Public Document Pack

Notice of Meeting

Licensing Panel
Councillors Mandy Brar (Chair), Gurch Singh (Vice-Chair), Clive Baskerville, Kashmir Singh, Genevieve Gosling, Geoff Hill, Neil Knowles, Siân Martin, Sayonara Luxton and Mark Wilson

Monday 12 October 2026 6.00 pm
Council Chamber - Town Hall - Maidenhead & on RBWM YouTube

www.rbwm.gov.uk
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

Agenda

Item	Description	Page
1	**Apologies for Absence** To receive any apologies for absence from Panel Members.	-
2	**Declarations of Interest** To receive any declarations of interest from Panel Members.	3 - 4
3	**Minutes** To consider and approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2026.	5 - 10
4	**Minutes of Licensing and Public Space Protection Order Sub Committees** To consider and note the minutes of the Sub Committees held on the following dates: • 18 February 2026 • 11 March 2026 • 17 March 2026 • 31 March 2026 • 17 April 2026 • 30 April 2026 • 11 May 2026 • 9 July 2026 • 22 July 2026	11 - 54
5	**Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Age Requirements** *Reporting Officer: Greg Nelson - Trading Standards and Licensing Manager* At present, RBWM policies covering how hackney carriages and private hire vehicles are licenced use vehicle age as a main determinant as to whether a vehicle will be licenced. Guidance from government says that local authorities should be moving away from vehicle age and instead should be using vehicle emissions, safety ratings and accessibility as determining factors.	55 - 72

	This report sets out options for changes to RBWM policies to reflect this government guidance and RBWM environment strategy, and seeks the Licensing Panel's endorsement of how this should now be progressed. The Panel are asked to note the report and: i) Agree to adopt the changes to RBWM policies set out in Option 1, subject to the recommended consultation.	
6	**Update to Licensing Act 2003 Policy - Digital Proof of Age** *Reporting Officer: Greg Nelson - Trading Standards and Licensing Manager* New regulations that allow for digital proof of age to be accepted for alcohol sales in licenced premises have come into effect. RBWM policy has been amended accordingly but the Licensing Panel needs to be made aware of this change. The Panel are asked to note the report and: i) Note the change made to RBWM Policy.	73 - 80
7	**Update to Licensing Panel - Revocations Made with Immediate Effect** *Reporting Officer: Greg Nelson - Trading Standards and Licensing Manager* Officers are required to report to the Licensing Panel certain actions taken against RBWM licenced drivers. This report provides the required information. The Panel are asked to note the report and: i) Note the information provided.	81 - 92

By attending this meeting, participants are consenting to the audio & visual recording being permitted and acknowledge that this shall remain accessible in the public domain permanently.

Please contact Kim Moodley, Kim.Moodley@RBWM.gov.uk, with any special requests that you may have when attending this meeting.

Published: Friday 2 October 2026

MEMBERS' GUIDE TO DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

Disclosure at Meetings

If a Member has not disclosed an interest in their Register of Interests, they **must make** the declaration of interest at the beginning of the meeting, or as soon as they are aware that they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Registerable Interest. If a Member has already disclosed the interest in their Register of Interests they are still required to disclose this in the meeting if it relates to the matter being discussed.

Any Member with concerns about the nature of their interest should consult the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Non-participation in case of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)

Where a matter arises at a meeting which directly relates to one of your DPIs (summary below, further details set out in Table 1 of the Members' Code of Conduct) you must disclose the interest, **not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room** unless you have been granted a dispensation. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that you have an interest. Dispensation may be granted by the Monitoring Officer in limited circumstances, to enable you to participate and vote on a matter in which you have a DPI.

Where you have a DPI on a matter to be considered or is being considered by you as a Cabinet Member in exercise of your executive function, you must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest and must not take any steps or further steps in the matter apart from arranging for someone else to deal with it.

DPIs (relating to the Member or their partner) include:

- *Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain.*
- *Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from the council) made to the councillor during the previous 12-month period for expenses incurred by him/her in carrying out his/her duties as a councillor, or towards his/her election expenses*
- *Any contract under which goods and services are to be provided/works to be executed which has not been fully discharged.*
- *Any beneficial interest in land within the area of the council.*
- *Any licence to occupy land in the area of the council for a month or longer.*
- *Any tenancy where the landlord is the council, and the tenant is a body in which the relevant person has a beneficial interest in the securities of.*
- *Any beneficial interest in securities of a body where:*
  a) that body has a place of business or land in the area of the council, and
  b) either (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body ***or*** *(ii) the total nominal value of the shares of any one class belonging to the relevant person exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.*

Any Member who is unsure if their interest falls within any of the above legal definitions should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

Disclosure of Other Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which ***directly relates*** to one of your Other Registerable Interests (summary below and as set out in Table 2 of the Members Code of Conduct), you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (as agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer), you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other Registerable Interests:

a) any unpaid directorships
b) any body of which you are a member or are in a position of general control or management and to which you are nominated or appointed by your authority
c) any body
(i) exercising functions of a public nature
(ii) directed to charitable purposes or
(iii) one of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union)

of which you are a member or in a position of general control or management

Disclosure of Non- Registerable Interests

Where a matter arises at a meeting which ***directly relates*** to your financial interest or well-being (and is not a DPI) or a financial interest or well-being of a relative or close associate, or a body included under Other Registerable Interests in Table 2 you must disclose the interest. **You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting** but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation**. If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer) you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Where a matter arises at a meeting which ***affects*** –

a. your own financial interest or well-being;
b. a financial interest or well-being of a friend, relative, close associate; or
c. a financial interest or well-being of a body included under Other Registerable Interests as set out in Table 2 (as set out above and in the Members' code of Conduct)

you must disclose the interest. In order to determine whether you can remain in the meeting after disclosing your interest the following test should be applied.

Where a matter (referred to in the paragraph above) ***affects*** the financial interest or well-being:

a. to a greater extent than it affects the financial interests of the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision and;
b. a reasonable member of the public knowing all the facts would believe that it would affect your view of the wider public interest

You may speak on the matter only if members of the public are also allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise **must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless you have been granted a dispensation.** If it is a 'sensitive interest' (agreed in advance by the Monitoring Officer, you do not have to disclose the nature of the interest.

Other declarations

Members may wish to declare at the beginning of the meeting any other information they feel should be in the public domain in relation to an item on the agenda; such Member statements will be included in the minutes for transparency.

LICENSING PANEL

Monday 9 February 2026

Present: Councillors Mandy Brar (Chair), Gurch Singh (Vice-Chair), Clive Baskerville, Kashmir Singh, Simon Bond, Genevieve Gosling, Neil Knowles, Siân Martin and Mark Wilson

Also in attendance: Councillor Jack Douglas

Officers: Mark Beeley, Greg Nelson and Amanda Gregory

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hill and Councillor Luxton.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor G Singh stated that he had spoken to drivers about the changes to tariffs but was attending the meeting with an open mind.

Councillor K Singh said that he had been approached by representatives of the Hackney Carriage Drivers Association but also came to the meeting with an open mind.

Minutes

AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 13th October 2025 were approved as a true and accurate record.

Minutes of Licensing and Public Space Protection Order Sub Committees

The Panel noted the minutes of the Licensing and Public Space Protection Order Sub Committee meetings held on 11th December 2025 and 12th January 2026.

Proposed Changes to the RBWM Hackney Carriage Tariff

Greg Nelson, Trading Standards and Licensing Manager, presented the report on proposed changes to the RBWM Hackney Carriage tariff. Greg Nelson reminded the Panel that at the last meeting, the Panel had agreed to increase Tariff 1 by 10%, with the minimum fare rising from £6 to £7. This decision had been subject to a statutory 14-day consultation period during which three objections were received. The objections raised concerns that the increase was unjustifiable, that it might deter customers, and one objector questioned the equality impact assessment. Greg Nelson explained that due to these objections, the Assistant Director for Housing and Public Protection had declined delegated authority to implement the changes and the matter therefore returned to the Panel for a final decision.

Greg Nelson went on to explain that clarification was needed regarding Tariff 1B and 2B, which applied to people carriers carrying five or more passengers. These tariffs were intended to apply a 50% surcharge on the standard day or night fare. However, some drivers believed

this uplift should also apply to the minimum fare, meaning people carriers would start at £9 during the day and £13.50 at night, rather than the standard minimums of £6 and £9. Officers did not consider a higher minimum to be fair, whereas some drivers argued that the increased cost of running larger vehicles justified it. Greg Nelson clarified that the Panel was being asked not only to confirm the tariff increase but also to decide whether the B tariffs should include the higher minimum fares.

The Chair invited Mr Sabir to address the Panel. He thanked Councillors for the opportunity and explained that when people-carrier tariffs were first introduced in 2022, drivers had believed the minimum fares for Tariff 1B and 2B would automatically be 50% higher. He said that neither drivers nor the Licensing Team had seen the final meter calibrations until installation, and that the two meter technicians had interpreted the tariff differently. One had applied the higher minimum fares, while the other had not. As a result, only some drivers had the uplift, while others did not. He argued this inconsistency was unfair and gave several examples of where the current arrangement made no sense, such as two saloon cars carrying three passengers each charging £12 in total, whereas one people carrier carrying all six would only charge £9. He said the drivers did not see their proposal as a rise, but a correction. He stressed the urgency of adopting Option 1 immediately, as drivers had already waited three months, and he asked the Panel to consider allowing both Option 1 and Option 2 to move forward if possible.

Councillor Knowles felt that the Panel had already discussed the issue extensively at the previous meeting and he believed the rationale for Option 1 was sound. However, he thought it made more sense to retain the same minimum distances but allow the 50% uplift on 1B and 2B, rather than increasing the minimum fares themselves. He argued that larger vehicles were more expensive to run and ensured passengers had a shared-cost option at busier times. He therefore strongly supported the approach reflected in Option 2, believing it to be the fairest balance.

Councillor G Singh agreed that this position was sensible. He reminded Councillors that increasing night-time fares too sharply risked making Hackney Carriages uncompetitive, which had been a concern at the previous meeting. He believed Councillor Knowles' view aligned with the needs of both drivers and passengers and was keen to ensure drivers received a fair wage, especially those who bought larger vehicles to help move large groups during major events such as Ascot.

Greg Nelson intervened to clarify the procedural position. He clarified that at the previous meeting they had agreed Option 1, not Option 2. Because Option 2 had never been consulted upon, adopting it now would require a new public consultation costing with an added cost.

Councillor G Singh responded by asking whether the Panel could make a "hybrid" decision by approving Option 1 immediately so drivers would not face further delays, while separately consulting on the additional Option 2 matter. He said many drivers were struggling financially and had been expecting the increase before Christmas. He argued that the consultation cost was reasonable and would ultimately be covered by licensing fees drivers already paid.

Councillor K Singh asked whether either Option 1 or Option 2 was fully compliant with the equality impact assessment. He also said diesel prices had fallen since COVID and questioned whether fare increases were warranted. He mentioned the future introduction of driverless cars in other countries and suggested drivers might risk pricing themselves out of the market. Councillor K Singh asked officers to confirm that people-carrier surcharges applied only when carrying five or more passengers, which officers confirmed. He also asked whether night-time fares applied to all vehicles, and officers said they did.

Councillor Baskerville said he wanted to understand whether adopting the proposed changes would resolve the meter-calibration confusion described earlier.

Greg Nelson explained that the confusion arose because two meter engineers had interpreted the tariff differently and a clear decision by the Panel would settle the matter. He added that at the last meeting drivers had been satisfied with Option 1 and had not supported a wider increase to Tariff 2B.

Councillor Wilson said the report was difficult to follow and that a table would have made the tariff structure clearer. He had drawn up his own table and asked officers to confirm whether his understanding of minimum fares and fare calculations was correct. He sought clarification about whether the minimum fare for a people carrier was currently the same as for a saloon car.

Greg Nelson explained that officers believed the minimum fare should indeed be the same and that the issue being debated was whether the minimum should be uplifted by 50% for B tariffs.

Councillor Wilson explained that he was trying to understand at what distance the minimum fare ended and the metered fare began. He said that, from what he could calculate, the cut-off seemed to be around one and three-quarter miles and felt the cut-off distance should be consistent regardless of which tariff was used. However, if the Panel chose not to uplift the minimum fare in line with the increased tariff, the cut-off point would shift, which he felt was counterintuitive. He said that although he was inclined towards supporting Option 2 and its higher minimum fare, he also recognised the drivers' desire not to restart the process. He therefore felt Option 1 should proceed immediately, but that a process should also begin to review how the minimum fare aligned with the distance at which the meter switched over, so that everything lined up properly across all vehicle types.

Greg Nelson said the difficulty lay in what the meter could actually display. He reminded the Panel that the tariff sheet set out fares in pence per number of metres because this reflected how the meters themselves were calibrated. He said that once Councillors decided what they wanted to achieve, officers could consult meter engineers to determine whether it was technically feasible. For the moment, he suggested the Panel focused on deciding Option 1 as previously consulted upon, or if they preferred Option 2, they could choose that instead, with the understanding that Option 2 would require a further public consultation. If Councillors wished to pursue both, Option 1 now, and consultation on Option 2, officers could do so and report back to the next Panel meeting in April.

Councillor Knowles said that the Panel had already consulted on Option 1 and he believed it would be sensible to proceed with it immediately, giving certainty to drivers who had already been waiting. He noted that delaying matters again would push back income increases for drivers and create further uncertainty, as well as additional delays in updating taxi meters, which already carried costs for drivers. He suggested implementing Option 1 now, while reviewing the 1B and 2B tariffs more slowly over the next couple of meetings.

Councillor K Singh asked for clarification on Option 2. He wanted to know whether the 50% increase for people carriers meant the minimum fare would rise from £6 to £9 in the daytime, and from £9 to £13.50 at night. Councillor K Singh then pointed out that this daytime increase would effectively be more than a 100% rise from the current minimum.

Greg Nelson confirmed that this was correct, the correct comparison was a 50% increase on the existing nighttime tariff of £9, resulting in £13.50.

Councillor Wilson noted that if the minimum charge stayed the same for people carriers, the distance before the metered fare kicked in would be shorter—perhaps around one mile instead of one and a half. He asked whether the council had data showing how many journeys were charged at the minimum fare versus longer journeys.

Officers could not provide this data and suggested it was not readily available.

Councillor Bond then said he did not often take taxis but found them useful when he did. He felt justice pointed toward Option 2 because of the odd situation in which some meters already showed the higher minimum and others did not. He noted the report indicated that most Hackney Carriage drivers preferred the higher minimum for larger vehicles. However, if Option 2 required consultation, then it had to follow the proper process. He therefore felt it was right to agree Option 1 now to give drivers their expected increase, but also right to clear up the inconsistency in B tariffs at the next opportunity. He also commented on one of the objections received, where a passenger had complained that his walk from the station to home exceeded the minimum-fare distance. Councillor Bond sympathised but felt the passenger was essentially hoping for the convenience of a taxi at the price of a bus. He said there was a natural hierarchy with the most convenient option costing more. He felt Option 1 should be agreed now, with Option 2 considered shortly after.

Councillor Martin asked what it cost drivers to update their meters, emphasising concern about creating a two-stage process that increased costs for drivers.

Greg Nelson responded that the update cost was £25.

Councillor G Singh emphasised that when the drivers' original petition was submitted, most drivers were saloon-car drivers, representing perhaps 80–90% of the trade. The focus at that time had therefore been on Saloon Tariff 1 increases. However, he said that larger-vehicle drivers faced higher operating costs, and if the Panel only approved Option 1 now, larger vehicles would be disadvantaged until the option could be revisited, which might take three or four months.

Greg Nelson clarified the proportions, with most RBWM Hackney Carriages being wheelchair-accessible vehicles, which were not saloons, but he accepted that Councillor G Singh was referring broadly to "non-people-carrier" vehicles.

Councillor Wilson said he agreed Option 1 should be approved immediately because it delivered the 10% increase without further delay. He suspected minimum-fare journeys were relatively few, making Option 1 more impactful overall. He asked whether the Panel should also explicitly confirm that B tariffs did not currently include higher minimum fares, so that the issue was clear while a consultation on Option 2 was being arranged.

Greg Nelson confirmed that this was correct and that officers would consult on Option 2 following the Panel's instruction, returning the results to a later meeting.

Councillor Knowles reiterated that Option 1 was the preferred option and should be approved immediately.

Greg Nelson clarified that people carriers already charged 50% more for the fare itself when carrying five or more passengers, but that under the current tariff all vehicles shared the same minimum fare. He said that if Option 1 were adopted, the 10% uplift would apply across the board, including to the B tariffs for the fare element but not the minimum fare.

Councillor Wilson noted that the nighttime £9 minimum under Tariff 2 was possibly the source of some confusion, because it meant there was not one single minimum fare across all tariffs. Clarification would therefore be helpful moving forward.

The Chair noted that Option 1 had been agreed at the last meeting, and that the current purpose was to determine whether to confirm it following the consultation, and whether the Panel also wished to begin consultation on Option 2.

Councillor Knowles read out his formal proposal, that the Panel accepted Option 1 and that the Panel also seek to consult on the changes contained within Option 2.

Councillor G. Singh seconded the proposal.

An electronic vote was taken.

To agree Option 1 as detailed in the report (Motion)	
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Kashmir Singh	For
Councillor Simon Bond	For
Councillor Genevieve Gosling	For
Councillor Neil Knowles	For
Councillor Siân Martin	For
Councillor Mark Wilson	For
Carried	

AGREED: That the Licensing Panel noted the report and:

i) Agreed to implement the proposed changed in Option 1 of the report:

- **Tariff 1 to be increased by 10%, with the minimum fare increased from £6 to £7.**
- **No changes be made to Tariff 2.**

ii) Clarified that the minimum fares under Tariff 1b and Tariff 2b would not be 50% higher than the standard minimum fare.

iii) Agreed that the Trading Standards and Licensing Manager would hold a public consultation on the proposals outlined in Option 2 of the report and report this back to a future meeting of the Licensing Panel.

Taximeters in RBWM Hackney Carriages

Greg Nelson introduced the report on taxi meters in RBWM Hackney Carriages, explaining that since 2016 only taxi meters compliant with the Measuring Instruments Regulations could be newly installed. Older meters already in use could continue to be used, but some of these were now becoming obsolete. The taxi meter engineer had reported that a small number, believed to be in single figures, were still in use despite their age and increasing unreliability. Greg Nelson recommended that all taxi meters be required to comply with the regulations by 31 December 2026, giving drivers ample time to replace them.

Councillor Knowles said that although Option 3 (conducting a survey) was included in the report, it would amount to a delay with no real benefit because the legislation would still apply. He felt Option 1 was sensible, as the deadline of the end of the year gave drivers enough time. He added, however, that it would still be useful to know how many drivers were affected, so that the Panel could revisit the deadline if the situation turned out to be more significant than expected.

Councillor G Singh said he felt the deadline should be brought forward. He had discussed the issue with drivers and understood that very few meters were non-compliant. He believed the council needed to maintain high levels of public trust and ensure all meters were accurate and consistent as soon as possible. He proposed a three-month deadline, arguing that the council was giving drivers a fare increase and must ensure residents were charged correctly. He suggested exploring the possibility of random checks to reassure residents.

Greg Nelson explained that officers already checked meters for the required compliance markings and that once a mandatory compliance date was set, officers could enforce it.

