

## London Borough of Islington

### Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

Minutes of the meeting of Licensing Sub-Committee A held at the Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 8 March 2012 at 10.15 am.

**Present: Councillors:** Wally Burgess, Troy Gallagher, (Items B4-7) Tracy Ismail (Items B1 and B3), Claudia Webbe (Items B2 and B4-B7) and Faye Whaley (Items B1-B3).

**Also Present Councillors** Martin Klute.

**COUNCILLOR FAYE WHALEY IN THE CHAIR (Items B1-B3)**  
**COUNCILLOR CLAUDIA WEBBE IN THE CHAIR (Items B4-B7)**

**113 INTRODUCTIONS (ITEM A1)**

Councillor Whaley welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked members and officers to introduce themselves.

Those present were informed that the procedure for the conduct of the meeting was detailed on page 3 of the agenda.

**114 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (ITEM A2)**

None.

**115 DECLARATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (ITEM A3)**

Councillor Ismail substituted for Councillor Webbe for items B1 and B3, Councillor Burgess substituted for Councillor Edwards for items B1 – B3 and Councillor Whaley for items B4-B7. Councillor Gallagher substituted for Councillor Edwards for items B4-B7.

**116 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (ITEM A4)**

None.

**117 ORDER OF BUSINESS (ITEM A5)**

The Sub-Committee noted that the order of business would be as follows:- B1, B3, B2, B7, B4, B5 and B6.

**118 MINUTES (ITEM A6)**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 5 January 2012 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**119 LADBROKES, 1-5 CYRUS STREET, EC1V 0BE – APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE UNDER THE GAMBLING ACT 2003 (Item B1)**

Alison Johnson, objector to the application, raised concerns regarding the location of the business and the possible anti-social behaviour around betting shops.

Rhiannon Daniel supported by Gavin Dalzell, Ladbrokes, speaking in support of the application, reported on the location of the premises, which was not far from the current location of a Ladbrokes shop that was closing down and outlined their staff training procedures.

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

### **RESOLVED:**

a) That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Gambling Act 2005 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's gambling policy, the premises licence in respect of Ladbrokes, 1-5 Cyrus Street, EC1V 0BE be approved.

b) That mandatory and default conditions, as detailed on pages 33 and 34 of the agenda, be applied to the licence.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the interested party and the applicant and balanced the conflicting needs of residents and the business interests of the applicant.

The Sub-Committee was satisfied that the licensing objectives would be met by the applicant.

The Sub-Committee noted the witness statement of Gavin Dalzell including details of the proposed location and layout of the premises, staff training and stating that their procedures and services for their customers concurred with the best practice guidance attached to the Council's policy.

The Sub-Committee took particular note of the location of the premises near a school and in a residential area.

The Sub-Committee also noted that this was a relocation of the premises a very short distance away and so was not adding premises to the area. The Sub-Committee noted the interested party's concerns about anti-social behaviour in the area but was satisfied that the applicant had outlined their procedures for reducing any anti-social behaviour related to the premises for example, a comprehensive CCTV system with a 24 hour control room and a close working relationship with the police as well as the Gamcare scheme and self exclusion procedure.

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that granting the application was in line with the Council's Gambling Policy and would promote the licensing objectives. The Sub-Committee took into consideration Part 2, paragraphs 42 – 52 of the Gambling policy regarding location of the premises, crime and disorder and protecting children and vulnerable persons.

### **120 AT's FOOD AND WINE, 22 CALEDONIAN ROAD, LONDON N1 9DU – APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B2)**

The Sub-Committee noted the additional information tabled by the trading standards officer. This would be interleaved with the agenda papers. He reported that the applicant had fully engaged with trading standards and he would not object to the granting of the licence with the appropriate conditions. The Sub-Committee noted that there had been a previous review of the licence which resulted in a revocation. Mr Khan was the owner of the business at this time.

Mr Noor representing Muhammed Sheikh, the applicant, considered that many customers would be lost if the licence was too restrictive. There were other neighbouring premises with 24 hour licences.

In response to questions, the police reported that the customers after 11pm would mainly be people who had already been drinking and the peak hours for alcohol related crime and disorder were from 2 am to 6 or 7 am in the morning. The Sub-Committee noted that the premises were currently open from 9am until 1am on weekdays and until 2 am at weekends.

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

### **RESOLVED:**

a) That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, the premises licence in respect of AT's Food and Wine, 22 Caledonian Road, N1 9DU be granted to permit the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises from 09:00 am until 01:00 am.

b) That conditions details on page 69/70 of the agenda be applied to the licence with the following amendments.

