

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB – COMMITTEE B 12 MARCH 2019
--

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B HELD ON TUESDAY 12 MARCH 2019, AT 0930 HOURS, IN ELLEN PINSENT, COUNCIL HOUSE, VICTORIA SQUARE, BIRMINGHAM, B1 1BB

PRESENT: - Councillor Nagina Kauser (for the first and second case) Councillor Barbara Dring (for the Expedited Review) in the Chair;

Councillors Mike Sharpe and Adam Higgs.

ALSO PRESENT

Bhapinder Nandhra – Licensing Section
Parminder Bhomra – Legal Services
Katy Townshend – Committee Services

NOTICE OF RECORDING

- 1/120319 The Chairman advised the meeting to note that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.
-

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 2/120319 Members were reminded that they must declare all relevant pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests arising from any business discussed at the meeting. If a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared a Member must not speak or take part in that agenda item. Any declarations to be recorded in the minutes of meeting.
-

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

- 3/120319 No apologies were submitted.
-

LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – GRANT - CLEARANCE ZONE AND POST OFFICE, 206 SOHO ROAD, HANDSWORTH, BIRMINGHAM, B21 9LR

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

(See document No. 1)

The following persons attended the meeting.

On behalf of the Applicant

Joga Singh – Applicant
Patrick Robson – John Gaunt Solicitors
Sundeep Malhi – Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS)

Those Making Representations

PC Abdool Rohomon – West Midlands Police
Diane Mansell – Soho Road BID
Tariq Rashid – Handsworth Community Action Group (HCAG) Streetwatch

* * *

Following introductions by the Chairman, Bhupinder Nandhra, Licensing Section, made introductory comments relating to the report.

Mr Robson, on behalf of the applicant, made the following points:-

- a) That the shop was a joint venture between Mr Singh and Mr Malhi.
- b) That it was a family business, his brother ran a Post Office as well.
- c) That the DPS ran another premises on Villa Road, which was only a *mile* away.
- d) That he had been a DPS since 2009 and had a good track record.
- e) That they had applied for 0800-2000 hours daily. However, they would be happy to compromise even further with the proposed hours:-
 - Monday-Saturday 0830-2000 hours
 - Sunday 1000-1800 hours.
- f) That they original applied hours were actually *modest* for Soho Road.
- g) That the premises was firstly going to be a Post Office; processing passport applications. It would play an important role in the community. The Post Office opposite had recent gone and therefore it was needed in the area.
- h) That the premises wanted to diversify in a difficult climate, by offering a convenience style store as well.
- i) That it was not uncommon for Post Offices to have an alcohol licence.
- j) That if anyone was to search for licensed Post Offices, there were lots of them in the Birmingham City Council area.

- k) That selling alcohol was an important revenue; it could be the difference between surviving or not.
- l) That there would be 3 members of staff other than the PLH and DPS and they may take on another 1-2 members of staff if needed.
- m) That the customer base would be similar to Villa Road.
- n) That it was a busy commercial area, with other licensed premises.
- o) That there were at least 11 other premises with off sale licenses.
- p) That on pages 47/48 of the document pack there was a list of premises with opening times equal to, or exceeding the applicant's request.
- q) That Iceland was one of the representations.
- r) That on page 49 he had provided a list of licensed premises on Soho Road, and the grid indicated that there was usually around 14/15 licensed premises every year. If the application was granted it would not exceed the normal amount of licensed premises in that area.
- s) That there were two premises that had their licenses suspended in 2015, meaning there was only 12 licensed premises on Soho Road currently.
- t) That in January 2019 a premises, that had previously been suspended, applied for a licence, yet WMP made no objections to that application.
- u) That no premises licenses on Soho Road had ever been refused.
- v) That child protection had not been raised as a concern.
- w) That the local commercial premises signed identical letters; like a petition. They all put their business addresses and therefore, they were unable to establish whether they were local residents or not.
- x) The concerns raised could not be linked to the premises as they were not operating as a licensed premises, therefore, not selling alcohol.

