the meeting were deemed to be consenting to being filmed.

Supplementary Agenda

The Chair also announced that a supplementary agenda had been published in respect of the application for Schofield's Bar, 1A Earlham Street, London, WC2H 9LL. This contained additional information from the applicant, including a response to the representation from the interested party.

A tabled paper with additional material for Simmons, known as KISS, 7 Camden High Street, NW1 7JE, was also circulated, containing additional submissions by the applicant.

Correction to the Agenda

A correction to the agenda was also noted. The published agenda contained an error with page numbering for the Covent Garden Community Association's submission. Additional information submitted started on page 78, continued on page 76, and finished on page 79, with the original representation found on pages 75 and 77.

6. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There was no notification of urgent business.

7. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consideration was given to the terms of reference.

RESOLVED –

THAT the terms of reference be noted.

8. MINUTES

Consideration was given to the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 April 2026.

Panel Members noted that none of them had been present at that meeting and therefore requested that the agreement of the minutes be deferred to the next

meeting of Licensing Panel B, so members could confirm the accuracy of the minutes with previous panel members.

9. SCHOFIELD'S BAR, 1A EARLHAM STREET, LONDON WC2H 9LL

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Investment, Place and Opportunity, which outlined an application for a premises new licence under section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of Schofield's Bar, 1A Earlham Street, London WC2H 9LL.

The Licensing Officer summarised the report and confirmed that supplementary paperwork from the applicant's solicitor, including their submission and presentation, had been received.

The application sought:

- Supply of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises: Monday to Saturday 10:00 to midnight and Sunday 10:00 to 23:00.
- Late night refreshments: Monday to Saturday 23:00 to midnight.
- Opening hours: Monday to Saturday 10:00 to 00:30 and Sunday 10:00 to 23:30.

The Licensing Officer confirmed that one relevant representation opposing the application was received from a Resident Association (Covent Garden Community Association). Following mediation with the Police Responsible Authority, the application was amended to include one additional condition, leading to the police withdrawing their representation.

The applicant's representative, Jack Spiegel, confirmed there were no amendments to the application.

David Kaner, representing the Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA), summarised the representation, objecting to the application, as set out in the agenda.

Responding to questions, David Kaner provided the following information:

- There were no other non-food based premises on this specific section of Earlham Street, however on the other side of the street across seven dials there was a cocktail bar. There was also a large chain pub near Earlham Street on Cambridge Circus, but patrons generally did not arrive or leave via Earlham Street, so disruption to residents was minimal.
- Noise from Cambridge Circus dropped off quickly on Earlham Street, and significant queuing at 23:00 would be an unfamiliar source of nuisance for residents in that part of the street, as dispersal from Cambridge Circus would likely move up the street, away from Earlham Street.
- As an alternative to the proposed personal use condition, an SIA condition was proposed after 22:00 to manage outside dispersal and queuing, particularly if a less responsible operator were in charge. An SIA condition

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

would give confidence that issues outside the premises could be addressed by the applicant.

- There was concern that future operators might not be motivated to actively address nuisance and other issues, leading continued suffering for residents. It was noted that prosecuting for breach of such conditions would be a long and difficult process.
- The Fopp store at the end of the street, sometimes had queues but these would be onto Shaftesbury Avenue. The Scholfield's Bar location was more sensitive due to its proximity to residents.

Jack Spiegel, solicitor for the applicant's Daniel Schofield and Joe Schofield, provided an overview of the application and responded to questions. The following information was provided:

- The map on page 79, showed the Fopp Store next door to the premises and the Polpo restaurant (which had since been taken over by the chain pub) directly across the road.
- Stricter SIA requirements could be counterproductive for the premises' business model.
- Thanks were expressed to the CGCA, local residents, and responsible authorities for positive consultation, noting that all aspects of the application, including proposed use, hours, and conditions, were agreed except for the CGCA's proposed personal use condition.
- The applicant's firm position, supported by legal counsel, was that the CGCA's condition should not be imposed as it would be unlawful, unnecessary, and inappropriate.
- While the Schofield brothers were committed long-term, the hospitality sector faced unprecedented challenges, and the condition would hinder future flexibility, restructuring, or sale, incurring future costs (application fees, legal fees, advertising, VAT).
- The condition ran contrary to statutory guidance (avoiding unnecessary costs) and Camden's new policy (nurturing business growth), and that it was the first new bar proposal in Seven Dials since the new policy was implemented.
- There were existing safeguards in place including conditions 1 and 2 (preventing high-intensity vertical drinking), the proposed hours being within framework hours, planning consent, and enforcement tools such as the licence review procedure.

