



BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B

17 January 2017

Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP

That, having considered the objection notices from West Midlands Police and Environmental Health in respect of the Temporary Event Notice as submitted by Mr Steven Bonnington, the proposed premises user / 'Organiser' for the event to be held on:

21 January 2017

at Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP,

this Sub-Committee determines that a Counter Notice be issued for this Temporary Event Notice under Section 105 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Sub-Committee's reason for issuing the Counter Notice is to prevent the event from taking place to promote the prevention of crime and disorder, and the prevention of public nuisance, licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee were greatly concerned that to allow the event would run a high risk of the premises being a focal point for crime and disorder in connection with the proposed event. They heard a very strong objection from West Midlands Police which was made on the basis that the proposed management arrangements remained too similar to those which had applied before, and which had resulted in a firearms incident taking place in the vicinity of the premises. West Midlands Police also reported that there had been inadequate engagement between the premises and the Police. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from the Police in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the crime & disorder objective.

In addition the Sub-Committee were of the opinion that allowing the event to proceed at the premises would cause unnecessary disturbance to neighbouring residents, particularly due to the close proximity of residential properties. On hearing the representations from Environmental Health, the Sub-Committee considered that there was a high risk of noise nuisance arising in the early hours of the morning - as a result of noise breakout from the premises, and the noise of patrons leaving the premises. The Sub-Committee accepted the Environmental Health Officer's view that the premises had rushed into serving the Temporary Event Notice without consulting Environmental Health. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from Environmental Health in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the prevention of nuisance objective.

Although due regard was given to the applicant's representations, the Sub-Committee were not at all confident that the proposed event could run well, or that the applicant could overcome the strong objections raised by both West Midlands Police and Environmental Health.

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, both crime and disorder and public nuisance would arise in connection with the proposed event at the premises, due to its history of very poor management and problem clientele. Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient separation between the proposed management arrangement and the previous management. They heard from the current Director, who had arranged for an Organiser to run the proposed event. Members were very concerned that the Director was the father of the previous Manager (who had been in charge at the time of the firearms incident). They heard submissions from the Director that, notwithstanding that they were father and son, the previous Manager had no current involvement with Beorma. The Director explained the arrangements to Members, namely:

- A Lease had been taken for the whole unit, which comprised Beorma (a nightclub premises) and Nozomi (a restaurant premises)
- The father had a financial interest in the Lease – as the sole Director and sole shareholder of TMR Ltd – although he had no involvement in management for either of these premises
- The son had been the owner and Manager of both of these premises, with responsibility for the day-to-day running of both premises
- Following the firearms incident and subsequent revocation of the Premises Licence for Beorma, the son had had no involvement with Beorma, and instead was responsible only for the Nozomi Restaurant
- As the son was now entirely removed from any management responsibility for Beorma, an experienced Organiser had been appointed to run Beorma. This person was no relation to the Director or his son, and he had been appointed because he had several years' worth of previous experience in the licensed trade, in Birmingham and also Manchester, including as a Designated Premises Supervisor
- The only connection between Nozomi and Beorma was the Lease, and the father's financial interest in both businesses. Attempts were under way by the Director to separate the Lease, such that only Nozomi would be retained. He had instructed solicitors to negotiate this with the head Landlord
- A lesson had been learnt from the revocation, and the Director understood that protection of the public is important

Whilst the Sub-Committee considered these submissions carefully, they were not convinced that there was a true separation between the previous and current management arrangements. The Director admitted that there was and always will be a financial connection, due to the Lease and the investment, and this did not unduly concern Members. However Members were mindful of the family relationship of father and son, and were therefore not persuaded that there could be complete separation. In addition, and far more seriously, the two premises are connected by doors which can be opened, there was a shared smoking area for patrons of both premises, shared Security Guard arrangements for both premises, and so on. Despite the assurances given to Members by the Organiser, namely that he would ensure that there would be no involvement by the son in the event, Members felt that there was a significant risk that this could happen, and given the previous history, they felt that such a risk was unacceptable.