- Condition 26 to read. This premises licence will not be used as an authorisation for licensable activities until premises licence number (LN/5392-220811) has been surrendered.
- Additional condition. The owner of the business, Mr Khan, shall play no part in the management of the business whilst this licence is in force.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the responsible authorities and the applicant and balanced the conflicting needs of residents and the business interests of the applicant.

The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant accepted the conditions put forward by the responsible authorities.

The Sub-Committee noted that the premises were open from 9am until 1am on weekdays and until 2am at weekends. The Sub-Committee noted the police concerns regarding 24 hour licences, particularly the police evidence that incidents of violent crime or alcohol related violent crime peak between 2am and 6 or 7 am. The applicant was asked whether he could operate without a 24 hour licence and responded that he did not need 24 hours. In light of this and the police evidence of a spike in crime at 2am, the Sub-Committee considered that the licensing objectives would be promoted by the granting of a licence between 9am and 1am with the conditions agreed.

In reaching their decision, the Sub-Committee took into particular consideration Licensing Policy 023 regarding the location of the premises, the character of the area, the views of the interested parties and the proposed hours of operation and Licensing Policy 010 regarding the protection of the amenity of residents and business in the vicinity of licensed premises. The Sub-Committee also considered Licensing Policy 021 regarding flexibility in licensing hours.

The Sub-Committee considered that with the conditions detailed on appendix 3 on page 69/70 of the report, subject to the amendments, the licensing objectives would be promoted.

### **121 FINSBURY SUPERMARKET, 231 SEVEN SISTERS, N4 2DA - APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE VARIATION UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B3)**

The licensing officer reported that they would undertake a formal investigation into possible licence breaches detailed in the papers.

The police opposed the proposed increase in hours.

Abbas Kaya, Ibrahim Shevket and Mehmet Kaya, spoke in support of the increase in hours. It was reported that the staff member who had sold after hours had now been dismissed. They reported that they needed an extension to their hours as there were neighbouring premises that were open

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

late and customers were taking their business elsewhere after 11pm.

The licensing officer reported that although the staff member was dismissed for serving after hours, there were four other members of staff in the premises at the time and they did not prevent the sale. Footage could not be obtained from the CCTV. The police were called to an incident on 21 December and it was reported that the proprietor was drunk on that evening. This was refuted by the applicant.

In response to questions regarding the planning use, which was restricted to 11pm daily, it was ascertained that the applicant was not aware of this restriction.

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

### **RESOLVED:**

That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, the premises licence variation in respect of Finsbury Supermarket, 231 Seven Sisters Road, N4 2DA be refused.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the police, the applicant and balanced the conflicting needs of residents and the business interests of the applicant.

The Sub-Committee noted the evidence of the licensing officer that there had been an out of hours sale at the premises. The applicant stated that this sale was made by an employee who had now left the business. The licensing officer stated that the sale took place at 12.50 am and that there were four members of staff present at the time. The applicant stated that the police had never been called to the premises but the Sub-Committee noted the police evidence in relation to an alleged incident on 21 December 2011 at the Muslim Welfare House. The applicant disputed this incident and it was noted that there was no further evidence from the police regarding this incident.

The Sub-Committee was not satisfied that the standards of management at the premises were sufficient to promote the licensing objectives. It was noted that the licensing team was conducting a formal investigation into possible breaches of the current licence held. It was further noted that the applicant was not aware that his current planning consent did not allow him to trade beyond 11pm and that he had been trading until 1 am in breach of this.

In reaching their decision, the Sub-Committee took into particular consideration Licensing Policy 009 which expects applicants to ensure that they have planning consent for the intended use and hours of operation, Licensing Policy 023 regarding the location of the premises, the character of the area, the views of the interested parties and the proposed hours of operation and Licensing Policy 010 regarding the protection of the amenity of residents and business in the vicinity of licensed premises. The Sub-Committee also considered Licensing Policy 013 which seeks to encourage the highest standards of management in licensed premises.

The Sub-Committee were not satisfied that even with conditions, the licensing objectives would be promoted if the variation sought was granted.

## **122 AVERS CONVENIENCE STORE, 89-91 HOLLAND WALK, N19 3XU – APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B4)**

The licensing officer reported that the health and safety officer had made a representation that had been omitted from the paperwork and an additional condition relating to this would need to be added to the licence, if granted.

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

The trading standards officer reported that the applicant was the brother of Miss Celik and the brother-in-law of Mr Karakus who were premises licence holders for Item B7, the licence of which had been revoked.

The police officer reported that he did not feel that there was sufficient change in the management of the premises.

