

Please reply to:

Contact: Christeen Abee
Service: Committee Services
Direct line: 01784 446224
E-mail: c.abee@spelthorne.gov.uk
Our ref: CC/LIC
Date: 1 May 2026

SPELTHORNE BOROUGH COUNCIL

DECISION NOTICE

In accordance with the LICENSING ACT 2003 s.23

Date of Licensing Sub-Committee: 1 May 2026
Applicant: Bobby Dhunay
Premises: 21b Clarence Street
Staines-upon-Thames
TW18 4SU

REASON(S) FOR HEARING: Relevant representations received from responsible authorities and other persons concerning Prevention of Crime and Disorder, and Prevention of Public Nuisance.

DECISION

Refused

With effect from 5 May 2026

REASONS FOR DECISION

1. The application submitted on 15 February 2026 is for a new premises licence for Rose Bar, 21b Clarence Street, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4SU (“the Premises”). The Premises is outlined in the application as a “relaxed lounge wine bar experience” serving wine, beer, cocktails with small plates and snacks.

Attendance

2. Six people attended the Sub-Committee hearing to make representations. They were:
 - Mr Bobby Dhunay, the applicant and director of Bando Bar Ltd;
 - Mr Peter Mayhew, Agent for the applicant, director of Beyond the Blue Ltd.;
 - Lucy Catlyn, Spelthorne Borough Council Licensing Department;
 - Barbara Wrona, Spelthorne Borough Council Environmental Health Department;
 - Jacquie Clarke, Surrey Police Licensing Enforcement Officer 9143
 - Caroline Laird, Home Office Immigration

Evidence

3. Mr Bobby Dhunay has applied for a premises licence for the premises known as Rose Bar located at 21b Clarence Street, Staines-upon-Thames, TW18 4SU.
4. Mr Dhunay is before the Licensing Sub-Committee today because on 15 February 2026, an application was received for a “relaxed lounge wine bar experience” serving wine, beer, cocktails with small plates and snacks.
5. In response to this application, the Licensing authority received representations from four responsible authorities, namely the Licensing Authority, Environmental Health, Surrey Police, and Home Office Immigration. Four other persons also submitted representations objecting to the licence. The representations were in connection to the licensing objectives of Prevention of Crime and Disorder and Prevention of Public Nuisance.
6. The Licensing Sub-Committee has heard and considered the oral representations made this morning on behalf of Mr Bobby Dhunay and his agent Mr Peter Mayhew, Jacquie Clarke from Surrey Police, Caroline Laird from Home Office Immigration, Barbara Wrona from Spelthorne Borough Council’s Environmental Health Department, and Lucy Catlyn from Spelthorne Borough Council’s Licensing Department.

7. The Sub-Committee has considered all of the evidence put before and in doing so has taken into account the Secretary of State's Guidance issued under the Licensing Act 2003 and Spelthorne Borough Council's Statement of Licensing Policy.

Findings and Decision

8. The Sub-Committee considered the representations made by the Applicant and their Agent at the hearing, as well as the representations made by Responsible Authorities at the hearing together with the written representations received from other persons and finds as follows:
9. The Sub-Committee considers that the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder and prevention of public nuisance have been engaged.
10. When considering the appropriate course of action to take to ensure the licensing objectives are promoted, the Sub-Committee are not satisfied that adding conditions to the existing premises licence would adequately prevent public nuisance, crime and disorder and public safety, particularly when considering the failure to adhere to previous robust and numerous licensing conditions.
11. The Sub-Committee finds the Responsible Authorities have exhausted their expertise in guiding the premises licence holder to comply with the licence conditions and adhere to the licensing objectives.
12. The Sub-Committee is of the view that Mr Dhunay has failed to demonstrate that he has a suitable or robust plan in place to comply with the licensing conditions sufficient to alleviate the concerns raised before the Sub-Committee by the licensing authority, police, environmental health and the Home Office. It is accepted that he has a contract to deal with back office functions including the employment of staff to ensure illegal workers are not employed. His past behaviour has demonstrated he has failed to comply with conditions, however exhaustive they may be which resulted in the revocation of his previous licence for these premises. Mr Dhunay has failed to demonstrate that he has learned lessons from this past experience. He says he has learnt his lessons, but has provided no cogent or robust evidence to show this. He admitted the payment plan for the Home Office fine has in recent times not been adhered to and payments have not been made. This does not show a regard for what needs or should be given any priority.
13. This application is for a new premises licence, but the previous history and conduct demonstrated by Mr Dhunay is an important and relevant factor that we have to take into account in considering whether or not the licensing

objectives would be adhered to. It has been evidenced that the police and licensing authorities have previously given Mr Dhunay on numerous occasions advice in respect of compliance with the licensing conditions and objectives, all of which have fallen on deaf ears. Environmental Health indeed stated that on visits by officers about noise and the level therefore, it was in fact turned up as the officers were leaving. This does not give, despite Mr Dhunay's assurances, that he will in fact comply with any advice or instruction given by relevant officers or police. Conditions previously set have covered these issues and consistently been breached. It is accepted Mr Dhunay may have read the documentation or DPS handbook Mr Mayhew mentioned and for which he undertook an examination, only yesterday and received a score of 35/45. However, laudable as that may be, it is not sufficient to give the sub-committee the confidence required to warrant the granting of a licence.

14. Mr Dhunay has said he now understands the importance of conditions and for them to be adhered to, however, given the previous history when it should have been obvious and part and parcel of the training any DPS who has management of any licensed premises that the conditions are not an optional part of the licence. Mr Dhunay accepts he exercised poor management of the premises previously and even overruled SIA door supervisors previously in accepting poor identification for individuals to make sure they were of an age for being in licensed premises. These actions do not show someone likely to comply with licensed conditions, in fact they clearly indicate someone who does not do so.
15. The Sub-Committee has therefore decided to refuse Mr Dhunay's application for a premises licence. The decision is made taking into account all the sub-committee have heard today and the representations made by Mr Dhunay and those on his behalf by Mr Mayhew together with those from the police, environmental health and licensing authority together with the Home Office the view of the Sub-Committee is that this is the only appropriate and proportionate step to take. The Sub-Committee has also taken this into account considering statutory guidance and licensing policy.
16. Had for example Mr Dhunay provided evidence of having successfully operated as a DPS in other licensed premises for a significant period of time, without issue the decision may have been different. It is unfortunate that this opportunity has not been taken by Mr Dhunay.

Conclusion

17. That is the decision of the Sub-Committee. A written copy of this decision has been provided to all parties concerned within 5 working days of the Sub-Committee hearing.

18. You have the right to appeal against this decision to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of receipt of this decision notice.
19. If you decide to appeal, you will need to submit your appeal to Guildford Magistrates' Court. You should allow sufficient time for your payment of the relevant appeal fee to be processed. For queries, Guildford Magistrates' Court can be contacted on 01483 405 300.

Cllr S Dunn - Chair

Cllr S Doran

Cllr J Turner

Date of Decision: 1 May 2026

Date of Issue: 6 May 2026