Responding to questions, the applicant's representative and the applicants provided the following information:

- Regarding queue management and dispersal, Daniel Schofield explained that in their Manchester venues, senior staff, including the owners, managed the door, limiting queues and considering online systems.
- Internal team management over SIA staff was preferred when appropriate due to potential preconceptions. Joe Schofield added that the door was a crucial guest interaction point, and senior leadership would manage it to mitigate noise nuisance and ensure proper dispersal.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

- The applicants believed their premium, seated offer would not attract clientele causing disturbance.
- There was an existing condition on the planning consent regarding an operational management plan, it was not appropriate to duplicate this on the premises license as duplication of regulatory regimes was advised against.
- The applicant agreed to add a specific "queuing policy" condition, mirroring the existing dispersal policy condition.
- The queuing policy condition would be: "the premises will have a Queuing Policy. The Policy shall be made available for inspection by a police officer and/or an authorised officer of the Council on request. The Policy will be reviewed if the licence holder becomes aware of repeated issues related to queuing."

A Panel Member noted the concerns raised by CGCA with regard to the SIA condition and clarified whether it was possible to amend condition 8 (SIA risk assessment) so that the risk assessment would to be conducted "in conjunction with either the licencing officer or the local police."

Jack Spiegelger agreed in principle to "liaising with or consulting" authorities but expressed hesitation about imposing a positive obligation on authorities who had not made representations.

The Legal Adviser confirmed that requiring consultation with relevant responsible authorities was possible but requiring joint work or sign-off from relevant authorities might impose undue obligations, so was not recommended.

David Kaner remained concerned about the condition, as police focus for SIA risk assessment was typically on crime and disorder, not public nuisance, which was the CGCA's primary concern. David Kaner also suggested that the proposed wording for condition 8, which involved making the risk assessment available and reviewing it, still allowed the applicant to have complete control, even if issues arose.

In response Jack Spiegelger reiterated that the proposed wording was based on model conditions from Camden's policy (page 96, condition 20) and confirmed that the applicant would be agreeable to condition 8 being amended to:

"The premises licence holder shall risk assess the requirement for an SIA registered supervisor to be on duty at the premises, the risk assessment shall be made available for inspection by a police officer and/or an authorised officer of the Council on request. The risk assessment will be reviewed, in consultation with the Police and Licensing Responsible Authorities, if the licence holder becomes aware of repeated issues related to dispersal."

The interested party made some closing remarks.

The Applicant made some closing remarks.

Deliberation and Reasons

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

Panel Members confirmed that they had been able to follow and understand the submissions and discussion in relation to the application for a new premises licence.

In deliberation, the Panel noted that the CGCA's proposed condition represented a blurring of personal and premises licences, which was outside the spirit of the Licensing Act. He did not believe it was necessary for the Panel to consider it, as the proper issues raised regarding a future licence holder could be addressed in other ways.

A Panel Member also raised concern that adding the proposed CGCA condition could have unforeseen consequences and potentially exclude good operators in future.

Panel Members supported the additional condition regarding queuing policy and the amended SIA risk assessment condition, as these directly met the interested party's concerns, including those about any potential less scrupulous future licence holders. Furthermore, these revised and conditions directly responded to the interested party's wider concerns.

With the amendment and addition of conditions, the Panel were satisfied that the applicant would uphold the licensing objectives.

