

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B

TUESDAY, 09 JUNE 2026 AT 10:00 HOURS
IN ON-LINE MEETING, MICROSOFT TEAMS

Please note a short break will be taken approximately 90 minutes from the start of the meeting and a 30 minute break will be taken at 1300 hours.

A G E N D A

1 NOTICE OF RECORDING/WEBCAST

The Chair to advise/meeting to note that this meeting will be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Public-I microsite ([please click this link](#)) and that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Members are reminded they must declare all relevant pecuniary and other registerable interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.

If a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared a Member must not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If other registerable interests are declared a Member may speak on the matter only if members of the public are allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If it is a 'sensitive interest', Members do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that they have an interest.

Information on the Local Government Association's Model Councillor Code of Conduct is set out via <http://bit.ly/3WtGQnN>. This includes, at Appendix 1, an interests flowchart which provides a simple guide to declaring interests at meetings.

3 **APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS**

4 **APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEE**

To note the appointment by the City Council of the Sub-Committee and Chair for the Municipal Year 2026/27.

Members of the Sub-Committee may nominate another Member of their respective Party Group on the Licensing and Public Protection Committee to attend in their place.

Any Member nominated must have had formal training as set out in the Licensing Committee Code of Practice for Members and Officers (Part C9 of the Constitution).

5 **DELEGATIONS TO SUB-COMMITTEE**

To note the delegations to the Sub-Committee as follows:-

To determine matters relating to the Licensing Act 2003, the Gambling Act 2005, hackney carriage licences private hire licences and such business as may be referred by the Assistant Director of Regulation and Enforcement.

6 **MINUTES**

5 - 26

To confirm and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2026 at 1000 hours.

To confirm and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2026 at 1000 hours.

To note the public part of the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2026 at 1200 hours and to confirm and sign the Minutes as a whole.

27 - 44

7 **LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – REVIEW 7 STAR FOOD AND WINE, 105 – 107 GLENPARK ROAD, ALUM ROCK, BIRMINGHAM, B8 3QL**

Report of the Director of Regulation and Enforcement.
N.B. Application scheduled to be heard at 10:00am.

8 **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

To consider any items of business by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) that in the opinion of the Chair are matters of urgency.

9 **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

That in view of the nature of the business to be transacted which includes exempt information of the category indicated the public be now excluded from the meeting:-

Exempt Paragraph 3

PRIVATE AGENDA

1 **MINUTES**

To note the private part of the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 May 2026 at 1200 hours and to confirm and sign the Minutes as a whole.

2 **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS (EXEMPT INFORMATION)**

To consider any items of business by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) that in the opinion of the Chair are matters of urgency.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

<p>LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B 28 APRIL 2026</p>

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B HELD
ON TUESDAY 28 APRIL 2026 AT 1000 HOURS AS AN ON-LINE MEETING.**

PRESENT: - Councillor Carmel Corrigan in the Chair;

Councillors Jilly Bermingham and Penny Wagg

ALSO PRESENT

Bhapinder Nandhra – Licensing Section

Joanne Swampillai – Legal Services

Katy Poole – Committee Services

(Other officers were also present for web streaming purposes but were not actively participating in the meeting)

1/280426 **NOTICE OF RECORDING/WEBCAST**

The Chair to advise/meeting to note that this meeting will be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Public-I microsite ([please click this link](#)) and that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

2/280426 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Members are reminded they must declare all relevant pecuniary and other registerable interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.

If a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared a member must not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If other registerable interests are declared a member may speak on the matter only if members of the public are allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If it is a 'sensitive interest', Members do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that they have an interest.

Information on the Local Government Association's Model Councillor Code of Conduct is set out via <http://bit.ly/3WtGQnN>. This includes, at Appendix 1, an interests flowchart which provides a simple guide to declaring interests at meetings.

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

3/280426 No apologies were submitted.

LICENSING ACT 2003 – PREMISES LICENCE – GRANT – ROSHAN SUPERSTORE, 92 QUEENS HEAD ROAD, HANDSWORTH, BIRMINGHAM, B21 0QJ

On Behalf of the Applicant

Koldjit Singh Roshan - Applicant

On Behalf of Those Making Representations

No one attended on behalf of those making representations.

* * *

The Chair introduced the members and officers present and asked if there were any preliminary points for the Sub-Committee to consider.

No preliminary points were raised.

At this stage, the Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the hearing and invited the Licensing Officer to present their report. Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section, outlined the report.

The Chair then invited the applicant to make their presentation, and Koldjit Singh Roshan made the following points: -

- a) That the application for a premises licence was submitted for his convenience store which sold groceries, and everyday items – alcohol would make up a small but essential part of the business.
- b) They would not be allowing alcohol to be drunk on the premises, the licence is for off sales only.
- c) He took the representations against the application very seriously.
- d) He had over 3 years' experience in running off licensed premises and selling age restricted products such as vapes. He had never had any issues or complaints.

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 28 April 2026

- e) The premises would operate a challenge 25 policy, refusals register, cctv covering inside and outside the premises which would be kept for 28 days and made available to responsible authorities upon request.
- f) There were no objections from any responsible authorities.
- g) There had been only one objection raised to the application.
- h) Many of the local residents supported the shop.
- i) It is a low risk application and he requested that it be granted.