At this stage Mr Robson referred Members to the Section 182 Guidance; he stated that the guidance suggested that licensing was not a primary mechanism for dealing with wider anti-social behaviour.

Mr Robson continued:-

- a) That there were lots of non-licensing mechanisms out there.
- b) That some of the issues in the area were not alcohol related.

- c) That the police should adopt a holistic approach in addressing the behaviours in the area.
- d) That if the premises was granted and had issues, they could use the review process to address concerns.
- e) That residents had issues *day and night*, yet they could not be sure residents had even objected, and the premises had modest hours.
- f) That the police did object and they placed a condition on the licence, not to sell beers and ciders above 5.5%, the premises committed to that condition the next day. Then the police emailed Licensing and confirmed that if the condition was added to the licence they had no objection to the application.
- g) However, on the last day of the licensing period, they changed their minds and put an objection in. therefore, the condition no longer stood.
- h) That they had amended the hours and had conditions on the license in order to promote the licensing objectives, such as: CCTV inside and outside, refresher training, challenge 25, refusals and incident book.
- i) That many other licensed premises did not have conditions like that.
- j) That the 182 Guidance recognised that external CCTV actually could be a deterrent for anti-social behaviour.
- k) That the premises had good lighting outside.
- l) That there was a training bundle included in the document pack.
- m) That the emphasis was on not selling alcohol to children, and not selling alcohol to drunks.
- n) That the training programme was a robust training package.
- o) That none of the other licensed premises had a condition regarding not selling beers and ciders over 5.5%.
- p) That the Local Government Guidance on high strength alcohol was 6.5% upwards. However, the police requested 5.5%; therefore it was more robust than *others out there*.
- q) That despite the condition not being binding the applicant was happy to offer it as a condition at the hearing.
- r) That other premises offered high strength beers and ciders.
- s) That the representations mentioned *litter* but they had offered conditions to address those concerns including; litter bins in the premises and spirits to be situated behind the sales counter.

- t) That the police representation had two concerns, the first was a Post Office selling alcohol, and the second was the saturation of licensed premises in that area already.
- u) That in regard to the Police's statement they had several issues with it. Firstly, the assumptions made with no statistical evidence regarding those with alcohol problems. The language of speculation concerned them, especially regarding those who collect benefits from the Post Office. There had been a large decline over the years of benefits being collect from Post Offices and therefore, the number of people the police had concerns about was limited.
- v) That most Post offices had alcohol licences.
- w) That it was a *fallacy* to presume that alcohol addicts go to the Post Office collect their benefits and then decide they *need alcohol*.
- x) That if someone came in with an alcohol dependency they would be looking for high strength alcohol which they would have to go somewhere else for.
- y) That the police had made assumptions that certain people would be targeting the shop, including:
 - Alcohol addicts,
 - Those collecting benefits,
 - Want for alcohol at time of collecting benefits.
- z) That it was a very limited group of people that WMP were concerned about.
- aa) That the Police had concerns that there was a saturation of premises nearby, however there was no Cumulative Impact Policy operating in Soho Road. The evidential burden was upon those making representations, yet, they had not done that.
- bb) That rejecting the application of the grounds the above would be *creating a Cumulative Impact Zone through the back door*.

In answer the Members questions Mr Robson continued:-

- a) That they had reached out to WMP but did not get any response from PC Rohomon as he was away.
- b) That they did not reach out to other businesses.

The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) Mr Sundeep Malhi made the following statements:-

- a) That they would not be selling high strength alcohol.

- b) That it was a way of helping customers so they could get everything under one roof.
- c) That they would have a refusals book and make sure it was recorded accurately.
- d) That obviously when they first started there would be more refusals as people try it on.

Mr Joga Singh, the applicant, made the following points:-

- a) That people would know they wouldn't be able to get cheap alcohol from the premises.
- b) That if people came and tried they would know not to serve them.

