

Application No:	17/01654/FUL
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 4 attached to planning permission 09/00622/FUL (Use of part of hotel as restaurant/coffee shop, formation of parking areas (retrospective), decking area including hot tub (retrospective) and re-roofing of conservatory in slate (re-submission)) to allow 60 covers within the restaurant
Location:	The Old Vicarage Boutique Hotel, Westgate, Southwell, Nottinghamshire, NG25 0NB
Applicant:	Mrs S Fitzpatrick
Registered:	13 September 2017 Target Date: 8 November 2017 Extension of time agreed until: 8 December 2017

This application is presented to the Planning Committee because the application to which this Section 73 planning application relates was determined by Planning Committee in 2009. Condition 4 was proposed by Members and as such it is considered appropriate for Members to determine this application.

The Site

The application site lies within the Conservation Area and the main built up area of Southwell and comprises a two-storey building (now a hotel) that presumably was once the Vicarage for Holy Trinity Church, which was erected in 1844. The building is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset which has been extended over time and is set within substantial grounds. Its presumed link to the listed church also gives it additional local historical interest.

The property has an authorised use for hotel (8 rooms) and restaurant/coffee shop (30 covers).

The building is set some distance back from the main highway with access and parking predominantly in front of the building. IT is situated within residential development, with dwellings to the north, east and west of the site; these dwellings are screened by fencing and established vegetation.

Relevant Planning History

14/02065/FUL - Erection of gazebo. Approved

13/01029/FUL - Change of Use from former Barn to Staff Accommodation and Erection of Two Storey and Single Storey Extensions to Rear (Amendment to 10/00639/FUL). Approved.

10/00639/FUL - Change of use from former barn to staff accommodation and erection of two storey extension to rear. Approved.

09/00972/ADV - Display of non-illuminated fibreglass advertising sign on pole legs at site entrance. Refused.

09/00622/FUL - Use of part of hotel as restaurant/coffee shop, formation of parking areas (retrospective), decking area including hot tub (retrospective) and re-roofing of conservatory in slate (re-submission). Approved.

Conditions attached to this current permission state:

- 1 The restaurant and coffee shop use hereby permitted shall not be open to non hotel residents between the hours of 2400 and 0800.
- 2 The access and parking arrangements as constructed shall be made available at all times the restaurant/coffee shop is operational.
- 3 There shall be no consumption of food on the outside decking area hereby permitted between the hours of 1900 and 0700.
- 4 The restaurant use hereby permitted shall provide no more than 30 covers for dinners at any one time.

08/02300/FUL - Use of part of hotel as restaurant/coffee shop, formation of parking areas (retrospective), decking area including hot tub (retrospective) and re-roofing of conservatory in slate (retrospective). Refused.

08/00696/FUL - Change of use from residential dwelling to a guesthouse. Approved.

The Proposal

The proposal seeks full planning permission to vary condition 4 of the original permission, considered and approved in 2009 which permitted part of the hotel to be used as a restaurant/coffee shop. Condition 4 currently states:

The restaurant use hereby permitted shall provide no more than 30 covers for dinners at any one time.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents and to reflect the applicant's specific intentions.

The proposal seeks to increase this number to 60 to allow the restaurant to serve the same maximum number of guests as the hotel's active ceremonies licence allows. No increase in venue size is proposed.

A plan has been submitted showing 29 on-site parking spaces being provided (including 3 designated staff spaces).

Public Advertisement Procedure

Occupiers of 30 neighbouring properties were individually notified by letter. A site notice has also been posted close to the site and an advert placed in the local press.