Councillor G Singh responded that in that case, three months seemed sensible.

Councillor Wilson said he agreed with the importance of consistency and transparency and felt that Option 1 made sense but he also supported moving relatively quickly. He was less convinced that a survey would add anything meaningful and suspected only a small number of meters were affected. He supported giving drivers enough time to make the changes without undue delay.

Councillor K Singh said he supported Councillor G Singh's view. With so few non-compliant meters remaining, he felt three months was reasonable, especially with major events like Royal Ascot coming up. Visitors should have confidence that all taxis were using compliant equipment. He said he would second the proposal.

Councillor Baskerville agreed that the date needed to be clear and aligned with the upcoming events calendar. He proposed 31 May, slightly more than three months away, but before Royal Ascot, as a practical and workable date.

Councillor G Singh supported this amendment.

The Chair confirmed that the Panel would vote on the 31 May deadline.

An electronic vote was taken.

To agree that taximeters used in RBWM licenced hackney carriages must comply with Measuring Instruments Regulations 2016 by 31 May 2026. (Motion)	
Councillor Mandy Brar	For
Councillor Gurch Singh	For
Councillor Clive Baskerville	For
Councillor Kashmir Singh	For
Councillor Simon Bond	For
Councillor Genevieve Gosling	For
Councillor Neil Knowles	For
Councillor Siân Martin	For
Councillor Mark Wilson	For
Carried	

AGREED: That the Licensing Panel noted the report and:

i) Agreed that taximeters used in RBWM licenced hackney carriages must comply with Measuring Instruments Regulations 2016 (as amended) by 31 May 2026.

The meeting, which began at 6.00 pm, finished at 7.05 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Wednesday 18 February 2026

Present: Councillors Clive Baskerville, George Blundell and Sayonara Luxton

Officers: Mikey Lloyd, Craig Hawkings, Roxana Khakinia and Monika Kolodziejczyk

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Luxton proposed that Councillor Baskerville be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Blundell.

AGREED: That Councillor Baskerville was appointed as Chair of the sub-committee.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The procedures of the Sub-Committee were read out to all parties present.

The procedures were noted.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Blundell declared that he previously visited a different Copas site as a child and further to his role as parliamentary assistant to Joshua Reynolds MP he had visited the farm taking minutes for a meeting organized by the NFU which ended with a tour of the facilities of the farm. Councillor Blundell also declared that he knew the applicant Tom Copas due to being the Rural Forum, Councillor Blundell said he came to the meeting with a clear and open mind.

Consideration of an application for of a new premises licence to be granted under the licensing act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, presented the report, explaining that it had been prepared to assist Members in considering an application for a new premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003. He confirmed that, in accordance with Section 18(3A) of the Act, a hearing was required because relevant representations had been received. The application had been submitted by Copas Traditional Turkeys Ltd for Kings Coppice Farm, Grubwood Lane, Cookham Dean, with the full application form contained in Appendix A of the bundle and a location map at Appendix B. Craig Hawkings summarised that the farm had been producing turkeys since 1957 and sold both turkeys and other meat products via retail, mail order, online sales, telephone orders, and in person. The business intended to move its farm shop into a nearby barn as shown in the plans. During the Christmas period and at other ad-hoc times they held entertainment such as choirs, carols, children’s performances, cooking demonstrations and carving displays. As a result, the application sought authorisation for regulated entertainment including plays, films, live and recorded music, and dance, as well as the sale and supply of alcohol for consumption both on and off the premises. The proposed

hours for regulated entertainment were Monday to Sunday from 07:00 to 23:00, and the hours for alcohol sales were Monday to Sunday from 06:00 to midnight, also covering dispatch and online sales between midnight and 06:00. The designated premises supervisor was named as Edward Herford. Consultation had concluded on 3 December 2025, and no responsible authorities had submitted objections. Agreed conditions with Trading Standards were included in Appendix C. Four representations from residents had been received, thereby requiring the Sub Committee to determine the application. Relevant extracts of the Council's Licensing Policy and the Section 182 Guidance were included in the report.

Councillor Blundell queried the number of Temporary Event Notices the applicants had used and whether any complaints were received. Craig Hawkings explained that while he did not have exact numbers, the applicants had used the maximum allocation permitted, 15 notices or 21 days, and no objections had been raised by the bodies permitted to object, namely Environmental Health and Thames Valley Police. In response to questions from Councillor Luxton, Craig Hawkings confirmed that each Temporary Event Notice permitted up to 499 people including staff and visitors. Councillor Blundell then asked whether the licensed area should be more clearly defined given the size of the farm, but the Craig Hawkings advised that Environmental Protection, as the relevant body for public nuisance, had not requested any restrictions. Councillor Luxton asked whether children's play areas or safety boundaries needed to be indicated, and Craig Hawkings explained that this was not required under the Licensing Act and related instead to event management considerations.

Councillor Blundell also queried how the proposed hours and scale compared to similar licensed sites elsewhere in the Borough. Craig Hawkings stated that each application was considered on its own merits and that the Borough had granted licences for many rural or large scale premises including online sellers and festival sites. Craig Hawkings also confirmed that enforcement of immigration related offences fell under Home Office Immigration Enforcement and that limited companies were exempt from producing right to work documentation.

The Chair invited the applicant to ask questions of the Craig Hawkings, but they declined, indicating their points would be addressed during their presentation. Tom Copas. Applicant, then presented their case, supported by Operations Director and proposed DPS, Ed Herford, and his sister, Tanya Copas, DPS at their sister site in Remenham. Tom Copas explained the long family history at Cookham, noting that the Copas family had farmed the land for a century and produced turkeys there since 1957. The business had previously supplied turkeys wholesale nationwide but had been forced to cease wholesale operations due to seasonal labour issues and economic pressures, instead focusing on high-welfare retail production.

Tom Copas said they now wished to formalise and stabilise their operations through a premises licence rather than continued reliance on numerous Temporary Event Notices. He explained that they used 20 out of 21 available Temporary Event Notices each year, leaving one contingency day, and this created significant operational confusion. Staff and customers were affected when alcohol related products such as hampers, or bottled items could not be sold on days when no Temporary Event Notice was active. It also prevented them from sampling products and caused difficulties in December when demand was highest and Temporary Event Notices could not run back to back. A full licence would regularise what they already did and allow gradual growth rather than any large scale expansion. Tom Copas stressed that turkey welfare was of paramount importance and that noisy or disruptive events would be managed carefully to avoid disturbing the birds, particularly close to Christmas. He confirmed there were no plans to hold large events attracting thousands of people, nor to run late night alcohol sales. The extended alcohol hours were solely to allow for dispatch and packing operations, when necessary, not onsite consumption.

When addressing questions previously raised by Members, Tom Copas began by responding to the concerns raised by Councillor Blundell regarding the extensive use of Temporary Event Notices and explained that the business relied heavily on them each December, using 20 out of 21 available days, leaving one day in reserve for emergencies. This caused practical

issues, such as customers being unable to purchase alcohol related products on certain days and staff struggling with “on sale/off sale” periods created by the gaps legally required between Temporary Event Notices. Tom Copas confirmed that the business wished to move away from them in favour of a stable premises licence that would regularise their operations.

Tom Copas then addressed questions posed by Councillor Luxton about event capacity and whether past events had attracted large crowds. Tom Copas explained that while there had never been events approaching the upper limits available under a premises licence, Christmas collections and community activities could attract enough people that the 499 person Temporary Event Notice limit might eventually be restrictive. For this reason, the licence would provide flexibility and ensure they were not inadvertently breaching limits and reiterated that they had no intention of holding large festival type events.

Responding to the question raised by Councillor Blundell about the scale of the licensed area, Tom Copas explained that the nature of the business required flexibility because different barns, sheds or spaces might be used in different years depending on operations. This was why the application covered a wider area rather than a single fixed footprint and added that sheds often provided natural sound insulation, which helped reduce noise impact.

Tom Copas then returned to Councillor Luxton’s questions about children’s safety and movement around the site. He explained that during events the business already used trained stewards, segregated areas, controlled traffic flows and safe layout planning to ensure families, vehicles and livestock were safely managed. Their existing safety practices at their Remenham site informed how they operated at Kings Coppice Farm.

The Chair asked about traffic on narrow rural lanes, particularly Kings Lane and Grubwood Lane, and Tom Copas responded by describing the one way systems used during Christmas and the availability of multiple access routes, including via The Hocket. Tom Copas explained how they imposed timed collection slots to manage arrivals and avoid congestion, and that at large events they could implement traffic management stewards. Tom Copas also noted that resident feedback had already led to improvements such as plans for clearer signage at the top of Kings Lane.

The Chair also asked about alpacas seen near the road and whether fencing prevented conflicts between livestock, vehicles and visitors. In response, Tom Copas explained that the alpacas were intentionally kept as fox deterrents and that fencing and thick hedging provided the necessary containment. Tom Copas said he undertook to inspect specific sections of fencing noted by the Chair.

Councillor Luxton asked whether alcohol sales or entertainment had ever continued until 2am under past Temporary Event Notices and Tom Copas confirmed that they had never operated late into the night and had no intention of selling alcohol at such hours. He clarified that the only reason the application included long alcohol authorised hours was to ensure they could legally dispatch mail order products that might include alcohol when working late during the Christmas period.

Craig Hawkings provided further clarification, stating that Temporary Event Notices were minimal permissions with limited consultation and limited enforceability. A premises licence would instead introduce enforceable conditions across the site. For larger events, the business would be required to engage with the Council’s Safety Advisory Group, which included representation from emergency services, highways, environmental protection, and others. Traffic management plans, risk assessments and event safety plans would be required for such events. Craig Hawkings explained that maximum capacity for the site would ultimately be determined by the fire safety certification rather than the premises licence itself and emphasised that residents could apply for a licence review at any time if nuisance or breaches occurred.

The applicant then provided closing remarks through Ed Herford, who explained the extreme pressures that high welfare poultry farming had faced in recent years, including COVID-19, bird flu and economic challenges. He explained that the business had reduced its wholesale operations by 80% in order to survive and had repositioned itself as a luxury food producer. The premises licence was essential to support this evolution and would help secure jobs, maintain the farm as a functioning agricultural site and protect the rural environment. Ed Herford also noted that he lived on the farm with his family and therefore shared local residents' desire for peace and tranquillity.

Finally, Craig Hawkings summarised the legal framework the Sub Committee must apply, reminding them of the requirement to promote the four licensing objectives, consider relevant representations, apply the Licensing Policy and Section 182 Guidance, and ensure that any decision was evidence-based, impartial and legally robust. The Sub Committee could grant the licence as applied for, grant it with modifications, refuse the licence, or refuse the DPS. Parties would have a right of appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of the decision.

All parties then left the room for deliberations at 11:15am and took no further part in the meeting apart from the sub-committee, the clerk and the Council's legal officer.

During their deliberations, after having heard all of the written and oral evidence that had been presented to them, the Sub-Committee agreed unanimously to grant the licence as applied with the conditions agreed by the Trading Standards and the inclusion of additional conditions suggested by the applicant in response to the objections received.

The Chair noted that there had been four objections submitted by the public and that the applicant had taken all of them on board by way of additional conditions suggested. The Chair reiterated the importance of understanding how rural the site was and how narrow the surrounding lanes were.

Councillor Blundell discussed applying a condition around any large event must have an event management plan that has gone to the Safety Advisory Group (SAG).

Councillor Luxton said she had no objections to the application but queried if there could be a reduction in the hours for the sale of alcohol on site, but it was clarified by Roxana Khakinia, Senior Lawyer, that it would be difficult to justify a reduction in the hours when they were not holding events until the early hours of the morning but that the hours were to help with the logistics of packing and shipping of orders overnight.

Councillor Luxton also said that she believed they should have a travel plan. Councillor Blundell highlighted that in the suggested conditions from the applicant in response to the objections it did include a traffic management plan being in place for all events over 500 people. Roxana Khakinia listed the suggested conditions from the applicant in the appeal paperwork for the Sub-Committee to consider. Councillor Blundell noted that the list of suggested conditions from the applicant seemed logical and fair to residents.

The Sub-Committee unanimously decided they wished to include them in their decision to grant the application along with the conditions listed by the Trading Standards and the additional condition that for any large event the applicant must submit an event management plan to SAG no later than 60 days prior to the event.

The meeting, which began at 10.02 am, finished at 11.30 am

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Wednesday 11 March 2026

Present: Councillors Clive Baskerville, Genevieve Gosling and Julian Tisi

Officers: Chloe Plummer, Craig Hawkings and Monika Kolodziejczyk

Officers in attendance virtually: Anthony Lenaghan

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Gosling proposed that Councillor Baskerville be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor J Tisi.

Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Del Campo, Councillor J Tisi attended the meeting as a substitute.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor J Tisi declared that they were a Ward Councillor for Eton and Castle, which is where the licensing premises was situated.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The Chair read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application to review a premises licence, under S51 of the Licensing Act 2003

Mr Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader explained that the sub committee had been convened to review the premises license for Plate at No.06, situated in Windsor. Mr Hawkings confirmed that the applicant was the Home Office's Immigration Enforcement team, represented by Mr Farnan. Mr Hawkings noted that the premises licence holder was Oriver & Co Ltd, the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was Mr Zhengmao Cheng, and that the premises operated as a restaurant. They referred members to Appendix A for the current licence (PL107091), a map of the area on page 37, and the review application itself at pages 31–36.

Mr Hawkings provided background information, they explained that on 19 February 2025 at around 13:10, the South-Central Immigration Compliance & Enforcement (ICE) team had entered the premises under Section 179 of the Licensing Act 2003, after they had received intelligence that illegal workers had been employed. Inside, officers encountered three employees, all of whom were identified as immigration offenders. Mr Hawkings then summarised the legislative framework and noted that amendments introduced by the Immigration Act 2016 had made the Home Secretary a Responsible Authority in relation to alcohol sales and late-night refreshment. They confirmed that the application was not frivolous, vexatious, or repetitive and related to the Prevention of Crime and Disorder licensing objective.

Mr Hawkings reiterated the four licensing objectives and explained to the sub committee that the review of the premises license was grounded in the belief that illegal working had been identified at the premises and therefore the crime and disorder objective had been

undermined. They also outlined the broader societal harms associated with illegal working, such as deprivation of tax revenue, worker exploitation, unfair competition with legitimate businesses, and poor living conditions for undocumented workers. They confirmed that the Home Office had provided supporting evidence, included as Appendix D.

Mr Hawkings then detailed the options open to the Sub-Committee, the choices were to:

- To modify the conditions of the licence
- To exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence
- To remove the designated premises supervisor
- To suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months
- To revoke the licence

The Chair asked for clarification about the premises licence holder's name, they noted that documentation referred to both "Oriver" and "On river." Mr Hawkings explained that the company had originally been named "On river" but a transfer application the previous year had amended it to "Oriver," which made Oriver the current licence holder.

Councillor Gosling asked how long Mr Zhengmao Cheng had been operating the business. Mr Hawkings replied that they would need to check the licensing records to confirm the dates. Councillor Gosling then asked why Mr. Zhengmao Cheng had been employing illegal workers and for how long. Mr Hawkings stated that they did not have that information and that such details may arise in the Home Office (the applicant's) evidence.

Councillor J Tisi then asked about similar immigration-related cases and said that previous crime and disorder reviews usually involved more localised crimes. Mr Hawkings responded that there was no typical outcome and that each case must be judged on its own merits. Councillor J Tisi then sought clarification on whether the concerns arose from the actions of Mr. Zhengmao Cheng or were embedded within the wider operation of the business, and whether imposing additional conditions on the licence could address those issues. Mr Hawkings clarified that the DPS (Mr. Zhengmao Cheng) could be removed, but the licence holder, a limited company, could not. All other statutory options remained open to the Sub-Committee.

Councillor J Tisi finally asked whether the HR team referred to by Mr. Zhengmao Cheng had been contacted. Mr Hawkings confirmed that such enquiries would not fall within the Licensing Authority's remit, although the Home Office might pursue such lines under separate powers.

With no further questions from members, the Chair confirmed that the questioning of the Licensing Officer had concluded and that the Sub-Committee would proceed to hear the applicant's case, presented by Mr Farnan, Licensing Compliance Officer, The Home Office.

Mr Farnan provided an overview of Plate at No.6 and explained that the availability of illegal work in the UK was a significant driver of illegal migration. They stated that such opportunities encouraged people to breach UK immigration laws, facilitated migrants remaining unlawfully in the country, and incentivised the use of illegal visa routes or dangerous methods of entry. They emphasised that illegal working undercut legitimate businesses that followed the rules and that employing individuals with no legal right to work fundamentally undermined the Prevention of Crime and Disorder, one of the key licensing objectives.

They informed the Sub-Committee that Immigration Enforcement had received allegations that illegal workers were employed at the premises. As a result, the South-Central Immigration Compliance & Enforcement team conducted a visit on 19 February 2025, during which they encountered three individuals who had no legal right to work in the UK. Following the visit, a civil penalty of £135,000 was issued to Oriver & Co Ltd, the premises licence holder.

They confirmed to the panel that the director of Oriver & Co Ltd was Mr Zhengmao Cheng, who also served as the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS). No objections or

representations against the civil penalty had been submitted, and the penalty remained outstanding in full, despite a lengthy process offering opportunities for the business owner to appeal. Consequently, the case had now been referred to a debt collection agency.

Mr Farnan further explained that the business's failure to engage with the civil penalty process had been considered when considering the seriousness of the non-compliance. As DPS, Mr Zhengmao Cheng was responsible for the day-to-day management of the licensed premises and should have been fully involved in ensuring the legal duties set out by the licensing authority were properly applied.

Mr Farnan informed the panel that Mr Zhengmao Cheng had attended the premises shortly after staff notified him of the enforcement visit. During his employer interview, Mr Zhengmao Cheng stated that right-to-work checks were conducted by his HR team; however, there was no evidence of such checks either during the visit or throughout the civil penalty investigation.

Each of the three illegal workers confirmed to officers that they had been employed by individuals within the business. They reported that they had provided documents for immigration status checks, although these checks would have failed had they been conducted. Mr Farnan noted that, had right-to-work checks been completed properly, no civil penalty would have been issued.

They highlighted that one of the workers had disclosed a dispute with Mr Zhengmao Cheng regarding non-payment of wages over a five-week period, amounting to more than £2,000 owed. Additionally, Mr Zhengmao Cheng had previously received a judgment against him from the Employment Tribunal for non-payment of wages to legal workers. The applicant commented that this was highly unusual and demonstrated a concerning pattern of behaviour.

Following the applicant's presentation, Councillor J Tisi sought clarification on one of the final points made by the applicant. They explained that they wished to ensure they correctly understood the statement regarding revocation and asked the applicant to repeat it. In response, Mr Farnan stated that the statutory guidance if revocation may be justified even for a first offence involving illegal workers. They added that, when a civil penalty was issued and the business failed to engage with the penalty process, the Home Office would also consider seeking revocation of the premises licence.

Councillor J Tisi asked a further question, noting that the circumstances suggested a significant degree of dishonesty on the part of Mr Zhengmao Cheng. They asked whether, in the applicant's experience, the seriousness of the issues in this case supported the Home Office's view that revocation was the appropriate outcome. In reply, Mr Farnan explained that several factors contributed to their position.