Mr Khan, representing the applicant, Mr Celik, reported that the applicant would do his best to manage the premises but could not take responsibility for the behaviour of groups of youths. Miss Celik would be managing the business with her brother, Mr Celik.

In response to questions the police reported that other premises engaged with the SNT to help prevent crime and disorder and they had not seen evidence of this from this licensee. He did not consider that this applicant was volunteering any change in the management structure. Members considered that the premises seemed to encourage youths rather than deter them.

In summing up, the trading standards officer reported that he had not heard anything at the hearing that had shown that this new management would be different to the previous management. The police agreed with this.

Mr Khan reported that they would be able to manage the people who gathered outside the premises.

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

### **RESOLVED:**

That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, the premises licence in respect of Avers Convenience Store, 89-91 Holland Walk, N19 3XU be refused.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION:**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the responsible authorities and the applicant and balanced the conflicting needs of residents and the business interests of the applicant.

The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant is the brother of Miss Melek Celik and the brother-in-law of Mr Karakus, who are the holders of the premises licence that was revoked by this Sub-Committee on the 8 March 2012 (Item B7). The Sub-Committee further noted that the applicant stated that Miss Celik would be assisting him in managing the business. The Sub-Committee was therefore not satisfied that the new proposed management would be sufficiently removed from the previous management who the Sub-Committee had concluded were not promoting the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee were not satisfied that sufficient evidence had been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the new management style would be any more robust than the old. The applicant, for example, did not satisfy the Sub-Committee that he would fully co-operate with the responsible authorities in tackling anti-social behaviour in the area of the premises. The Sub-Committee were not satisfied that the licensing objectives could be promoted by the granting of the licence even with the addition of conditions.

In reaching their decision, the Sub-Committee took into particular consideration Licensing Policy 023 regarding the location of the premises, the character of the area, the views of the interested parties and the proposed hours of operation and Licensing Policy 010 regarding the protection of

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

the amenity of residents and business in the vicinity of licensed premises. The Sub-Committee also considered Licensing Policy 013 regarding the highest standards of management in licensed premises.

### 123 **ST PETER'S FOODSTORE, 75 ST PETER'S STREET, N1 8JT – APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE REVIEW UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B5)**

The licensing officer reported that the health and safety officer had been in contact with the licence holder. The licensee reported that all works had been completed except those relating to an emergency light.

The Sub-Committee noted the additional information tabled by the trading standards officer. This would be interleaved with the agenda papers. The trading standards officer reported that since the review papers had been served, contact had been made by the licence holder. He reported that he was encouraged by the way that the licence holder had acted on the advice given and advised that conditions could be added to the licence if the Sub-Committee chose not to revoke the licence. He had concerns that there were no invoices available and he had not received an explanation as to why some smuggled stock was hidden behind other bottles.

Mrs Kayran, supported by Mr Kayran, the licence holders, outlined the measures that they had taken since the seizure. This included the destroying of all other bottles from the same stock, using a uv light, keeping copies of all invoices. The bottles had been obtained from a cash and carry. She had tried to obtain the invoices but their accountant had changed offices and the files could not be obtained very easily. Bottles would not have been intentionally hidden and the Bacardi was on the top shelf which was not used for display.

Councillor Klute informed the Sub-Committee that he had known the licence holders for seven years and they were very diligent and hardworking. They provided a good level of amenity to residents and youths did not hang around the premises. He believed that the licence holders were possibly naïve rather than having any malicious intent.

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, conditions as detailed on page 171/172 of the agenda be applied to the premises licence in respect of St Peter's Foodstore, 75 St Peter's Street, N1 8JT.

#### **REASONS FOR DECISION:**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the responsible authorities, the licensee and interested parties speaking in support of the licensee.

The Sub-Committee noted that the review was brought following smuggled and counterfeit alcohol being found at the premises by the responsible authorities. The Home Office guidance at paragraphs 11.26 and 11.27 identified criminal activity which the Secretary of State considered should be treated particularly seriously, including the sale of smuggled and counterfeit alcohol. It was envisaged that licensing authorities would use the review procedures to deter such activities and crime.

The Sub-Committee noted that the evidence of trading standards was that the licensee had reacted positively to trading standards advice. The licensee had purchased a UV light to test for non duty paid and had started keeping copies of all invoices. The Sub-Committee noted the evidence of the licensee that they had found the trading standards CD Rom to be very informative, had removed other alcohol from the same stock and had followed trading standards advice regarding caution over

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

the purchase of alcohol in resealed boxes.

