

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

**LICENSING SUB -
COMMITTEE A -
6 AUGUST 2018**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE A HELD
ON MONDAY 6 AUGUST 2018
AT 0930 HOURS IN ELLEN PINSENT ROOM,
COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

PRESENT: - Councillor Barbara Dring in the Chair;

Councillors Bob Beauchamp and Martin Straker-Welds.

ALSO PRESENT:

Bhupinder Nandhra – Licensing Section
Joanne Swampillai – Legal Services
Sarah Stride – Committee Manager
A representative from the media/press was also in attendance.

NOTICE OF RECORDING

01/060818 The Chairman advised the meeting that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

02/060818 No declarations of interest were raised.

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

03/060818 No apologies were submitted.

**LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – (GRANT) – SANTRA, 2ND
FLOOR, KOTWALL HOUSE, WROTTESLEY STREET, BIRMINGHAM, B5 4RT**

The following persons attended the meeting:

On behalf of the Applicant

Duncan Craig – Citadel Chambers
Desmond Murphy – Applicant.

Those Making Representations

PC Abdool Rohomon – West Midlands Police.

The following report of the Acting Director of Regulation and Enforcement was submitted:-

(See Document No. 1)

Following introductions by the Chair, the main points of the report were outlined by Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section. He requested that the Sub-Committee note that there is a special policy in force for the Hurst Street/Arcadian area. The effect of a special policy is to create a rebuttable presumption that applications for new licences or material variations to existing licences will normally be refused unless it can be shown that the premises concerned will not add to the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives being experienced. The Council will expect the applicant to demonstrate the steps it will take to promote the licensing objectives. Where relevant representations are made, the Council will consider the application on its individual merits and decide whether to apply the special policy.

On behalf of the Applicant

Duncan Craig – Citadel Chambers

The following additional information showing the layout and floor plan and a sample food menu was submitted:-

(See Document No. 2)

Mr Craig made reference to page 25 of the applicants premises licence submission and stated that under the prevention of crime and disorder heading the words stated bullet point 6 'If the premise uses any new promoter or any event' be deleted and replaced with 'the premises shall not use any outside promoter for any event.' He also requested that bullet point 9 with reference to West Midlands Police having the power to veto to be deleted entirely.

In addition he stated that the premises holder will offer 'to undertake a fire risk assessment in conjunction with West Midlands Fire Service before any licensing activities are undertaken.'

With reference to the additional document submitted at the meeting he confirmed that after recent negotiations with PC Rohomon the following revisions to the operating schedule be implemented:

- The premises shall provide a minimum proportion of 50% seating in relation to the number of persons in the premises at any time.
- The maximum number of persons in the premises to be limited to 250.
- Waiting service shall be provided to customers whenever the sale of alcohol by retail is carried on from the premises.
- Substantial food shall be provided until 2200 hours whenever the sale of alcohol by retail is carried on from the premises.
- Licensable activities to cease at 0130 hours.

- Food will be served until 2200 hours.
- The premises will close at 0100 hours.
- Last admittance of entry at 1230 hours.

Mr Craig stated that the premise was previously licensed when the cumulative impact one was already in place and that the business model submitted by his client reflected the local area and, following extensive negotiations, the concerns expressed by West Midlands Police.

In response to questions raised by Members Mr Craig and Mr Murphy made the following comments:

- Vertical drinking was offered but the food will form the substantial part of the business. There was a desire to retain customers in the venue after they had finished in the restaurant. The premises would not just provide food and dancing but would also offer customers standing room at the bar and the surrounding areas to consume alcohol.
- Customer numbers will be monitored on the doors.
- The menu proposed was not a set menu and was work in progress.
- The dance floor was open on two sides with seating provided around the perimeter.
- Waitress service will be provided to attract upmarket customers who do not have to eat in the restaurant but can consume alcohol only.
- The entertainment will consist of an in-house DJ operating from a booth that was not fixed in one location. No live music entertainment will be provided.
- The venue was not a restaurant but a 'hybrid operation'. The dance floor and the restaurant was a significant part of the operation and it was stated that this type of venue was commonplace in the London area.