Koldjit Singh Roshan, in response to a question from one of the elected Members, stated that he had not reached out to the objector to try and deal with their concerns.

Koldjit Singh Roshan made a brief closing statement, summarising his previous points.

The Members and Committee Lawyer conducted the deliberations in a separate private session and the decision of the Sub-Committee was sent to all parties as follows;

4/280426

RESOLVED:-

That the application by Roshan Food and Wine Limited for a premises licence in respect of Roshan Superstore, 92 Queens Head Road, Handsworth, Birmingham B21 0QJ, be granted in accordance with the application. Those matters detailed in the operating schedule and the relevant mandatory conditions under the Licensing Act 2003 will also form part of the licence issued.

At the start of the meeting the Senior Licensing Officer confirmed to the Chair that the name of the premises was Roshan Superstore.

The director of the applicant company attended the meeting to address the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee noted that a written representation had been received; this was in the Committee Report. The person who had made the written representation did not attend the meeting in person to address the Sub-Committee. However, the Sub-Committee took the written representation carefully into consideration when making the determination.

The director of the applicant company explained that the application was for a convenience store at 92 Queens Head Road. The shop would primarily sell groceries and everyday household items, with alcohol being a small but essential part of the offer.

The alcohol was for consumption off the premises only; there would be no drinking on the premises. The director understood the concerns which had been raised in the written representation, and confirmed that he took them very seriously. He stated that he intended to operate in a manner which would

“prevent crime, disorder, public nuisance and ensure the protection of vulnerable people”. The Members found this reassuring.

The director had over three years’ experience in running off-licence premises and had not faced any issues or complaints. He also had further experience in the sale of age-restricted products such as vapes, as he had been conducting such sales for over eight years. The Sub-Committee noted this.

He confirmed that, in order to ensure that the premises operated in a responsible manner, he would be implementing a strict Challenge 25 policy and a refusals register. There would be CCTV covering both inside and outside the shop; it would be retained for 28 days, and would be made available upon request to the responsible authorities. The premises would not serve intoxicated individuals or those suspected of street drinking. Clear signage would be displayed. The Sub-Committee found all of this to be satisfactory.

The director reminded the Sub-Committee that there had been no objection from any of the responsible authorities, including either the Police or Environmental Health, and only one written representation against the application had been received. The director remarked that he had received support from the garage next door and the barber shop.

The director emphasised that the premises would be a low-risk style of operation, namely a retail shop selling alcohol for consumption off the premises, similar to many other convenience stores nearby. The Sub-Committee found this reassuring.

The Sub-Committee was aware that, under paragraph 9.43 – 9.44 of the Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under s182 of the Act, there was a presumption to grant such applications unless there was good evidence of a risk to the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee therefore looked carefully at whether there was evidence that the proposed operation would in fact have an adverse effect on the licensing objectives when considering the representation made against the application (in the Committee Report).

However, the Members accepted the director’s submissions that, whilst the objector had expressed fears about the undermining of the licensing objectives, the premises was planning to open as a convenience store - selling alcohol alongside general grocery products, for customers to take home. The Sub-Committee accepted the director’s submission that this was a low-risk style of operation.

The Members were aware of the relevant caselaw, namely *R (on the application of Daniel Thwaites plc) v Wirral Borough Magistrates’ Court [2008] EWHC 838 (Admin)*, which emphasised the principles laid down by the Licensing Act 2003 and its accompanying Guidance – namely that there should be light touch bureaucracy applied to applications for licences, and that restrictions should only be attached to premises licences where they were necessary to promote the licensing objectives.

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 28 April 2026

The case highlighted the fact that decisions on applications should be made on evidence, and not based on speculation. The Sub-Committee was aware that if the authority gave weight to speculative opinions, it would in fact fail to follow the Guidance issued under s182 of the Act, and its own Statement of Licensing Policy.

When deliberating, the Sub-Committee noted that the operating schedule had been drafted with consideration of the licensing objectives, and had been approved by the responsible authorities, who were the experts in the upholding of the licensing objectives. This was reassuring. The applicant was experienced in licensed retailing.

The person who had made representations did not attend the meeting, and the Sub-Committee therefore did not have an opportunity to ask questions. The Members could see no evidence-based reason not to grant the application.

The concerns raised by the person making written representations had been rather speculative; the applicant had taken a responsible and robust approach to address concerns. The Sub-Committee considered the operating schedule to be satisfactory to deal with any potential for risks to the licensing objectives. There was no reason to suppose that a carefully-managed off licence shop premises would create risks to the licensing objectives.

Moreover, having examined the operating schedule, all potential risks to the upholding of the licensing objectives had already been satisfactorily addressed, such that the Police and the other responsible authorities had found all to be in order. There was therefore no need to add conditions.

After careful consideration, the Sub-Committee determined that the application could safely be granted as requested. The Members considered that by granting the application, the licensing objectives in the Act would be properly promoted. The Sub-Committee was satisfied that trading would be safe, and considered that all areas of concern had been satisfactorily addressed.

In reaching this decision, 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 application for a premises licence, the written representation received, and the submissions made at the hearing by the director of the applicant company.

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 meeting ended at 10:28 hours.

CHAIR.....