PC Rohomon, on behalf of West Midlands Police (WMP), made the following points:-

- a) PC Rohomon wanted to ask how often the DPS worked at Villa Road – the DPS advised it was 4 times a week.
- b) That whilst there was a conditions regarding high strength alcohol, when PC Rohomon spoke with the local area inspector he explained the issues in the area and that he was not supportive of the application, therefore WMP objected. They did apologise for the sudden change.
- c) That he did not deal with the day to day stuff of the neighbourhood officers, so they weren't aware what was going on in Soho Road.
- d) That Soho Road was second highest for crime in central Birmingham.
- e) That they had put a lot of effort into controlling the alcohol, violence, begging, prostitutions and domestic violence in that street and they couldn't take the foot of the pedal. They were working closely with partner agencies to try and consistently deal with issues.
- f) That the issues had not gone, they were just being constantly actioned against.
- g) That they could not afford to reduce the work load, they had to keep going.
- h) That it was not a Cumulative Impact Zone area, but that was not to say they were not having problems. Further, it was not to say that it should be granted just because it was not a Cumulative Impact Zone.
- i) That crime rates in the area were going up.
- j) That accordingly to case law, they don't have to wait for problems to happen to make an objection.

- k) That the applicant said to grant the application, then if problem occur there was a review process to deal with it.
- l) However, the review process was lengthy and during the appeal process they could still trade.
- m) Should we wait for problems to arise, or should we be more proactive in the first place?
- n) That the Licensing Act stated that each responsible authority was experts in their own field. Therefore, police were experts in crime and disorder and their evidence should be viewed strongly.
- o) That selling *to drunks was harder to prove and prosecute than murder*.
- p) That from Inspector Ahmed's statement, it was clear how many resources were being put in to trying to manage the situation in Soho Road.
- q) That adding another premises would add to the pressures.
- r) That there was no Post Office on Soho Road, therefore, people could go in and get money and it would actively encourage people to get alcohol; it's convenient.

In response to Members questions PC Rohomon made the following points:-

- a) That they were objecting to the application, and did not feel the issues could be overcome by way of conditions.
- b) That as with every crime pattern, there were peaks and troughs, however, the *problems in the area were never low enough to take the foot of the pedal*.
- c) That having read the inspectors statement the reasons were compelling, grounded and necessary.
- d) That there were no grounds not to object after seeing his statement.

Mr Robson and PC Rohomon had a discussion regarding how many reviews there had been in that area, PC Rohomon said it was minimal.

Mrs Diane Mansell, from Soho Road BID, made the following points:-

- a) That the Soho Road BID was coming to the end of their fifth year and there had been issues in and around that area for some time.
- b) That in 2015 they had to set up a project called Ambassadors Programme. They employed 2 members of staff to patrol the area supporting businesses and shops in the local area on business advice. However, they

were now spending their time dealing with anti-social behaviour, and street drinking.

- c) That most of their time was spent in the middle part of the shopping area where the Post Office was situated. Last year they had to increase the numbers, so 4 people were patrolling the area.
- d) That 43% of their resources was spent on crime in the area.
- e) That the area had high levels of unemployment and many people were economically inactive.
- f) That there were high levels of people with complex needs.
- g) That crime rates were increasing even with the extra resources.
- h) That the police were doing daily patrols with them.
- i) They had 23 benches removed from the town centre to try discourage street drinking and anti-social behaviour
- j) That whilst it was not a Cumulative Impact Zone, they were pushing for one.
- k) That businesses themselves came forward due to the issues they faced in the area, and wanting to show as a community they were working to cut down issues.
- l) That another licensed premises would only add to the existing issues.
- m) That high % alcohol and single can sales were a concern.
- n) That where the Post office was situated, it was in one of the biggest problem areas.
- o) That many premises were being reviewed on that stretch of road.
- p) That it was hard to tell if people were drunk, until they were refused alcohol and became aggressive. There were already lots of issues with street drinkers and aggressive behaviour.
- q) That all the businesses were residents also.
- r) That staff for the BID wore body cameras and vests due to safety.
- s) That although the applicant had said they won't sell cheap alcohol, their name suggested different.
- t) That to the right side of the property there was an alleyway to the car park and they had issues of homelessness, begging, drug taking, and alcohol misuse down there.