Those Making Representations:

West Midlands Police

PC Abdool Rohomon expressed concerns with regard to the scope and variety of food on the menu and stated that the food offered was not of restaurant quality and quantity. He stressed that the venue should not be considered a vertical drinking establishment and he was concerned that it could potentially be seen as operating as a night club.

PC Rohomon stated that the history of the area should be taken into account as it was in a cumulative impact area and it was important that activities in the venue did not add to the crime and disorder that currently existed in the area. He expressed concern that the current application had not changed the layout of the venue from the previous applicant which was licensed as a night club but did not trade.

He made reference to the revised operating schedule submitted at the meeting and stated that West Midlands Police had asked for a no entry policy to commence from 2300 hours and for the venue to close at 0130 hours. This was not reflected in the revised operating schedule which was in his opinion an alcohol related business and not a food related business. He was under the assumption that the DJ booth would be fixed and that more seating would be available.

PC Rohomon made reference to the Fire Authority and stated that they had not seen the revised schedule which in his opinion was significantly differed to the original plan previously submitted. He doubted as to whether the venue could comfortably fit 240 customers inside. He stated that he had not seen the fire risk assessment and expressed concern that tables and chairs had been positioned directly outside the kitchen doors and that seating booths were placed in front of and would obstruct the fire exit doors.

Mr Duncan replied that the venue would use an external agency to complete the fire risk assessment and would seek approval from West Midlands Fire Service on the outcome. The customer capacity for the venue would be determined by WMFS.

In response PC Rohomon stated that the fire risk assessment should include the tables and chairs as shown on the revised plan. If WMFS instructed that the tables and chairs be removed then there would not be the capacity for 150 seating and the venue would therefore be a vertical drinking premises. He stated that the revised plan should be submitted to WMFS as technically it would be seen as a breach of premises licence if they were not aware.

Mr Duncan replied that if WMFS requested that the tables and chairs be removed then they are not fixed and can be accommodated in other areas of the venue.

PC Rohomon pointed out that if the venue was a vertical drinking establishment it would add to the crime and disorder in the area. If the venue was identified as a restaurant and a food led business it would reduce the risk level of crime in order to satisfy the requirements of West Midlands Police.

Summary of Statements

In summing up PC Rohomon made the following points:

- The cumulative impact area is a C1 Policy issued by Birmingham City Council.
- If the venue was a food led business it would reduce the risk of crime and disorder. However, the menu and food offered was inadequate in quantity and variety. It was his view that the venue would become a vertical drinking establishment which would ultimately add to the crime and disorder that was already in existence in the area.

In summing up Mr Duncan made the following points:

- The revised operating plan has been submitted. Food will be provided until 2200 hours. The menu is subject to change and can be altered.
- The layout of the venue has been met by the fire risk assessment and to be approved by WMFS.
- He asked Members to concentrate on the amended conditions and not the menu as provided.
- Entry and re-entry to the venue can be determined by Members of the Sub-Committee. If Members determined to alter the proposed timings then the amended timings will be adhered to.

After an adjournment and at 1215 hours all parties were recalled to the meeting and the decision of the Sub-Committee was announced as follows:-

04/060818

RESOLVED:-

That the application by Desmond Murphy for a premises licence, in respect of Santra, 2nd floor Kotwall House, Wrotesley Street, Birmingham B5 4RT,

BE REFUSED

In reaching this decision, the Sub-Committee was mindful of the promotion of the Licensing Objectives in the Act, particularly the prevention of crime and disorder, and the prevention of public nuisance.

The Sub-Committee's reasons for refusing this application for a premises licence are due to concerns expressed by West Midlands Police regarding the impact of the proposed operation on the particular locality of the premises. The Sub-Committee noted that the Hurst Street/Arcadian district is a Special Policy Area, the effect of which is to create a rebuttable presumption that applications will normally be refused unless it can be shown that the premises concerned will not add to the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives being experienced. The Santra premises are located within the area covered by the policy.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the operating schedule put forward by the applicant, including the amendments made by the applicant shortly before the hearing, and the likely impact of the amended application. However the Sub-Committee was not persuaded that that the proposed operation of the premises was suitable. It was the recommendation of West Midlands Police that the business needed to be 'food-led' if it were not to add to the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives in the Hurst Street/Arcadian area.