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

<p>LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B 05 MAY 2026</p>

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B HELD ON TUESDAY 05 MAY 2026 AT 1000 HOURS AS AN ON-LINE MEETING VIA MS TEAMS.

PRESENT: - Councillor Saddak Miah in the Chair;

Councillors Adam Higgs and Ray Goodwin

ALSO PRESENT

Bhapinder Nandhra – Licensing Section
Joanne Swampallai – Legal Services
Owen Roberts – Committee Services

(Other officers were also present for web streaming purposes but were not actively participating in the meeting)

1/050526 **NOTICE OF RECORDING/WEBCAST**

The Chair advised that the meeting was being webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Public-I microsite ([please click this link](#)) and that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there were confidential or exempt items.

2/050526 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Members were reminded they must declare all relevant pecuniary and other registerable interests arising from any business to be discussed at the meeting.

If a disclosable pecuniary interest was declared a Member must not have participated in any discussion or have voted on the matter and must not have remained in the room unless they had been granted a dispensation.

If other registerable interests were declared a Member may have spoke on the matter only if members of the public were allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not have taken part in any discussion or have voted on the matter and must not have remained in the room unless they had been granted a dispensation.

If it was a 'sensitive interest', Members did not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that they had an interest.

Information on the Local Government Association's Model Councillor Code of Conduct is set out via <http://bit.ly/3WtGQnN>. This includes, at Appendix 1, an interests flowchart which provides a simple guide to declaring interests at meetings.

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

3/050526 No apologies were submitted.

MINUTES

4/050526 The minutes of the meeting on 14 April 2026 were agreed.

**LICENSING ACT 2003 – PREMISES LICENCE – GRANT – ESCAPE HUNT,
UNIT 8, 36 CANNON STREET BIRMINGHAM B25EE**

On Behalf of the Applicant

Priyamvada Subhash - Legal Counsel, Escape Hunt
Joanne Briscoe Brown- Chief Legal Officer and Solicitor, Escape Hunt
Martyn Payne - Escape Hunt Head of Operations

On Behalf of Those Making Representations

Luisito Guanlao - Resident
Simon Everington
Luke Smith - Resident
Caroline Chadwick – Resident
Samuel Harris – Resident
James Spong - Managing Agent for Newton Chambers

* * *

The Chair introduced the Members and officers present and asked if there were any preliminary points for the Sub-Committee to consider.

No preliminary points were raised.

At this stage, the Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the hearing and invited the Licensing Officer to present their report. Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section, outlined the report.

The Chair then invited the applicant to make their presentation, and Priyamvada Subhash made the following points:

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 05 May 2026

- a) Escape Hunt had conversed proactively with those who made representations and consequently, two objectors no longer fully objected to the granting of the licence.
- b) Escape Hunt had offered voluntary concessions to reassure objectors, which included having a sign asking customers to leave quietly, a contact number for residents should noise levels be too high, and a reduction in opening hours (to 23:30) and serving hours (to 23:00).
- c) Escape Hunt was not a bar, nightclub or pub, but a pre-booked venue. All customers had to pre-book their visit in advance. The premises did not have any anonymous footfall on the day. Bookings would also be spread throughout the day, and as such, there would not be an excess of customers outside the venue upon it closing.
- d) Customers did not primarily attend the premises to drink, but to play games, and a visit to Escape Hunt lasted approximately 90 minutes.
- e) Music would be played at a low level. This was for commercial reasons as loud music would detract from the game experience. There would be no outdoor queues, speakers or seating. Escape Hunt was also a smoke free business and thus would not operate a smoking area.
- f) The drinks menu at the premises would predominantly consist of soft drink options.
- g) Escape Hunt had invited objectors to attend the already operational Escape Hunt in resorts world at Birmingham Airport to alleviate their concerns.
- h) Noise emitted from the premises would be low and game rooms were built to be soundproof.
- i) The business had been operational for eight years, and now had 25 venues and had never received any concerns from a licensing authority.

At this point, the Chair invited questions from Members.

Members had no questions.

The Chair then invited those making representations to make their submission, and the following points were made by objectors:

- a) The main objection was to the anticipated level of noise from the premises.
- b) James Spong questioned whether it was necessary for the premises to sell alcohol.
- c) The opening hours of the premises and hours of permitted licensable activity could be further reduced.

d) The premises would operate from, and nearby residents lived in old buildings that lacked noise insulation.

e) The unit from which the premises would operate was previously used as a hairdressers and a clothes shop, both of which naturally created less noise than what Escape Hunt would.

f) Residents living on the first floor could hear everything on the street below them as there was no sound proofing in the residential building.

g) Escape Hunt had invited objectors to the already operational venue in Resorts World, however this was not comparable as there was no residential housing near this venue.

h) As a licence, once granted, could be transferred to a new occupier of the premises in the future, residents were also concerned about the future use of the premises if the licence was granted by the Committee.

The Committee had no questions for those making representations.

Objectors were then invited to make a brief closing submission, and objectors reiterated the forementioned points, and added that if customers were having a cigarette or waiting for an uber this could increase noise levels at night, and questioned why work had already begun on the premises.