They stated that, beyond the employment of illegal workers, Mr Zhengmao Cheng was both the director of the company and the Designated Premises Supervisor and therefore held responsibility for upholding licensing rules and running the business appropriately. They felt that none of the required standards had been met and that there appeared to be a wholesale absence of proper compliance.

Mr Farnan added that although the Home Office did not usually proceed directly to a review often first issuing warnings or engaging further with the operator the severity of the issues in this instance required an immediate review. They also highlighted that there had been no engagement from Mr Zhengmao Cheng during the process.

The Chair then commented that the papers made clear that the enforcement and penalty process had been ongoing for around thirteen months and had not arisen suddenly. The Chair asked the applicant to confirm whether the £135,000 civil penalty was a standard amount or specific to this case. Mr Farnan clarified that the standard amount was £45,000 per illegal worker for a first offence, reduced when the business engaged with the penalty process. In

this case, with three illegal workers, the penalty totalled £135,000. For a second offence, the amount would have been £60,000 per worker.

The Chair then asked whether Mr Zhengmao Cheng had at any stage indicated a willingness to pay the penalty. Mr Farnan stated that there had been no engagement whatsoever. They explained that the civil penalty process included opportunities to object, appeal, or submit representations, and the Home Office had allowed additional time to encourage engagement, but no response had been received.
Councillor Gosling then asked whether Mr Zhengmao Cheng lived in the UK and whether they were a British citizen. Mr Farnan confirmed that Mr Zhengmao Cheng was a dual national and held both British and Chinese nationality.
The Chair invited any further questions. Mr Hawkings then added that, following a review of the licensing records, the premises licence had first been granted in May 2020.

The Chair asked for clarification of the address on the original application and whether it listed Mr Zhengmao Cheng. Mr Hawkings confirmed that the licence holder was originally on river, prior to changing its name to Oriver, and that the registered address was the same as the premises 6/7 Market Street.

Before moving on, the Chair noted that the licence holder was not present and invited the applicant to provide a summary of their position. Mr Farnan stated that the Home Office did not seek to place unnecessary restrictions on legitimate community businesses such as pubs, restaurants, and shops. However, significant concerns existed about the way this business was being operated.

They explained that appropriate action was necessary to prevent the behaviour from recurring and to send a clear message to compliant businesses that enforcement action was taken seriously. They referred to the statutory guidance, which the Sub-Committee, supported by its legal adviser, would need to consider. They emphasised that Mr Zhengmao Cheng, as premises licence holder, bore ultimate responsibility for ensuring that crime and disorder were prevented, and that the Home Office considered the failures at this premises to pose an ongoing risk. In line with the guidance, they stated that the Home Office felt revocation of the premises licence was appropriate.

The Chair then asked whether the three individuals identified during the enforcement visit remained in the UK. Mr Farnan responded that one had been removed from the UK; one had subsequently been granted leave to remain in a different capacity; and one had an outstanding case still pending.

The Chair then invited the reporting officer, Mr Hawkings to provide a summary. Mr Hawkings reminded the Sub-Committee that the relevant extracts from the Section 182 Guidance concerning immigration offences were included within the agenda bundle, specifically pages 11 to 15.

They confirmed that all statutory requirements, such as notice of the hearing and opportunities for the licence holder to attend had been fully complied with. Mr Hawkings explained that although Mr Zhengmao Cheng had been offered the option of attending remotely, there had been no engagement.

Mr Hawkings reiterated the Sub-Committee’s duty to promote the four licensing objectives when determining the application: prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance, and protection of children from harm. They reminded members that they must have regard to both national guidance and the Council’s policy, and that any decision must be based solely on the written and oral evidence provided.

They summarised the possible steps available to the Sub-Committee: modifying conditions, excluding a licensable activity, removing the DPS (in this case, Mr Zhengmao Cheng), suspending the licence for up to three months, or revoking it. They emphasised the need for

impartiality and for the written decision to address all relevant evidence, explain any reliance on or departures from policy or guidance, and ensure the decision could withstand scrutiny on appeal.

The Legal Adviser, Anthony Lenaghan, sought confirmation for the public record that the meeting had previously been listed and adjourned at the request of Mr Zhengmao Cheng, who had sought time to obtain legal advice but had not subsequently done so. Mr Hawkings confirmed that the process had been postponed on multiple occasions, including early requests from the Home Office to allow additional time for Mr Zhengmao Cheng to engage, but no representations or attendance had materialised.

The Chair thanked all parties and confirmed that the Sub-Committee would now retire to deliberate. The decision would be issued within five working days.

All parties then left the room for deliberations and took no further part in the meeting apart from the sub-committee, the clerk and the Council's legal officer (Anthony Lenaghan).

During deliberations, the sub committee agreed unanimously to revoke the license to which its reasons were as follows:

Firstly, the sub committee stated that the impact of the illegal employment was stated by the Home Office, particularly that as this premises operated outside the law, there was the risk that the premises could further exploit workers, with evidence that this had already happened. The panel mentioned the worker who had been owed £2,000.

Secondly, the panel stated that there was considerable dishonesty from the DPS, Mr Zhengmao Cheng. This was backed up by the lack of communication with the Civil Penalty Team or the Licensing Team from Mr Zhengmao Cheng. They noted that there was a pattern of behaviour from the DPS. Furthermore, the DPS had not provided written submissions for the sub committee to consider.

Thirdly, the sub committee highlighted that the investigation had been ongoing for 13 months and that the matter had been adjourned on multiple occasions to enable Mr Zhengmao Cheng to seek legal advice, though this had not materialised. They also commented that Plate at No.06 was now boarded up and no longer operating, and that the DPS had left the country, making it apparent that the business had ceased functioning.

The sub committee concluded that the safest option would be to revoke the license entirely, primarily due to the not upholding the Licensing Act 2003 objective: the prevention of crime and disorder. The sub committee stated that anything less than revoking the licence would be inappropriate.

The meeting, which began at 2.03 pm, finished at 2.56 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Tuesday 17 March 2026

Present: Councillors Mandy Brar (Chair), Simon Bond, and Genevieve Gosling

Officers: Laurence Ellis, Roxana Khakinia, Craig Hawkings and Monika Kolodziejczyk

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Gosling proposed that Councillor Brar be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Bond.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: That Councillor Brar was appointed as Chair of the Sub Committee.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The clerk read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application for a variation to a premises licence under the licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, outlined the application submitted by Linda Wells (the Applicant), on behalf of Electric Nightlife Limited, for a full variation of the premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003.

Craig Hawkings informed that, in line with Section 18, subsection 3A of the Act, where relevant representations had been made against an application, a hearing must be held to consider it. The purpose of the Sub-Committee was to hear the application, consider written and oral representations from other parties, and then determine the application.

Craig Hawkings explained that the Applicant was operator of the premises known as The Sporting King, located at 73 Peascod Street, Windsor, SL4 1DH; which was described as a public house.

Craig Hawkings highlighted that Appendix C – current premises licence (PAPA 0000590) – had been missed out from the report and published agenda, but this had been circulated before the meeting and Sub Committee members had been provided with a copy.

The application primarily sought to:

- extend the Sunday start time for the sale and supply of alcohol from 12:00pm (midday) to 10:00am, aligning it with weekday hours.
- extend live music on Fridays and Saturdays by one additional hour, from midnight to 1:00am.

- submit updated plans of the premises.
- remove or vary a number of conditions within of the current licence (Annex 2 of the report), many of which related to live music and legacy nightclub-style operations applied to former tenants.

These included the proposed removal or amendment of conditions 6, 9, 23, 24, 28, and 30 within Annex 2, as well as several conditions listed in Annex 3 in the report.

Craig Hawkings confirmed that officers had reviewed the operating schedule and the conditions proposed in the application. The application had been properly advertised, and all statutory requirements had been fully complied with.

Craig Hawkings reminded the Sub-Committee that, in promoting the licensing objectives, they must also have regard to the national guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003, and the Council's own licensing policy.

Craig Hawkings also emphasised that, because relevant representations had been submitted and not withdrawn, the licensing authority was required to hold the meeting.

He summarised the four licensing objectives:

- Prevention of crime and disorder,
- Public safety,
- Prevention of public nuisance,
- Protection of children from harm

He also reported that officers had received:

- A representation from Environmental Protection, with Michael McNaughton attending to speak on behalf of that team,
- A representation from a local resident.

Craig Hawkings noted that the application fell within the Council's framework hours, and that had no objections been received, the licence would have been granted as applied for.

Councillor Bond queried where the nearest residential accommodation was located. Craig Hawkings answered that the map did not distinguish between commercial and residential properties, but residences were within a few hundred yards.

The Applicant had no questions to Craig Hawkings. Therefore, the Chair invited them to speak.

The Applicant, Linda Wells, explained that they had submitted a few points within the application, fully aware of the cost and time involved in making a full variation. For that reason, she had placed everything into a single application to avoid needing to return with repeated future applications.

Linda Wells explained that the main purpose of the variation had been to move the sale of alcohol on Sundays to 10:00am, bringing it in line with their existing weekday start times; adding that they were not only a public house but also a sports bar, and most weekend sporting fixtures began at midday. Under the current licence, they could not serve alcohol drinks until 12:00pm, which created operational difficulties: large groups arrived just before kick-off wanting to order drinks, making it difficult to maintain a steady pace of service. Customer feedback had also been clear: patrons wanted to be able to buy a pint and settle in to watch the game, but the licence prevented this.

Linda Wells acknowledged awareness of the building's history and the behaviour of previous tenants but explained she had not realised the full extent of the issues until after purchasing the business. She stressed that they were a small family business and, despite the company name being Electric Nightlife Limited, they had no connection whatsoever to the previous

venue, Electric Garden. They had purchased Electric Nightlife Ltd. entirely as a trading company.

Linda Wells confirmed that the lease for the building had been held since 1 October 2024 – not 2025, as one representation had claimed – and offered to provide a copy of the lease if required. She had taken over directorship of the company in the same month (around 7 or 8 October), reiterating that they had no affiliation with the previous tenant.

Linda Wells added that they were well aware of the noise-nuisance history associated with the premises and had encountered numerous issues that they had been forced to resolve as a new tenant and new director, arising from the way previous operators had run the site. She explained that one of the aims of the meeting was to introduce themselves properly, to emphasise that they were a small family-run operation with no link to the past, and to request fair treatment equivalent to other public houses in Windsor which also had residents living above, below, and alongside.

Turning to live music, Linda Wells explained that current conditions created a significant barrier between what customers wanted and what the business could practically offer. As a free house with no brewery support, they bore all costs themselves, working shifts behind the bar and investing their own money. Hosting even a small or low-key live event – such as karaoke, an open mic night, or a single musician with a guitar – legally counted as “live music,” which under the current licence triggered the requirement for two SIA-licensed door supervisors. This represented a substantial cost on top of paying the performer.

There were also conditions relating to the sale of bottled drinks which reflected a nightclub environment that they did not operate. Such conditions, she said, were neither proportionate nor in keeping with how other Windsor pubs were required to trade.

Linda Wells stressed that Electric Nightlife Ltd. wished to work with authorities and with neighbours, and that she already had a positive relationship with the immediate residents, some of whom regularly drank in the venue. The aim was simply to grow their business, improve life for their family, and contribute positively to the community. She emphasised repeatedly that they did not want DJs every weekend, nor did they wish to resemble the previous nightclub-style operation. She wanted the flexibility to host karaoke, acoustic acts, small bands, and similar events, with a DJ only occasionally for private hires such as birthday parties.

Linda Wells also referred to the documentation she had brought to demonstrate when she had acquired both the company and the lease, as well as correspondence they had seen between RBWM Environmental Protection and the former tenants. She added that they had made several attempts to build a new working relationship with Environmental Protection and had hosted visits from other authorities in their efforts to improve the premises’ reputation and create a safe, welcoming community space.

Linda Wells noted she was an experienced licensee, having been one since 2005, and had also previously held an SIA Door Supervisor licence. They were familiar with Windsor, having worked in the town in that capacity. She stressed their commitment to working with authorities to bring positive change without disturbing residents.

Linda Wells then addressed the specific representation relating to bottle noise. She offered an apology for any distress caused. She explained that the resident had visited the premises in February 2026, and upon learning of the issue – and realising they had underestimated how far noise travelled – the owners had immediately agreed to stop disposing of bottles at night, incorporating this instead into their morning routine. She confirmed that they had not carried out bottle disposal at night since that conversation and expressed regret that the resident had felt unable to speak to them before making a formal objection.

Linda Wells then referred to an event held on October 2025, where some residents had initially approached them with apprehension based on negative experiences with former tenants. One resident living opposite the premises had said their first thought was “here we go again,” but after speaking with the new owners, they felt reassured, exchanged contact details with them, and acknowledged that their concern had stemmed from the misleading impression that the old nightclub had merely reopened under a new name.

Linda Wells concluded that she they wanted to build this same open, positive relationship with all residents and had provided their contact number to Environmental Protection to share with anyone who had concerns.

The Chair invited the Sub Committee to ask questions to the Applicant.

Councillor Gosling conveyed her main concern on the proposal to extend live music until 1:00am, asking whether this extension was intended to be a regular occurrence – for example every weekend – or occasionally, such as for karaoke.

Linda Wells answered that the current opening hours already extended to that time, so they were not seeking to extend the premises hours, only to allow more flexibility regarding live music. She clarified that at present the premises only played pre-recorded music through their own sound system. She could not foresee hosting bands, karaoke, or other live events until 1:00am on a regular basis; rather, the extended hour was intended primarily for occasional private hires, such as birthday parties, where a DJ setup might be appropriate. It was not something they intended to operate every Friday, Saturday, or Thursday, as had occurred under previous tenants.

Councillor Gosling then asked about the disposal of bottles, confirming that the Applicant was now storing bottles overnight and only emptying them in the mornings, rather than at night. Linda Wells confirmed this, explaining that bottle disposal had now become part of their morning routine. Whilst not initially realising sooner how far the sound carried until she was approached by neighbours, she confirmed that bottle disposal no longer took place at night.

Councillor Bond asked for clarification on the specific licence conditions the Applicant wished to vary.

Linda Wells explained that the proposed changes centred on two main points:

1. Serving alcohol earlier on Sundays, moving from 12:00pm to 10:00am, which matched the hours already permitted from Monday to Saturday.
2. Varying several restrictive conditions inherited from previous nightclub-style operators.

Councillor Bond clarified that he was asking about the specific conditions, rather than the hours.

Linda Wells outlined that:

- The removal of the requirement to employ two licensed door supervisors for any live music event, noting that such events could include karaoke or an acoustic performance – situations in which other town-centre pubs had no such requirement.
- The removal of conditions requiring the decanting of bottled drinks into shatterproof containers, which were typical of a nightclub but impractical in a public house. This prevented the sale of bottled wine or prosecco and gave customers the impression of a high-risk environment, which did not reflect reality.
- The removal conditions about acoustic limitations and noise limiters. Linda Wells explained that the building had no noise limiter; the previous tenants had never installed one despite being required to. Installing such equipment now would impose a significant cost on the family-run business and was not a standard condition for pubs running ordinary live events, such as karaoke or acoustic nights.

Linda Wells emphasised that they had a reputation among customers for being a strict and responsible licensee and intended to maintain that standard. She did not want to cause any distress to neighbours and would prefer residents to feel welcome in the venue.

Linda Wells reiterated that, as an independent free house without brewery backing, the financial burden of the extensive conditions was considerable. Most other pubs without a problematic history did not carry such onerous restrictions. She personally trained all staff and took safeguarding and compliance seriously, as it was her own personal licence at stake.

Councillor Gosling asked for clarification on Condition 28, elaborating that the wording suggested that only smokers could go outside after 11:00pm and wanted to understand whether the Applicant wished to allow non-smokers outdoors as well.

Linda Wells explained that the wording had been unclear. It appeared to prohibit anyone from going outside after 11:00pm, which was impractical as smokers had to be permitted access. Linda Wells confirmed they only wished for customers to be able to go outside to smoke – not to drink outside at night – and said she would even accept a restriction limiting late-night smoking to the rear enclosed garden rather than the street-side frontage, in order to contain noise.

Linda Wells noted that customers nowadays generally wished to keep their drinks with them, but the applicant was willing to accept restrictions to ensure residents were not disturbed.

Roxana Khakinia, Legal Officer, asked the Applicant to describe the layout and accessibility of the outside spaces.

Linda Wells outlined:

- The front area had a street seating area with four small tables, each with two chairs, and controlled by designated barriers. Originally there had been eight tables, but the number had already been reduced.
- The rear garden was fully enclosed and accessible only through the main entrance, with no public access from outside. It contained five to six small tables and was covered by the premises' CCTV system.
- Police Licensing had inspected the CCTV and described it as very good quality.

Roxana Khakinia then asked how many SIA staff had been used since the Applicant took over. Linda Wells confirmed they had held five events, with two licensed door staff at each, and that she personally checked all badges on arrival to ensure they were licensed. She added that she was not opposed to using door staff when appropriate (e.g., DJ events), but the requirement for any live music event was disproportionately expensive.

The Chair asked how many family members worked during events. Linda Wells explained that she was on-site almost all of the time at present, and for previous events there had always been at least two family members behind the bar, with others working there to support. She aimed to ensure smooth running of the event, to debrief afterwards, and to maintain strong oversight.

Councillor Gosling asked about the capacity of the premises. Linda Wells replied that capacity varied according to layout, as confirmed by a recent fire-safety assessment. Depending on furniture configuration and use of the side fire exit, capacity ranged from 116 to 300, though she would cap it at 250, and had never approached even that number.

With no more questions from the Sub Committee, the Chair then invited any Objectors to make their submissions.

Michael McNaughton, Environmental Protection Officer at RBWM (Objector), explained that the Council had a long history of complaints relating to various iterations of this venue, dating

back to 1996, continuing through 2004, with the most recent complaint in October 2025, which he understood took place under the current ownership.

Michael McNaughton then described the Council's complaint-handling process. When a complaint was made, two formal letters were issued: one to the complainant, explaining how their concern would be handled; and another to the alleged source of the nuisance.

Complainants were also provided with a 14-day diary log. In the majority of cases, the matter was usually concluded, as the perpetrators typically amend their activities.

However, to establish a statutory nuisance, Environmental Protection had to demonstrate frequency, duration, and severity. Some incidents affected amenity but did not meet the threshold for statutory nuisance and therefore did not lead to formal notices.

Michael McNaughton noted that although the Applicant had stated they did not intend to run a nightclub-style operation, several proposed activities resembled nightclub-type activities: opening until 1am, having DJs, and hosting private parties. He warned that removing controls – such as the existing noise limiter requirement and allowing customers outside with drinks – increased the risk of further complaints, even if those complaints did not escalate to statutory nuisance.

Michael McNaughton acknowledged that the reason the Council had not received statutory nuisance-level complaints in previous years was, in part, because the previous tenants never complied with the licence, notably by failing to install a noise limiter.

Michael McNaughton then explained the value of a noise limiter. It was typically installed following an acoustic assessment, allowing limits to be set for both overall decibel levels and individual frequencies, recognising that lower frequencies (such as bass) travel further and behave differently from speech or higher tones. He described how, for example, someone several houses away might hear only the bass beat from a party, without any voices, or vice versa.

