

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 27 June 2013

PRESENT: Councillors Clive Skelton (Chair), John Robson, Philip Wood and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1982 - SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUES - SPEARMINT RHINO, 60 BROWN STREET, S1 2BS

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application for the renewal of a sexual entertainment venue licence, made under Section 10 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, in respect of premises known as Spearmint Rhino, 60 Brown Street, Sheffield S1 2BS.

4.2 At the commencement of the hearing, all parties were invited to attend. The Chair outlined the procedure intended to be followed. He stated that this procedure is set out in Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 at Section 10, to assist those attending such hearings and it was the intention of the Sub-Committee to hold the meeting in two parts. Part One would be open to the objectors who would be invited to outline their objections, after such, the Chair would close that element of the hearing, the objectors would be asked to leave the room and the applicants would then be invited to attend the hearing and present their case. The Chair also stated that the decision would be given orally to both parties at the conclusion of the meeting.

4.3 Present at the meeting for Part One of the hearing were Andrew Ridge, Head of Property, Strategy and Services, Sheffield Hallam University (objector), Matthew Shaw (Solicitor for the objector), Andy Ruston (Senior Licensing Officer), Louise Slater (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and Jennie Skiba (Democratic Services).

4.4 Andy Ruston presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that an objection to the application had been received and was attached to the report at Appendix B.

- 4.5 Matthew Shaw outlined the main objections to the application. He stated that the premises are situated in a very high traffic area for students of Sheffield Hallam University with an abundance of student accommodation nearby and a new development for student accommodation immediately adjacent to the premises. He added that the University had spent considerable resources to ensure students felt safe and secure during their time at the University and when moving around the Campus.
- 4.6 Matthew Shaw commented that the venue falls within the Cultural Industries Quarter (CIQ) and that the venue portrays the area in an anti-social light which was not conducive to the setting of the CIQ, with the perception of crime being induced in some people who use the area including when walking past the club. He stated that the presence of a club in the heart of the CIQ was inappropriate with the focus of the area being arts, media and education mixed with the City's industrial heritage. He added that the area is designed to attract new, emerging businesses but this type of club was no longer appropriate in the area. Sheffield's train station and transport interchange were close to the venue which provided a gateway to and from the city centre.
- 4.7 Matthew Shaw produced a map and highlighted an area of open space which the University hoped to develop as an area where festivals and similar events could be held.
- 4.8 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, Andrew Ridge stated that around 150 students were accommodated near the premises with a further 200 students located further along the road. He said that parts of the University Campus are set aside for student worship.
- 4.9 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was closed to the objectors and the meeting was subsequently opened to the applicants.
- 4.10 Present for Part Two of the hearing were Robert Sutherland (Solicitor for the applicants) and John Specht (Vice President of Spearmint Rhino), Andy Ruston (Senior Licensing Officer), Louise Slater (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and Jennie Skiba (Democratic Services).
- 4.11 Louise Slater outlined the procedure which would be following during the hearing.
- 4.12 Andy Ruston presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that an objection to the application had been received and was attached to the report at Appendix B.
- 4.13 Robert Sutherland stated that the application was for a renewal of the first licence, which was granted under the provisions of the Sexual Entertainment Venues Provisions last year. He stated that the objections raised last year were similar and for the same reasons as the objections to this current application. He added that the premises had been operating since 2002, it employed around 50 local people and many of the staff had worked there a long time. He stated that there had been no objections from the responsible Authorities, and no issues of crime

and disorder or public nuisance. He referred to statements submitted to the Sub-Committee last year which revealed that lapdancing clubs do not create anti-social behaviour.

- 4.14 Robert Sutherland then referred to crime statistics for the month of April, 2013, these being the latest figures published. He stated that seven crimes in the area had been reported, with just one crime committed on Brown Street itself. He added that Spearmint Rhino worked closely with students, held student nights, and an advertisement for the Club could be found on the Student Calendar. Following a question from a Member of the Sub-Committee, he confirmed the Company employed students to work in the club.
- 4.15 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, John Specht stated that he could guarantee that dancers would not stand outside the premises as stated by the objectors as this was against company policy but this would be checked with the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS). Robert Sutherland also informed Members that he had checked with the DPS to see if any complaints had been received and the DPS confirmed that no complaints had been received.
- 4.16 In summing up, Robert Sutherland stated that there had been more than 50 objections to the licence last year, this year there was only the one and if the Sub-Committee saw fit to grant the licence last year, there should be no reason not to do so this year.
- 4.17 Andy Ruston then outlined the options open to the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.
- 4.18 RESOLVED: That the applicants and objectors be excluded from the meeting before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted. If those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in Paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 4.19 Louise Slater reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.
- 4.20 At this point in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the applicant and objectors.
- 4.21 RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committee agrees to grant the renewal, for a period of 12 months, of the sexual entertainment venue licence in respect of the premises known as Spearmint Rhino, 60 Brown Street, Sheffield S1 2BS.

This page is intentionally left blank