Members heard from the proposed premises user/ Organiser, who had submitted the Temporary Event Notice. Given his previous experience, Members were surprised at the inadequate standard of the Notice, which had not included a map or plan, and observed that the Notice even included several blank spaces where no detail was given. They found this worrying. On the Notice, the event was called a 'discotheque' in one box, but a 'late lounge/ cocktail bar' in another box, and Members had to seek clarification from the Organiser in the hearing. When the Organiser addressed the Members he admitted that he had not discussed the security arrangements with Police, which Members considered extraordinary in the light of the fact that the premises has previously attracted patrons with firearms. On other issues, the Organiser seemed to Members to be unprepared. Regarding the issue of parking, the Organiser stated that "if he were advised to" barricade off the on-street parking area, he would

be prepared to do so; however Members felt that he should have sought such advice well in advance of submitting the Notice, especially given that previously a firearm had been discharged in the street outside the premises. West Midlands Police observed that, in the light of the premises' troubled history, in their view "the first person they should have asked" before submitting the Notice was the Police. Members agreed that this should have been the correct course.

West Midlands Police also made other observations – namely that there had been no plan to isolate the two business premises to make them truly separate from each other (Beorma was still connected to Nozomi by means of doors that could easily be opened, which the Sub-Committee considered quite unsatisfactory). The Police also made representations about the Organiser's previous conduct - namely that an event at other premises, where the Organiser was the DPS, involving an appearance by a controversial rap artiste from America, was not notified to the Police by the DPS, even though such an event had an obvious and significant risk element due to the likelihood of crime and disorder. This failure to notify had given the Police little confidence that the Organiser understood the importance of engaging with the Police in advance where trouble was a possibility. Police drew a parallel with the past failures of the Beorma management (regarding their clientele and use of firearms) which had resulted in the revocation of the Premises Licence. Members agreed with the Police views.

The Sub-Committee also heard from the Environmental Health Officer who stated that he would have expected the Organiser to make arrangements to deal with noise issues in advance of submitting the Notice. These arrangements should have included the appointment of a Noise Consultant, implementation of a Noise Limiter system, the blocking off of the windows, and the use of a DAT Recorder. No such arrangements had been made by the Organiser, and accordingly Environmental Health did not feel at all confident that he had taken such issues seriously. Members agreed with the Environmental Health Officer's views.

The Sub-Committee therefore determined that it would be appropriate to reject the Temporary Event Notice, for the promotion of the prevention of crime and disorder & prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee gave regard to the evidence, argument and submissions placed before it, in addition to the report, and also the Section 182 Home Office Guidance, and the Council's own Statement of Licensing Policy.

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. No appeal may be brought later than five working days before the day on which the event period specified in the Temporary Event Notice begins.



BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B

17 January 2017

Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP

That, having considered the objection notices from West Midlands Police and Environmental Health in respect of the Temporary Event Notice as submitted by Mr Steven Bonnington, the proposed premises user / 'Organiser' for the event to be held on:

28 January 2017

at Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP,

this Sub-Committee determines that a Counter Notice be issued for this Temporary Event Notice under Section 105 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Sub-Committee's reason for issuing the Counter Notice is to prevent the event from taking place to promote the prevention of crime and disorder, and the prevention of public nuisance, licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee were greatly concerned that to allow the event would run a high risk of the premises being a focal point for crime and disorder in connection with the proposed event. They heard a very strong objection from West Midlands Police which was made on the basis that the proposed management arrangements remained too similar to those which had applied before, and which had resulted in a firearms incident taking place in the vicinity of the premises. West Midlands Police also reported that there had been inadequate engagement between the premises and the Police. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from the Police in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the crime & disorder objective.