The revised application did show an effort to implement this advice, but West Midlands Police were not convinced that the operation was truly food-led, feeling that it was more accurately described as an alcohol and entertainment premises which also served some food. The food was described on the sample menu submitted by the applicant as 'small plates', 'small plates to share', 'sides' and 'sauces'. Upon examining the sample menu, the Sub-Committee agreed with the Police that the proposed sample menu was of the 'bar snacks' variety, meaning snacks offered as a supplement to drinks, rather than the substantial food one would expect from a genuinely food-led establishment.

Although the applicant considered the business to be a 'hybrid operation', namely a licensed premises with food as a substantial part of the business, the Police's concern was that the premises was more accurately described as a nightclub, given that the central area was a dance floor. The Police observed that the Santra premises had been designed and used as a nightclub. Whilst the premises had been licensed previously, they had not traded, so there was no indication of whether the previous operation had added to the cumulative effect on the licensing objectives. The applicant

said the intention was to attract the upmarket customer, with waitress service at tables - but as the Police observed, fifty per cent of the premises was designated as vertical drinking, which would correspond to the arrangements seen at most nightclub-style premises.

Regarding the amendments suggested by the applicant shortly before the hearing, the Police observed that although the hours had been shortened it was still certainly a late night entertainment venue, not a restaurant, and the risks regarding crime and disorder had to be assessed on the basis that it was offering late night entertainment. The other observations made by the Police were that the premises was not truly food-led, and examination of the menu showed that it was clearly a case of the alcohol/ entertainment aspect of the business leading the food aspect, rather than the other way round; the designation of fifty per cent of the premises to be vertical drinking proved conclusively that food was not really the focus of the offer; there were only 119 seats, and in any event the layout shown on the Plan was certainly not that seen in any typical restaurant premises.

The Sub-Committee was of the view that the amended application made it likely that the premises would add to the cumulative impact in the Hurst St/ Arcadian area. The food offer was not anything beyond bar snacks, and the Sub-Committee agreed with the Police that the style of operation would attract drinkers rather than people going out for dinner. The size of the kitchen shown on the revised Plan was not that of any food-led premises. The Plan also showed the limited number of seats and consequently the proportion allocated to vertical drinking. Any late-night entertainment venue which proposed fifty per cent vertical drinking would inevitably add to the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives because of the increased risk of crime, disorder and public nuisance.

The Sub-Committee gave consideration to whether any measures could be taken to ensure that the licensing objectives were adequately promoted and that therefore the licence might be granted; however the Sub-Committee considered that any attempt to do this could not mitigate the concerns raised by those making representations – namely that the premises was not ‘food-led’ but was predominantly an alcohol and entertainment venue which offered some food. Accordingly, the application was refused.

The Sub-Committee has given due consideration to the City Council’s Statement of Licensing Policy, including the Cumulative Impact Policy in force for the Hurst Street/Arcadian area, the Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 by the Home Office, the information contained in the application, the written representations received, and the submissions made at the hearing by the applicant, his legal adviser and by those making representations (ie West Midlands Police).

All parties are reminded that under the provisions contained within Schedule 5 to the Licensing Act 2003, there is the right of appeal against the decision of the Licensing Authority to the Magistrates’ Court, such an appeal to be made within twenty-one days of the date of notification of the decision.

**LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – (GRANT) – THE MINIMARKET,
235 – 237 LOZELLS ROAD, BIRMINGHAM, B19 1RJ**

Prior to the applicants attending the meeting the Chair advised that she knew PCSO Rob Capella extremely well. She was advised that as PCSO Capella was not in attendance at the meeting she did not need to declare an interest.

Members had no objections to the above.

The following persons attended the meeting:

On behalf of the Applicant

Rob Edge – Licence Leader Ltd
Mr Saman Jowhar Kahraman – Applicant.

Those Making Representations

PC Abdool Rohomon – West Midlands Police
Mr Heath Thomas – Licensing and Regularity Solicitor on behalf of the neighbouring/shopkeeper who was also in attendance.

The following report of the Acting Director of Regulation and Enforcement was submitted:-

(See Document No. 3)

Following introductions by the Chair, the main points of the report were outlined by Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section.