Planning Policy Framework

The Development Plan

Newark and Sherwood District Council Core Strategy DPD (adopted March 2011)

Spatial Policy 1: Settlement Hierarchy

Spatial Policy 2: Spatial Distribution of Growth

Core Policy 6: Shaping our Employment Profile

Core Policy 7 : Tourism Development

Core Policy 9: Sustainable Design

Core Policy 14: Historic Environment

SoAP 1: Role and Setting of Southwell

Allocations & Development Management DPD

Policy DM5: Design

Policy DM9: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Southwell Neighbourhood Plan (2016)

Policy CF4 – Tourism

Policy HE4 – Economic Development and Employment

Policy TA4 – Parking Standards

Other Material Planning Considerations

- Southwell Conservation Area Appraisal 2006
- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Consultations

Southwell Town Council –*object to this proposal for the following reasons:*

- *increased noise pollution to neighbouring properties*
- *a proposed parking space is directly over tree no 10*
- *the council request the clarification of the application as there are various number for different events*

- *The condition was originally applied to protect the neighbouring properties and the council request reassurance the present condition of 30 covers is enforced.*

NCC Highways – *This proposal is for the variation of condition no. 4 of planning permission 09/00622/FUL to increase the number of covers within the restaurant from 30 to 60. The number of parking spaces is to be increased from 17 to 29 and it is recommended that these be clearly delineated within the site to maximise the available space.*

The Design and Access Statement indicates that the proposed covers served in a 24 hour period will not exceed 60. The agent has confirmed by email dated 1 November that this application is specifically to facilitate the wedding event function.

The information submitted is acceptable and subject to the above, the Highway Authority would not wish to raise objection.

NSDC Environmental Health Officer – *No objection to proposal. There is a history of complaint about these premises. Complaints have been in respect of use of the decking area, music, alleged rowdy behaviour, lighting and fireworks. Following the investigation, no formal enforcement action has been taken in response to these complaints.*

NSDC Licensing Officer – No comments received to date

Southwell Civic Society – *We have no objection to the increase to 60 covers. However in the interest of neighbours and the highway, this should be for functions only and not for everyday restaurant dining.*

We suggest Condition 4 should be amended as follows:-

“The restaurant use hereby permitted shall provide no more than 30 covers for dinners at any one time except for functions when up to 60 covers may be permitted.”

13 letters of representation from local residents have been received, 8 in support and 5 objecting. The points raised are detailed below,

Objections raised were:

- Noise pollution and potential disruption to neighbouring properties. Current situation causes issues
- Insufficient car parking has resulted in guests parking on the road in front of neighbouring properties
- Impact upon trees as a result of additional parking spaces.

Supporting comments include:

- The hotel provides tourism and employment to Southwell

- Removal of the condition would help the local business to progress further
- Supports nearby businesses such as hairdressers
- The proposal would allow only 60 guests all day at a function rather than guests coming and going throughout the day

Comments of the Business Manager for Growth and Regeneration

Principle of Development

An application under Section 73 (variation of condition) is in effect a fresh planning application but should be determined in full acknowledgement that an existing permission exists on the site. This Section provides a different procedure for such applications for planning permission and requires the decision maker to consider only the question of the conditions subject to which planning permission was granted. As such, the principle of the restaurant within the hotel is accepted and has been implemented and therefore cannot be revisited as part of this application.

The application seeks to vary condition 4 of the planning approval for use of part of the hotel for a restaurant/café which refers to a restriction upon the number of covers allowed in the restaurant at any one time; this limit is currently 30 people. The amendment sought would vary the condition to allow the number of covers within the restaurant to be increased to a maximum of 60, which the applicant has stated is the same maximum number of people their licence allows for wedding attendance at the hotel.

The approved planning policies are set out in the Planning Policy Framework section above. This includes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These policies indicate that the District Council will support amendments subject to an assessment of site specific issues.

Impact on the Character of the Area

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Policy CP14 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM9 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD requires continued preservation and enhancement of heritage assets. Local planning authorities need to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. DM5 of the DPD states that local distinctiveness should be reflected in the scale, form, mass, layout, design and materials in new development.

As a building of local interest, the building is considered to contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 137/138 of the NPPF goes on to say that Local Planning Authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas to enhance or better reveal their significance.

Section 72 requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. In this context, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm. The courts have said that these statutory requirements operate as a paramount consideration, 'the first consideration for a decision maker'.

The principle of the use of part of the building as a restaurant/café has already been established within the original 2009 application. This application does not seek to alter the external appearance of the building, nor the overall use and as such is not likely to have an adverse impact upon the character of the area; furthermore this application does not seek to alter outdoor accommodation/facilities for guests.