In addition the Sub-Committee were of the opinion that allowing the event to proceed at the premises would cause unnecessary disturbance to neighbouring residents, particularly due to the close proximity of residential properties. On hearing the representations from Environmental Health, the Sub-Committee considered that there was a high risk of noise nuisance arising in the early hours of the morning - as a result of noise breakout from the premises, and the noise of patrons leaving the premises. The Sub-Committee accepted the Environmental Health Officer's view that the premises had rushed into serving the Temporary Event Notice without consulting Environmental Health. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from Environmental Health in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the prevention of nuisance objective.

Although due regard was given to the applicant's representations, the Sub-Committee were not at all confident that the proposed event could run well, or that the applicant could overcome the strong objections raised by both West Midlands Police and Environmental Health.

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, both crime and disorder and public nuisance would arise in connection with the proposed event at the premises, due to its history of very poor management and problem clientele. Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient separation between the proposed management arrangement and the previous management. They heard from the current Director, who had arranged for an Organiser to run the proposed event. Members were very concerned that the Director was the father of the previous Manager (who had been in charge at the time of the firearms incident). They heard submissions from the Director that, notwithstanding that they were father and son, the previous Manager had no current involvement with Beorma. The Director explained the arrangements to Members, namely:

- A Lease had been taken for the whole unit, which comprised Beorma (a nightclub premises) and Nozomi (a restaurant premises)
- The father had a financial interest in the Lease – as the sole Director and sole shareholder of TMR Ltd – although he had no involvement in management for either of these premises
- The son had been the owner and Manager of both of these premises, with responsibility for the day-to-day running of both premises
- Following the firearms incident and subsequent revocation of the Premises Licence for Beorma, the son had had no involvement with Beorma, and instead was responsible only for the Nozomi Restaurant
- As the son was now entirely removed from any management responsibility for Beorma, an experienced Organiser had been appointed to run Beorma. This person was no relation to the Director or his son, and he had been appointed because he had several years' worth of previous experience in the licensed trade, in Birmingham and also Manchester, including as a Designated Premises Supervisor
- The only connection between Nozomi and Beorma was the Lease, and the father's financial interest in both businesses. Attempts were under way by the Director to separate the Lease, such that only Nozomi would be retained. He had instructed solicitors to negotiate this with the head Landlord
- A lesson had been learnt from the revocation, and the Director understood that protection of the public is important

Whilst the Sub-Committee considered these submissions carefully, they were not convinced that there was a true separation between the previous and current management arrangements. The Director admitted that there was and always will be a financial connection, due to the Lease and the investment, and this did not unduly concern Members. However Members were mindful of the family relationship of father and son, and were therefore not persuaded that there could be complete separation. In addition, and far more seriously, the two premises are connected by doors which can be opened, there was a shared smoking area for patrons of both premises, shared Security Guard arrangements for both premises, and so on. Despite the assurances given to Members by the Organiser, namely that he would ensure that there would be no involvement by the son in the event, Members felt that there was a significant risk that this could happen, and given the previous history, they felt that such a risk was unacceptable.

Members heard from the proposed premises user/ Organiser, who had submitted the Temporary Event Notice. Given his previous experience, Members were surprised at the inadequate standard of the Notice, which had not included a map or plan, and observed that the Notice even included several blank spaces where no detail was given. They found this worrying. On the Notice, the event was called a 'discotheque' in one box, but a 'late lounge/ cocktail bar' in another box, and Members had to seek clarification from the Organiser in the hearing. When the Organiser addressed the Members he admitted that he had not discussed the security arrangements with Police, which Members considered extraordinary in the light of the fact that the premises has previously attracted patrons with firearms. On other issues, the Organiser seemed to Members to be unprepared. Regarding the issue of parking, the Organiser stated that "if he were advised to" barricade off the on-street parking area, he would

be prepared to do so; however Members felt that he should have sought such advice well in advance of submitting the Notice, especially given that previously a firearm had been discharged in the street outside the premises. West Midlands Police observed that, in the light of the premises' troubled history, in their view "the first person they should have asked" before submitting the Notice was the Police. Members agreed that this should have been the correct course.