On behalf of the Applicant

Rob Edge – Licence Leader Ltd

The following information showing additional conditions to be added to the operating schedule of the premises licence and cash and carry receipts for purchase of stock for the premises was submitted:-

(See Document No. 4)

Mr Edge explained that Mr Kahraman had, for four years, owned a retail premises in Telford and he wished to expand to include a second minimarket business on Lozells Road. Mr Kahraman had successfully promoted the licensing objectives in his Telford shop and, if granted the licence, would continue to do the same for the premises on Lozells Road. He currently had a manager running the Telford business and Mr Kahraman would be available to run the minimarket. Mr Kahraman was aware of the problems of crime and disorder in the Lozells area and has therefore, requested a licence to sell alcohol until midnight.

He made reference to the amended conditions submitted and stated that his client would operate with a full manual and a 24 hour CCTV system. He will provide signage to include the Challenge 25 Policy ruling and will request identification

from customers prior to their purchase and will also provide additional signage requesting all customers to show respect to neighbouring shops and residential dwellings.

Mr Kahraman will refurbish the premises and had signed a five year lease agreement and will provide local employment in the area. He will train staff to be vigilant to proxy purchases and customers under the influence of alcohol will not be served. He would operate a two shift system and employ four members of staff during opening hours. Alcohol signage will not promote cheap sale of alcohol and will not be displayed in the shop windows. The alcohol for sale will not be visible from the shop frontage in order to safe guard children with regard to the mosque situated opposite the premises. Staff will operate litter picking outside the premises to keep the area tidy.

Mr Kahraman was aware of the drug and alcohol problem in the area and was willing to work with the local Policing team to combat the problems and safeguard children, vulnerable people and street drinkers.

Mr Kahraman will not reside on the premises but will operate the hours of opening as stated on the licence application. He will however, if deemed necessary, be willing to close the minimarket at 2300 hours. He made reference to the neighbouring shop and stated that it operates a sale of alcohol licence with limited conditions until 0300 hours. Mr Kahraman will offer a varied range of food and drink in the minimarket for customers.

In response to questions raised by Mr Thomas, Mr Edge provided the following information:

- The minimarket at 235 – 237 Lozells Road was currently not opened to the public and Mr Kahraman was not trading from the premises.
- Mr Kahraman will not reside on the premises but will, for the first months of opening, spend his time in the premises in Lozells Road. He will employ a manager to run the shop once he was satisfied that the business was trading well and without problem.
- Mr Kahraman will employ four local employees to manage a two shift system – two members of staff in the morning and two in the evening.
- Mr Kahraman considered that the problems encountered in Lozells Road were not all that different to the problems he currently encountered in Telford.
- When signing the lease on Lozells Road he did not seek legal advice but spoke instead to the current landlord of the property.
- The invoices attached dated 11 July 2018 were stock purchases for the Telford shop and will be transferred to the shop located in Lozells once it had opened and was trading.

Those Making Representations:

West Midlands Police

The following additional information showing a witness statement received from PCSO Rob Capella was submitted:-

(See Document No. 5)

PC Rohomon stated that West Midlands Police had objected to the application because it was located in a high area of demand and required a high demand on Police resources. He felt that, in his opinion, the applicant was not aware of the history of the area before he signed the lease agreement. He felt that the opening hours were inappropriate as alcoholics would be able to access alcohol from the early hours until late at night.

He made reference to the statement provided by PCSO Capella which also included visual pictures of litter and street drinkers. The local area Police Team had worked well and had managed to stop the majority of anti-social behaviour in the area. He felt that adding another late night licenced premises would exacerbate current problems and add to crime and disorder in the area.

He stated that the premises was double fronted and expressed concern that customers would be able to see the sale of alcohol, cigarettes and wine from the front door of the premises. The beer fridge was located next to the front door and customers would be able to see the sale of beer from the street. There were a number of high risk buildings in the area providing a service to vulnerable people (soup kitchen, street drinkers etc).

Mr Edge replied that the shop front windows will be screened from the outside and beer and spirit racks will be obscured from street level.