The Sub-Committee noted the evidence of Councillor Klute, speaking in support of the licensee, that in his dealings with the licensee, over the past seven years, he had always found the premises to be well run and he believed that there was no malicious intent on the part of the licensee and that it was more likely to be naivety.

The Sub-Committee considered that revocation was not necessary or proportionate in this case and that the licensing objectives would be promoted by the addition of conditions to the licence. The Sub-Committee took account of the co-operation of the licensee and the licensee's willingness to accept conditions proposed by trading standards.

### **124 ODESSE FOOD AND WINE, 59 COPENHAGEN STREET, N1 0JH - APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE REVIEW UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B6)**

The trading standards officer reported that there had been no communication from the licensee since the review had been called. He reported that the licence had been previously suspended for seven days following an underage sale in March 2008 and this had been omitted from the report.

A translator for Hayri Kale, the licensee, reported that the spirits had been given to Mr Kale by a supermarket in Stratford that was closing down. The wine had come from a cash and carry in North London. The cash and carry would not give a copy invoice on request. He reported that all invoices would be kept in the future.

The Sub-Committee noted that Bulent Kale was the name given for the inspection notice. However, Bulent Kale, who was sitting in the committee room denied that he had signed it. It was believed that Mr Murat Yasar had been present at the time of the seizure and he would have given the wrong name.

In summing up, the trading standards officer did not consider that he had heard anything at the meeting that would make him feel more confident about the management of the business. He would have expected to have heard from the licensee to ask for further guidance. The police reported that they had concerns regarding the management.

The translator reported that the licensees were the victims and the premises were run very well. He requested that the licence should not be revoked as there was more than one family reliant on working at the premises.

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, the premises licence in respect of Odesse Food and Wine, 59 Copenhagen Street, N1 0JH be revoked.

#### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the responsible authorities and the licensee.

The Sub-Committee noted that the review was brought following smuggled and counterfeit alcohol being found at the premises by the responsible authorities. The Home Office guidance at paragraphs 11.26 and 11.27 identified criminal activity which the Secretary of State considered should be treated particularly seriously, including the sale of smuggled and counterfeit alcohol. It was envisaged that licensing authorities would use the review procedures to deter such activities and crime. Where licensing authorities determined that the crime prevention objective was being undermined, it was expected that revocation of the licence should be seriously considered.

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

The Sub-Committee noted that on the 12 October 2011, officers attended the premises and seized spirits and wine believed to be smuggled and/or counterfeit. The Sub-Committee also noted that on 19 March 2008 the licence was suspended for a period of seven days following a review brought by trading standards in relation to two underage sales.

The licensee explained to the Sub-Committee that the spirits were given to him free of charge, by a supermarket in Stratford that was closing down. He further stated that the wine came from a cash and carry in the Tottenham area and that he had lost the original invoice and the cash and carry would not provide a copy. The licensee accepted that it was his fault and stated that it would not happen again.

The Sub-Committee noted that at the time that the alcohol was seized only one member of staff was at the premises and he gave his name as Mr Bulent Kale. When the licensee was asked who Mr Kale is, he pointed to a gentleman sitting at the back of the Committee Room and stated that Mr Kale was buying the business. Trading standards and the police confirmed that this was not the member of staff that they had met at the time that the alcohol was seized. The licensee confirmed that the member of staff present at the time of the seizure was in fact, Mr Murat Yasar, who still worked at the premises and was the person who purchased the wine that was seized. When Mr Bulent Kale was asked whether he was at the premises at the time of the seizure, no satisfactory response was given.

The Sub-Committee further noted that there had been no attempt on the part of the licensee to contact trading standards regarding these problems.

In light of the above the Sub-Committee was deeply concerned about the standards of management at the premises, in particular the lack of contact with trading standards, the willingness to accept free alcohol from premises that were closing down and the fact that an employee, who gave the wrong name to council officers and the police, was still employed at the premises. This was coupled with the history of the premises when conditions had been breached and the fact that there was little evidence that a previous suspension had any affect. The Sub-Committee therefore considered that revocation was necessary and proportionate in this case to ensure that the licensing objectives were upheld.

### **125 GOLDSTAR FOOD CENTRE, 89-91 HOLLAND WALK, N19 3XU - APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE REVIEW UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 (Item B7)**

The trading standards officer reported that there had been a number of non-compliances since 2005 and following a review in 2009, an additional condition that had been added to the licence and which had still not been complied with. He had still not been informed by the licensee where the wine that had been seized in September, had been obtained.