West Midlands Police also made other observations – namely that there had been no plan to isolate the two business premises to make them truly separate from each other (Beorma was still connected to Nozomi by means of doors that could easily be opened, which the Sub-Committee considered quite unsatisfactory). The Police also made representations about the Organiser's previous conduct - namely that an event at other premises, where the Organiser was the DPS, involving an appearance by a controversial rap artiste from America, was not notified to the Police by the DPS, even though such an event had an obvious and significant risk element due to the likelihood of crime and disorder. This failure to notify had given the Police little confidence that the Organiser understood the importance of engaging with the Police in advance where trouble was a possibility. Police drew a parallel with the past failures of the Beorma management (regarding their clientele and use of firearms) which had resulted in the revocation of the Premises Licence. Members agreed with the Police views.

The Sub-Committee also heard from the Environmental Health Officer who stated that he would have expected the Organiser to make arrangements to deal with noise issues in advance of submitting the Notice. These arrangements should have included the appointment of a Noise Consultant, implementation of a Noise Limiter system, the blocking off of the windows, and the use of a DAT Recorder. No such arrangements had been made by the Organiser, and accordingly Environmental Health did not feel at all confident that he had taken such issues seriously. Members agreed with the Environmental Health Officer's views.

The Sub-Committee therefore determined that it would be appropriate to reject the Temporary Event Notice, for the promotion of the prevention of crime and disorder & prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee gave regard to the evidence, argument and submissions placed before it, in addition to the report, and also the Section 182 Home Office Guidance, and the Council's own Statement of Licensing Policy.

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. No appeal may be brought later than five working days before the day on which the event period specified in the Temporary Event Notice begins.



BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B

17 January 2017

Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP

That, having considered the objection notices from West Midlands Police and Environmental Health in respect of the Temporary Event Notice as submitted by Mr Steven Bonnington, the proposed premises user / 'Organiser' for the event to be held on:

4 February 2017

at Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP,

this Sub-Committee determines that a Counter Notice be issued for this Temporary Event Notice under Section 105 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Sub-Committee's reason for issuing the Counter Notice is to prevent the event from taking place to promote the prevention of crime and disorder, and the prevention of public nuisance, licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee were greatly concerned that to allow the event would run a high risk of the premises being a focal point for crime and disorder in connection with the proposed event. They heard a very strong objection from West Midlands Police which was made on the basis that the proposed management arrangements remained too similar to those which had applied before, and which had resulted in a firearms incident taking place in the vicinity of the premises. West Midlands Police also reported that there had been inadequate engagement between the premises and the Police. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from the Police in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the crime & disorder objective.

In addition the Sub-Committee were of the opinion that allowing the event to proceed at the premises would cause unnecessary disturbance to neighbouring residents, particularly due to the close proximity of residential properties. On hearing the representations from Environmental Health, the Sub-Committee considered that there was a high risk of noise nuisance arising in the early hours of the morning - as a result of noise breakout from the premises, and the noise of patrons leaving the premises. The Sub-Committee accepted the Environmental Health Officer's view that the premises had rushed into serving the Temporary Event Notice without consulting Environmental Health. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from Environmental Health in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the prevention of nuisance objective.

Although due regard was given to the applicant's representations, the Sub-Committee were not at all confident that the proposed event could run well, or that the applicant could overcome the strong objections raised by both West Midlands Police and Environmental Health.