Noise limiters ensured that regardless of the DJ, the equipment, or the type of event, sound levels remained within safe parameters.

Michael McNaughton observed that many complaints arose when different DJs brought their own equipment and bypassed the venue's usual setup. Venues without noise limiters tended to generate ongoing complaints that, over time, accumulated enough evidence to meet the statutory nuisance threshold – something Environmental Protection did not want, as it introduced criminal consequences for businesses. It was preferable, he argued, to manage issues at the licensing stage.

Regarding outdoor areas, Michael McNaughton said that when one person went outside to smoke, friends often accompanied them to continue conversations, which carried into the street. Complaints at this venue predominantly occurred in summer, when residents were using their gardens or sleeping with windows open.

Michael McNaughton explained that late-night noise, particularly up to 1:00am, could disturb sleep, which was why conditions restricting outdoor drinking and requiring noise controls existed – not to prevent the business from operating, but to balance enjoyment for patrons with respect for residents.

Michael McNaughton conveyed that Environmental Protection therefore wished to keep the noise limiter condition and restrict outside drinking, permitting only smoking outside.

On the subject of acoustic lobbies, Michael McNaughton clarified that Environmental Protection did not object to removing the lobby if alternative sound-containment measures were in place. He explained the lobby's original purpose: past tenants frequently left doors

propped open, allowing noise to escape. Lobbies had ensured that at least one of two doors remained closed at all times.

However, Michael McNaughton said that if the applicant fitted self-closing (spring-loaded) doors, Environmental Protection would be satisfied, as this maintained similar noise-control benefits.

The Chair then invited questions from the Sub-Committee to the Objector.

Councillor Gosling asked whether self-closing doors would satisfy the function of the lobby condition. Michael McNaughton confirmed that they would, as long as they closed automatically and prevented prolonged noise escape.

Councillor Bond asked about noise limiters – how they worked, whether they could be bypassed, and whether they were always required.

Michael McNaughton explained some operators had attempted bypasses in the past, but noise limiters provided a clear regulatory framework, allowing Environmental Protection to check acoustic output if complaints were received. Noise limiters required maintenance and had to be set correctly, but they were an effective control.

Roxana Khakinia asked for clarification on whether Environmental Protection always sought a noise limiter for any pub licence application. Michael McNaughton responded that conditions were venue specific. Many existing licences were old and had never required such controls. New restrictions were generally only sought where there was a history of complaints or where residents were in close proximity.

The Chair invited the Applicant to ask any questions to the Objector. However, before she spoke, Craig Hawkings asked for clarification from the Applicant. He noted there were over 43 existing conditions on the premises licence, including those added in 2011, and he sought confirmation from the Applicant on whether they wished to replace all current conditions with those listed in Section M of the application.

Lisa Wells replied that they only wished to amend or remove the specific conditions they had listed. She was happy to comply with training requirements and other responsible licensing practices.

She then explained that her understanding of the lobby condition had been that it required expensive acoustic panelling, which they had already partly installed inside the premises due to shared walls with residents. No noise limiter had ever been installed by previous tenants; and installing a limiter now would impose significant costs that they could not manage as a small family business. She fully understood the historical issues but stressed they were a different business with different practices.

Lisa Wells mentioned that she found old letters from Environmental Protection addressed to previous tenants; and had made multiple attempts to contact Environmental Protection from October 2024 onward to introduce themselves as new owners. She also mentioned that she only learnt of a complaint in October 2025 indirectly through the Licensing Enforcement Officer; and had attempted to follow up but was informed that the complainant had left no contact details, preventing any resolution or apology.

Lisa Wells emphasised that removing or amending onerous conditions was not an attempt to avoid responsibility, but to enable Electric Nightlife Ltd to operate fairly and comparably with other local pubs. She highlighted that many public houses in Windsor hosted private parties, karaoke nights, and live mic events without any of the restrictive conditions placed on their premises.

The Chair asked Michael McNaughton whether anything the Applicant had said changed his position. Michael McNaughton replied that the lobby requirement could be waived if self-closing doors were fitted. He clarified that acoustic panelling alone was difficult for the Council to assess unless derived from a proper acoustic assessment.

On noise limiters, he suggested a possible compromise: instead of a full limiter installation, the Applicant could conduct a controlled event, have an acoustic assessment completed to establish acceptable limits (for example, up to 55 dB at the nearest residential building), and thus demonstrate compliance to Environmental Protection.

Lisa Wells then asked one final procedural question: whether the blue notice displayed at the premises could be removed. Craig Hawkings confirmed it could have been taken down after the 28-day consultation period.

Lisa Wells then made a closing plea, explaining that the Electric Nightlife Ltd did not already have a noise limiter in place. Whilst she appreciated the suggested compromise from Michael McNaughton, this still represented a substantial cost. She reiterated that they had inherited the problems created by previous tenants and had spent months repairing supplier and creditor relationships. She wished to prove themselves without incurring further disproportionate burdens not faced by other local pubs.

With no further comments or questions, the Chair invited the Applicant to summarise their case.

Lisa Wells summarised that Electric Nightlife Ltd sought the removal of certain conditions not to avoid responsibility, but to allow normal operation of a small family business. She took remote management seriously, used CCTV actively, and upheld compliance standards. She wanted a fair opportunity to operate like other pubs while still maintaining high standards of training, safety, and responsibility.

The Chair then invited Craig Hawkings to deliver his closing summary.

Craig Hawkings wished to recap a few key points. He noted that, based on what the Applicant had described, the request for earlier Sunday hours – particularly in relation to sporting fixtures – was essentially an effort to future-proof the licence, avoiding the need for repeated Temporary Event Notices (TEN) and their associated costs. Likewise, the request to extend hours for specific activities was again intended to reduce dependence on TENs when hosting private events.

Craig Hawkings then summarised the Sub-Committee's statutory responsibilities. He reminded the Sub Committee that they were required to determine the application with a view to promoting the four licensing objectives:

1. The prevention of crime and disorder,
2. Public safety,
3. The prevention of public nuisance,
4. The protection of children from harm.

He advised that, in making their decision, the Sub Committee must have regard both to the national Section 182 guidance and the Council's own Licensing Policy. They must also take into account:

- all representations that had been made,
- the evidence heard during the hearing, and
- the written representation from the resident included in the agenda papers.

Craig Hawkings explained that, having regard to the application and the relevant representations, the Sub-Committee must take whatever steps it considered appropriate for promoting the licensing objectives. These steps could include:

- Rejecting the application,

- Granting the application with modifications to the activities, hours, or conditions; or
- Granting the application as submitted, ensuring that appropriate conditions were attached.

Craig Hawkings emphasised that a written decision letter must set out the reasons for the Sub-Committee's determination. He reminded the Sub Committee of their duty of impartiality and the need to base their decision solely on the evidence presented.

If the Sub-Committee refused the application wholly or partly, or modified any element of the licence, they must explain why such steps were considered appropriate for promoting one or more of the licensing objectives and identify the evidence that supported that conclusion.

Craig Hawkings reminded Sub Committee that they could seek the assistance of the Legal Advisor in formulating legally robust reasons, but final decisions must be those of the Sub-Committee itself. He also noted that any party to the hearing could appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of receiving the written decision.

All parties then left the room for deliberations at 3:11pm and took no further part in the meeting apart from the sub-committee, the clerk and the Council's legal officer.

During the deliberations, after having heard all the evidence that had been presented to them from the Applicant, Craig Hawkings, and the Objector, the Sub Committee agreed unanimously to grant the licence as applied with all for with the added condition:

- The disposal of bottles into external waste receptacles shall not take place between the hours of 22:00 and 09:00 to prevent noise disturbance to local residents.

In making their decision, the Sub-Committee were extremely mindful of its duty to promote the four licensing objectives which are:

- The Prevention of Crime & Disorder,
- Public Safety,
- The Prevention of Public Nuisance,
- The Protection of Children from Harm.

The Sub-Committee were presented with no substantive evidence to suggest that any of the four licensing objectives would be breached if they were to grant a variation to the license.

Having considered the written and oral submissions that had been made by the Objectors, the Sub Committee believed no evidence had been presented to suggest that the license and the conditions would be breached at this stage. They noted that the issues which were raised by Objectors occurred under the previous owners and acknowledged the Applicant's efforts in ensuring good relations with neighbours and the authority.

The Sub Committee reminded that the right of review under the Licensing Act was open to all where any license has been granted.

AGREED UNANINMOUSLY: To grant the application for a variation to the premises license to be granted at Electric Nightlife Limited / The Sporting King, as applied for with the added condition:

- **The disposal of bottles into external waste receptacles shall not take place between the hours of 22:00 and 09:00 to prevent noise disturbance to local residents.**

The meeting, which began at 2.03 pm, finished at 3.46 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Tuesday 31 March 2026

Present: Councillors Mandy Brar, Genevieve Gosling and Mark Howard

Officers: Craig Hawkings, Anthony Lenaghan**,** Oran Norris-Browne, Monika Kolodziejczyk and Becky Oates

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Howard proposed that Councillor Brar be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Gosling.

AGREED: That Councillor Brar be elected as Chair of the Sub Committee.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The clerk, Oran Norris-Browne, read out the Procedures of the Sub Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application for a variation to a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, outlined the application submitted by Epic Bars and Clubs Berkshire Limited. He explained that the application sought a variation of the premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 to extend the hours for all licensable activities from 03:00 to 03:30 hours on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays immediately preceding a Bank Holiday Monday. He confirmed that the applicant had discussed the proposal with Thames Valley Police prior to submission and that an updated dispersal policy was included within the agenda bundle. No other changes to the premises licence were sought.

The Designated Premises Supervisor was confirmed as Mr Jonathan Kieran Taylor.

The last date for representations was 3 March 2026.

Craig Hawkings advised that the application had been correctly advertised and that all statutory requirements had been met. He reminded Members of the four licensing objectives and confirmed that no responsible authorities had submitted representations. One representation had been received from a local resident, which was included in the agenda papers in redacted form.

He outlined the Sub-Committee's available options:

- to refuse the application;

- to grant the application with modifications to activities, hours or conditions; or
- to grant the application as applied for.

He confirmed that, had no representations been received, the application would have been granted under delegated authority.

Councillor Howard sought clarification on the definition of Bank Holidays and it was confirmed that the variation applied only to Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays preceding a Bank Holiday Monday. Further clarification was sought regarding opening hours and late-night refreshment.

Craig Hawkings confirmed that late-night refreshment was licensable from 23:00 hours and that the proposed variation did not alter opening hours beyond 03:30.
Andrew Woods addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the applicant.
He clarified that the application related only to the extension of licensable activities, not to later closing times, and that the premises would still close and fully disperse customers by 03:30. He confirmed that Thames Valley Police had raised no objections and that an updated dispersal policy had been provided. He noted there were also no objections from RBWM Environmental Health or Licensing.

Andrew Woods summarised the applicant's written case summary, highlighting robust management practices including CCTV, body-worn cameras, trained door staff, radio links, a qualified medic on busy nights, and proactive engagement with police and environmental health. He explained that the premises was located at the top of Goswell Hill and that staff actively monitored dispersal routes. He stated that noise from the premises itself could not be heard at Bridgewater Terrace and that customers typically dispersed towards the station taxi rank. He confirmed that the premises had also previously operated under Temporary Event Notices without incident.

Councillor Gosling asked about engagement with residents and how often this had taken place. Andrew Woods advised that a meeting had taken place with residents facilitated by neighbourhood policing, that the premises' contact details were publicly available, and that no direct complaints relating specifically to the premises had been received.

Councillor Gosling asked if there was a policy or notice that made guests aware that they had to leave quietly. Jon Taylor, Applicant, confirmed that door staff actively managed dispersal. He explained that staff remained onsite until dispersal was complete.
Councillor Gosling asked why a 30 minute extension was requested. Jon Taylor explained that the request was commercially motivated, citing successful Temporary Event Notices and demand for an additional 30 minutes of licensable activity.
Clarification was sought regarding service close-down procedures. Andrew Woods confirmed that alcohol would not be served up to the final minute and that bars were closed progressively to allow orderly dispersal.

Councillor Brar asked about litter and what was being done to address complaints regarding this. Jon Taylor confirmed that staff undertook post-closure street cleaning in the immediate area and mentioned that free water bottles were provided.
Suzanne Howell was then invited to address the Sub-Committee on behalf of residents. She stated that residents objected to the application on the grounds of crime and disorder, public safety, and public nuisance. She expressed concern that extended drinking time could increase intoxication levels and antisocial behaviour during dispersal. She cited longstanding issues in the area, including disorder, parking, delayed emergency access, noise from waiting taxis and social groups. She stressed that issues arose primarily from the cumulative impact of clustered venues rather than a single premises.

While acknowledging that music from the premises itself was not audible, she emphasised that disturbance arose from customers after dispersal, particularly between 03:30 and 05:00.

Councillor Gosling asked how residents distinguished the source of customers affecting Bridgewater Terrace. Suzanne Howell acknowledged difficulty in attributing behaviour to a single premises, explaining that patrons from multiple venues dispersed along the same routes.

The applicant confirmed that they had no questions for the objectors.
Suzanne Howell clarified that objections related to customer behaviour following dispersal, not to noise emanating from the premises building itself
Andrew Woods briefly summarised the applicant's position, reiterating that the premises would not operate later, that management standards were high, and that there was no evidence linking the issues described directly to Labyrinth patrons
Craig Hawkings then summarised by reminding the Sub Committee of the applicant's compliance history, the absence of objections from responsible authorities, and the lawful operation of previous Temporary Event Notices. He restated the Sub Committee's decision-making framework and the requirement to base the decision solely on the evidence presented, having regard to the Council's Licensing Policy and the National Section 182 Guidance.

The Sub Committee retired to deliberate in private.

The Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and said that the decision would be issued in writing to all parties within five working days.

During their deliberations the Sub Committee agreed with the resident concerns with the dispersal of customers and litter, to which they strongly recommended that the premises looked at taking a lead in setting up a group with the fellow premises, to try and address the concerns raised.

The Sub Committee also wished to explore recommending to the RBWM Licensing Panel to put in place a group for this area. to look into and investigate the public nuisance on Bridgewater Terrace.

In conclusion, the Sub Committee's decision was to grant the variation as applied for as no evidence could be presented that any premises in the area was contributing more than another to any public nuisance or litter within the area and that no representation had been made by Thames Valley Police.

AGREED: That the variation to the premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 be granted at Labyrinth, Unit 15A Windsor Royal Station, Jubilee Arch, Windsor SL4 1PJ.

The meeting, which began at 2.00 pm, finished at 2.55 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Friday 17 April 2026

Present: Councillors Genevieve Gosling, Neil Knowles and Helen Taylor

Also in attendance: Councillor Jack Douglas

Officers: Mikey Lloyd, Craig Hawkings, Anthony Lenaghan and Monika Kolodziejczyk

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Gosling proposed that Councillor Knowles be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Taylor.

AGREED: That Councillor Knowles be elected as Chair for the duration of the Sub Committee.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The Chair read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application of a new premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkins, Licensing Team Leader, presented the report and explained the application was for the grant of a new premises licence. Craig Hawkins stated that the application related solely to the provision of late night refreshment, namely hot food and non alcoholic drinks for consumption on and off the premises, from 23:00 hours to 03:00 hours, Monday to Sunday. He confirmed that no Designated Premises Supervisor was required for this activity under the Licensing Act 2003.

Craig Hawkins advised that the application had been correctly advertised, that the deadline for representations was 18 February 2026, and that a hearing was required due to relevant representations being received. Craig Hawkings reminded the Sub-Committee of the four licensing objectives:

- the prevention of crime and disorder,
- public safety,
- the prevention of public nuisance, and
- the protection of children from harm

Craig Hawkins confirmed that Thames Valley Police had agreed conditions with the applicant and that no other responsible authorities had objected. He noted that four objections from

other parties had been received and were included in redacted form within the agenda papers. Craig Hawkins outlined the Sub-Committee's options, including refusing the application, granting it with amendments, or granting it as applied for.

Councillor Gosling asked what the existing permitted hours were prior to the application. Craig Hawkins responded that the premises had previously operated until 23:00 hours.

The Chair stated that, based on experience of similar late night premises elsewhere, there were concerns regarding public nuisance and the congregation of young people, particularly given that such venues could attract late night congregations and associated disorder. The Chair asked whether there was a benchmark or standard approach to assessing such risks.

Craig Hawkins replied that each application had to be assessed on its own merits and stated that the applicant's operating schedule, internal policies, agreed police conditions, and the absence of objections from responsible authorities were all relevant considerations, but that there was no fixed benchmark applicable.

Councillor Taylor queried how the agreed condition requiring SIA licensed security staff on specified evenings, including Fridays, Saturdays, and before Bank Holidays, would operate in practice. Craig Hawkins advised that this was an operational matter for the applicant to explain and would typically be managed through ongoing liaison between the premises and Thames Valley Police.

Freddie Humphreys, Legal Representative for the Applicant, confirmed they had no questions for Craig Hawkings.

Freddie Humphreys introduced himself as counsel representing the applicant and confirmed that Shafali Shown-Keen, Applicant, was also present to answer questions. Freddie Humphreys explained that his presentation would outline the application, the operation of the premises, and the measures in place to promote the licensing objectives.

Freddie Humphreys stated that Shafali Shown-Keen operated seven McDonald's premises, including two with 24 hour licences and three with late night refreshment licences, demonstrating substantial experience in managing similar operations. He highlighted Shafali Shown-Keen's familiarity with Maidenhead and the support available through McDonald's corporate policies and procedures.

Freddie Humphreys described the layout of the premises, noting a single, set back entrance with an automatic closing door, designed to minimise noise nuisance. He explained that the premises employed approximately 60 staff and, if the licence were granted, additional staff would be recruited. He stated that extended hours would allow safer and more sociable shift patterns for employees.

Freddie Humphreys outlined robust measures to manage crime, disorder, and antisocial behaviour, including extensive CCTV coverage, trained management presence at all times, and the installation of a "Staff Safe" system providing immediate external support when incidents arose. He explained that staff were trained to manage antisocial behaviour using practical measures such as Wi-Fi control and music changes.

Freddie Humphreys addressed delivery driver management, confirming that drivers waited inside the premises only, were monitored through reporting systems, and were subject to ongoing engagement with delivery companies. He also detailed regular litter picking, waste management practices, and engagement with the local community, including support for council staff facilities.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed that the applicant had proactively engaged with Thames Valley Police, resulting in reduced proposed hours and agreed conditions, including SIA licensed door supervisors with body worn cameras. He concluded that the application was supported

by strong management, agreed police conditions, no objections from responsible authorities, and would adequately promote the licensing objectives.

The Chair raised questions regarding the management, access, and governance of CCTV and body worn camera footage at the premises, particularly in relation to data protection and whether suitably trained or licensed individuals would oversee the storage and release of footage. The Chair sought clarification on who would review footage and how compliance with GDPR would be ensured.

Freddie Humphreys explained that CCTV footage was automatically recorded to secure storage and retained for 31 days in accordance with conditions agreed with Thames Valley Police. Freddie Humphreys confirmed that any request to view or release footage would be considered by appropriately trained McDonald's personnel in compliance with GDPR requirements. He clarified that references in the documentation to 12 months related to incident logs rather than CCTV footage.