The application has been accompanied by a site layout plan indicating the car parking layout and landscaping. Members will note that this differs from the layout plan submitted with the 2009 planning application. However, the applicant has advised that the current layout of the site (as shown in the submitted plan with this application) was constructed on the advice of the Tree Officer's advice during the 2009 application and was constructed at the time of the previous Officer's visit and that of the Planning Committee. Unfortunately the LPA does not have any record of photographs taken of this layout in 2009, nor an updated layout plan to show the amendments made since the application was made; the applicant has provided some photographs of the site during construction but these do not clearly show the whole site. I also note that the number of parking spaces accommodated on the site in 2009 were shown on two plans, one showing 17 spaces and one showing 20 spaces, although the 2009 permission did not condition a plan.

No changes to the site layout are proposed from that currently existing on the site, however should Members be minded to approve the application, I would suggest that a condition tying the new planning permission to the submitted layout plan through varying condition 2 of the 2009 permission to ensure that the site is retained as existing. This will also ensure that the parking spaces are retained, as discussed below in the Highway Safety section of this report.

I am mindful that the application only seeks to vary condition 4, however the LPA does have control to add, vary or remove other conditions under a Section 73 application if they consider it appropriate to do so to enable the proposed changes to be acceptable. In this instance, it is felt that variation of condition 2 is required to ensure that the permission is tied to the additional parking spaces provided on site; fewer spaces is likely to raise a highway objection which is discussed in the Highway Safety Section below.

In terms of the car park's impact upon the character of the area, the area to the front of the building is gravelled which presents a less harsh surface that complements the building. Vegetation and trees break up the hard surfacing and also significantly screen the site from the public realm; the parking areas are not overly prominent from the street, set back from the public highway, and cannot be easily viewed unless looking through the railings along the site's boundary. I am mindful that 29 cars parked in front of the hotel would be visible to an extent from the street, although the maximum number is likely to only be parked during weddings and therefore not on a daily basis and in any event, the site is well-screened from the highway which

limits the site's overall impact upon the character of the area. The trees screening the site are also protected by a tree preservation order and therefore consent would be required for their removal, adding additional control for the local planning authority over the future appearance of the site.

As such I am satisfied that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved in accordance with Section 72 of the 1990 Act and that the proposal is in compliance with Core Policy 14 and Policies DM 9 and 5 of the Allocations and Development Management DPD.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Policy DM5 of the Council's DPD requires new development to respect the amenities of the surrounding land uses to ensure that there is no adverse impact by virtue of overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing issues.

The 2009 application raised concern from both local residents during the consultation period and Members when the application was discussed at Planning Committee. These concerns were mostly relating to noise from the hotel during events which was disturbing the neighbouring properties and I understand that this was the reason for limiting the original permission to a maximum of 30 covers, so as to limit the noise originating from the site.

Regardless of the number of covers the restaurant can provide, Condition 3 would remain in place to prevent diners using the outside decking area for eating beyond 1900 and its relative size would also provide a natural limit to numbers and the intensity of the use of this external space. It may also be helpful for Members to review the comments made by the Officer in 2009,

In assessing the impact arising from activity on the decking area I consider it is firstly necessary to set this within the context of the impact that could arise from the operation of the hotel without a restaurant open to the public and the terms of the premises licence.

If the hotel was occupied to capacity this could result in approximately 16 residents dining on the decking area. The hotel could also legitimately hold functions such as weddings which could generate many more people on the decking and within the gardens. Conditions attached to the premises licence prevent outdoor drinking between 2300 and 0700, prevent any regulated entertainment at all outside and require doors and windows to be closed when regulated entertainment takes place indoors between 2300 and 0700. Further conditions also require any noise arising from regulated entertainment not to give reasonable cause for annoyance to the occupiers of any nearby residential property and that the hot tub shall not be used or available for use during any function attended by non-residents.

I consider that the conditions attached to the premises licence adequately deal with the impacts arising from the normal use of the hotel and its use for functions. The impacts that require assessing through this application are therefore the potential noise and disturbance arising from non-residents using the decking area and in particular for dining, as only outdoor drinking and not

dining is covered by the premises licence. I have estimated the capacity of the decking at approximately 20 people, and if this were occupied by 16 hotel guests, it leaves the impact of approximately 5 extra people to assess. On balance, I do not consider that this would give rise to a significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents. As outdoor dining is not controlled by the premises licence I consider it would be reasonable to control this by planning condition.