Nasra Khan, representing Mr E and Mr K Karakus, the licence holders, accepted that there had been a handful of incidents since 2005. He reported that the wine had probably been bought from a cash and carry. Invoices had not been provided as the licensees were unaware which bottles had been seized. They reported that they had not complied with the health and safety condition as there was a substantial leak in the premises above which had caused damage to their premises. There was an ongoing dispute regarding this matter between the Council and the licensees. Mr Khan reported that this was a difficult area in which to manage a premises and it did not make sense for the licence holders to go head to head with gang members.

In response to questions, the licensee offered to obtain all invoices from the accountant and pass them to trading standards officers. The trading standards officer reported that it was very late to ask for clarity now regarding the wine that had been seized in September 2012. He had not heard anything from the licensee since September. The licensee did state he had written to him in January 2012 asking for details although this letter had not been received. The trading standards



## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

officer was surprised that no-one had telephoned him to check this information before.

Members noted that the premises supervisor was present in the premises when the underage sale occurred although not in the sales area. A list of the health and safety works required, was passed to members.

In summing up, trading standards officers reported that this business had not engaged with them since the breaches and they did not feel that this would change. The police reported that the SNT had tried to engage with the premises holders regarding the youths outside but to date they had not received a call from the licence holders. They considered that the premises would require robust management.

Mr Khan reported that the premises provided an essential service and if alcohol was removed then the premises would have to close.

Members of the Sub-Committee left the room to consider their decision, together with the legal officer and the clerk.

### **RESOLVED:**

That, having considered all of the oral and written evidence and having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003 and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's licensing policy, the premises licence in respect of Goldstar Food Centre, 89-91 Holland Walk, N19 be revoked.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee considered the submissions put forward by the responsible authorities and the licensee.

The Sub-Committee noted that the review was brought following smuggled alcohol being found at the premises by the responsible authorities and an underage test purchase. The Home Office guidance at paragraphs 11.26 and 11.27 identified criminal activity which the Secretary of State considered should be treated particularly seriously, including the sale of smuggled alcohol and the purchase and consumption of alcohol by minors. It was envisaged that licensing authorities would use the review procedures to deter such activities and crime. Where licensing authorities determined that the crime prevention objective was being undermined, it was expected that revocation of the licence should be seriously considered.

The Sub-Committee noted that on 15 September 2011, trading standards and HMRC visited the business and seized 28 bottles of Italian wine. Also on 19 November 2011, alcohol was sold by the business to a 14 year old volunteer assisting trading standards, in a test purchase operation. The Sub-Committee also noted that in May 2009, the premises licence was suspended for one month following a review of the licence in respect of counterfeit vodka and an underage sale. Further conditions were also added to the licence including a condition that prevented use of the licence until health and safety works were completed and approved.

The Sub-Committee noted the statements from the police and their concerns about anti-social behaviour in the area and their submission that the premises required robust management in order to promote the prevention of crime and disorder objective.

The licensee apologised to the Sub-Committee for the non-compliances since 2005, which were described as very sporadic and only a handful of incidents. It was put forward on behalf of the licensee that the amount of smuggled alcohol seized, being 28 bottles, was a very small percentage of the alcohol in stock and that this was bought from reputable cash and carry businesses. The Sub-Committee noted his evidence that invoices had not been provided as he did not know which bottles were seized and that the licensee at the hearing offered to obtain copies of all invoices from his accountant and provide these to trading standards, although this offer was not made any earlier than the day before the hearing. The Sub-Committee noted that in relation to the underage sale this

## Licensing Sub-Committee A – 8 March 2012

was made by the licensee's cousin who was no longer with the business.

The Sub-Committee noted that the condition of the licence requiring health and safety works to be completed and approved before the licence was used has not been complied with since April 2009. The Sub-Committee further noted that the licensee had not made any efforts to contact Trading Standards to discuss any of the issues raised, other than a letter written in January which was not received by Trading Standards, a copy of which could not be produced by the licensee.

The Sub-Committee noted the history of non-compliance at the premises and was not satisfied that the licensee would engage in robust enough management to ensure that the licensing objectives were promoted. The breach of the health and safety condition led the Sub-Committee to conclude that the licensing objectives could not be promoted by the addition of further conditions to the licence. The Sub-Committee was not satisfied that the licensing objectives could be promoted through any suspension of the licence, as a previous review had resulted in suspension, yet further non-compliances occurred.

The Sub-Committee considered that revocation was necessary and proportionate in this case. The Sub-Committee took account of the lack of co-operation of the licensee, the history of the premises and the licensee's continuing breach of the health and safety condition. The Sub-Committee considered that a revocation of the licence was necessary and proportionate in the circumstances to ensure that the licensing objectives were upheld.

The meeting ended at 5pm.

CHAIR