Therefore, it was

RESOLVED –

i) THAT the application for a new premises licence be granted as follows:

a) Supply of alcohol (For consumption on and off the premises)

Monday to Saturday 10:00 – 00:00

Sunday 10:00 – 23:00

Non standard timings: 00:30 on Sundays immediately before Bank Holiday Mondays

b) Late night refreshments

Monday to Saturday 23:00 – 00:00

Non standard timings: 00:00 on Sundays immediately before Bank Holiday Mondays

c) Opening Hours

Monday to Saturday 10:00 – 00:30

Sunday 10:00 – 23:30

Non standard timings: 00:00 on Sundays immediately before Bank Holiday Mondays

ii) THAT the following conditions be added to the licence:

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

1. The consumption of alcohol on the premises shall be by seated persons only, except for persons waiting to be seated or during bona fide pre booked private functions or events.
2. There shall be no irresponsible drinks promotions at the premises, 'happy hours', 'buy one get one free' offers or similar.
3. Substantial food and non-intoxicating beverages, including drinking water, shall be available in all parts of the premises where alcohol is sold or supplied for consumption on the premises during the periods when alcohol is authorised for sale.
4. CCTV shall be installed, operated, and maintained, to function all times that the premises is open for licensable activities. Said CCTV will comply with the following criteria: The licensee will ensure that the system is checked every two weeks to ensure that the system is working properly and that the date and time are correct;
 - a) A record of these checks, showing the date and name of the person checking, will be kept and made available to the police or other authorised officer on request;
 - b) The Police will be informed if the system will not be operating for longer than one day of business for any reason;
 - c) The system will record in real time and recordings will be date and time stamped;
 - d) Recordings will be kept for a minimum of 31 days and downloaded footage will be provided free of charge to the police or other authorised officers on request (subject to the Data Protection Act requirements) within 24 hours of any request.
 - e) CCTV to cover at least all entry and exit points of the building and also the area the delivery drivers park their vehicles. CCTV will also cover areas to which members of the public have access (excluding toilets) to the extent agreed with the Police/Council Licensing.
 - f) CCTV will be of good quality to a standard approved by the Police/Council Licensing officers.
5. An incident log shall be kept at the premises, and made available on request to an authorised officer or the Police, which shall record the following:
 - a) all crimes reported to the venue all ejections of patrons
 - b) any complaints received
 - c) any incidents of disorder and violence
 - d) all seizures of drugs or offensive weapons
 - e) any faults in the CCTV system
 - f) any refusal of the sale of alcohol to include date, time, and staff member
 - g) any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

6. No noise generated on the premises, or by its associated plant or equipment, shall emanate from the premises nor vibration be transmitted through the structure of the premises which gives rise to a nuisance.
7. A direct telephone number for the manager at the premises shall be publicly available at all times the premises is open. This telephone number is to be made available to residents in the vicinity.
8. The premises licence holder shall risk assess the requirement for an SIA registered supervisor to be on duty at the premises, the risk assessment shall be made available for inspection by a police officer and/or an authorised officer of the Council on request. The risk assessment will be reviewed, following consultation with the Police and Licensing Responsible Authorities, if the licence holder becomes aware of repeated issues related to dispersal.
9. The premises will have a Dispersal Policy. The Policy shall be made available for inspection by a police officer and/or an authorised officer of the Council on request. The Policy will be reviewed if the licence holder becomes aware of repeated issues related to dispersal.
10. The premises licence holder or designated premises supervisor shall ensure that any queue to enter the premises which forms outside the premises is orderly and supervised by members of staff or SIA staff so as to ensure that there is no public nuisance or obstruction to the public highway.
11. All sales of alcohol for consumption off the premises shall be in sealed containers only, and shall not be consumed on the premises, except for the designated external seating area.
12. Alcohol consumed outside the premises building shall only be consumed by patrons seated at tables within an area owned or leased by the premises, or within an area licensed by a pavement licence.
13. Outside tables and chairs shall be rendered unusable by 22:00 hours each day.
14. The pavement from the building line to the kerb edge immediately outside the premises shall be swept or washed regularly to keep it free from business related litter and deposits. Collected litter and sweepings must be stored according to approved storage arrangements.
15. All front of house staff shall be trained in Welfare and Vulnerability Engagement (WAVE), "Ask for Angela", drink spiking and first aid. Records of staff training shall be provided to an authorised officer upon request.
16. A Challenge 25 policy will be in place and enforced. This requires that any person reasonably looking under the age of 25 shall be asked to prove their age when attempting to purchase alcohol and signs to this effect will be displayed at the premises. The only acceptable forms of identity will be those with photographic identification documents recognised in Home Office