A copy of the premises licence is attached at the end of this report, for information.

Similar concerns have been raised during the process of this Section 73 application and Members will note that the internal Environmental Health Officer has referenced complaints received regarding noise, although none of the complaints have resulted in enforcement action being taken against the hotel following investigation and they raise no objection to this proposal.

I am mindful that the hotel and restaurant will create additional noise during events however the current conditions imposed on the permission allows for an unlimited number of restaurant sittings within a 24 hour period so long as no more than 30 people are at each sitting; this could in effect provide substantial noise disturbance to neighbouring properties throughout the day; the proposed increase to 60 covers could be controlled to ensure that is the maximum number in a 24 hour period should Members be minded to approve the application, thus limiting the number of diners on site each day. Further to this, condition 3 of the 2009 permission restricts eating outdoors between the hours of 7pm and 7am; this condition is not proposed to be altered.

In terms of increasing the number of covers within the restaurant, I acknowledge the concerns raised and appreciate that this could be viewed likely to increase noise emanating from the site. However, I am aware that the current licences held by the hotel allow 60 guests to attend a wedding at the venue which is no greater in number than the variation to condition 4 sought; the alignment of numbers will aid the hotel in management of guests and will not encourage additional numbers of guests visiting the hotel at any one time as this is controlled through both planning permission and wedding licences held by the hotel.

Additionally, conditions will remain restricting outdoor eating and I understand the hotel must also accord with a licence preventing outdoor drinking between 11pm and 7am, which I would expect to limit overall noise late at night.

On the basis of the above, I consider the increase of covers within the restaurant to 60 is acceptable in terms of residential amenity and accords with Policy DM5.

Impact upon Highway Safety

Policy DM5 is explicit in stating that provision should be made for safe and inclusive access to new development whilst Spatial Policy 7 encourages proposals which place an emphasis on non-car modes as a means of access to services and facilities.

The submitted plan reflecting the existing scenario shows 29 parking spaces provided on site (including 3 designated staff spaces). I note the comments received from local residents with regards to parking along Westgate. There are reasonable transport connections for Southwell and as such it is expected that some guests may use public transport rather than drive to the venue. However, parking layout was discussed as part of the 2009 Officer Report and I consider it appropriate to highlight their commentary to Members,

The parking layout as submitted and constructed contains a greater number of spaces than the previous proposal and consequently satisfies the Highway Authority. Members will be aware that in the interests of sustainability, maximum rather than minimum parking standards are now applied, and in this case some weight has to be given to the site's location within a sustainable settlement, where it is not necessary to access the site by car. I note objectors concerns over the apparent inadequacy of these arrangements arising from their use, but do not consider that they override the Highway Authority's conclusion.

The parking layout as constructed has no spaces under the canopy spread of the protected tree and therefore avoids any potential for harm. Whilst the removal of the trees on the grassed island was unauthorized and unfortunate, it cannot be remedied through the consideration of this application. There is a requirement to replant equivalent trees elsewhere in the site as part of the process relating to removal of trees within a conservation area.

No specific plan was conditioned as part of this permission, although condition 2 states that *'The access and parking arrangements as constructed shall be made available at all times the restaurant/coffee shop is operational'*. A plan showing increased parking availability from that shown on the plans submitted with the 2009 application has been submitted which whilst increasing the number of spaces from that referred to in 2009, does not appear to significantly increase the level of hardstanding within the site. I am mindful that there is no plan condition on the original permission and therefore cannot be varied to reference this plan. However, as already discussed above, the applicant is of the view that the site layout is as constructed prior to the determination of the 2009 application and as there was no specific plan condition, the LPA have no approved plan to tie this to.

