
CENTRAL LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE 24.06.09

Present: Councillors W.Tudor Owen (Chair); Bob Anderson; Ieuan Roberts.

Also Present: Sion Huws (Propriety Officer), Amlyn ab Iorwerth (Licensing Manager) and Barbara Owen (Committee Officer).

Others invited to the meeting:

Applicants: Ms Cheryl Wright and Mr. Jonathan Wittle (on behalf of Bangor University)

Objectors: Dr and Mrs Barnes; Mr and Mrs Goodwin

Local Member: Councillor Keith Marshall

Apologies: Councillor J.R.Jones

1. APPLICATION TO VARY THE PREMISES LICENCE FOR BAR UNO, FFRIDDOEDD ROAD, BANGOR

Submitted – the report of the Licensing Manager providing details on an application by the manager of Bar UNO, Ffriddoedd Road, Bangor to vary the current premises licence to permit the sale of alcohol with food to members of the public, i.e. to delete condition a) in Appendix 2 on the original licence (*'Access shall be restricted to staff, students and visitors to the University of Wales Bangor only'*). It was reported that a letter had been received from the Police stating that they did not object to the application; emails from Trading Standards and the Council's Planning Department stating that they had no observations and letters from nearby residents objecting on grounds of noise nuisance and concerns regarding an increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic owing to people returning home during the early hours. He also referred to the request to vary the time during which recorded music may be played so that the permitted hours would be consistent every day.

In considering the application, the following procedure was followed:

Members of the Sub-committee were given an opportunity to ask questions of the Council's representative.

The applicant was invited to ask questions of the Council's representative.

Each consultee was invited to support any written observations.

The applicant was given the opportunity to expand on his application and call witnesses.

Members of the Sub-committee were invited to ask questions of the applicant.

The Council's representative and the applicant were given the opportunity to summarise their case.

When taking advantage of the opportunity to support his written observations, Dr Barnes (one of the objectors) expressed his concern regarding the application and stated that the noise outside his home was horrendous on many nights of the week during the academic term. He

stated that customers left the premises past Ffriddoedd Road and Menai Drive, which was a residential area, although there had been some improvement recently in traffic management as a result of work done by the university. He reported that he had complained to Security Staff, the Police and the Environmental Health Department on numerous occasions following incidents of affray and public nuisance but that he had not received a response. He stated that he wanted to see a reduction in the hours of the licence, but it was explained that it was not possible to reduce the hours of a licence except in a review.

Mrs Goodwin (another objector to the application) added her observations and explained that she also had complained to the police on numerous occasions regarding the noise created by people leaving the premises, which often continued until 3.00am. She reported that she had been given to understand that an additional 1,000 students would be coming to the area in the future and that this raised concerns of even more noise in the Bar UNO area as a result of taxi vehicles, lorries unloading and empty bottle collections. In response to a question, she confirmed that no music noise carried from the building.

In support of the application, the applicant reported that the purpose of the application was to enable the public to come into the premises to eat a meal with alcoholic beverages if they so wished. In no way did he propose to see the premises being run as a public house. He added that only one complaint had been received relating to noise and disorder, i.e. on the evening on the Annual University Ball, and that it was not clear that those responsible were customers of Bar UNO. Also, he was not aware of any proposal to establish a Student's Union on the site.

The University was supportive to the application, and the Day Manager confirmed that the proposal was to establish a restaurant with a relaxed atmosphere for meeting socially rather than a bar solely for drinking. He reported that controls were in place in relation to entry for students and their guests, and that the public would not be granted entry except for dining. He added that management had arranged a meeting with the neighbours to discuss any concerns, and that this would take place regularly in the future.

In response to a question, the applicant stated that usually there were no more than 300 customers in the premises at weekends, and that arrangements were made for security staff to be on duty during special events when great numbers of customers were expected to attend.

The applicants, Police representatives, Licensing Manager, local member and objectors left the meeting and the application was discussed by members of the Sub-committee who gave consideration to all the evidence submitted and addressed specifically the principles of the act, namely:

- Crime and Disorder Prevention
- Public Safety
- Public Nuisance Prevention
- Protection of Children from Harm

On the whole, members were in favour of approving the application, although one member expressed concern that those refused entry might create a public nuisance, but it was accepted that it was not possible to foresee such a situation.

RESOLVED to approve the application as follows:

- a) **To vary the time during which recorded music is permitted (Paragraph F) to 08.30 until 01.00 hours**
- b) **To approve entry to members of the public to eat meals from the menu**
- c) **To approve the sale of alcohol (Paragraph M) to members of the public but only when served with a meal from the menu**

The Propriety Officer reported that a letter would be sent to all those who participated in the meeting within a week confirming the decision of the Sub-committee, and informing them of the right to appeal against the decision within three weeks of the date of that letter.

The meeting commenced at 10.30am and concluded at 11.45am.