Mr Rashid, from Handsworth Community Action Group (HCAG) Streetwatch, made the following points:-

- a) That the group was set up in October last year.
- b) That he was a resident, with a young family.
- c) That all his volunteers were local residents.
- d) That they set the group up because of the high levels of prostitutes, street drinking, and drug taking in the area. They faced those problems on a regular basis.
- e) That the first thing they found was a knife.
- f) That in Soho Road, people were drinking alcohol and carrying cans around. They patrolled in pairs, however, after a week they had to start patrolling in groups of five due to safety.
- g) That 23 benches had been removed to try combat street drinking.
- h) That they could not patrol the street without the police.
- i) That both inspectors were supporting them and the initiative was working.
- j) That at the back of the Post Office there were lots of spirit bottles.
- k) That he had something to share with the Committee.

At this stage the Committee Lawyer advised that any new evidence should have been served on all parties prior to the hearing.

Mr Rashid confirmed that he would leave the evidence out of his submission.

Mr Rashid continued:-

- a) That residents were complaining about the problems.
- b) That people didn't always report the low level alcohol crimes.

In Summing up Mr Rashid made the following points:-

- That families were being affected by the issues.
- Alcohol was easy to get hold of.
- That street drinkers did not look at what was cheap and what was not, they just bought it.
- That the application should be rejected.

In summing up Mrs Mansell made the following points:-

- That they were really struggling and this would add to the issues.
- That the premises survived without alcohol before so why would they need it now?

In summing up, PC Rohomon, on behalf of WMP made the following points:-

- That it was a compelling case, he had never seen so many written objections.
- That there were issues in the area rarely did the BID object as they were there to promote business.
- That WMP worked to address alcohol in the area.
- That powerful bodies were telling the Committee about the issues in the area; people who lived there, people who worked there. The applicant lived in Wolverhampton, was not familiar with the area and was not dealing with the issues on a daily basis.
- That people who had to deal with it on a daily basis were telling the Committee about the serious issues they faced.
- That in order to prevent crime and disorder the application should be refused. The legislation supported that determination.

In summing up, Mr Robson, on behalf of the applicant, made the following points:-

- That they wanted to join the community as a family run business.
- That they would be working there a lot and wanted to be treated like residents.
- That they wanted to discourage problems.
- That hopefully they could establish a partnership with all parties today.
- That the application should be judged on its own merits and the determination should be evidence based, not based on the presumption that the premises would cause more issues.
- That there was no evidence to suggest the statistics were alcohol related.
- The statistics had not been broken down.
- That there were no issues directly related to the operator.
- The operator was responsible.
- That they would not add to the issues.
- That they had robust conditions.

- That there was no Cumulative Impact policy in place.
- That they could review the premises if issues arose.
- That they invited the Committee to grant the application, including the offered conditions.

At 1115 hours the Sub-Committee adjourned and the Chairman requested that all present, with the exception of the Members, the Committee Lawyer and the Committee Manager withdraw from the meeting.

At 1139 hours all parties were recalled to the meeting and the decision of the Sub-Committee was announced as follows:-

4/120319 **RESOLVED:-**

That the application by Joga Singh for a premises licence in respect of Clearance Zone & Post Office, 206 Soho Road, Handsworth, Birmingham, B21 9LR **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 other persons and the local Inspector from the West Midlands Police, for the Handsworth Ward covering Soho Road, regarding the impact of the proposed operation of a Post Office with an off licence.

The Sub Committee considered the local knowledge of the area highlighted by the Soho Road Bid Manager, and personal experiences of the HCAG Streetwatch representative around the issues affecting residents and businesses in the locality of Soho Road, such as; the availability of alcohol in influencing negative drinking behaviours and associated alcohol-related problems, as an important feature of the licensing regime that could not be ignored.

Members noted the other person's concerns focused on the increase in the availability of alcohol from yet another off-licensed premises not just to the catchment of Post Office customers but to those with alcohol dependencies, irrespective of the alcoholic strength by volume sold which would escalate current alcohol related issues that the area suffers from.