The Chair expressed broader safeguarding concerns, particularly regarding young people congregating late at night and the potential risks this could pose. The Chair queried whether any age related controls or restrictions had been considered during late night hours.

Freddie Humphreys responded that there was no legal basis for enforcing age restrictions in such premises and that restricting access could inadvertently remove a safe, supervised location for vulnerable individuals. He explained that McDonald's participated in schemes designed to provide safe spaces and that staff were trained to manage safeguarding concerns.

The Chair questioned how safeguarding would be managed in practice and asked whether evidence of staff training could be provided.

Shafali Shown-Keen confirmed that all staff received safeguarding training during induction, with additional training provided to crew trainers and managers. She explained that staff were trained to escalate concerns appropriately, including contacting management, using the Staff Safe system, or involving the police if necessary, and confirmed that documentary evidence of training could be provided upon request.

Councillor Gosling asked about demand for extended hours, the anticipated customer profile, and the safety of women using the premises late at night.

Shafali Shown-Keen responded that extended hours supported safer staff travel and served key workers, delivery customers, and late night patrons. She stated that the premises attracted a broad mix of customers and provided a well lit, supervised environment that could offer women a safe place when needed.

Councillor Douglas, speaking on behalf of two residents of his ward who had submitted objections to the application but were unable to attend the meeting, clarified that he was presenting their views only and not his own personal opinion.

Councillor Douglas first sought clarification from Craig Hawkins as to whether objectors were named in the public papers, and Craig Hawkins confirmed that objectors' identities were redacted from the public documentation, although the applicant was aware of them.

Councillor Douglas then summarised the objections raised. He asked the applicant to clarify the reference in the application to late night refreshment being provided both indoors and outdoors, noting that there was no external serving hatch or collection point and that residents sought reassurance on what "outdoors" meant in this context.

Councillor Douglas outlined concerns raised by residents regarding the lack of demonstrated community need for extended hours and argued that the application exceeded the Council's

framework hours, which he suggested required exceptional justification. He noted objections to the permanent nature of the licence, concerns that CCTV proposals lacked clarity regarding external coverage, and worries about litter and food waste affecting Kidwells Park, including an existing rat problem. He asked whether extended litter patrols into the park area could be considered.

Councillor Douglas also referred to concerns about delivery vehicle noise, potential strain on police resources, and alleged issues with the online consultation process. He concluded by highlighting framework hours and localised litter impacts as key matters for the Sub-Committee's consideration.

The Sub-Committee confirmed they had no questions to ask of Councillor Douglas, representing the objectors.

Freddie Humphreys stated that it would not be appropriate for him to question Councillor Douglas directly, as Councillor Douglas had been summarising objections made by third parties rather than presenting his own views.

The Chair then asked whether any other Members wished to raise further questions or make additional comments before the Sub-Committee moved to summaries.

Councillor Douglas asked the applicant to clarify the reference in the application to late night refreshment being provided both indoors and outdoors. He queried whether any outdoor serving or collection area was intended, noting that the current premises appeared to have no such provision.

Freddie Humphreys explained that "outdoors" referred to food being taken off the premises, rather than any external serving area. He confirmed that the licence covered customers purchasing food to take away and delivery drivers collecting food from inside the premises for delivery.

The Chair confirmed that this definition included delivery drivers.

Councillor Douglas then asked Craig Hawkins whether ticking the "outdoor" provision box was necessary in this context.

Craig Hawkins confirmed that this was standard practice for late night refreshment licences, explaining that "on the premises" referred to food consumed inside, while "off the premises" covered takeaway food and deliveries.

Councillor Douglas thanked both for the clarification and turned to litter concerns, acknowledging the applicant's existing litter picking commitments. He asked whether the applicant would consider extending litter patrols into Kidwells Park.

Freddie Humphreys responded that while the applicant was happy to engage in community initiatives and discussions, it would not be appropriate to include litter management at a distant location as a licence condition. He confirmed willingness to discuss voluntary initiatives.

The Chair observed that ongoing communication between the Council and the applicant would be appropriate if litter issues arose.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed the applicant's willingness to continue local engagement.

Councillor Douglas asked about CCTV coverage outside the premises.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed that while the premises did not monitor the wider street, CCTV coverage included the immediate entrance area.

Finally, Councillor Douglas requested contact details for future engagement with the town team. Freddie Humphreys confirmed his agreement and added that the applicant would also consider participation in council led safety initiatives if invited.

The Chair invited the applicant to provide a brief closing summary and confirm that all relevant points had been addressed.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed that he was satisfied that the applicant had addressed the concerns raised by objectors through explanation of the premises' operation, policies, and safeguards. He clarified that the licensing regime did not require an applicant to demonstrate need, that premises licences were inherently permanent rather than temporary, and that the Council's framework hours were guidelines rather than absolute limits. He reiterated that the applicant had proactively engaged with Thames Valley Police, agreed detailed conditions, and that no responsible authorities had objected. He emphasised that licensing decisions must be evidence based and that there was no evidence of existing or likely problems attributable to the premises. He also reiterated his comments regarding the wording of the litter picking condition.

Anthony Lenaghan, Legal Officer, asked what alternative wording could be proposed for the litter condition.

Freddie Humphreys suggested wording requiring litter picking of the premises and associated external areas, subject to precise definition to ensure enforceability.

The Chair proposed that the condition define a clear "immediate vicinity", potentially supported by an agreed description or diagram, to avoid ambiguity.

Freddie Humphreys agreed in principle, subject to defining a reasonable area, noting practical constraints at the side of the premises.

Craig Hawkins cautioned that attaching a map directly to a licence condition was unusual but agreed that defining an area within the wording could be appropriate.

The Chair suggested that wording could require an agreed defined area, to be approved by the Licensing Team.

Craig Hawkins then summarised the Sub-Committee's options: to refuse the application, grant it with modified activities, hours, or conditions, or grant it as applied for. He reminded Members of their duty to act impartially, base decisions on evidence, have regard to the Council's Licensing Policy and section 182 guidance, and provide clear, legally robust reasons capable of withstanding appeal.

The Chair thanked all participants and confirmed that the Sub-Committee would retire to deliberate, with the written decision to be issued within five working days, the Chair then asked if there was a time to reconvene.

Mikey Lloyd, Democratic Services Officer, advised that no specific time could be given for reconvening, and that parties would be notified following deliberations.

Anthony Lenaghan requested that any agreed revised wording for condition six be shared by email.

All parties then left the room for deliberations at 12:10pm, apart from the sub-committee, the clerk and the Council's legal officer.

During deliberations, the Sub-Committee discussed the appropriateness of imposing additional conditions relating to litter management. They acknowledged that McDonald's

generally demonstrated good practice in managing litter, but noted location specific challenges, particularly where waste issues arose from adjoining land or alleyways beyond the applicant's control. The Sub-Committee agreed that any litter picking condition should clearly define the area for which the premises would be responsible, to avoid imposing obligations over land owned or managed by the Council or third parties.

The Sub-Committee considered whether conditions should specify distances or marked areas and agreed that a defined "immediate vicinity", described precisely in the wording of the condition, would be preferable to vague or unenforceable requirements. It was agreed that attaching a map directly to the licence would be inappropriate, but that the decision notice could reference a clearly described area.
Concerns were raised about the premises being the only venue operating until 03:00 hours and the potential for it to attract late night congregation by default.

While recognising these concerns, the Sub-Committee accepted legal advice that speculative risks could not justify refusal where there were no objections from responsible authorities and agreed police conditions were in place.

The Sub-Committee discussed whether a "trial period" could be imposed and were advised that licences could not be granted on a temporary basis. However, the Sub-Committee agreed that the decision letter could strongly emphasise expectations, encourage active monitoring by Licensing and Environmental Health officers, and clearly reference the statutory power of licence review should problems arise.

The consensus of the Sub-Committee was to grant the application, subject to the agreed police conditions and amended wording of the litter picking condition, accompanied by highlighting scrutiny expectations and the availability of review mechanisms in the decision letter.

UNANIMOUSLY AGREED: To grant the application of a new premises licence at McDonalds, 65-67, High Street, Maidenhead, SL6 1JT with the amended wording to condition six in relation to litter picking.

All parties for the next application returned to the room at 12:40pm and the meeting reconvened to hear the second application.

Consideration of an application of a new premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkins introduced the application for a new premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 for McDonald's, 13–14 Thames Street, Windsor. He explained that the application was identical in licensable activity to the previous item, seeking permission for the provision of late night refreshment between 23:00 and 03:00 hours, seven days a week. Craig Hawkins confirmed that the application had received one representation from a local resident, that the same conditions had been agreed with Thames Valley Police, and that no other responsible authorities had made representations. He reminded the Sub-Committee that their options remained to refuse the application, grant it as applied for, or grant it with modifications.

The Chair noted that, aside from the differing location, the application was substantively the same as the earlier McDonald's application considered that day.

Craig Hawkins agreed and added that revised wording for the litter picking condition, similar to that proposed for the Maidenhead premises, would also apply to this application and be forwarded to the legal officer.

It was confirmed that the neither the Sub-Committee, nor the applicant had any questions for the reporting officer.

The Chair then invited the applicant to present their case. Freddie Humphreys stated that, given the similarities to the earlier application, he would not repeat the detailed policies and procedures already discussed, confirming that all safeguarding, staffing, CCTV, delivery management, and “Staff Safe” systems were also in place at the Windsor premises. He outlined that staffing levels and management structures were comparable, with increased staffing anticipated if the licence were granted.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed that Shafali Shown-Keen had engaged with Thames Valley Police via the local ward councillor and that police had raised no concerns, leading instead to agreed conditions to promote the licensing objectives. He explained that the premises already undertook litter picking along Thames Street, Thames Avenue, River Street, and towards the nearby tennis courts, approximately three times daily. He added that the premises was actively engaged in community initiatives, including participation in a sponsored litter picking event in Windsor.

Freddie Humphreys noted that only one objection had been received, which he characterised as principled rather than evidence based, with no complaints made directly to the operator. He concluded that there was no evidence of existing or likely problems arising from the grant of the licence and invited the Sub-Committee to ask any further questions specific to the Windsor premises.

The Chair raised Windsor specific considerations, particularly the condition requiring SIA licensed door staff. The Chair suggested that, given the significant increase in footfall during state occasions and royal visits, additional security coverage on such days might be appropriate, even where they fell outside weekends or Bank Holidays.

Freddie Humphreys responded that condition nine already allowed Thames Valley Police to request SIA staff at any other times they deemed necessary, which would include state occasions. He confirmed that such requests would be assessed and accommodated.

Shafali Shown-Keen added that the premises already adjusted staffing and security levels during major events and cited recent state visits where additional measures had been taken when required.

The Chair then raised concerns regarding delivery riders congregating near Windsor Central Station and asked whether further steps could be taken to discourage riders from waiting in sensitive locations.

Shafali Shown-Keen confirmed she was willing to engage directly with delivery companies to discourage inappropriate congregation and seek alternative waiting arrangements.

The Chair also queried toilet availability within the premises late at night. Shafali Shown-Keen confirmed that toilets were intended to remain open at all times, including disabled facilities on the ground floor, and apologised for any previous inconvenience.

Councillor Gosling raised questions regarding litter picking frequency, signage discouraging littering, staff training duration, and safeguarding awareness.

Shafali Shown-Keen explained that litter patrols currently took place three times per day and could be adjusted, confirmed signage was already in place, outlined training periods ranging from several weeks to months, and confirmed safeguarding training formed part of staff induction. She also confirmed participation in a safety scheme similar to “Ask for Angela”, with signage displayed onsite.

Councillor Taylor sought clarification on whether the application proposed 24 hour trading.

Freddie Humphreys confirmed that, following consultation with Thames Valley Police, the application had been reduced to late night refreshment until 03:00 hours.

Craig Hawkins confirmed that subsequent representations suggesting 24 hour trading had been received after the consultation deadline and could not be considered.

The Chair noted that no objectors were present and invited final comments before closing the public hearing.

Freddie Humphreys provided a brief closing statement, reiterating reliance on earlier submissions, the absence of objections from responsible authorities, and confidence that the application promoted the licensing objectives.

Craig Hawkins restated the Sub-Committee's decision making options.

The Chair thanked all attendees, confirmed that the public session had concluded, and advised that the Sub-Committee would retire to deliberate, with the decision to be communicated within five working days.

All parties then left the room for deliberations at 1:02pm and took no further part in the meeting apart from the sub-committee, the clerk and the Council's legal officer.

During deliberations, the Sub-Committee discussed the application with particular reference to location specific impacts and late night operation.

The Sub-Committee acknowledged that delivery activity and associated impacts were not unique to the applicant but reflected wider issues affecting restaurants along Thames Street. It was noted that the night time economy in Windsor differed from that in Maidenhead and that the dynamics of the area might continue to evolve over the coming years.

The Sub-Committee also noted that the proposed terminal hour of 03:00am aligned with existing conditions and that the application did not seek 24 hour trading and reference was made to the strong and comprehensive conditions already agreed with Thames Valley Police.

The Sub-Committee therefore supported granting the application, subject to the same robust approach adopted for the earlier McDonald's application considered that day.

The Sub-Committee agreed that Licensing and Environmental Health officers should actively monitor the premises following commencement of late night trading and that the statutory review powers should be clearly referenced should issues arise.

The Sub-Committee agreed to approve the application on this basis, subject to agreed conditions and clarified wording regarding litter management.

UNANIMOUSLY AGREED: To grant the application of a new premises licence at McDonalds, 13-14 Thames Street, Windsor, SL4 1PL with the amended wording to condition six in relation to litter picking.

The meeting, which began at 11.03 am, finished at 1.15 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Thursday 30 April 2026

Present: Councillors Mandy Brar, Gurch Singh and Clive Baskerville

Officers: Munsoor Ayub, Chloe Plummer, Monika Kolodziejczyk, Craig Hawkings and Anthony Lenaghan

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Baskerville proposed that Councillor Brar be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Singh.

AGREED: That Councillor Brar be elected as Chair of the Sub Committee.

Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Knowles.

Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The chair read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application of a new premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, presented the report. He explained that the application had been submitted by Mehmet-Guest Equestrian Limited for The Oaks Polo Club at Martins Lane, Shurlock Row.

He stated that the application sought permission for live and recorded music between 12:00pm and 20:00pm and the supply of alcohol between 12:00pm and 22:00pm, Monday to Sunday. He confirmed that the application had been properly advertised and that no responsible authorities had submitted objections. However, fourteen representations had been received from members of the public.

The Sub-Committee were advised that the premises included a clubhouse and surrounding land identified within a red-line boundary where licensable activities would take place. Members were reminded of the four licensing objectives and the options available to them when determining the application.

Councillor Baskerville asked Craig Hawkings to clarify the layout of the site and whether the polo fields fell within the licensable area. The Officer advised that the red-line plan defined the licensable area and suggested that further detail could be provided by the applicant.

Councillor Singh asked whether planning matters raised in objections should be considered. Craig Hawkings advised that planning and licensing were separate regimes and that the Sub-Committee should focus on the licensing objectives.

William Edwards, Solicitor for the applicant, addressed the Sub-Committee. He explained that the application had been amended following earlier concerns and that hours had been reduced, particularly for music which would finish at 20:00pm. Alcohol would stop being served at 22:00pm.

He stated that the intention was for activities to remain ancillary to polo and not to introduce late-night or disruptive uses. He emphasised that the applicant sought to avoid causing disturbance to neighbouring residents.

Charlie Smith, Estate Manager at The Oaks Polo Club, confirmed this position and stated that the premises would not operate as a commercial events venue. He advised that there were no plans to host weddings or open events to the wider public, and that any gatherings would be limited to polo-related activities or private use connected to the owner.

He added that he lived on site and would oversee operations directly. He confirmed that he was available to residents and that contact details were publicly accessible.

Councillor Baskerville asked Charlie Smith to clarify the relationship between the clubhouse and the polo fields. Charlie Smith explained that the polo fields were located adjacent to, but outside, the licensable area, and that alcohol would not be taken onto the field.

Councillor Brar asked about the use of marquees and potential capacity. Charlie Smith advised that marquees would only be used occasionally, primarily in poor weather, and that larger capacities were rare and based on exceptional events.

Councillor Singh asked whether the applicant could comply with the proposed conditions, particularly regarding noise and hours. Charlie Smith confirmed that this would not be an issue and emphasised that there was no intention to operate late or host disruptive events.

Councillor Singh also raised the provision of a contact number for residents. Charlie Smith confirmed that he was already directly contactable and would continue to act as a point of contact.

Olly Lomas, a Registered Speaker, addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of nearby residents. He outlined concerns regarding the potential impact of the licence on residential amenity.

He explained that residents were particularly concerned about increased noise from music, evening activity and vehicle movements. He stated that the site was in a quiet rural location where sound travelled easily across open land and that nearby properties had direct line of sight to the clubhouse.

Olly Lomas also raised concerns regarding traffic and parking, noting that access roads were narrow and not suited to increased volumes of vehicles. He suggested that the level of activity proposed would be significantly greater than what had previously been anticipated when planning permission was granted.

Further concerns were raised regarding capacity, lack of parking provision, and perceived inconsistencies between the planning application and current proposals. It was suggested that the licence could enable a wider use of the site beyond polo-related activity.

The second registered speaker in objection, Vicky Lomas added that the impact on families, particularly young children, was a significant concern due to noise and evening disturbance.

Councillor Singh asked Olly Lomas to clarify the distance between his property and the clubhouse. Olly Lomas confirmed that it was approximately 370 metres, with open land between the two.

Councillor Baskerville asked about comparable local venues. The objectors explained that other venues in the area operated on a much smaller scale and did not give rise to similar concerns.

Charlie Smith responded to points raised by objectors. He reiterated that there were no plans to host public events or operate on a daily basis and that activities would remain limited and associated with polo.

He confirmed that parking arrangements could be managed on site and that traffic would not be directed along routes close to neighbouring properties. He acknowledged residents' concerns and stated his intention to maintain open communication and good relationships.

Craig Hawkings summarised the key considerations. He advised that matters relating to planning and capacity were governed by separate legislation and that nuisance issues could be addressed through environmental protection powers.

He reminded Members that a review process existed should problems arise after any licence was granted. The Sub-Committee was asked to determine the application having regard to the evidence presented and the licensing objectives.

After deliberations, the panel agreed to grant the license on the conditions that the applicant share their contact details with residents, adequate signage be put up telling customers to leave quietly and that it be included in the decision letter that the premises were to be used for Polo and not for commercial usage.

AGREED: That the premises license be granted to The Oaks, Martins Lane, Shurlock Row, Reading, RG10 OPP. The panel added two conditions.

- The applicant share their contact details with residents, and display contact details on the premises

- Adequate signage at the exit of the Polo Club to advise patrons to leave quietly and respectfully.

The meeting, which began at 11.01 am, finished at 12.14 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Monday 11 May 2026

Present: Councillors Simon Bond, Mark Howard and Catherine Del Campo

Officers: Anthony Lenaghan, Andy Aldridge and Chloe Plummer

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Howard proposed that Councillor Del Campo be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Bond.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: Councillor Del Campo elected as Chair for the remainder of the Sub-Committee meeting.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The Chair read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of a Public Space Protection Order for the prohibition of ticket touting

The Chair invited the reporting officer, Andy Aldridge, Community Safety Manager, to present the application for a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) relating to ticket touting and unauthorised sales during the Royal Ascot event. Andy Aldridge provided a structured overview of the proposal, explaining that the PSPO was intended to address persistent and recurring issues observed each year on the High Street and at the train station, including ticket touting, unlicensed street trading and the obstruction of pedestrian movement.