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, both crime and disorder and public nuisance would arise in connection with the proposed event at the premises, due to its history of very poor management and problem clientele. Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient separation between the proposed management arrangement and the previous management. They heard from the current Director, who had arranged for an Organiser to run the proposed event. Members were very concerned that the Director was the father of the previous Manager (who had been in charge at the time of the firearms incident). They heard submissions from the Director that, notwithstanding that they were father and son, the previous Manager had no current involvement with Beorma. The Director explained the arrangements to Members, namely:

- A Lease had been taken for the whole unit, which comprised Beorma (a nightclub premises) and Nozomi (a restaurant premises)
- The father had a financial interest in the Lease – as the sole Director and sole shareholder of TMR Ltd – although he had no involvement in management for either of these premises
- The son had been the owner and Manager of both of these premises, with responsibility for the day-to-day running of both premises
- Following the firearms incident and subsequent revocation of the Premises Licence for Beorma, the son had had no involvement with Beorma, and instead was responsible only for the Nozomi Restaurant
- As the son was now entirely removed from any management responsibility for Beorma, an experienced Organiser had been appointed to run Beorma. This person was no relation to the Director or his son, and he had been appointed because he had several years' worth of previous experience in the licensed trade, in Birmingham and also Manchester, including as a Designated Premises Supervisor
- The only connection between Nozomi and Beorma was the Lease, and the father's financial interest in both businesses. Attempts were under way by the Director to separate the Lease, such that only Nozomi would be retained. He had instructed solicitors to negotiate this with the head Landlord
- A lesson had been learnt from the revocation, and the Director understood that protection of the public is important

Whilst the Sub-Committee considered these submissions carefully, they were not convinced that there was a true separation between the previous and current management arrangements. The Director admitted that there was and always will be a financial connection, due to the Lease and the investment, and this did not unduly concern Members. However Members were mindful of the family relationship of father and son, and were therefore not persuaded that there could be complete separation. In addition, and far more seriously, the two premises are connected by doors which can be opened, there was a shared smoking area for patrons of both premises, shared Security Guard arrangements for both premises, and so on. Despite the assurances given to Members by the Organiser, namely that he would ensure that there would be no involvement by the son in the event, Members felt that there was a significant risk that this could happen, and given the previous history, they felt that such a risk was unacceptable.

Members heard from the proposed premises user/ Organiser, who had submitted the Temporary Event Notice. Given his previous experience, Members were surprised at the inadequate standard of the Notice, which had not included a map or plan, and observed that the Notice even included several blank spaces where no detail was given. They found this worrying. On the Notice, the event was called a 'discotheque' in one box, but a 'late lounge/ cocktail bar' in another box, and Members had to seek clarification from the Organiser in the hearing. When the Organiser addressed the Members he admitted that he had not discussed the security arrangements with Police, which Members considered extraordinary in the light of the fact that the premises has previously attracted patrons with firearms. On other issues, the Organiser seemed to Members to be unprepared. Regarding the issue of parking, the Organiser stated that "if he were advised to" barricade off the on-street parking area, he would

be prepared to do so; however Members felt that he should have sought such advice well in advance of submitting the Notice, especially given that previously a firearm had been discharged in the street outside the premises. West Midlands Police observed that, in the light of the premises' troubled history, in their view "the first person they should have asked" before submitting the Notice was the Police. Members agreed that this should have been the correct course.

West Midlands Police also made other observations – namely that there had been no plan to isolate the two business premises to make them truly separate from each other (Beorma was still connected to Nozomi by means of doors that could easily be opened, which the Sub-Committee considered quite unsatisfactory). The Police also made representations about the Organiser's previous conduct - namely that an event at other premises, where the Organiser was the DPS, involving an appearance by a controversial rap artiste from America, was not notified to the Police by the DPS, even though such an event had an obvious and significant risk element due to the likelihood of crime and disorder. This failure to notify had given the Police little confidence that the Organiser understood the importance of engaging with the Police in advance where trouble was a possibility. Police drew a parallel with the past failures of the Beorma management (regarding their clientele and use of firearms) which had resulted in the revocation of the Premises Licence. Members agreed with the Police views.