guidance. This includes passport, photo-card driving licence or proof of age card bearing the PASS hologram and any digital ID approved by the government.

17. Deliveries to the premises shall not take place between 22:00 and 08:00 the following day.
18. Police must be called to incidents of violence and/or serious disorder.
19. The premises will have a Queuing Policy. The Policy shall be made available for inspection by a police officer and/or an authorised officer of the Council on request. The Policy will be reviewed if the licence holder becomes aware of repeated issues related to queuing.

10. SIMMONS (KISS), 7 CAMDEN HIGH STREET, LONDON NW1 7JE

Consideration was given to the report of the Executive Director Investment, Place and Opportunity which detailed an application for the transfer of a premises licence under section 42 of the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of Simmons, 7 Camden High Street, London NW1 7JE, now known as Kiss.

The Licensing Officer introduced the report and highlighted the following information:

- Additional papers were tabled from the applicant's legal representation, including photographs and further information.
- The application for transfer had taken immediate effect, and the applicant was regarded as the licence holder unless the application before the Panel was rejected.
- One relevant representation was received from the Police Responsible Authority, opposing the application.

Members were advised that when considering transfer applications with an objection, they must hold a hearing and, having regard to the notice, reject the application if it is considered necessary for the promotion of the crime prevention objective or to grant if the crime and disorder objective would not be undermined.

PC Christopher Malone, representing the Police Responsible Authority, outlined their representation, objecting to the application as set out in the Police representation contained within the agenda. The following information was provided:

- The objection was on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder.
- The hearing was not about criminal liability; the test was risk and likelihood, not proof beyond reasonable doubt.
- The representation was not personal but based on the police's statutory duty to monitor compliance and act on patterns of concern.
- The objection was based on a consistent pattern of poor management and compliance issues across multiple premises linked to the applicant, including repeated compliance failures, multiple resident complaints regarding noise, and poor engagement with responsible authorities.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

- There had been a number of serious incidents, including one premises being reviewed following a stabbing, another subject to a police warrant (burglary, serious offences, vulnerability), and immigration concerns regarding a worker.
- There were ongoing regulatory concerns, with a further premises linked to the applicant currently subject to review proceedings.
- The applicant's reliance on the absence of arrests and charges was misplaced, as the licencing regime was not dependent on criminal thresholds.
- The Police Responsible Authority requested the Panel to refuse the application.

Responding to questions, the responsible authority provided the following information:

- The crime reports including in the Police submission reflected initial allegations and that final disposals would be on the Police National Computer (PNC), not typically on the crime report itself. The attempted murder report was so designated due to the seriousness of the stabbing injuries, which were life-threatening.
- Incidents had occurred in 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025 across various venues linked to the applicant. The crime report for the attempted murder was dated November 18, 2023.

Kashka Ray, the applicant, accompanied by Paul Richards, licencing consultant, and provided an overview of the application and clarified key points in their submission, as follows:

- KISS was a multipurpose venue running community events, comedy shows, live music, DJ nights, and art shows.
- The Police submission was believed to be reputationally damaging and contained unproven, inaccurate, and irrelevant allegations.
- Allegations alone, without investigation or substantiation, should not be the basis for refusing a transfer.
- Regarding the attempted murder allegation, the alleged perpetrator was acquitted due to a self-defence claim, and the incident was not directly connected to the applicant or the venue. The bar staff member assaulted by the two individuals who were stabbed was not the applicant, and the incident occurred down the road after the bar staff member left the venue.
- Repeated reference to the venue being linked to an attempted murder was inaccurate and damaging.
- Allegations of prostitution and drugs at the Newmarket Ale House were unfounded, with a no evidence being uncovered following the execution of a search warrant.
- The burglary allegation was uninvestigated, and the applicant had spoken to the tenant and found no attempted burglary.
- Immigration concerns were addressed by the applicant providing right-to-work documents, and the issue subsequently disappeared before the review hearing.
- The police submission failed the legal test for reliance on evidence under the Licencing Act 2003 and Section 182 guidance, as it was not relevant, evidence-based, specific to the premises, or capable of demonstrating a real risk to the licencing objective.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

- The applicant had demonstrated good management, provided requested information, and that the Simmons premises had operated for six weeks without concerns brought to his attention from responsible authorities or residents.
- The Licensing Consultant had been employed to actively support the applicant to ensure compliance, though not as the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) but to advise and ensure measures were in place.
- A transfer application was not a review or a character test but solely to ensure the licence holder could uphold licencing objectives with his management team.
- The police objection was factually inaccurate, legally flawed, unsupported by evidence, and misleading, whereas the applicant had demonstrated compliance, responsible management, transparency, and cooperation.

Responding to questions, the applicant and his representative set out their views as follows:

- The Kiss the Sky, Crouch End premises Licence was revoked by the local authority and upheld by the Magistrates' Court. The applicant taken over the venue over during the Covid-19 Pandemic, and complaints largely pre-dated the applicant's tenure, with two neighbours complaining constantly despite a petition of 5,000 signatures supporting the venue.
- The Newmarket Ale House tenancy was cancelled by the Landlord. The Police had contacted the Landlord regarding "unfounded" allegations of prostitution and drugs, which had led to an abrupt lease termination.
- Kiss the Sky, 11-13 Camden High Street was reviewed in December 2024 following a stabbing incident, which had resulted in additional conditions. The alleged perpetrator of the stabbing incident was not related to the venue and was acquitted.
- A second review of the 11-13 Camden High Street premises in May 2025 led to a six-week licence suspension due to immigration and other matters.
- "Paperwork breaches" and other compliance mistakes had taken place but were corrected and consultants employed to improve compliance.
- The immigration issue was unfounded, as all necessary documents had been provided, and that the review had focused on breaches rather than the immigration issue.
- Repeated mention of the stabbing incident was not justified given the acquittal in the criminal case and the declaration of self-defence.
- The immigration issue should never have led to review as it was unfounded.
- The repeated mention of attempted murder and the alleged burglary was untrue and distasteful and could cause the Applicant significant commercial damage.
- Paul Richards had been appointed as a licencing consultant and would be employing a permanent compliance officer for both venues, provided weekly event rosters to the police, had SIA staff every weekend, and was in communication with neighbours to manage noise. He also stated he had a licencing consultant for several months prior to Paul Richards being employed.
- The applicant had started operating premises in 2021.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

- Regarding the Ask for Angela conditions, there had been a few incidents where staff helped vulnerable individuals (e.g. a drunk girl needing water or the toilet), but these individuals did not explicitly use "Ask for Angela." Internal records of such incidents were kept and there had been "at least a few" occasions of such instances.
- WAVE training had been planned for staff and door supervisors, and it was intended that a safe area within the premises be established.
- The Licensing Consultant had been employed to ensure compliance with licence conditions and promote all four licencing objectives. Efforts had already been made to improve record keeping, including staff training, SIA registers, and other comprehensive documentation.

A Panel member clarified whether the alleged perpetrator of the stabbing incident had been independent of the premises, as the applicant had stated, as there was an indication that they could have been linked to the premises as a Door Supervisor.

PC Chris Malone confirmed that evidence indicated that licensing officers had attended the venue a few weeks before the stabbing incident and had identified the alleged perpetrator working as a doorman. The stabbing incident was considered directly connected to the premises, as it involved individuals associated with the venue, including the doorman and a member of bar staff. As evidence also indicated that a female bar worker had been assaulted inside the venue by two individuals who were subsequently stabbed. It was reported that the female member of bar staff had approached the off-duty doorman who was sat in a vehicle, and then the stabbing had taken place further down the road, where the individual identified as a doorman had stabbed the two males.

