

**Minutes of the meeting of Licensing Sub-Committee held at  
Online meeting/Conference Room 1 - Herefordshire Council,  
Plough Lane Offices, Hereford, HR4 0LE on Tuesday 25  
November 2025 at 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillor Polly Andrews (chairperson)  
Councillor (vice-chairperson)

**Councillors:** Dave Davies and Peter Hamblin

**In attendance:** Councillors

**Officers:** Licensing technical officer and Senior Lawyer - Civil Litigation

**24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies for absence were received.

**25. NAMED SUBSTITUTES (IF ANY)**

There were no substitutes present at the meeting.

**26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**27. APPLICATION FOR A GRANT OF A PREMISES LICENCE IN RESPECT OF  
PUDLESTON COURT, PUDLESTON, LEOMINSTER, HR6 0QY - LICENSING ACT  
2003**

Members of the licensing Sub-Committee from the Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee considered the above application, full details of which appeared before the members in their agenda published on 17 November 2025.

Prior to making its decision the senior licensing officer presented the report which outlined the options available to the Sub-Committee. No representations were received from the responsible authorities. Six (6) representations were received from members of the public that the licensing authority accepted as being relevant. Six (6) representations were received from members of the public that were rejected by the licensing authority as not being relevant as they did not address at least one (1) of the four (4) licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee heard from the public representative that:

- The residential property of the speaker was set at 650m from Pudlestone Court; the home was an older home with no noise insulation. The family home would be prone to disruption with the approval of the application. The area was a very quiet, rural area set in open fields. There were no natural barriers to sound which travelled easily across the village. It was possible to hear livestock from

1km away therefore there was concern that noise from the Court would be clearly audible.

- The nearest property to Pudlestone Court was set at 300m and livestock, including horses, were present close to the Court.
- It was stated on the application that no sound would be perceived and there was an assumption that all doors and windows would be closed. There was concern that in Summer, with windows and doors open, sound from the venue would be audible.
- Pudlestone was a quiet village and noise from the court would be audible across the village.
- The current sound level at night was between 20-30dB, a moderate level of 65-75dB would be clearly audible to nearest dwelling at 300m and perceptible to the family home at 650m. The claim in the application that noise would not be audible was not credible.
- There was concern that the change and extension of licensing hours would extend drinking beyond midnight into the early hours of the morning.
- It was requested that if the licence was granted strict conditions should be imposed. There should be no outdoor amplified music after 9 p.m., controls on sound levels at source, there should be limits on event frequency and duration and a noise impact assessment should be undertaken before any outdoor entertainment.

Following questioning by the Sub-Committee, it was confirmed that:

- Music could be played until 11 pm. in accordance with the Live Music Act 2012 as amended

The Sub-Committee then heard from the applicant representative:

- A noise management plan (NMP) was in place and noise levels were tested at the extremities of the property.
- The application was for seven (7) days a week but it was intended that the majority of events would involve yoga and wellness weekends. There would not be events everyday. Events at the Court would, in the majority of cases, be small scale with up to 42 people in attendance which was the number of guests the hotel was capable of hosting. There would be no impact on highways beyond the current level of usage.
- Larger scale events including weddings and corporate events would form only a minor part of the events programme. For events such as weddings it was anticipated that a maximum of 100 people would be in attendance.

Following questioning by the Sub-Committee, the applicant confirmed that:

- It was confirmed that there would never be fireworks; livestock were present on the site and there was concern regarding the fire risk to the Grade II listed building on site.
- Most of the events at the court, including yoga and wellness weekends would have only background music or gentle soundscapes.
- There was no current interest in wedding receptions; a small, quiet venue was favoured.
- A staff member was always on site who could be contacted in the event of local resident concerns. A NMP was in place and a decibel monitor was regularly used around the boundaries of the site.
- 300m – 650m to local properties were measurements to the boundaries of the Court; the venue was in the centre of the estate and at a greater distance from local residents.
- The venue would notify residents of any large scale events.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered all the representations, reports and evidence before them. They have had regard to their duties under S4 of the Licensing Act and considered guidance issued under s182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and Herefordshire Council's Statement of Licensing Policy 2020

- 2025.

## **DECISION**

The Sub-Committee's decision is to grant the application as applied for.

## **REASONS**

The Sub-Committee fully considered the detailed report by the Senior Licensing Officer, the application and written representations in the report pack, as well as the evidence presented at the hearing by local resident, Mr Lawry and Ms Stirling-Brown on behalf of the applicant. The Sub-Committee has also taken into account the relevant policy and guidance.

Six (6) relevant representation were received from members of the public. The Sub-Committee understands the concerns being raised by the public representatives and the reasons why the representations were made. The Sub-Committee carefully considered the detailed and thoughtfully prepared submission of Mr Lawry, a local resident, raising issues regarding the application. The Sub-Committee understood the nature of the concerns being raised and Mr Lawry's apprehension that granting the licence may have an impact on the quiet, rural nature of the locality and on his family's quiet enjoyment of their home. Mr Lawry confirmed that both he and his partner worked full time, and his children were at school, and they did not want the activities, in particular noise, at the premises to have an adverse impact on their day-to-day life. The Sub-Committee considered Mr Lawry's submissions alongside the other written representations contained within the reports pack.

The Sub-Committee then considered the submissions of Ms Stirling-Brown. In particular, it was noted that a Noise Management Plan was in place and that noise levels at events will be monitored either by a member staff present at the premises or an on-call member of staff. Ms Stirling-Brown helpfully explained the kind of events that would be held at the premises. It was further stated that noise levels will be monitored at the extremities of the site. It was accepted by the sub-committee that the events will be low key in nature, based around wellness weekends including yoga and would have only background music or gentle soundscapes, catering for up to 42 people. It was stated by Ms Stirling-Brown that larger events such as weddings were not a primary focus at the premises and it was anticipated that a maximum of 100 people would be in attendance. Ms Stirling-Brown was clear that fireworks were not going to be used at the premises because of livestock and risks to the Grade II listed building on site.

Ms Stirling Brown clarified that the distances quoted to neighbouring properties (300m and 650m) were calculated from the boundary of the site and that events being held on the premises were towards the centre of the site, therefore a greater distance away.

In reaching its decision, the sub-committee balanced the submissions of Mr Lawry and those made on behalf of the applicant. The sub-committee were able to ask questions of those in attendance and regarded the answers provided by the applicant's representative to be very helpful when reaching their decision.

The sub-committee were satisfied that they had explored the concerns raised in the representations as far as they could and were reassured by the evidence from those representing the applicant that the granting of the premises licence would not undermine the licensing objectives.

Based on the evidence before them, the sub-committee were of the view that granting the licence would not have an adverse effect on the locality.

The Sub-Committee considered the options available to them and based on the evidence available, decided to grant the application for the Premises Licence.

The meeting ended at 11.00 am

**Chairperson**