The Sub Committee thought it was significant that Soho Road, on which the premises is located, is the second highest crime and anti-social behaviour hot spot outside Broad Street as per Inspector Ahmed's witness statement. Member's considered this evidence to be relevant and important as it derived from the expert on crime and disorder who identified street drinking and prostitution particularly as an on-going problem on the stretch of road where the premises is situated.

Members did give due consideration to the applicant's submissions made during the hearing and felt there was not much of an awareness to the ongoing problems despite operating this business together with another one in the Handsworth ward.

The Sub Committee recognised the prevention of crime and disorder requires a prospective consideration of what is warranted in the public interest. A proposal to reduce licensable hours and proffer new additional conditions did not surmount the concerns of the Responsible Authority nor the other persons. Members could foresee another off-licence would lead to increased consumption and increased harm through the availability of another alcohol outlet and deemed a refusal was appropriate in the public interest.

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

**THE DUKES, BRISTOL ROAD SOUTH, NORTHFIELD, BIRMINGHAM, B31
2JR - LICENSING ACT 2003 AS AMENDED BY THE VIOLENT CRIME
REDUCTION ACT 2006 - APPLICATION FOR EXPEDITED REVIEW OF
PREMISES LICENCE: CONSIDERATION OF INTERIM STEPS**

5/120319 A certificate issued by West Midlands Police under Section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003, an application for Review of Licence, a copy of Premises Licence and Location maps were submitted:-

(See document No. 1)

The following persons attended the meeting.

On behalf of West Midlands Police

PC Deano Walker – West Midlands Police (WMP)

On behalf of the Premises Licence Holder

No one attended on behalf of the premises.

* * *

The Chair made introductions and outlined the procedure to be followed and enquired whether there were any preliminary matters.

On behalf of West Midlands Police PC Walker stated that he intended to show the Members CCTV footage of a serious crime and serious disorder at the premises. The investigations were on-going and they were yet to make any arrests. PC Walker requested that the CCTV be held in private.

At 1247 hours the Sub-Committee adjourned to discuss the issue and to take legal advice and the Chairman requested that all present, with the exception of the Members, the Committee Lawyer and the Committee Manager withdraw from the meeting.

At 1249 hours all parties were recalled to the meeting and the Chair advised that the Sub-Committee had considered the preliminary matter and had decided that CCTV presentations will be held in private on this occasion due to the on-going criminal investigation (Regulation 14(1) (2), The Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005).

Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section, made introductory comments relating to the documents submitted.

On behalf of West Midlands Police PC Walker made the following points:

- a) That during the early hours of the morning of 9 March 2019 there were numerous phone calls made to WMP. The phone calls indicated that:-
 - There was a disorder
 - At least 25 people were involved
 - People were punching each other
 - That someone had been stabbed.
- b) That when the Police arrived at the venue, there was a male with stab wounds to the chest.
- c) That after the incident another male was found to have received multiple stab wounds to the back.
- d) That officers soon established that 2-3 Asian males had entered the venue and started *trouble*. People began to make their way upstairs and that's when they found a male with stab wounds.
- e) That the male on the stairs was receiving first aid from patrons until the ambulance arrived.
- f) The venue was a basement venue.
- g) That one male received 4 stabs wounds and a punctured lung, and the second victim had a stabbed abdomen and a sliced Liver.
- h) That despite reports, it was not believed that a hammer was used as a weapon.

- i) That police soon established that a third male had been glassed during the serious disorder. During the CCTV footage a male could be seen with a bottle in his hand, and later a different male was seen with blood all over him exiting the venue. He later presented himself to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.
- j) That the CCTV footage showed people entering and leaving the venue and a male staggering and falling at the top of the stairs. The DJ exited the venue and stepped over the injured person, who was collapsed at the top of the stairs. No members of staff gave, or assisted with first aid. Police Officers arrived and assisted with first aid before the medical staff arrived by ambulance.
- k) That the investigating officer who had viewed CCTV extensively believed a handgun was present and drugs were being exchanged.
- l) That the licence holder could be seen on the CCTV. The DPS was a female, but they could not be certain whether she featured in the CCTV footage or not.
- m) That they had major concern over how the premises was managed during the incident and going forward.
- n) There was a deeper concern that the offenders may return, or that a revenge attack may take place.