Mr Heath Thomas – Licensing and Regularity Solicitor

Mr Thomas explained that his client was the premises holder of the neighbouring shop premises and that all previous applications for an alcohol licence at 235 – 237 Lozells Road had failed because of the high incidence of crime and disorder in the area. His client was worried that competing operating licences will fail to adhere to their conditions and existing problems in the area will escalate because of this. There were currently three shops within close proximity with similar licensing conditions. The area had alcohol related problems. His client had been trading in the area for over ten years and knew the area well. His client was robbed once and cash and spirits were taken. His staff had been fully trained on how to deal with this situation and to not put themselves at risk of harm. His client had three members of staff per shift. CCTV systems were not a deterrent as his client was robbed once again three days later.

Mr Thomas stated that his client lived in the area and knew of the problems that exist. He knows and recognises the street drinkers and refuses to sell alcohol to those individuals.

All of his client's staff had attended various training courses in how to deal with difficult and abusive customers. There was a gang problem in the area and many individuals run into the local shops for protection. His staff fully know how to deal with this situation if and when it arises. His client had good relationships with the local Police.

Cash machines and security firms filling up the cash machines have encountered problems with the level of gang culture in the area. He felt that Mr Kahaman was not aware of the full extent of the problems that exist in the area.

He stated that he fully complied with the comments and concerns previously expressed by PC Rohomon and the local Police team.

Summary of Statements

In summing up Mr Heath Thomas made the following points:

- He requested that Members disregard the statement about previous owners of the premises.
- It was stressed that Mr Kahraman did not fully understand the problems in the area and was ill equipped to deal with them adequately if they arose.

His client was asked whether he had anything further to add but he declined as he felt that all vital particulars had previously been relayed.

In summing up PC Rohomon made the following points:

- The area had a lot of anti-social behaviour difficulties due to alcohol abuse.
- The provision of an additional retail shop with an alcohol licence will add further problems to the existing difficulties. The applicant had not developed any objectives to deter this from happening.
- Training staff for a two month period was considered wholly insufficient.

In summing up Mr Edge made the following points:

- New staff will be trained within a two month period. The first staff to operate on site will be sufficiently trained at a higher level of training.
- Mr Kahraman will work with the local Police team and discuss local issues with existing shop keepers.
- He stated that it was purely Mr Kahraman's personal choice as to whether he sought legal advice or not before signing his lease agreement.

After an adjournment and at 1430 hours all parties were recalled to the meeting and the decision of the Sub-Committee was announced as follows:-

05/060818

RESOLVED:-

That the application by Saman Jowhar Kahrahman for a premises licence in respect of The Minimarket, 235 – 237 Lozells Road, Birmingham B19 1RJ,

BE REFUSED

The Sub-Committee's reasons for refusing this application for a premises licence are due to concerns expressed by West Midlands Police regarding the management of the proposed operation in what had for many years been a very difficult and challenging area for the neighbourhood Police team. In reaching this decision, the Sub-Committee was mindful of the promotion of the licensing objectives in the Act, particularly the prevention of crime and disorder and the protection of children from harm objectives.

The Sub-Committee paid particular attention to a statement submitted by the local PCSO which outlined the extensive problems of crime and anti-social behaviour in this part of Lozells and East Handsworth – caused in large part by street drinking and gang culture.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the operating schedule put forward by the applicant, and the likely impact of the application, but were not persuaded that that the applicant and the proposed operation of the premises could promote the licensing objectives. Although it was accepted that the applicant had experience of running a similar type of shop in Telford, the Sub-Committee were not convinced that he fully understood the specific problems facing an alcohol retailer in the Lozells Road area.

West Midlands Police attended the meeting to confirm what the local PCSO had stated – that the area generated a huge amount of work for the neighbourhood Police team due to the numerous issues of crime, disorder and nuisance in and around Lozells Road. These issues were overwhelmingly created through irresponsible drinking; over the years it had been observed that the cause was the prevalence of street drinkers. The Police dealt constantly with drunkenness and extremely high levels of litter & refuse all over the area. Photographs were submitted - one showed two men sitting on the ground surrounded by alcohol; other photographs showed the extent of the severe litter problem in the area. The level of antisocial behaviour was high; the long-term demand on Police resources had been, and continued to be, significant.