The applicant was then invited to make a brief closing submission and representatives of Escape Hunt outlined that Escape Hunt was an events business and thus the primary purpose of the venue was not to sell alcohol, with customers typically only purchasing a couple of drinks at most. Representatives of Escape Hunt further added that concerned residents had been invited to the venue at Resorts World as it was the closest venue geographically to them, that other Escape Hunt venues operated in residential areas without issue, that planning permission had been sought and approved by the local authority and that any new operators at the premises would require a variation to the license for additional licensable activity to take place, and residents would be given the opportunity to object should this happen.

The Members and Committee Lawyer conducted the deliberations in a separate private session and the decision of the Sub-Committee was sent to all parties as follows;

5/060126 **RESOLVED:** -

That the application by Escape Hunt Group Limited for a premises licence in respect of Escape Hunt, Unit 8, 36 – 38 Cannon Street, Birmingham B2 5EE, be granted together with those terms and conditions which were offered by the applicant company during the meeting, namely:

- the terminal hour for alcohol service is reduced to 23.00 hours
- the opening hours of the premises shall be 10.00 hours to 23.30 hours

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 05 May 2026

- the premises will install clear signage requiring patrons to leave quietly and to be respectful of neighbouring residents
- a dedicated venue contact number will be provided to the residents of Newton Chambers for any complaints

The Sub-Committee resolved to adopt the offered conditions in order to ensure the promotion of the licensing objectives. Those matters detailed in the operating schedule and the relevant mandatory conditions under the Licensing Act 2003 will also form part of the licence issued.

Before the meeting began, the Sub-Committee noted from the Committee Report that nine written representations from local residents had been received. The Members considered all of these carefully.

The applicant company was represented by three of its officers in the meeting. The Sub-Committee noted all the company's documents in the Committee Report.

Five of the nine persons who had made written representations also attended in person. The remaining persons did not attend, but the Sub-Committee took their written representations into account carefully when making the determination.

The legal counsel from the company addressed the Sub-Committee to acknowledge the representations made by the residents of Newton Chambers, situated directly above the premises. She assured the Sub-Committee that all at the company understood the residents' concerns.

She reported that following proactive outreach to the objectors in advance of the hearing, the company had received constructive responses from two residents, both of whom had agreed that the concessions which the company was offering addressed a significant number of their concerns; as a result, neither of those two persons were seeking an outright refusal any more.

She went on to explain the proposed operating style in detail. The venue would be a "premium, pre-booked escape room experience venue". Every visit would be pre-booked in advance, so that the company knew exactly who was in the venue at any given time, how many patrons were there, and when they would be leaving. There was therefore no anonymous footfall at any point. Walk-in patrons would only be accepted to play a game - never to just drink.

Alcohol would never be served to anyone who was not participating in a booked session. Each session was time-limited to sixty minutes. Patrons arrived, they played, and then they left. The total time in the venue was approximately 90 minutes per visit. Departures would be staggered throughout the evening because bookings would be spread across the different time slots that the venue offered.

There was no single closing time which could create a rush of people onto Cannon Street at any point. There was no external area or external speakers, no outdoor seating, and no queuing outside the premises at any time – all of which had been raised as concerns in the representations made by residents.

Music was played at a deliberately low level in the lounge, as music that was too loud would 'bleed' into the game rooms and ruin the experience for the patrons.

Regarding smoking, the legal counsel remarked that the venue was a completely smoke-free business, and vaping was not allowed either. There was therefore no smoking area. Regarding alcohol, she stated that sales of alcohol accounted for "approximately 5% to 7% of our venue. The majority of our drinks menu is pre-packaged product. It's an entertainment business, not a drinks business". She added that most patrons consumed a maximum of one or two drinks at most, due to the structured, time-limited nature of the experience, and the premium price point.

The company had been operating 25 venues across the UK for over eight years. No concerns had been raised in that time by any licensing authority, or local residents, about any of the company's venues regarding the promotion of the four licensing objectives. The company hoped that the Sub-Committee would consider the company's track record when assessing the representations.

The company's offer of conditions reflected its operations and practice. The last game session of the evening started no later than 22.00 hours. The session concluded by 23.00 hours at the latest, and no alcohol was served in that final slot in any event.

The legal counsel then addressed the specific points that had been made by residents in the representations. The first of these was the issue of noise nuisance. The company acknowledged the building's structural limitations, but stressed that the style of operation meant that the premises would be "a low-noise venue by design and commercial necessity". The Sub-Committee noted this.

She stated that the company already implemented reasonable measures and made sure that the rooms were noise-proof so as not to spoil the experience for patrons. Furthermore, the company did not think that noise creation would be louder than what had already been experienced with the previous commercial occupants of the site; she surmised that noise levels would probably be lower.

Regarding external dispersal and the potential for noise creation, the legal counsel repeated that the company's pre-booking policy, and the staggered model of booking and exit times, meant that patrons would depart in small groups at different times throughout the evening. There would not be any mass dispersal event at any point. The dispersal policy, and the exit signage offered in the conditions, would cover any concerns. The Sub-Committee agreed with this.

In terms of alcohol and antisocial behaviour, the legal counsel repeated that the premises would not be a drinks-led venue. The price point, the structured experience, and the '90 minute per visit' scheduled time slots were not at all likely to give rise to the type of alcohol-fuelled behaviour which the residents feared. The company's smoke-free policy meant that there was no reason for patrons to congregate outside.