PC Chris Malone also confirmed that immigration had informed the Police Responsible Authority they could not issue enforcement regarding the previous immigration issue because the company controlling the venue at the time went into liquidation. The Panel had not previously been provided with this information as the Police were only informed after recent follow up on this issue.

The Panel sought clarification on the legal basis for considering outcomes of criminal charges. The Legal Adviser clarified that the Panel should consider the effect on licencing objectives and any relevant previous history or reviews. Criminal charges provide background, but the outcomes of any reviews are directly relevant. Furthermore, an acquittal in a criminal does not prevent a factual finding on the civil standard (balance of probabilities).

The Responsible Authority made some closing remarks.

The Applicant made some closing remarks.

Deliberation and Reasons

Panel Members confirmed that they had been able to follow and understand the submissions and discussion in relation to the application for transfer of a premises licence in respect of Simmons (known as Kiss), 7 Camden High Street, NW1 7JE.

In deliberation, the Panel noted the representations and the information provided by the Police Responsible Authority and the Applicant. The Panel reminded itself that the options were to grant the transfer if the crime and disorder objective would not be undermined, or to reject it if it may be undermined, with no middle ground for applying conditions.

A Panel Member stated that the objection by the Metropolitan Police was properly brought and should be upheld by the panel and believed, based on the evidence provided and the discussion at the hearing, the transfer should be refused.

The Panel Member further stated that the circumstances of this particular application were exceptional due to the applicant's poor record over recent years and that the applicant was not a fit licence holder. This assessment was based on factual determinations, not unproven matters, including:

- The closure of a premises in another borough in 2021/22.
- Responsible Authority and other agency involvement and landlord-initiated closure of another premises.
- Two reviews within the last 18 months (late 2024 and 2025).
- The suggestion that issues at 11-13 Camden High Street were merely "paperwork difficulties," should be rejected, given that there was a failure to call the police for serious crime, employment of staff without immigration checks, failure to hand over proper CCTV, and not proactively assisting police investigations.
- There had been two reviews in relation to the Kiss/ Kiss the Sky premises at 11 – 13 Camden High Street (where the licence was surrendered), and one review so far at The Camden with another pending.

On the balance of probabilities, the Panel Member found the applicant fundamentally undermined the crime prevention objective as a licence holder.

Another Panel Members stated agreement and despite wanting to maintain an open mind regarding the applicant's position, they were not convinced that the applicant was a responsible licence holder. In addition to the more serious issues highlighted, other issues such as paperwork and record keeping were noted as important, and the applicant had been unable to do this to a satisfactory standard.

The Panel Member also expressed concern that the applicant seemed to imply their responsibility as a premises owner was not licencing, as upholding the terms of the licence was a core responsibility for any licence holder and premises owner. Whilst there had been some potentially unfortunate circumstances, they had seemed to occur soon after every licence was granted or premises acquired.

The Chair agreed with the Panel, whilst acknowledging that a refusal would be disruptive and disheartening for the applicant. The Chair suggested that a fresh application, allowing for a comprehensive review of appropriate conditions, might be a better path forward.

Licensing Panel B - Thursday, 11th June, 2026

The Chair also highlighted that the applicant's discussion of events had involved a "gross minimisation of what had taken place" which was concerning and disappointing to the Panel.

Overall, Panel Members agreed that, considering all evidence provided and the information discussed during the course of the hearing, the prevention of crime licensing objective would be undermined by granting the transfer of the premises licence.

Therefore, it was

RESOLVED –

THAT the application for the transfer of a premises licence under section 42 of the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of Simmons, 7 Camden High Street, London NW1 7JE (known as Kiss) be refused.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There was none.

The hearing ended at 10.06 pm.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Rebecca Timoney

Telephone No: 020 7974 8543

E-Mail: licensing.committee@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END