They advised that these activities created nuisance, compromised public safety and had a detrimental impact on the overall experience of residents, visitors and legitimate businesses. They outlined that the proposed PSPO would provide a clear and proportionate mechanism to manage such behaviours during the event period.

Andy Aldridge explained that the order would be made under Section 59 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, and that the Council was satisfied that the legal tests had been met, namely that the activities were persistent or continuing in nature, unreasonable, and justified restrictions in order to protect quality of life. They further confirmed that consideration had been given to Articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and that the proposed restrictions were considered proportionate and did not unlawfully interfere with those rights.

The Panel was advised that the PSPO would introduce three principal restrictions within a defined area: prohibiting ticket touting without the written permission of the event organiser, including the sale, offer or advertisement of tickets; prohibiting unauthorised street trading, including the sale of goods, services or the erection of stalls without appropriate licences or

consent; and preventing obstruction of pedestrian movement, which was highlighted as particularly important given the volume of footfall during Royal Ascot.

Andy Aldridge advised that the order would remain in force for a period of three years, and that any breach could result in a Fixed Penalty Notice or prosecution, with enforcement intended to be proportionate and intelligence-led, focusing on persistent or deliberate breaches rather than incidental conduct. They also noted that, as with all PSPOs, there would be a six-week period during which the order could be challenged in the High Court.

Councillor Howard queried whether the level of the Fixed Penalty Notice, reduced to £75 if paid promptly, was sufficient to act as a deterrent, particularly given the potential profits associated with ticket touting. Andy Aldridge acknowledged this concern and advised that the primary purpose of the PSPO was behavioural change rather than income generation.

They explained that the fine level aligned with standard powers available and that, as this was the first implementation of such an order, it was considered appropriate to begin at that level, with the intention to review its effectiveness following the event. Councillor Howard also asked about engagement with Ascot Racecourse in relation to ticket transfer technology.

Andy Aldridge confirmed that the racecourse had been consulted as part of a six-week public consultation process and were supportive of the proposals. They advised that while Ascot Racecourse was taking steps internally to address ticket transfer and touting through technological measures, the Council's PSPO would apply to activity outside the racecourse, where the authority had responsibility.
Further discussion explored the primary drivers behind the proposal. Councillor Bond reflected on the congestion observed, particularly along Station Hill, noting that pedestrian movement could be impeded, resulting in individuals stepping into the roadway and creating safety risks.

Andy Aldridge confirmed that public safety and the management of large volumes of people were the key drivers behind the introduction of the PSPO, rather than complaints about ticket pricing or availability. They advised that consultation responses had been relatively low in number, with 33 responses received, the majority of which supported the proposals, particularly from those living close to the racecourse who raised concerns about congestion and safety. A small number of objections were noted, primarily relating to perceived restrictions on personal freedoms or a preference for informal ticket purchasing.

Councillor Bond raised questions regarding enforcement and repeat offending, asking whether individuals could simply absorb the cost of the fine and continue trading. Andy Aldridge advised that enforcement would be undertaken jointly by Community Wardens and police officers, and that individuals issued with a Fixed Penalty Notice would also be directed to leave the area for a period of up to 24 hours. They confirmed that failure to comply with such directions could result in escalation, including the potential for arrest under public order powers, although this was not the intended approach as it would divert police resources.

The Chair queried the potential impact on legitimate businesses, such as cafés placing tables and chairs outside premises. Andy Aldridge confirmed that existing licensed businesses operating within their permitted boundaries would not be affected, and that officers would focus on clear and deliberate breaches. They added that experienced officers would be deployed who were familiar with local licensing arrangements and would adopt a pragmatic, communication-led approach where minor issues arose.

The Chair discussed the range of unauthorised trading activities typically encountered during Royal Ascot, including the sale of souvenirs, flowers and promotional items, as well as unlicensed charity collections. Andy Aldridge confirmed that only those with the appropriate permissions, including registered charities authorised for specific days, would be permitted to operate, and that all others would fall within the scope of the PSPO restrictions.

In response to The Chair, regarding how residents or businesses could raise concerns or seek clarification, Andy Aldridge advised that, if the PSPO were approved, details would be published and contact information provided via the Community Safety team, with enquiries directed accordingly.

They clarified that while individuals could ultimately challenge the validity of the PSPO through the High Court within the statutory period, there was no direct appeal mechanism against the issuing of a Fixed Penalty Notice itself, although non-payment could result in the matter being considered by the courts.

The Chair thanked Andy Aldridge for their comprehensive presentation and responses, and Councillor Howard acknowledged the significant scale of planning and operational work required to support the Royal Ascot event each year. In conclusion, Andy Aldridge summarised the options available to the Panel, namely to approve the introduction of the PSPO as proposed, thereby providing an additional enforcement tool to manage identified issues, or to reject the application and continue to rely on existing legislation and discretionary powers.

After deliberations, it was unanimously agreed that the Public Space Protection Order be granted as applied for, for Royal Ascot week in June.

The sub-committee strongly suggested that once the Public Space Protection Order had been implemented, that the Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) increased from £75. The sub-committee believed that the potential financial gains ticket touts could benefit from selling Ascot tickets would outweigh the £75 FPN, therefore the fine would not deter ticket touts.

Furthermore, the sub-committee strongly recommended making Ascot Racecourse tickets less transferable, as this could help reduce congestion at turnstiles during ticket verification.

AGREED UNANIMOUSLY: The Public Space Protection Order was granted which prohibits ticket touting during the Royal Ascot racing event that takes place annual over 5 days in June.

The meeting, which began at 2.06 pm, finished at 2.42 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Thursday 9 July 2026

Present: Councillors Mandy Brar, Suzanne Cross and Helen Taylor

Officers: Mikey Lloyd, Craig Hawkings, Anthony Lenaghan, Monika Kolodziejczyk and Ricky Austnin

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Taylor proposed that Councillor Brar be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Cross.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The clerk read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application of a new premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, presented the report relating to an application from Faraway Ascot Limited for a new premises licence at 4 Broomhall Buildings, London Road, Ascot Sunningdale, SL5 0DH. He advised that the application sought permission to provide late night refreshment between 11:00pm and 2:00am, seven days a week, for a pizza restaurant and takeaway.

Craig Hawkings confirmed that the application had been correctly advertised, that all responsible authorities had been consulted, and that conditions had been agreed with Thames Valley Police. Craig Hawkings reported that two objections had been received and reminded the Sub-Committee of its duty to consider the application in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003, the Council's Licensing Policy and the four licensing objectives.

The Chair asked if the Sub-Committee or the applicant, Ramandeep Bola, had any questions for Craig Hawkings but there were none.

The Chair then invited Ramandeep Bola to address the Sub-Committee.

Ramandeep Bola stated that, after 11:00pm, the premises would operate on a delivery only basis, with no customer collections permitted. The Applicant considered that the proposals supported the licensing objectives and explained that the application had been driven by demand from hospitality workers, security staff, hotel guests and other customers working non standard hours. Ramandeep Bola also stated that extending trading hours would provide an opportunity to increase business revenue.

Councillor Cross sought clarification regarding collection hours advertised on the business website.

Ramandeep Bola confirmed that the website required updating and reiterated that no collections would take place after 11:00pm.

Councillor Cross asked if there had been any market research to evidence a need for increased hours.

In response Ramandeep Bola explained how that temporary event notices granted during the football World Cup had resulted in increased late night trade, with several orders being received between 11:00pm and 1:00am.

Ramandeep Bola added that customers had regularly enquired about later opening hours and that the requested 2:00am terminal hour would provide flexibility during busy seasonal periods such as Christmas and New Year.

Councillor Cross also questioned the potential for late night noise and disturbance from delivery drivers.

Ramandeep Bola explained that only company employed drivers would operate after 5:00pm and that all deliveries would be undertaken using cars rather than mopeds.

Ramandeep Bola confirmed that, after 11:00pm, only one driver would normally be on duty, collecting orders directly from the premises before departing immediately.

Ramandeep Bola further advised that drivers parked off the main road and that measures were in place to minimise disruption to neighbouring residents.

Councillor Cross asked if there was a litter bin currently outside the premises?

Ramandeep Bola stated that whilst there was no bin outside the premises there had been no complaints since the business opened in 2023 and that staff regularly checked the surrounding area to ensure it remained clean and free of takeaway packaging.

Ramandeep Bola concluded by summarising that the requested licence would enable delivery only trading between 11:00pm and 2:00am with minimal staffing on site and appropriate measures to promote the licensing objectives.

Craig Hawkings then summarised the options available to the Sub-Committee, including granting the application as submitted, granting it with modified hours, activities or conditions, or refusing the application. He reminded members that their decision must be based on the evidence presented and supported by reasons linked to the licensing objectives.

The Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and advised that the Sub-Committee would retire to deliberate. The decision would be communicated in writing within five working days

The Sub-Committee retired to deliberate, and all parties left the room at 2:25pm, except for the clerk and legal officer.

During deliberations the Sub-Committee took into account that there had been no complaints since being opened in 2023, including being open later through temporary event notices during the World Cup this summer.

The Sub-Committee also acknowledged the agreed police conditions in the application and were encouraged by the use of the applicants own delivery drivers from 5:00pm every day. The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant using their own delivery drivers would give them more control over driver behaviour at night which would assist in the prevention of public nuisance.

The Sub-Committee acknowledged the written objections and were sympathetic towards them but were content that the applicant had made it clear in their representations and request for the new premises license that the restaurant would not be open for the public to enter after 11pm and would be open for delivery only.

The Sub Committee noted that if any nuisance or complaints were to arise from the late opening hours for deliveries, that these could be highlighted and reviewed by the Environment Health Team.

In conclusion the Sub-Committee unanimously agreed to approve the new premises licence as submitted.

AGREED: That the new premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 be granted at 4 Broomhall Buildings, London Road, Ascot Sunningdale, SL5 0DH.

The meeting, which began at 2.00 pm, finished at 2.35 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

LICENSING & PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) SUB COMMITTEE

Wednesday 22 July 2026

Present: Councillors Simon Bond, Mandy Brar and Neil Knowles

Officers: Chloe Plummer, Craig Hawkings, Monika Kolodziejczyk and Anthony Lenaghan

Appointment of Chair

Councillor Bond proposed that Councillor Knowles be elected Chair of the Sub Committee. This was seconded by Councillor Brar.

AGREED: Councillor Knowles to be Chair for the duration of the sub-committee.

Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

Declarations of Interest

No Declarations of Interest received.

Procedures of the Sub Committee

The Chair read out the Procedures of the Sub-Committee to all parties present, who in turn noted them.

Consideration of an application for a new premises licence to be granted under the Licensing Act 2003

Craig Hawkings, Licensing Team Leader, presented the report and explained that the application had been submitted by Berkshire Sport and Leisure Limited for a new premises licence at Level 90, 87 High Street, Maidenhead. He advised that the application sought permission for the sale of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises, regulated entertainment and late-night refreshment.

Craig Hawkings explained that the ground floor would operate as a games bar during the day and early evening, whilst the basement would operate as a late-night bar providing live and recorded music. He confirmed that the application had been advertised correctly and that all consultation requirements had been complied with.
Craig Hawkings advised that all Responsible Authorities had been consulted and that no objections had been received from Thames Valley Police, Environmental Health, Trading Standards or any other Responsible Authority. He noted that conditions had been agreed between the applicant, Trading Standards and the Licensing Team. He further advised that one representation had been received from an interested party, necessitating consideration by the Sub-Committee.

Craig Hawkings outlined the hours sought for the sale of alcohol, regulated entertainment and late-night refreshment and reminded Members of the four licensing objectives. He advised that the hours sought were slightly outside the Council's framework hours but noted that, had no objections been received, the application would have been granted under delegated authority.

The Chair queried the proposed 3.00am closing time on Fridays and Saturdays and asked whether there was sufficient justification for extending beyond the framework hours.

Craig Hawkings advised that officers had no concerns regarding the proposed hours and reiterated that the application would have been granted as submitted had no representation been received. He noted that all Responsible Authorities, including the Police and Environmental Health, had been consulted and had raised no objections.
Councillor Brar asked why the applicant had sought a licence until 3.00am rather than 2.00am. Craig Hawkings advised that this would be a matter best answered by the applicant, although his understanding was that the proposed hours mirrored those previously operated by former premises in the town centre.

Councillor Bond asked for clarification regarding the meaning of "on and off sales" and sought clarification regarding the proposed non-standard timings. Craig Hawkings explained that on-sales related to alcohol consumed on the premises whilst off-sales related to alcohol purchased to be consumed elsewhere. He further advised that non-standard timings for bank holidays, national celebrations and sporting events were commonly requested and were already in use at a number of licensed premises within the borough.

The Chair then invited the applicant's representative to address the Sub-Committee.
Felix Faulkner, Solicitor acting on behalf of the applicant, introduced himself and Daniel Bisset, the proposed Designated Premises Supervisor. Felix Faulkner explained that the venue would be operated by experienced local hospitality operators and would provide a family-friendly 1990s-themed entertainment venue in Maidenhead town centre.

Felix Faulkner outlined Daniel Bisset's experience within the hospitality industry and advised that he had worked extensively within Maidenhead, operating several licensed premises and maintaining positive working relationships with licensing authorities and Thames Valley Police. Felix Faulkner explained that the ground floor would provide gaming, dining and family entertainment, whilst the basement would provide a late-night leisure offer. He advised that pre-application discussions had been held with Licensing Officers and Thames Valley Police and that 38 safeguarding conditions had been incorporated into the application, with a further four conditions agreed with Trading Standards.

Felix Faulkner noted that no Responsible Authority had objected to the application and addressed the sole representation received from Sorbon Estates. He submitted that the concerns raised related largely to future residential developments that had not yet been constructed and argued that there was no evidence to suggest the application would undermine the licensing objectives. He advised that regulated entertainment would be confined to the basement and that soundproofing measures would be installed to control noise.

Felix Faulkner stated that the applicant had sought to engage with the objector following receipt of the representation but that the invitation to meet had not been accepted. He submitted that the application would contribute positively to the local economy and the regeneration of Maidenhead town centre.

Councillor Brar asked how the applicant intended to ensure that under-18s left the premises by 9.00pm. Daniel Bisset explained that SIA-registered door supervisors would be on duty and would monitor compliance with the age restrictions. He advised that age verification procedures would be followed and that the requirement for under-18s to leave by 9.00pm would be communicated clearly and enforced.

Councillor Brar then asked how noise from customers leaving the premises at 3.00am would be managed. Daniel Bisset advised that door supervisors would oversee customer dispersal and seek to minimise disturbance. He explained that other town centre premises already operated until similar hours and that having trained security staff present would assist with managing customers as they left the venue.

Felix Faulkner added that the application included a written dispersal policy and a wind-down period before closing to assist with the safe and orderly dispersal of customers.
Councillor Bond raised concerns regarding potential noise nuisance and sought clarification regarding the location of the basement and the proposed food preparation arrangements.
Daniel Bisset explained that food provision was still being finalised and that options included either installing a small kitchen in the premises or utilising the kitchen facilities already available at Off The Tap. He advised that food would primarily be served during daytime trading periods rather than late at night.

Daniel Bisset described the layout of the basement and explained that acoustic consultants had undertaken surveys and assessments of the premises. He stated that suitable soundproofing measures would be installed and stressed that the venue was not intended to operate as a nightclub.

Councillor Bond noted the presence of residential properties above and behind the premises and queried whether those residents would be affected by noise. Daniel Bisset explained that acoustic monitoring had been undertaken in nearby residential accommodation and that the applicant was confident that noise would remain within acceptable levels. He noted that the venue would operate at a smaller capacity than some former late-night venues in the town centre.

Councillor Bond also queried smoking arrangements outside the premises. Daniel Bisset confirmed that smokers would be managed by door supervisors and that there would be no tables or chairs outside during late-night hours. He advised that smokers would be expected to smoke and then return inside.

Councillor Bond then raised concerns regarding the proposed non-standard timings and whether they could result in extended trading on nights preceding normal working days. Felix Faulkner explained that the non-standard timings generally permitted only an additional hour beyond the normal terminal hour and clarified that, where those occasions fell on weekdays, the latest closing time would generally be midnight rather than 4.00am.

Daniel Bisset further explained that bank holiday extensions generally related to the night before the bank holiday rather than the night before a normal working day.
The Chair commented that many of the issues he may otherwise have raised had already been addressed through the extensive conditions included within the application. He noted that the premises was located in the town centre and that the proposed conditions appeared appropriate and proportionate.

Councillor Bond commented that Maidenhead town centre was evolving and becoming increasingly focused on leisure and alternative town centre uses. He observed that the proposal appeared consistent with wider efforts to diversify and revitalise the town centre.

Daniel Bisset agreed and commented that there were significantly fewer late-night venues in Maidenhead than there had been previously. He expressed the view that the proposal would help support the evening economy and provide additional leisure opportunities within the town.

The Chair asked whether there were any registered objectors present.
Chloe Plummer, Democratic Services Officer, confirmed that there were no registered speakers or objectors present.

The Chair noted that Members had nevertheless considered the written representation contained within the agenda papers. The Chair invited the applicant to make any final comments. Daniel Bisset advised that he had nothing further to add and respectfully requested that the application be granted as submitted.

Felix Faulkner briefly summarised the applicant's case, highlighting the extensive consultation undertaken, the conditions agreed with Responsible Authorities, the applicant's experience within Maidenhead and the absence of objections from Responsible Authorities. He requested that the application be granted as applied for.
Craig Hawkings reminded Members that, should any issues arise following the grant of a premises licence, any resident, Responsible Authority or elected Member could seek a review of the licence. He then restated the options available to the Sub-Committee and reminded Members of the need to have regard to the Licensing Act 2003, the Section 182 Guidance and the Council's Licensing Policy when reaching their decision.

The Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and advised that the Sub-Committee would retire to deliberate in private. It was confirmed that the decision would be issued in writing within five working days.

During deliberations, the Sub-Committee stated that the Applicant had submitted a thorough and well-prepared application. They were satisfied that the application and supporting documentation adequately addressed matters relevant to the licensing objectives, including noise management, safeguarding measures, age verification procedures and customer dispersal arrangements.

The Sub-Committee noted that no Responsible Authorities had objected to the application and that a significant number of conditions had been agreed with the Licensing Team and Trading Standards. Councillors further noted that, had the application not received a representation from an interested party, it would have been granted under delegated officer powers.

Having considered all the written and oral evidence before it, the Sub-Committee was satisfied that the licensing objectives would be promoted and therefore resolved to grant the premises licence as applied for.

AGREED UNANIMOULSY: NEW PREMISES LICENCE TO BE GRANTED TO BERKSHIRE SPORT AND LEISURE LTD UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003.

The meeting, which began at 2.04 pm, finished at 2.53 pm

Chair…….

Date…….....