Concern has also been raised with regards to the impact of parking arrangements upon surrounding trees; it is difficult for the LPA to control parking over the grassed areas where many of the trees are located. I have however sought guidance from the Council's Tree Officer who has advised new hard surfacing should only cover 20% of tree rooting area and construction should be no dig with porous surfacing. Whilst we cannot control existing hardsurfacing within the site, I note that the surface is mostly gravel which is porous and therefore less harmful to tree roots. This of course can be controlled through a planning application for additional hardstanding, if required.

The Highways Authority have been consulted on the application and have advised that they have no objections to the proposal and welcome the increased number of parking spaces from that commented on in 2009. The Highways Officer has recommended that the spaces are marked out, which whilst ideal may be difficult given the existing gravel surface without partially resurfacing

the parking area, which may in turn have an adverse impact upon the character of the site if more hardstanding was introduced. Having spoken to the Highway Officer, I am satisfied that the marking of bays is not essential and in not doing so would not raise a highway objection; their advice was simply to ensure that the applicant could maximise the use of the available space by designating spaces rather than leaving visitors to park as they felt appropriate, thus reducing the likelihood of overspill of parked cars onto the public highway.

As mentioned earlier in the report, the applicant has sought only to vary condition 4 of 09/00922/FUL, however the LPA have the control to vary, add or remove conditions imposed upon a Section 73 application as they feel appropriate and according to the changes sought by the applicant. In this instance, the proposed increase in covers at the restaurant has the potential to require additional parking and whilst I am mindful of the number of guests the existing wedding licence for the property allows in attendance (the licence of which does not need planning permission) however this application is the first opportunity the LPA has had to control the parking arrangements for 60 guests attending the venue since the 2009 permission.

In this instance I consider it appropriate to vary condition 2 to ensure that the 29 parking spaces shown on the submitted plan are retained, and having seen the Highways Officer's advice, this number of parking spaces is acceptable for the increased number of guests for the restaurant; retaining the reduced number of 17 spaces considered under the 2009 application is likely to raise an objection from the Highway Authority as they do not consider 17 spaces would be sufficient for the increased number of guests. Therefore, the 29 parking spaces shown on the submitted plan in my view are required to enable the new proposal to operate safely from a highways perspective and therefore the variation of condition 2 along with condition 4 is not unreasonable in this case.

On the basis of the above, I am satisfied that the proposal will not have an adverse impact upon highway safety, although I would recommend that should Members be minded to concur with this conclusion, a varied condition 2 (from that appended to 09/00922/FUL) is imposed to ensure the existing parking and access is retained in accordance with the submitted plan.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

The application seeks to vary condition 4 of planning permission 09/00622/FUL to allow for 60 covers at any one time within a 24 hour period in the restaurant of The Old Vicarage Boutique Hotel as opposed to the current 30 permitted. It is considered that the variation of this condition would enable the planning permission to accord with the existing wedding licence held by the hotel and as a result is unlikely to substantially increase the number of guests attending an event from those visiting under current arrangements. This in turn is considered unlikely to have an adverse impact upon neighbour amenity, with parking arrangements also considered appropriate through condition.

To this end, it is recommended to Members that condition 4 is varied to be worded as follows,

The restaurant use hereby permitted shall provide no more than 60 covers for dinners at any one time within a 24 hour period.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents and to reflect the applicant's specific intentions.

Additionally, condition 2 should be varied to read as follows,

The access and parking arrangements shall be retained in accordance with plan reference 17VBH – 001 (dated 08.09.2017) and shall be made available at all times the restaurant/coffee shop is operational.

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring residents.

RECOMMENDATION

That full planning permission is granted, subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

01

The restaurant and coffee shop use hereby permitted shall not be open to non-hotel residents between the hours of 2400 and 0800.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents.

02

The access and parking arrangements shall be retained in accordance with plan reference 17VBH – 001 (dated 08.09.2017) and shall be made available at all times the restaurant/coffee shop is operational.

Reason: for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of highway safety and the amenities of neighbouring residents.

03

There shall be no consumption of food on the outside decking area hereby permitted between the hours of 1900 and 0700.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents.

04

The restaurant use hereby permitted shall provide no more than 60 covers for dinners at any one time within a 24 hour period.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents and to reflect the applicant's specific intentions.