The Sub-Committee also heard from the Environmental Health Officer who stated that he would have expected the Organiser to make arrangements to deal with noise issues in advance of submitting the Notice. These arrangements should have included the appointment of a Noise Consultant, implementation of a Noise Limiter system, the blocking off of the windows, and the use of a DAT Recorder. No such arrangements had been made by the Organiser, and accordingly Environmental Health did not feel at all confident that he had taken such issues seriously. Members agreed with the Environmental Health Officer's views.

The Sub-Committee therefore determined that it would be appropriate to reject the Temporary Event Notice, for the promotion of the prevention of crime and disorder & prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee gave regard to the evidence, argument and submissions placed before it, in addition to the report, and also the Section 182 Home Office Guidance, and the Council's own Statement of Licensing Policy.

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. No appeal may be brought later than five working days before the day on which the event period specified in the Temporary Event Notice begins.



BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B

17 January 2017

Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP

That, having considered the objection notices from West Midlands Police and Environmental Health in respect of the Temporary Event Notice as submitted by Mr Steven Bonnington, the proposed premises user / 'Organiser' for the event to be held on:

11 February 2017

at Beorma, 5 Fleet Street, Birmingham, B3 1JP,

this Sub-Committee determines that a Counter Notice be issued for this Temporary Event Notice under Section 105 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Sub-Committee's reason for issuing the Counter Notice is to prevent the event from taking place to promote the prevention of crime and disorder, and the prevention of public nuisance, licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee were greatly concerned that to allow the event would run a high risk of the premises being a focal point for crime and disorder in connection with the proposed event. They heard a very strong objection from West Midlands Police which was made on the basis that the proposed management arrangements remained too similar to those which had applied before, and which had resulted in a firearms incident taking place in the vicinity of the premises. West Midlands Police also reported that there had been inadequate engagement between the premises and the Police. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from the Police in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the crime & disorder objective.

In addition the Sub-Committee were of the opinion that allowing the event to proceed at the premises would cause unnecessary disturbance to neighbouring residents, particularly due to the close proximity of residential properties. On hearing the representations from Environmental Health, the Sub-Committee considered that there was a high risk of noise nuisance arising in the early hours of the morning - as a result of noise breakout from the premises, and the noise of patrons leaving the premises. The Sub-Committee accepted the Environmental Health Officer's view that the premises had rushed into serving the Temporary Event Notice without consulting Environmental Health. Given the previous history it would be expected that the premises would seek advice from Environmental Health in advance of submitting any Temporary Event Notice. The Sub-Committee determined that the event was not capable of promoting the prevention of nuisance objective.

Although due regard was given to the applicant's representations, the Sub-Committee were not at all confident that the proposed event could run well, or that the applicant could overcome the strong objections raised by both West Midlands Police and Environmental Health.

The Sub-Committee were satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, both crime and disorder and public nuisance would arise in connection with the proposed event at the premises, due to its history of very poor management and problem clientele. Members were not persuaded that there was sufficient separation between the proposed management arrangement and the previous management. They heard from the current Director, who had arranged for an Organiser to run the proposed event. Members were very concerned that the Director was the father of the previous Manager (who had been in charge at the time of the firearms incident). They heard submissions from the Director that, notwithstanding that they were father and son, the previous Manager had no current involvement with Beorma. The Director explained the arrangements to Members, namely:

- A Lease had been taken for the whole unit, which comprised Beorma (a nightclub premises) and Nozomi (a restaurant premises)
- The father had a financial interest in the Lease – as the sole Director and sole shareholder of TMR Ltd – although he had no involvement in management for either of these premises
- The son had been the owner and Manager of both of these premises, with responsibility for the day-to-day running of both premises
- Following the firearms incident and subsequent revocation of the Premises Licence for Beorma, the son had had no involvement with Beorma, and instead was responsible only for the Nozomi Restaurant
- As the son was now entirely removed from any management responsibility for Beorma, an experienced Organiser had been appointed to run Beorma. This person was no relation to the Director or his son, and he had been appointed because he had several years' worth of previous experience in the licensed trade, in Birmingham and also Manchester, including as a Designated Premises Supervisor
- The only connection between Nozomi and Beorma was the Lease, and the father's financial interest in both businesses. Attempts were under way by the Director to separate the Lease, such that only Nozomi would be retained. He had instructed solicitors to negotiate this with the head Landlord
- A lesson had been learnt from the revocation, and the Director understood that protection of the public is important