Report Title:	**Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Age Requirements**
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance
Meeting and Date:	Licensing Panel 12 October 2026
Responsible Officer(s):	Amanda Gregory, Assistant Director Housing and Public Protection
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

REPORT SUMMARY

At present, RBWM policies covering how hackney carriages and private hire vehicles are licenced use vehicle age as a main determinant as to whether a vehicle will be licenced.

Guidance from government says that local authorities should be moving away from vehicle age and instead should be using vehicle emissions, safety ratings and accessibility as determining factors.

This report sets out options for changes to RBWM policies to reflect this government guidance and RBWM environment strategy, and seeks the Licensing Panel's endorsement of how this should now be progressed.

This will support the aim "A cleaner, greener, safer and more prosperous borough" in the Council Plan (2024-28).

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

RECOMMENDATION: That the Licensing Panel notes the report and:

i) Agrees to adopt the changes to RBWM policies set out in Option 1, below, subject to the recommended consultation

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Options

Table 1: Options arising from this report:

Option 1	Comments
1. Remove age based licensing requirements for both existing and newly licenced hackney carriage and private hire vehicles for; a. zero emission (electric and hydrogen) vehicles, and b. Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliant vehicles from 01 April 2027	This would - bring RBWM into compliance with government requirements, - support RBWM's Environment and Climate Strategy 2026-2035 in relation to territorial emissions, and - remove potentially prohibitive driver costs of having to buy vehicles with strict age limitations

Option 1	Comments
2. Require that all newly licenced hackney carriage and private hire vehicles are Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliant from 01 April 2028 3. Require that all newly licenced hackney carriage and private hire vehicles are ULEV or ZEC compliant from 01 April 2030 4. Maintain age based licensing requirements for all other RBWM licenced hackney carriage and private hire vehicles but align them for both types of vehicle to a maximum age of five years on first licensing, and a maximum licensing age of 12 years 5. Before final adoption, all of these steps are first consulted on with the trade and other interested stakeholders **This is the recommended option**	
Option 2 The Licensing Panel may have other views on vehicle licensing requirements around vehicle age and emissions	Members may have views that differ from the proposals in Option 1, and views on a potential longer term move away from fossil fuelled vehicles being licenced
Do Nothing (mandatory)	RBWM would not comply with government requirements concerning vehicle licensing and would be out of step with national good practice No action would be taken to support RBWM's Environment and Climate Strategy 2026-2035 or towards moves to cleaner air quality in the borough Drivers would remain confronted with the potentially prohibitive costs of having to buy vehicles with strict age limitations

2.1 For many years, RBWM policies (the Hackney Carriage Driver and Vehicle Policy & Conditions, and the Private Hire Driver and Vehicle Policy & Conditions) have stipulated that only vehicles that meet certain age requirements will be considered for licencing.

2.2 All vehicles to be newly licenced as a hackney carriage must be wheelchair accessible except to replace an existing saloon or non-wheelchair accessible vehicle, in which case it can be a saloon or non-wheelchair accessible vehicle.

2.3 Hackney carriages that are wheelchair accessible must be no more than three years old when first licenced but once licenced can continue to be licenced indefinitely. Non wheelchair accessible hackney carriages must be no more than five years old when first licenced, but once licenced can be licenced to a maximum of 12 years from the date of first registration.

2.4 Private hire vehicles must be no more than five years old when first licenced and can be licenced to a maximum of 12 years from the date of first registration.

2.5 The Department of Transport's "Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing best practice guidance for licensing authorities in England" states that arbitrary vehicle age limits may be inappropriate and counterproductive, for example an older electric vehicle (EV) may produce lower emissions than a new petrol or diesel vehicle, so rigid age restrictions can actually hinder moves towards decarbonisation and clean air initiatives.

2.6 The guidance goes on to say (in paragraph 8.4 Vehicle age limits)

"Licensing authorities should not impose age limits for the licensing of vehicles, instead they should consider more targeted requirements to meet their policy objectives on emissions, safety rating and increasing wheelchair accessible provision where this is low."

2.7 RBWM's Environment and Climate Strategy 2026-2035 considers council influenced emissions. Whilst emissions from RBWM licenced vehicles are not specifically mentioned, it is clear that RBWM should make every effort to reduce territorial emissions, ie emissions generated inside the Royal Borough's boundary, where the council has influence on how the emissions are produced.

2.8 Transport dominates territorial emissions so moving away from age based licensing requirements to emission based requirements will contribute to the lowering of territorial emissions in a meaningful way.

2.9 Strategic Priority 2 in the Strategy, Sustainable Transport, has three main ambitions, one of which is "Support the transition to zero-emission vehicles".

2.10 In the long term, this may include a move to a position where fossil fuelled vehicle will no longer be licenced in RBWM as hackney carriages or private hire vehicles.

2.11 However, this will take considerable planning, the provision of a reliable, accessible network of public EV (electric vehicle) charge points, including at hackney carriage ranks, and a lead in time of at least ten years to allow drivers to plan ahead. It will also require clarity from government around the continued sale of fossil fuelled vehicles and targets they set for the sale of electric vehicles.

2.12 With regards to EV charge points the RBWM Electric Vehicle Chargepoint Implementation Plan of February 2023 does include the following;

“Buses and taxis
The borough is keen to support bus and taxi fleets to transition electric. It is anticipated that most recharging will take place in depots/homes when the vehicles are not in service, but we will introduce charging facilities in key locations and will identify a trial site for a taxi charging facility.

Action: Identify a trial site for a taxi charging facility.”

2.13 For now, whilst the Panel may have views on these longer term matters, it is proposed that the council concentrates on the first steps towards reducing emissions by changing RBWM policies as set out in Option 1, above.

2.14 This raises environmental standards and provides a phased move toward ULEV (Ultra Low Emission Vehicle) and ZEC (Zero Emission Capable) vehicles which will be simple to verify, aligns with the council’s environmental objectives and is a realistic transition for the trade.

2.15 The next step will be towards fully electric vehicles but, as already suggested, that is probably for the future at this time.

2.16 Euro 6 is the current European vehicle emissions standard for most petrol and diesel cars and vans. Its purpose is to reduce harmful air pollution from vehicle exhausts, particularly nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM), which are linked to respiratory and cardiovascular health problems. It is used for some air-quality schemes such as London's ULEZ (Ultra Low Emission Zone).

2.17 For practical purposes, Euro 6 compliance is usually established by;

- the vehicle's V5C and manufacturer data
- DVLA and vehicle type-approval records
- ULEZ/Clean Air Zone compliance checkers
- a manufacturer's certificate of conformity (CoC)

2.18 ULEV (Ultra Low Emission Vehicle) is not an emissions standard. It is a category of vehicles with very low carbon emissions and includes plug-in hybrids, battery electric vehicles and range-extender electric vehicles.

2.19 For licensing purposes, ULEV is established by;

- the vehicle's V5C emissions data
- DVLA vehicle enquiry records
- type-approval records
- a manufacturer's certificate of conformity (CoC)

2.20 ZEC (Zero Emission Capable) is the highest environmental standard for vehicles, short of fully electric vehicles, and such vehicles must be capable of running with zero tailpipe emissions, have a minimum electric-only range and meet very low overall CO_2 emissions requirements.

2.21 For licensing purposes, ZEC is established by;

- a manufacturer's certificate of conformity (CoC)
- vehicle type approval documentation
- manufacturers’ specifications

2.22 It is important to note that compliance with Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC standards is not the same as a vehicle passing an MOT. This is because a standard MOT station does not have the equipment or approval to verify Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliance.

2.23 Vehicles may pass its MOT while not meeting these standards, conversely a Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliant vehicle could fail an MOT because of an unrelated defect, so MOTs will continue to be required for all licenced vehicles to ensure that all of the other MOT requirements are being met.

2.24 RBWM's hackney carriage drivers have reported that the cost of wheelchair accessible vehicles under three years old is becoming prohibitive and have therefore requested that this requirement be amended or removed. Some private hire drivers have wanted to licence an electric vehicle which is more than five years old which is not permitted under current policy requirements. This does bring into question whether current requirements are fair and appropriate for RBWM licenced drivers and best for the environment.

2.25 It should be noted that if Option 1, above, is adopted in full, wheelchair accessible licenced hackney carriages that are not Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliant would no longer continue to be licenced indefinitely. This would be a benefit environmentally as non-compliant vehicles would eventually cease to be licenced (from April 2040 if Option 1 is adopted), but this may have an effect on drivers who currently own an older non-compliant vehicle.

2.26 Up to now they could assume that they could carry on using their vehicle indefinitely but this would no longer be the case. Some allowance could be made for existing licenced vehicles but this would undermine the whole point of moving to emissions as a deciding factor, with all of the environmental benefits that that would bring.

2.27 It is not known how many current licenced vehicles are Euro 6, ULEV or ZEC compliant and there may be unforeseen consequences to adopting the measures set out in Option 1, so all of these measures should first be consulted on with the trade and all relevant stakeholders.

2.28 Most modern TX4, LEVC TX, Mercedes Vito and similar hackney carriages will be Euro 6 compliant. ULEV or ZEC compliant vehicles are also available to buy.

2.29 Euro 7 will apply to new light-duty vehicle models from 29 November 2026 and to new heavy-duty vehicle models from 29 May 2028. It will be the strictest standard yet and the first to include non-exhaust emissions such as pollutants from vehicle brakes and tyres.

2.30 It is not intended that RBWM should use Euro 7 in the immediate future. This can be looked at when the matter of vehicle emissions and a potential move away from fossil fuelled vehicles as licenced vehicles is considered in the future.

Other Licensing Authorities

2.31 Other licensing authorities are taking a range of approaches to the move to emissions as a determining factor when licensing a vehicle. Some examples are set out in Appendix B

Vehicle Safety Standards

2.32 As well as MOTs, RBWM licenced vehicles are required to undergo compliance testing annually (every six months for vehicles over nine years old).

2.33 This consists of tests over and above the MOT on the safety and condition of the vehicle and the presence of a fire extinguisher.

2.34 This is considered sufficient for now and no changes to vehicle safety standards for RBWM licenced vehicles are proposed at this time.

Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles

2.35 A large majority of RBWM licenced hackney carriages are wheelchair accessible. This ensures that there will almost always be a wheelchair accessible vehicle available at a RBWM hackney carriage rank.

2.36 All newly licenced hackney carriages are required to be wheelchair accessible (unless replacing an existing saloon vehicle).

2.37 The percentage of private hire vehicles that are wheelchair accessible is lower but a private hire vehicle must be pre-booked, so the operator will always supply a wheelchair accessible vehicle if one is requested.

2.38 That being the case, no changes to the provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles are proposed at this time.

2.39 The Licensing Panel is invited to agree to Option 1.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 Adopting the measures set out in Option 1, above, will be a major change to RBWM vehicle licensing.

3.2 The full implications for the drivers may not yet be known and may become apparent when the recommended consultation is carried out. These can be reported to the next Licensing Panel meeting.

3.3 The benefits to the local environment will be an important element of RBWM reaching the targets and ambitions sets out in its Environment and Climate Strategy 2026-2035.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 There are no financial implications. Changes to licencing practices that result from the changes recommended in this report will be absorbed within current team resources.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Section 47 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 states;

(1) A district council may attach to the grant of a licence of a hackney carriage under the Act of 1847 such conditions as the district council may consider reasonably necessary

(3) *Any person aggrieved by any conditions attached to such a licence may appeal to a magistrates' court*.

5.2 Section 48 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 states;

48 Licensing of private hire vehicles.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Part of this Act, a district council may on the receipt of an application from the proprietor of any vehicle for the grant in respect of such vehicle of a licence to use the vehicle as a private hire vehicle, grant in respect thereof a vehicle licence:

(7) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of a district council to grant a vehicle licence under this section, or by any conditions specified in such a licence, may appeal to a magistrates' court.

5.3 It is highly unlikely that a driver would appeal to a magistrates court against the changes proposed in this report as long as a full consultation is carried out and the driver's views taken into account when a final decision is made

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 No risks have been identified. This may change as a result of the recommended consultation and will be reported to the next Licensing Panel meeting

6.2 There will be environmental risks to not moving towards emission based standards for the licensing of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles, even if they will not be directly quantifiable. There may also be reputational risks if the council continues to allow standard diesel and petrol vehicles to be licenced indefinitely.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.

7.2 Climate change/sustainability. As set out in paragraphs 2.7 to 2.13, above, the recommended option in this report directly supports council influenced moves to reduce emissions and move towards zero emissions vehicles as set out in the RBWM Environment and Climate Strategy 2026-2035

7.3 There are no data protection/GDPR implications from this report.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 As stated in Option 1, above, a consultation with the trade and all relevant stakeholders is recommended before a final decision is made on the policy changes set out in this report.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 The full implementation stages are set out in table 2.

Table 2: Implementation timetable

Date	Details
12 October 2026	Licensing Panel Meeting
From 13 October 2026	Consultation
08 February 2027	Licensing Panel Meeting – consultation feedback and final decision made
01 April 2027	Decision Implementation begins

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by two appendices:

- Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B - Other Licensing Authorities

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by three background documents:

- The RBWM Hackney Carriage Driver and Vehicle Policy & Conditions https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2026-02/licensing_hackney_carriage_driver_vehicle_policy_condition.pdf
- The RBWM Private Hire Driver and Vehicle Policy & Conditions https://www.rbwm.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2026-01/licensing_private_hire_driver_vehicle_policy_conditions.pdf
- The Department of Transport's "Taxi and private hire vehicle licensing best practice guidance for licensing authorities in England" https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/taxi-and-private-hire-vehicle-licensing-best-practice-guidance/taxi-and-private-hire-vehicle-licensing-best-practice-guidance-for-licensing-authorities-in-england

12. CONSULTATION

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Mandatory:	*Statutory Officer (sign off is mandatory for all reports)*		
Rachel Howard	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	24/09/2026	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	24/09/2026	
Deputies:	*(can sign off as Deputy for the above in their absence)*		
Julian McGowan	Assistant Director of Finance & Deputy S151 Officer	24/09/2026	25/09/2026
Anthony Lenaghan	Lead Counsel - Litigation & Deputy Monitoring Officer	24/09/2026	30/09/2026
Mandatory:	*Equalities Officer (or deputy – Sarah Collins) – sign off is mandatory to advise on EQiA, or to agree that an EQiA is not required*		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Community Engagement Officer	22/09/2026	23/09/2026
Other consultees:			
Assistant Directors (where relevant)			
Amanda Gregory	Assistant Director of Housing and Public Protection	14/09/2026	14/09/2026
External (where relevant)			
N/A			

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted.	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance	Yes 17/09/2026

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Licensing Panel decision	No	No

Report Author: Greg Nelson
Trading Standards & Licensing Manager
greg.nelson@rbwm.gov.uk
07970 446526

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

www.rbwm.gov.uk
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Age Requirements
Service area:	Trading Standards & Licensing
Directorate:	Place

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal: • What are its intended outcomes? • Who will deliver it? • Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?
This is a proposal in a report to the Licensing Panel to change RBWM licensing policies covering hackney carriages and private hire vehicles to move away from vehicle age to using vehicle emissions as a determining factor when licensing a vehicle It will be delivered by the Trading Standards & Licensing team This is a proposal to change an existing policy

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees? • If Yes, state 'Yes' and proceed to Section 3. • If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues. • Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)
Yes

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal? For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff
Those affected will be - drivers and owners of RBWM licenced hackney carriages and private hire vehicles - everyone in RBWM (due to the beneficial effects of cleaner air)
Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) disproportionately represented? For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?
Yes, among those affected by the proposal, the protected characteristics of sex, race and religion are disproportionately represented because, compared to the general population, a higher proportion of RBWM licenced hackney carriage drivers are male and from ethnic and religious minorities People with mobility problems who may come under the protected characteristic disabled are more likely to use hackney carriages or private hire vehicles. However, the proposals should not affect passengers of RBWM licenced hackney carriages or private hire vehicles because no changes are being proposed to current requirements around the provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles
What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned? • How has/will equality considerations be taken into account? • Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement? • If council staff are likely to be impacted by this proposal, consider engaging staff networks – the Ambassadors Group (ambassadors@rbwm.gov.uk) and the EDI Network (edi.network@rbwm.gov.uk)
None at this time. If the proposals in the report are agreed by the Licensing Panel then they will go out to a full public consultation, including the trade
What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment? Examples of possible sources of information are in the Guidance document (Section 2.3).
Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England, 2024 (revised) - GOV.UK https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/taxi-and-private-hire-vehicle-statistics-england-2024/taxi-and-private-hire-vehicle-statistics-england-2024#taxi-and-phv-drivers

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'.
More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the EQIA Guidance document (available on the intranet).

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age	Not Applicable		
Disability	The latest figures available (2023) in the National Travel Survey statistics (*NTS0709a_trips - Average number of trips by mobility status and main mode, aged 16 and over, trips per person per year*) show that the average number of trips by taxi (hackney carriage) and minicab (private hire vehicle) per year were - for people with a mobility difficulty 19 - for people with no mobility difficulty 9 https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/nts03-modal-comparisons#travel-by-car-access-household-income-household-type-ns-sec-and-mobility-status	None – there are no plans to change current requirements around the provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles	None – there are no plans to change current requirements around the provision of wheelchair accessible vehicles
Sex	The majority of RBWM licenced drivers are male	See below	See below
Race, ethnicity and religion	Data collected at a national level (Taxi and private hire vehicle statistics, England, 2024 (revised) - GOV.UK) indicates that a high proportion of licensed taxi drivers are Asian or Asian British. Although information on the ethnicity of drivers is not collected by the council, anecdotal information from the Licensing team strongly suggests that this is also the case at a local leve	The removal of age requirements for licenced vehicles will allow drivers to buy older, and therefore much cheaper, vehicles, as long as they comply with the emissions requirements	Drivers of older, non-emissions compliant vehicles will not be able to licence them indefinitely
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment	Not Applicable		

Pregnancy and maternity	Not Applicable		
Marriage and civil partnership	Not Applicable		
Armed forces community	Not Applicable		
Socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income, poverty	Not Applicable		
Care experience	Not Applicable		

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it? For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group
The proposals are largely beneficial to licenced drivers and have been welcomed in initial discussions
Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this?
N/A at this stage, this can be reviewed if necessary following the public consultation process
How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?
N/A at this stage, this can be reviewed if necessary following the public consultation process

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Greg Nelson	**Date**: 22/09/2026
Approved by:	**Date:**

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	**Date**:

Appendix B - Other Licensing Authorities

---

1. Transport for London (TfL)

Approach: Strong emissions-led licensing (with supporting age limits)

- Since **1 January 2018**, all newly licensed taxis must be **Zero Emission Capable (ZEC)**.
- ZEC definition includes:
  - ≤50g/km CO_2
  - Minimum **30-mile zero-emission range**
- Diesel taxis are no longer licensed for the first time.
- For PHVs, since **January 2023**, all new licences must meet **ZEC and Euro 6 standards**.

Summary:
TfL is the **leading UK example** of emissions-first licensing policy. Although a maximum vehicle age still exists, the **primary gatekeeper is emissions performance**, particularly ZEC compliance.

---

2. Wolverhampton City Council

Approach: Proposed full shift to emissions-based system

- Proposal to **remove vehicle age limits entirely**.
- Replace with **emissions-based criteria**, particularly favouring electric vehicles.

Summary:
Wolverhampton represents one of the clearest moves toward a **pure emissions-led licensing model**, aligning vehicle eligibility with environmental standards rather than age.