One resident had asked about the planning use class; the legal counsel observed that the matter for consideration was not a planning application, but a new premises licence application which fell within the existing use class of the premises. The Sub-

Committee agreed with this and was aware that planning and licensing were two separate regimes.

The legal counsel observed that the application had no bearing on any of the four licensing objectives. The company had invited the residents to come to visit its other venue in Birmingham, in an attempt to put a lot of the concerns to rest. The company believed that the worries raised by the residents, while entirely understandable, were based on a misunderstanding of what the business was and how it would operate.

The Sub-Committee found all to be in order in terms of the proposed operating style. The Members noted in particular that there had been no representations whatsoever from any of the responsible authorities. All of the responsible authorities had found the application satisfactory without even the need for additional conditions.

Fears about alcohol-related antisocial behaviour had been mentioned by the residents, but West Midlands Police, who were the experts in terms of the prevention of crime and disorder, had endorsed the application without amendments.

Whilst those making representations had mentioned public nuisance, there had been no objection from the Environmental Health department of the City Council.

Regardless of this, the company had offered its own conditions to help to ensure the promotion of the licensing objectives. This inspired confidence.

The Sub-Committee was aware that there was a presumption to grant such applications unless there was good evidence of a risk to the promotion of the licensing objectives. The Members were mindful that paragraph 9.43 – 9.43 of the Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under s182 of the Act required that any decision had to be proportionate and evidence-based.

The Sub-Committee was aware of the relevant caselaw, namely *R (on the application of Daniel Thwaites plc) v Wirral Borough Magistrates' Court [2008] EWHC 838 (Admin)*, which emphasised the principles laid down by the Licensing Act 2003 and its accompanying Guidance – namely that there should be light touch bureaucracy applied to applications for licences, and that restrictions should only be attached to premises licences where they were necessary to promote the licensing objectives.

That case highlighted the fact that decisions on applications should be made on evidence, and not based on speculation. The Sub-Committee was aware that if the authority gave weight to speculative opinions, it would in fact fail to follow the Guidance, and its own Statement of Licensing Policy.

The Sub-Committee therefore looked carefully at whether there was evidence that the proposed operation would in fact have an adverse effect on the licensing objectives when considering the written submissions made against the application in the Report, and the submissions made in the meeting by those residents who had attended in person.

The residents who had attended addressed the Sub-Committee and agreed that the main concern was noise, as Newton Chambers was a very old building, and not up to modern standards in terms of insulation and noise suppression.

The company had mentioned that it would take reasonable steps, but the residents wanted to know exactly what that would involve, whether the company had noise monitoring in its other venues, the number of rooms there were and at what levels. The Sub-Committee noted that if the residents had taken up the company's offer of a visit, it could have allayed these types of fears.

Those from the premises confirmed that there were going to be nine rooms within the venue, but not all would be open straight away. Some of them would 'go live' at the beginning and others would be staggered as the venue grew. The venue was arranged across three floors. Five of the games would be on the bottom floor, four would be on the top floor. The bar area for the sale of alcohol would be on the ground floor.

The patrons would be taken up to their rooms. The rooms were roughly 5 square metres. Once inside the room, the game would be to solve puzzles, rather to run around. It was not comparable to a 'Crystal Maze'-style entertainment which involved adrenaline and running about. The Sub-Committee noted this. The music played at the premises would be low level atmospheric music so that the patrons in the rooms would not be disturbed.

Regarding the booking schedule, it would only be four games that would be held on the top floor; bookings were staggered and the patrons would be in their room for around an hour. There would therefore be four games going throughout the day, at various points.

Residents asked whether it was completely necessary for the venue to serve alcohol given that the legal counsel had said that alcohol was a small part of the offer and patrons would not generally have that many drinks. The legal counsel said that the sale of alcohol was part of the offer to patrons visiting the venue, to add to the general experience. The Sub-Committee agreed with this.

Residents noted that the terminal hour for alcohol sales had been reduced, but remarked that this was still late to be serving alcohol and for people to be making noise in that sort of venues, particularly at weekends. They asked if there was any potential for further reduced hours. The Sub-Committee considered that the company had already offered generous concessions.

Regarding the premises' track record, one resident noted that the invitation which had been offered was to visit the site at Resorts World, which was not close to residential properties. The legal counsel explained that this venue had been chosen as it was the nearest for the residents to visit. The Sub-Committee found this satisfactory.

He was also worried that after patrons left, they might smoke or wait for taxis on the street, which could create noise. He observed that the windows at Newton

Chambers were single glazed. However, the Sub-Committee noted that Cannon Street was in a densely commercial area.

Concerns were also raised about other matters. These included the possibility of transfer of licences between owners. The company's legal counsel explained the procedures for licence transfer and variation applications to the resident, but in any event, the Sub-Committee was considering the instant application on its own merits.

One resident referred to the mention of the previous tenants (a clothes shop and a hairdressers), and the suggestion that the company would not create any additional noise compared to the previous commercial tenants. He felt that this was not likely to be correct. However, the Sub-Committee noted the description of the trading style which had been given by those from the company.