The Police recommended that successful operation in Telford should not necessarily be seen as a reliable indicator of how the applicant would operate in the Lozells Road area, due to the specific problems seen in Lozells Road, as illustrated by the PCSO's statement and photographs. Any proposal that would increase the availability of alcohol in an area already plagued by street drinkers required the applicant to have had experience of selling alcohol in this type of 'difficult' neighbourhood – otherwise, an increase in crime and disorder would be the likely result.

The Police stated that they were not confident that the applicant would be capable of promoting the licensing objectives. The Police considered that neither the applicant nor the operating schedule showed sufficient understanding of the Lozells Road environment. The Sub-Committee accepted this; given that alcohol-fuelled crime and disorder around Lozells Road was already a major problem for the neighbourhood Police, any additional licensed premises could place the licensing objectives at risk, unless the applicant was experienced in selling alcohol in this type of environment.

Another person also attended the meeting, represented by a solicitor, to address the Sub-Committee. This person was a local shopkeeper; he ran the premises adjacent to The Minimarket. His premises was a convenience shop licensed to sell alcohol by retail. The neighbouring shopkeeper had operated for a number of years, and therefore had a good understanding of the Lozells Road area.

The neighbouring shopkeeper confirmed that Lozells Road was exactly as described by the PCSO, with drunkenness, disorder, litter and nuisance all seen regularly. He stated that gangs and drugs had also become a feature of the area. He stated to the Sub-Committee that as a result of what he had directly observed whilst trading in his own shop, he shared the view of the Police – namely that Lozells Road was plagued by alcohol-fuelled crime and antisocial behaviour at such a level that it was difficult for licence holders to operate safely unless they were familiar with the area, or a similarly troubled area.

He explained that at the start of 2018 his shop had been subjected to a robbery in which a knife had been brandished; both cash and alcohol had been stolen from his shop. In another episode, there had been an attempt to rob the in-store cashpoint machine whilst it was being filled. The Sub-Committee noted that this shop was directly next door to The Minimarket, and therefore anybody proposing to operate in the premises would need to be prepared for these types of problems.

The neighbouring shopkeeper went on to explain that, as a result of these incidents, he had had to retrain his staff for their own safety, such that they understood what to do in 'conflict situations'. He had also had to adjust his staffing arrangements for safety reasons, ensuring that three members of staff would always be on duty.

All in all the neighbouring shopkeeper felt that the area was 'difficult', and therefore what was required was a person familiar with operation either in Lozells Road or in a comparable type of 'difficult' area. It was the opinion of the neighbouring shopkeeper that the applicant could not understand problems such as knife crime, gangs or drugs, as the applicant was not familiar with Lozells Road, and therefore would only understand trading in terms of the Telford area. (The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant had confirmed that he lived in Telford).

The Sub-Committee gave consideration to whether any measures could be taken to ensure that the licensing objectives were adequately promoted and that therefore the licence might be granted; however Members considered that neither modifying the conditions of the licence nor excluding any of the licensable activities from the scope of the licence would mitigate the concerns raised by those making representations. The evidence of the Police and the neighbouring shopkeeper had shown that the area was indeed 'difficult', and therefore that any increased availability of alcohol would have to be very carefully managed by an experienced person. The instant applicant had experience of trading in Telford, but that was not a suitable comparator when considering Lozells and East Handsworth. The Sub-Committee had doubts that either the applicant, or the operating schedule, would be capable of upholding the licensing objectives in an area which already had significant problems of crime, disorder and nuisance. Accordingly the Sub-Committee resolved to refuse the application.

The Sub-Committee has given due consideration to the City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Guidance issued under Section 182 of

Licensing Sub-Committee A – 6 August 2018
the Licensing Act 2003 by the Secretary of State, the information contained in the application, the written representations received and the submissions made at the hearing by the applicant, their adviser, and those making representations.

All parties are reminded that under the provisions contained within Schedule 5 to the Licensing Act 2003, there is the right of appeal against the decision of the Licensing Authority to the Magistrates' Court, such an appeal to be made within twenty-one days of the date of notification of the decision.

OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

6/240418 There was no other urgent business.

The meeting ended at 1450 hours.

.....
CHAIRMAN