---

3. Bolton Council

Approach: Age limits removed, emissions compliance required

- Scrapped long-standing age caps.
- Vehicles must instead meet emissions standards (e.g. **Euro 6 diesel / Euro 4 petrol**) by a set deadline (2030).
- Supported by **twice-yearly testing** to ensure safety.

Summary:
A strong example of replacing age limits with **compliance deadlines tied to emissions standards**, aligning with Clean Air Plan objectives.

---

4. Milton Keynes City Council

Approach: Reduced reliance on age limits, incentives for zero-emission vehicles

- Removed age limits for **electric and hydrogen vehicles**.
- Proposed removing initial age restrictions and extending limits for other vehicles.
- Policy justified by DfT guidance recommending **focus on emissions, not age**.

Summary:
Milton Keynes is shifting toward an **incentivised emissions model**, where cleaner vehicles face fewer (or no) age restrictions.

---

5. Leicester City Council

Approach: Linking age flexibility to emissions compliance

- Proposes increasing allowable vehicle age **if Euro 6 emissions standards are met**.

Summary:
Leicester retains age limits but **subordinates them to emissions performance**, allowing older vehicles where they meet modern standards.

---

6. Wakefield Council

Approach: Extended operational life for zero-emission vehicles

- Proposes allowing **battery electric vehicles up to 20 years old**.

Summary:
This reflects a **clear emissions-over-age hierarchy**, recognising that electric vehicles remain compliant regardless of age.

---

7. Manchester (Greater Manchester authorities collectively)

Approach: Flexible age limits to support emissions transition

- Extended taxi age limits to assist drivers transitioning to cleaner fleets.
- Linked to broader **Clean Air Plan and funding schemes**.

Summary:
A **transitional emissions-led model**, where age limits are relaxed to enable fleet decarbonisation.

8. Edinburgh City Council

Approach: Conditional age extensions based on emissions upgrades

- Age limits extended for:
    - **Euro 6 vehicles**, or
    - Euro 5 vehicles upgraded via retrofit (CVRAS).
    - **Summary:**
      A hybrid approach where **emissions compliance (including retrofit)** allows vehicles to exceed typical age thresholds.

---

9. Birmingham City Council

Approach: Clean Air Zone-driven emissions compliance

- Focus on **Euro 6 compliance** and retrofitting (e.g. LPG conversions).
- Policies tied to Clean Air Zone requirements, with investment in EV infrastructure.

Summary:
Although still using age limits, Birmingham's system is heavily **driven by emissions compliance and Clean Air Zone policy**, reducing the relevance of age alone.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report Title:	Update to Licensing Act 2003 Policy – Digital Proof of Age
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance
Meeting and Date:	Licensing Panel 12 October 2026
Responsible Officer(s):	Amanda Gregory, Assistant Director Housing and Public Protection
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

REPORT SUMMARY

New regulations that allow for digital proof of age to be accepted for alcohol sales in licenced premises have come into effect. RBWM policy has been amended accordingly but the Licensing Panel needs to be made aware of this change.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: That the Licensing Panel notes the report and the change made to RBWM Policy

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION

2.1 On 15 September 2026 the Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2026 came into effect.

2.2 This Order provides for businesses licenced under the Licensing Act 2003 to be able to choose to accept certified digital proof of age alongside existing physical forms of identification to confirm that a customer is aged 18 or over when purchasing alcohol. Physical identification documents will remain valid and businesses are not required to adopt digital proof of age when confirming that a customer is 18 or over.

2.3 This required a change to the RBWM Statement of Licensing Policy 2026 – 2030 in that the acceptance of certified digital proof of age had to be added to the Proof of Age section of ANNEX 2 – Pool of Conditions in the policy.

2.4 This has been done and this section of Annex 2 of the policy now states;

"The only acceptable forms of ID should be;

- A valid passport
- A photo driving licence
- A proof of age card such as the PASS card from the national Proof of Age Standards Scheme bearing the PASS hologram
- A Ministry of Defence Form 90 (Defence Identity Card)
- Certified digital proof of age provided through a certified Digital Verification Service listed on the statutory register and meeting the standards set out within the UK digital verification services trust framework"

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 None, this change is to comply with changes in legislation.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 None.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The change to policy is a result of the coming into force on 15 September 2026 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2026. This has the effects set out in paragraph 2.2 above. There are no wider legal implications.

6. RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 No risks have been identified.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.

7.2 There are no climate change/sustainability impacts.

7.3 There are no Data Protection/GDPR impacts.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 No consultation is needed as this is a change in legislation which is required to be implemented.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 The required change to RBWM policy has been implemented as it was a statutory requirement.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 This report is supported by one appendix:

- Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 This report is supported by one background document, the Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2026;

- https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2026/1022/contents/made

Name of consultee	Post held	Date sent	Date returned
Mandatory:	*Statutory Officer (sign off is mandatory for all reports)*		
Rachel Howard	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	24/09/2026	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	24/09/2026	
Deputies:	*(can sign off as Deputy for the above in their absence)*		
Julian McGowan	Assistant Director of Finance & Deputy S151 Officer	24/09/2026	25/09/2026
Anthony Lenaghan	Lead Counsel - Litigation & Deputy Monitoring Officer	24/09/2026	30/09/2026
Mandatory:	*Equalities Officer (or deputy – Sarah Collins) – sign off is mandatory to advise on EQiA, or to agree that an EQiA is not required*		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Community Engagement Officer	24/09/2026	25/09/2026
Assistant Directors (where relevant)			
Amanda Gregory	Assistant Director of Housing and Public Protection	17/09/2026	24/09/2026

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted.	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance	Yes – 17/09/2026

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	To follow item?
Licensing Panel decision, for information	No	No

Report Author: Greg Nelson, Trading Standards & Licensing Manager
greg.nelson@rbwm.gov.uk
07970 446526

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

www.rbwm.gov.uk
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Update to Licensing Act 2003 Policy – Digital Proof of Age
Service area:	Trading Standards & Licensing
Directorate:	Place

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal: • What are its intended outcomes? • Who will deliver it? • Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?
The Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2026 makes a statutory change to what can be accepted as proof of age in a licenced premises in that digital proof of age can now be accepted to prove that the purchaser is 18 or over RBWM policy needs to be amended accordingly, and brough to the attention of the Licensing Panel, it was delivered by Licensing and is a change to an existing policy

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees? • If Yes, state 'Yes' and proceed to Section 3. • If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues. • Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)
Yes

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal? For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff
Owners and staff at licensed premises Customers at licensed premises and venues
Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) **disproportionately represented?** For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?
Young adults are most likely to be a in position where they need to provide proof of age to obtain service or entry to a licenced premises.
What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned? • How has/will equality considerations be taken into account? • Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement? • If council staff are likely to be impacted by this proposal, consider engaging staff networks – the Ambassadors Group (ambassadors@rbwm.gov.uk) and the EDI Network (edi.network@rbwm.gov.uk)
N/A
What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment? Examples of possible sources of information are in the Guidance document (Section 2.3).
N/A

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'.
More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the EQIA Guidance document (available on the intranet).

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age		Young people benefiting by not having to carry physical ID like passports/driving licences and also being able to prove their age without disclosing other personal information.	
Disability	N/A		
Sex		Being able to provide proof of age without disclosing other personal information may particularly benefit women who may feel vulnerable in licensed premises.	
Race, ethnicity and religion	N/A		
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment		Being able to provide proof of age without disclosing other personal information may benefit trans and non-binary individuals who risk being 'outed' if using other forms of ID	

Pregnancy and maternity	N/A		
Marriage and civil partnership	N/A		
Armed forces community	N/A		
Socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income, poverty	N/A		
Care experience	N/A		

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it? For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group
The change provides customers and venues with choice in the type of proof of age ID that they use so different individuals and licence holders should be able to choose the form of ID that does not disadvantage them.
Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this? • For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.
N/A
How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?
N/A This change to RBWM policy reflects changes in legislation

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Greg Nelson	**Date: 24/09/2026**
Approved by: Ellen McManus-Fry	**Date: 25/09/2026**

Report Title:	Update to Licensing Panel – Revocations Made with Immediate Effect
Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No - Part I
Cabinet Member:	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance
Meeting and Date:	Licensing Panel 12 October 2026
Responsible Officer(s):	Amanda Gregory, Assistant Director Housing and Public Protection
Wards affected:	All

www.rbwm.gov.uk Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

REPORT SUMMARY

Officers are required to report to the Licensing Panel certain actions taken against RBWM licenced drivers. This report provides the required information.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: That the Licensing Panel notes the report and the Information provided

2. REASON(S) FOR RECOMMENDATION

2.1 The RBWM Constitution (in PART 6, B7 Licensing & Public Space Protection Order Sub Committee) includes the following:

> xvi. Where officers make an urgent decision to revoke a hackney carriage or private hire licence, they shall report this to the next meeting of the Licensing Panel

2.1 Two such revocations need to be reported to the Licensing Panel. A brief summary of each case is Appendix B.

2.2 Urgent revocations, that is, revocations with immediate effect, are dealt with by officers because, on the evidence available, officers believe that this is the appropriate and proportionate action required to maintain public safety and trust in the Royal Borough's licensing procedures and practices.

2.3 This is used in the most serious cases where officers believe that it is required in the interests of public safety. This will include cases where officers believe that the driver is an immediate danger to the public; where there are repeated offences or a pattern of offending, particularly in relations to motoring offences or dishonesty; where officers' trust in a driver had broken down completely.

2.4 Drivers can be revoked but not with immediate effect. This is for situations where officers believe that a driver is not "fit and proper", as required by law, to be a licenced driver, but does not fall into the categories in paragraph 2.3. Under the RBWM Constitution, such cases must be decided by a Licensing and Public Space Protection Order Sub-Committee.

2.5 In such cases, the driver may continue to work as a licenced driver until the matter is decided by a sub-committee.

2.6 Drivers who have their licence revoked with immediate effect by officers have the statutory right to appeal to a magistrates court.

2.7 Drivers who have their licence revoked or suspended by a sub-committee have the statutory right to appeal to a magistrates court.

2.8 The Licensing Panel is asked to note this report and the action taken by officers.

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

3.1 None, this report is for information only in compliance with the RBWM Constitution.

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS / VALUE FOR MONEY

4.1 None.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Under section 61 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, officers may suspend or revoke or refuse to renew the licence of a driver of a hackney carriage or a private hire vehicle on any of the following grounds:—

(a) that he has since the grant of the licence—

(i) been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty, indecency or violence; or

(ii) been convicted of an offence under or has failed to comply with the provisions of the Act of 1847 or of this Part of this Act;

(aa) that he has since the grant of the licence been convicted of an immigration offence or required to pay an immigration penalty; or

(b) any other reasonable cause.

5.2 Section 61(2)(b) of the Act states;

"If it appears that the interests of public safety require the suspension or revocation of the licence to have immediate effect, and the notice given to the driver... includes a statement that that is so and an explanation why, the suspension or revocation takes effect when the notice is given to the driver."

5.3 Any person aggrieved by any conditions attached to such a licence may appeal to a magistrates' court.

RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 No risks have been identified.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Equalities. An Equality Impact Assessment is available as Appendix A.

7.2 There are no climate change/sustainability impacts.

7.3 There are no Data Protection/GDPR impacts.

8. CONSULTATION

8.1 No consultation is needed as this report is for information only.

9. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Not applicable.

10. APPENDICES

10.1 There are two appendices:

- Appendix A - Equality Impact Assessment
- Appendix B – Revocation Summaries

11. BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

11.1 there are no background documents

Name of consultee	**Post held**	**Date sent**	**Date returned**
Mandatory:	*Statutory Officer (sign off is mandatory for all reports)*		
Rachel Howard	Executive Director of Resources & S151 Officer	25/09/2026	
Elaine Browne	Deputy Director of Law & Governance & Monitoring Officer	25/09/2026	
Deputies:	*(can sign off as Deputy for the above in their absence)*		
Julian McGowan	Assistant Director of Finance & Deputy S151 Officer	25/09/2026	25/09/2026
Anthony Lenaghan	Lead Counsel - Litigation & Deputy Monitoring Officer	25/09/2026	30/09/2026
Mandatory:	*Equalities Officer (or deputy – Sarah Collins) – sign off is mandatory to advise on EQiA, or to agree that an EQiA is not required*		
Ellen McManus-Fry	Equalities & Community Engagement Officer	25/09/2026	28/09/2026
Assistant Directors (where relevant)			
Amanda Gregory	Assistant Director of Housing and Public Protection	15/09/2026	15/09/2026

Confirmation relevant Cabinet Member(s) consulted.	Cllr Del Campo, Acting Cabinet Member for Public Protection & Community Governance	Yes – 25/09/2026

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	**Urgency item?**	**To follow item?**
Licensing Panel decision, for information	No	No

Report Author: Greg Nelson, Trading Standards & Licensing Manager
greg.nelson@rbwm.gov.uk
07970 446526

Equality Impact Assessment

For support in completing this EQIA, please consult the EQIA Guidance Document or contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

www.rbwm.gov.uk Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead

1. Background Information

Title of policy/strategy/plan:	Update to Licensing Panel – Revocations Made with Immediate Effect
Service area:	Trading Standards & Licensing
Directorate:	Place

Provide a brief explanation of the proposal: • What are its intended outcomes? • Who will deliver it? • Is it a new proposal or a change to an existing one?
The report brings information to the attention of the Licensing Panel as required by the RBWM Constitution It was delivered by Licensing

2. Relevance Check

Is this proposal likely to directly impact people, communities or RBWM employees? • If Yes, state 'Yes' and proceed to Section 3. • If No, please explain why not, including how you've considered equality issues. • Will this proposal need a EQIA at a later stage? (for example, for a forthcoming action plan)
No

If 'No', proceed to 'Sign off'. If unsure, please contact equality@rbwm.gov.uk

3. Evidence Gathering and Stakeholder Engagement

Who will be affected by this proposal? For example, users of a particular service, residents of a geographical area, staff

Among those affected by the proposal, are protected characteristics (age, sex, disability, race, religion, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, marriage/civil partnership) **disproportionately represented?** For example, compared to the general population do a higher proportion have disabilities?
What engagement/consultation has been undertaken or planned? • How has/will equality considerations be taken into account? • Where known, what were the outcomes of this engagement? • If council staff are likely to be impacted by this proposal, consider engaging staff networks – the Ambassadors Group (ambassadors@rbwm.gov.uk) and the EDI Network (edi.network@rbwm.gov.uk)
What sources of data and evidence have been used in this assessment? Examples of possible sources of information are in the Guidance document (Section 2.3).

4. Equality Analysis

Please detail, **using supporting evidence**:

- How the protected characteristics below might influence the needs and experiences of individuals, in relation to this proposal.
- How these characteristics might affect the impact of this proposal.

Tick positive/negative impact as appropriate. If there is no impact, or a neutral impact, state 'Not Applicable'.
More information on each protected characteristic is provided in the EQIA Guidance document (available on the intranet).

	Details and supporting evidence	Potential positive impact	Potential negative impact
Age			
Disability			
Sex			

Race, ethnicity and religion			
Sexual orientation and gender reassignment			
Pregnancy and maternity			
Marriage and civil partnership			
Armed forces community			
Socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income, poverty			
Care experience			

5. Impact Assessment and Monitoring

If you have not identified any disproportionate impacts and the questions below are not applicable, leave them blank and proceed to Sign Off.

What measures have been taken to ensure that groups with protected characteristics are able to benefit from this change, or are not disadvantaged by it? For example, adjustments needed to accommodate the needs of a particular group
Where a potential negative impact cannot be avoided, what measures have been put in place to mitigate or minimise this? • For planned future actions, provide the name of the responsible individual and the target date for implementation.
How will the equality impacts identified here be monitored and reviewed in the future?

6. Sign Off

Completed by: Greg Nelson	**Date**: 25/09/2026
Approved by:	**Date:**

If this version of the EQIA has been reviewed and/or updated:

Reviewed by:	**Date**:

Appendix B - Revocation Summaries

Driver A

A DBS check revealed that Driver A had been convicted on 08/10/2025 for the following offences, committed on 12/07/2025:

- ‘made a provision for invitation/acceptance of/accept private hire booking not holder London PHV OP. Licence’
    - Private Hire Vehicles (London) Act 1998
        - Fine £4440
        - costs £295,
        - victim surcharge £132
- ‘Unlicensed Person (Taxi Tout) Soliciting persons for hire car services’
    - Criminal Justice & Public Order Act 1994
        - Fine £440
- ‘Use a motor vehicle on a road/public place without third party insurance’
    - RTA 1988
        - Fine £440
- ‘Fail to comply with requirement properly made by constable/authorised officer’
    - Private Hire Vehicles (London) Act 1998
        - Fine £440

Total of fines & costs £6 187

This had not been disclosed on Driver A’s licence application form

Acting as an unlicenced operator and driver deceives the public, completely undermines the licensing system and puts the passenger in an uninsured vehicle driven by an uninsured driver.

Transport for London previously revoked this driver as follows;

> “Revocation-17/01/2026-Revocation-Complaints - Abuse/behaviour towards passenger (non sexual)”

On his RBWM application form, Driver A ticked “No” to the question – “have you previously had a hackney carriage or PH driver with RBWM or anyone else”

Driver A’s dishonesty was exacerbated by his deliberate failure to include his convictions and previous licence revocation on his application form, despite signing the form saying that the information was true and accurate to the best of his knowledge

Driver B
A DBS review in August 2026 revealed that Driver B had been convicted on 13/08/2025 for Handling Stolen Goods contrary to S.22(1) Theft Act 1968 on the 03/09/2022 and was sentenced to a community order, unpaid work requirement and forfeiture and destruction – of mobile phone, costs of £500 and victim surcharge of £114

In summary;

- Driver B was arrested on 7 March 2023, interviewed and bailed
- his application for a private hire driver licence was dated 12 May 2024
- that licence was granted on 03 December 2024
- he was charged on 28/03/2025
- he was convicted on 13/08/2025

On his RBWM licence application form, in answer to the question “Are you currently on bail or subject of any outstanding charge or summons?”, Driver B ticked “No”.

Driver B did not inform RBWM licensing at any point of being charged with any offences, or of his conviction on 13/08/2025

This was a false declaration and in breach of the policy requirement;

> DISCLOSURE GUIDANCE / REQUIREMENTS
> Applicants should note that to make a false statutory declaration is a serious criminal offence, punishable upon conviction by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to a fine to be decided by the court or both. This statutory declaration may in certain circumstances be forwarded to the police for examination.
>
> Applicants for driver licences are required to declare ANY convictions or cautions including those regarded as “Spent” under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974.

As well as this, Driver B

- did not inform RBWM Licensing of being charged on 28/03/2025
- did not inform RBWM Licensing of being convicted on 13/08/2025

This is all in breach of RBWM policy requirements

In relation to previous convictions, RBWM policy states;

- Dishonesty - where an applicant has a conviction for any offence where dishonesty is an element of the offence, a licence will not be granted until at least seven years have elapsed since the completion of any sentence imposed.

The disclosure guidance and requirements make it crystal clear that to make a false statutory declaration is a serious criminal offence, and under RBWM policy (based on national statutory guidance) he should not be licenced for at least seven years from completion of his sentence

This page is intentionally left blank