Notes to Applicant

01

The application as submitted is acceptable. In granting permission without unnecessary delay the District Planning Authority is implicitly working positively and proactively with the applicant. This is fully in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 (as amended).

02

The applicant is advised that all planning permissions granted on or after the 1st December 2011 may be subject to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website at www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk/cil/

The proposed development has been assessed and it is the Council's view that CIL is not payable on the development given that there is no net additional increase of floorspace as a result of the development.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Application case file.

For further information, please contact Nicolla Ellis on ext 5833.

All submission documents relating to this planning application can be found on the following website www.newark-sherwooddc.gov.uk.

Kirsty Cole
Deputy Chief Executive

**Kelham Hall, Newark, Notts, NG23 5QX
Premises Licence**

Premises licence number 001415

Part 1 – Premises details

Postal address of premises, or if none, ordnance survey map reference or description The Old Vicarage Boutique Hotel Westhorpe			
Post town	Southwell	Post code	NG25 0NB
Telephone number	01636-815989		

Where the licence is time limited the dates Not applicable
--

- | |
|--|
| <p>Licensable activities authorised by the licence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Regulated Entertainment<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. The performance of playsb. The exhibition of filmsc. Indoor sporting eventsd. The provision of live musice. The provision of recorded musicf. Performances of danceg. Anything of a similar description to that falling within d, e or fh. The provision of facilities for making musici. The provision of facilities for dancingj. Anything of a similar description to that falling within h or i2. Late night refreshment3. The supply of alcohol |
|--|

<p>The times the licence authorises the carrying out of licensable activities</p> <p>A Standard Times All licensable activities other than late night refreshment Monday to Sunday – 09:00 to 00:00 Late night refreshment Monday to Sunday – 23:00 to 05:00 the following day</p> <p>B Non Standard Times All licensable activities other than late night refreshment 1st January – 00:01 to 00:00 The supply of alcohol to residents of the hotel and their bona fide guests Monday to Sunday – 00:01 to 00:00</p>
--

<p>The opening hours of the premises Monday to Sunday – 00:01 to 00:00</p>

<p>Where the licence authorises supplies of alcohol whether these are on and/or off supplies Both on and off the premises</p>
--

Part 2

Name, (registered) address, telephone number and e-mail (where relevant) of holder of premises licence

Mrs Suzanne Edgington
The Old Vicarage
Westhorpe
Southwell
Notts
NG25 0NB
Tel: 01636-815989

Registered number of holder, for example company number, charity number (where applicable)

Not applicable

Name, address and telephone number of designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorises the supply of alcohol

Mrs Suzanne Edgington

Tel: 01636-815989

Personal licence number and issuing authority of personal licence held by designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorises the supply of alcohol

001406
Newark & Sherwood District Council

Annex 1 - Mandatory conditions

- 1 No alcohol may be supplied under this Licence:
 - a at any time when there is no Designated Premises Supervisor in respect of these Premises; or
 - b at any time when the Designated Premises Supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his/her personal licence is suspended
- 2 Every supply of alcohol under this licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence
- 3 Admission of children (i.e. persons under the age of 18 years) to any exhibition of film must be restricted in accordance with any certificate and/or recommendation relating to that film made by the British Board of Film Classification

Annex 2 - Conditions consistent with the Operating Schedule

1. No sales of alcohol shall be made to any person apparently under the age of 18 unless an acceptable proof of age is produced. Acceptable proof of age shall be a valid passport, photo driving licence or a card bearing the PASS logo. Additional acceptable forms of identification may be notified to the Licence Holder from time to time.
2. There shall be no consumption of drinks between 2300 and 0700 in any of the outside areas.
3. When Regulated Entertainments are taking place all doors and windows shall remain closed between 2300 and 0700 save for entry and exit to the premises.
4. Any noise produced, or associated with, regulated Entertainment shall not give reasonable cause for annoyance to the occupiers of any nearby residential property.

5. There shall be no regulated entertainment outdoors.

Annex 3 - Conditions attached after a hearing by the licensing authority

The hot tub shall not be used or available for use during any function attended by non-residents

Annex 4 – Plans

Attached

Committee Plan - 17/01654/FUL