One resident noted that a Grade II listed building was not designed to support noisy activities; previously, the site had been a barristers' chambers. Another resident was worried that the grant of an alcohol licence would set a precedent for what the unit could be used for in future. She remarked that there was no soundproofing at all. She was 'seriously worried' about the effect on property prices. The Sub-Committee considered that the central issue was the promotion of the licensing objectives.

A further concern was raised about the works which had already begun in the venue, but those from the company confirmed that these works were pursuant to a lease that the company had signed. All of the relevant planning permissions had been arranged, and consent had been given by the local authority to start those works. The Sub-Committee accepted this.

When deliberating, the Members determined that the risks had been proportionately covered by the conditions that the company had offered. The proposed style of operation was not likely to create risks to the upholding of any of the licensing objectives.

The Members were aware that the decision should be based on the evidence before them, and found that no negative evidence had been provided by the residents. The evidence was that the licensing objectives would be promoted by an operating schedule which included conditions voluntarily suggested by the company. The company had considerable experience of running the style of venue proposed for the Cannon Street site.

The Members were aware of other relevant case law, namely *R (on application of Hope and Glory Public House Ltd) v City of Westminster Magistrates' Court and Others (2011) EWCA Civ 312*, which had confirmed that licensing decision making was a balancing exercise between the legitimate concerns of people in communities about the impact that licensed premises could have upon their lives, and the licensed premises themselves.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the submissions from those making representations, but determined that the fears expressed were speculative. The company had proactively sought to engage with residents, and had even invited them to come and visit its nearest venue. This inspired confidence. The Members

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 05 May 2026

noted that the two residents who had accepted the offer of engagement had found the proposals satisfactory.

The Sub-Committee was reassured by the conditions offered by the company. The Sub-Committee did not see that any extra measures were required, as all potential risks to the upholding of the licensing objectives had already been satisfactorily addressed.

The applicant company had offered a carefully thought out operating schedule. None of the responsible authorities had objected; they were the Sub-Committee's source of expert advice on risks to the licensing objectives. No direct evidence had been produced by the objectors to support their comments. There was a community benefit in granting the application.

The Members found all to be in order in terms of the proposed operating style, and a responsible style of trading had been proposed via the conditions. The Members were therefore satisfied that any potential for issues had been sufficiently addressed in the application and offered conditions.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee determined that the application could safely be granted together with the company's conditions as offered in the meeting. The Members considered that by granting the application, the licensing objectives in the Act would be properly promoted. The Sub-Committee was satisfied that trading would be safe, and considered that all areas of concern had been addressed.

In reaching this decision, 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 application for a premises licence, the written representations received and the submissions made at the meeting by the applicant company (via its staff) and by 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 meeting ended at 11:02 hours.

CHAIR.....

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

<p>LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B 5 MAY 2026</p>
--

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE B HELD ON TUESDAY 5 MAY 2026 AT 1200 HOURS AS AN ON-LINE MEETING.

PRESENT: - Councillor Saddak Miah in the Chair;

Councillors Ray Goodwin and Adam Higgs

ALSO PRESENT

Bhapinder Nandhra – Licensing Section

Joanne Swampillai – Legal Services

Katy Poole – Committee Services

(Other officers were also present for web streaming purposes but were not actively participating in the meeting)

1/050526

NOTICE OF RECORDING/WEBCAST

The Chair to advise/meeting to note that this meeting will be webcast for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's Public-I microsite ([please click this link](#)) and that members of the press/public may record and take photographs except where there are confidential or exempt items.

2/050526

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members are reminded they must declare all relevant pecuniary and other registerable interests arising from any business to be discussed at this meeting.

If a disclosable pecuniary interest is declared a member must not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If other registerable interests are declared a member may speak on the matter only if members of the public are allowed to speak at the meeting but otherwise must not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation.

If it is a 'sensitive interest', Members do not have to disclose the nature of the interest, just that they have an interest.

Information on the Local Government Association's Model Councillor Code of Conduct is set out via <http://bit.ly/3WtGQnN>. This includes, at Appendix 1, an interests flowchart which provides a simple guide to declaring interests at meetings.

APOLOGIES AND NOTIFICATION OF NOMINEE MEMBERS

3/050526 No apologies were submitted.

**LICENSING ACT 2003 – PREMISES LICENCE – APPLICATION TO VARY A
PREMISES LICENCE TO SPECIFY AN INDIVIDUAL AS DESIGNATED
PREMISES SUPERVISOR – NUMBER 1 PUBLIC HOUSE, 641 COLLEGE
ROAD, KINGSTANDING, BIRMINGHAM, B44 0AT**

On Behalf of the Applicant

June Large – Applicant
Duncan Craig – Barrister

On Behalf of Those Making Representations

Mark Swallow – WMP (West Midlands Police)
Sam Huntbach - WMP

* * *

The Chair introduced the members and officers present and asked if there were any preliminary points for the Sub-Committee to consider.

As a preliminary point, Mark Swallow on behalf of WMP requested that the meeting be held in private as he intended to make reference to two incidents which were subject to criminal proceedings and therefore, he did not wish to prejudice any investigations or forthcoming criminal trials. He also stated he would show body camera footage.

No one raised any objections to the meeting being held in private and following a short adjournment the Committee resolved to accept WMP's request to hold the meeting in private.