Whilst the Sub-Committee considered these submissions carefully, they were not convinced that there was a true separation between the previous and current management arrangements. The Director admitted that there was and always will be a financial connection, due to the Lease and the investment, and this did not unduly concern Members. However Members were mindful of the family relationship of father and son, and were therefore not persuaded that there could be complete separation. In addition, and far more seriously, the two premises are connected by doors which can be opened, there was a shared smoking area for patrons of both premises, shared Security Guard arrangements for both premises, and so on. Despite the assurances given to Members by the Organiser, namely that he would ensure that there would be no involvement by the son in the event, Members felt that there was a significant risk that this could happen, and given the previous history, they felt that such a risk was unacceptable.

Members heard from the proposed premises user/ Organiser, who had submitted the Temporary Event Notice. Given his previous experience, Members were surprised at the inadequate standard of the Notice, which had not included a map or plan, and observed that the Notice even included several blank spaces where no detail was given. They found this worrying. On the Notice, the event was called a 'discotheque' in one box, but a 'late lounge/ cocktail bar' in another box, and Members had to seek clarification from the Organiser in the hearing. When the Organiser addressed the Members he admitted that he had not discussed the security arrangements with Police, which Members considered extraordinary in the light of the fact that the premises has previously attracted patrons with firearms. On other issues, the

Organiser seemed to Members to be unprepared. Regarding the issue of parking, the Organiser stated that “if he were advised to” barricade off the on-street parking area, he would be prepared to do so; however Members felt that he should have sought such advice well in advance of submitting the Notice, especially given that previously a firearm had been discharged in the street outside the premises. West Midlands Police observed that, in the light of the premises’ troubled history, in their view “the first person they should have asked” before submitting the Notice was the Police. Members agreed that this should have been the correct course.

West Midlands Police also made other observations – namely that there had been no plan to isolate the two business premises to make them truly separate from each other (Beorma was still connected to Nozomi by means of doors that could easily be opened, which the Sub-Committee considered quite unsatisfactory). The Police also made representations about the Organiser’s previous conduct - namely that an event at other premises, where the Organiser was the DPS, involving an appearance by a controversial rap artiste from America, was not notified to the Police by the DPS, even though such an event had an obvious and significant risk element due to the likelihood of crime and disorder. This failure to notify had given the Police little confidence that the Organiser understood the importance of engaging with the Police in advance where trouble was a possibility. Police drew a parallel with the past failures of the Beorma management (regarding their clientele and use of firearms) which had resulted in the revocation of the Premises Licence. Members agreed with the Police views.

The Sub-Committee also heard from the Environmental Health Officer who stated that he would have expected the Organiser to make arrangements to deal with noise issues in advance of submitting the Notice. These arrangements should have included the appointment of a Noise Consultant, implementation of a Noise Limiter system, the blocking off of the windows, and the use of a DAT Recorder. No such arrangements had been made by the Organiser, and accordingly Environmental Health did not feel at all confident that he had taken such issues seriously. Members agreed with the Environmental Health Officer’s views.

The Sub-Committee therefore determined that it would be appropriate to reject the Temporary Event Notice, for the promotion of the prevention of crime and disorder & prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives in the Act.

The Sub-Committee gave regard to the evidence, argument and submissions placed before it, in addition to the report, and also the Section 182 Home Office Guidance, and the Council’s own Statement of Licensing Policy.

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. No appeal may be brought later than five working days before the day on which the event period specified in the Temporary Event Notice begins.