At this juncture, the Chairman advised that the public would now be excluded from the meeting.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

6/120319

RESOLVED:

That in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearing) Regulations 2005, the public be excluded from the hearing due to the sensitive nature of the evidence to be presented.

At this stage in the meeting having viewed the CCTV footage in private the public were readmitted to the meeting.

PC Walker continued to make the following points, in answer to Members questions:-

- a) That they had much more CCTV to show at the full review hearing.
- b) That the incidents were serious disorder and serious crime.
- c) That the premises had a lack of control.
- d) That the CCTV footage was distressing.

- e) That the premises were clearly not preventing crime and disorder or concerned with public safety.
- f) That the Premises Licence Holder (PLH) did not protect anyone.
- g) That WMP believed the incidents could have been prevented with stronger staff.
- h) That the venue generally only opened at weekends.
- i) That the premises were supposed to notify WMP of events, but had not been doing that.
- j) That WMP had power of veto over the premises.
- k) That the premises had no history of issues, they were not on WMP's radar.
- l) That there were at least 8 individuals to be arrested, but they were still not aware who the individuals were.

At 1337 hours the Sub-Committee adjourned and the Chairman requested that all present, with the exception of the Members, the Committee Lawyer and the Committee Manager withdraw from the meeting.

At 1400 hours all parties were recalled to the meeting and the decision of the Sub-Committee was announced as follows:-

7/120319

RESOLVED:-

That having considered the application made and certificate issued by West Midlands Police under Section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003 for an expedited review of the premises licence held by Mr Patrick De Ward in respect of The Dukes T/A Medleys, Bristol Road South, Northfield, Birmingham, B31 2JR this Sub-Committee determines that the licence be suspended pending a review of the licence, such a review to be held within 28 days of receiving the Chief Officer of Police's application.

The Sub-Committee's reason for imposing this interim step is due to the concerns of West Midlands Police in relation to matters which came to light at the premises on 9th March 2019 at 2:20am as outlined in the Chief Officer of Police's certificate and application.

The West Midlands Police showed CCTV footage (viewed in private) of at least one stabbing incident occurring in the bar area of the premises and of the victim being helped up the stairs until he collapsed surrounded by female patrons.

It was very apparent from the CCTV footage, the door staff were not in control of patrons leaving and entering the premises prior to and after the incident occurred.

Further, the DPS and Premises Licence Holder showed no regard for the injured person(s) lying in the bar area and on the stairs.

Members were quite concerned by the lack of management and compliance of the licence conditions and as such, felt there could be no trust or confidence in the operation of the venue by the Premises Licence Holder and by the door staff.

The Sub Committee considered the West Midlands Police request for a suspension on the basis there could potentially be a repeat of the serious crime and disorder that occurred in the form of a revenge attack by the friends of the injured persons.

In view of the CCTV footage and West Midlands Police submissions, Members determined it was therefore necessary and reasonable to impose the interim step of suspension to address the immediate problems identified with the premises, in particular the likelihood of serious crime and or serious disorder, and to promote the prevention of crime and disorder objective in the Act.

The Sub-Committee considered whether it could impose other interim steps including modification of licence conditions, exclusion of the sale of alcohol or other licensable activities, or removal of the Designated Premises Supervisor. The Sub-Committee did not believe however that any of these would address the totality of issues brought to their attention by the police.

In reaching this decision, the Sub-Committee has given due consideration to the City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Guidance issued by the Home Office in relation to expedited and summary licence reviews, and the submissions made by the police at the hearing.

All parties are advised that the premises licence holder may make representations against the interim steps taken by the Licensing Authority. On receipt of such representations, the Licensing Authority must hold a hearing within 48 hours.

All parties are advised that there is no right of appeal to a Magistrates' Court against the Licensing Authority's decision at this stage.

8/120319

OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There were no matters of urgent business.

The meeting ended at 1406 hours.

.....
CHAIRMAN