At this stage, the Chair outlined the procedure to be followed at the hearing and invited the Licensing Officer to present their report. Bhapinder Nandhra, Licensing Section, outlined the report.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

4/050526 **RESOLVED:-**

That in view of the nature of the business to be transacted which includes exempt information of the category indicated the public be now excluded from the meeting:-

Exempt Paragraph 3.

The Members and Committee Lawyer conducted the deliberations in a separate private session and the decision of the Sub-Committee was sent to all parties as follows;

5/050526 **RESOLVED:-**

That the application by Roshan Food and Wine Limited for a premises licence in respect of Roshan Superstore, 92 Queens Head Road, Handsworth, Birmingham B21 0QJ, be granted in accordance with the application. Those matters detailed in the operating schedule and the relevant mandatory conditions under the Licensing Act 2003 will also form part of the licence issued.

At the start of the meeting the Senior Licensing Officer confirmed to the Chair that the name of the premises was Roshan Superstore.

The director of the applicant company attended the meeting to address the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee noted that a written representation had been received; this was in the Committee Report. The person who had made the written representation did not attend the meeting in person to address the Sub-Committee. However, the Sub-Committee took the written representation carefully into consideration when making the determination.

The director of the applicant company explained that the application was for a convenience store at 92 Queens Head Road. The shop would primarily sell groceries and everyday household items, with alcohol being a small but essential part of the offer.

The alcohol was for consumption off the premises only; there would be no drinking on the premises. The director understood the concerns which had been raised in the written representation, and confirmed that he took them very seriously. He stated that he intended to operate in a manner which would “prevent crime, disorder, public nuisance and ensure the protection of vulnerable people”. The Members found this reassuring.

The director had over three years’ experience in running off-licence premises and had not faced any issues or complaints. He also had further experience in the sale of age-restricted products such as vapes, as he had been conducting such sales for over eight years. The Sub-Committee noted this.

He confirmed that, in order to ensure that the premises operated in a responsible manner, he would be implementing a strict Challenge 25 policy and a refusals

register. There would be CCTV covering both inside and outside the shop; it would be retained for 28 days, and would be made available upon request to the responsible authorities. The premises would not serve intoxicated individuals or those suspected of street drinking. Clear signage would be displayed. The Sub-Committee found all of this to be satisfactory.

The director reminded the Sub-Committee that there had been no objection from any of the responsible authorities, including either the Police or Environmental Health, and only one written representation against the application had been received. The director remarked that he had received support from the garage next door and the barber shop.

The director emphasised that the premises would be a low-risk style of operation, namely a retail shop selling alcohol for consumption off the premises, similar to many other convenience stores nearby. The Sub-Committee found this reassuring.

The Sub-Committee was aware that, under paragraph 9.43 – 9.44 of the Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under s182 of the Act, there was a presumption to grant such applications unless there was good evidence of a risk to the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee therefore looked carefully at whether there was evidence that the proposed operation would in fact have an adverse effect on the licensing objectives when considering the representation made against the application (in the Committee Report).

However, the Members accepted the director's submissions that, whilst the objector had expressed fears about the undermining of the licensing objectives, the premises was planning to open as a convenience store - selling alcohol alongside general grocery products, for customers to take home. The Sub-Committee accepted the director's submission that this was a low-risk style of operation.

The Members were aware of the relevant caselaw, namely *R (on the application of Daniel Thwaites plc) v Wirral Borough Magistrates' Court [2008] EWHC 838 (Admin)*, which emphasised the principles laid down by the Licensing Act 2003 and its accompanying Guidance – namely that there should be light touch bureaucracy applied to applications for licences, and that restrictions should only be attached to premises licences where they were necessary to promote the licensing objectives.

The case highlighted the fact that decisions on applications should be made on evidence, and not based on speculation. The Sub-Committee was aware that if the authority gave weight to speculative opinions, it would in fact fail to follow the Guidance issued under s182 of the Act, and its own Statement of Licensing Policy.

When deliberating, the Sub-Committee noted that the operating schedule had been drafted with consideration of the licensing objectives, and had been approved by the responsible authorities, who were the experts in the upholding of

Licensing Sub-Committee B – 5 May 2026

the licensing objectives. This was reassuring. The applicant was experienced in licensed retailing.

The person who had made representations did not attend the meeting, and the Sub-Committee therefore did not have an opportunity to ask questions. The Members could see no evidence-based reason not to grant the application.

The concerns raised by the person making written representations had been rather speculative; the applicant had taken a responsible and robust approach to address concerns. The Sub-Committee considered the operating schedule to be satisfactory to deal with any potential for risks to the licensing objectives. There was no reason to suppose that a carefully-managed off licence shop premises would create risks to the licensing objectives.

Moreover, having examined the operating schedule, all potential risks to the upholding of the licensing objectives had already been satisfactorily addressed, such that the Police and the other responsible authorities had found all to be in order. There was therefore no need to add conditions.

After careful consideration, the Sub-Committee determined that the application could safely be granted as requested. The Members considered that by granting the application, the licensing objectives in the Act would be properly promoted. The Sub-Committee was satisfied that trading would be safe, and considered that all areas of concern had been satisfactorily addressed.

In reaching this decision, 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 application for a premises licence, the written representation received, and the submissions made at the hearing by the director of the applicant company.

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 meeting ended at 1306 hours.

CHAIR.....

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC REPORT

Report to:	Licensing Sub Committee B
Report of:	Director of Regulation & Enforcement
Date of Meeting:	Tuesday 9th June 2026
Subject:	Licensing Act 2003 Premises Licence – Review
Premises:	7 Star Food and Wine, 105 – 107 Glenpark Road, Alum Rock, Birmingham, B8 3QL
Ward affected:	Alum Rock
Contact Officer:	Bhapinder Nandhra, Senior Licensing Officer, licensing@birmingham.gov.uk

1. Purpose of report:

To consider an application to review a Premises Licence.

2. Recommendation:

To consider the review application and representation received and to determine this matter, having regard to:

- The submissions made by all parties
- The Statement of Licensing Policy
- The Public Sector Equality Duty
- The s182 Guidance

3. Brief Summary of Report:

Review application received on 14th April 2026 from Trading Standards in respect of 7 Star Food and Wine, 105 – 107 Glenpark Road, Alum Rock, Birmingham, B8 3QL.

A representation has been received from West Midlands Police as a responsible authority.

4. Compliance Issues:**4.1 Consistency with relevant Council Policies, Plans or Strategies:**

The report complies with the City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the Council's Corporate Plan to improve the standard of all licensed persons, premises and vehicles in the City.

5. Relevant background/chronology of key events:

Trading Standards applied on 14th April 2026 for a review of the Premises Licence under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 for 7 Star Food and Wine, 105 – 107 Glenpark Road, Alum Rock, Birmingham, B8 3QL.

A representation has been received from West Midlands Police as a responsible authority, which is attached at Appendix 1.

The Review application is attached at Appendix 2.

The Premises Licence is attached at Appendix 3.

Site location plans are attached at Appendix 4.

When carrying out its licensing functions, a licensing authority must have regard to Birmingham City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under s182 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Licensing Authority is also required to take such steps as it considers appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives, which are: -

- a. The prevention of crime and disorder;
- b. Public safety;
- c. The prevention of public nuisance; and
- d. The protection of children from harm.

6. List of background documents:

Copy of the representation from West Midlands Police, Appendix 1
Review Application Form, Appendix 2
Copy of Premises Licence, Appendix 3
Site location plans, Appendix 4

7. Options available

Modify the conditions of Licence
Exclude a Licensable activity from the scope of the Licence
Remove the Designated Premises Supervisor
Suspend the Licence for a period not exceeding 3 months
Revoke the Licence
No Action

Where the authority takes a step to modify conditions or exclude a licensable activity, it may provide that the modification or exclusion is to have effect for only such period (not exceeding three months) as it may specify.

From: bw licensing
Sent: 22 April 2026 07:58
To: Licensing
Cc: Martin Williams
Subject: FW: [External]: RE: new Licence review application ; 7 Star Food & Wine,105/7 Glenpark Road, Alum Rock, Birmingham B8 3DD

Good Morning Licensing

Re: 7 Star Food & Wine, 105/7 Glenpark Road , Alum Rock

West Midlands Police have been made aware that on 2nd January 2026 Trading Standards undertook an underage- sales test purchase operation into the sale of alcohol to persons under the age of 18 years of age at the above premises. During this exercise two 16 year old children entered the premises and one of the children selected a bottle of 3.4% alcohol and a male behind the counter allowed them to purchase this and at no time asked for identification. Due to the premises failing to uphold the protection of children from harm licensing objective West Midlands Police would like to support Trading Standards with their review application and strongly recommend that the licensing committee consider a period of suspension of the licence for all staff serving to receive more robust training at a minimum but more preferably for all staff to obtain personal alcohol licences

Kind Regards

Shelley



Shelley Benning 57831
Police Alcohol Licensing Officer
Birmingham Licensing Team
West Midlands Police

Working in partnership, making communities safer



**Application for the review of a premises licence or club premises certificate under the
Licensing Act 2003**

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes at the end of the form.
If you are completing this form by hand please write legibly in block capitals. In all cases ensure that your answers are inside the boxes and written in black ink. Use additional sheets if necessary. You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

I Martin Williams, (Chief Inspector of Weights & Measures)

Apply for the review of a premises licence under section 51 of The Licensing Act 2003 for the premises described in part 1 below.

Part 1 – Premises or club premises details

Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference or description	
7 STAR FOOD & WINE 105/7 Glenpark Road Alum Rock	
Post town BIRMINGHAM	Post code (if known) B8 3QL

Name of premises licence holder or club holding club premises certificate (if known)
Mr AJMEET SINGH

Number of premises licence or club premises certificate (if known)
4514

Part 2 - Applicant details

I am

Please tick ✓ yes

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1) an individual, body or business which is not a responsible authority (please read guidance note 1, and complete (A) or (B) below) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2) a responsible authority (please complete (C) below) | YES |
| 3) a member of the club to which this application relates | <input type="checkbox"/> |

(C) DETAILS OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY APPLICANT

Name and address; Martin Williams Birmingham Trading Standards 1-3 Ashted Lock Way Aston Birmingham B7 4AZ Our Ref: 11477957
Telephone number (if any)
E-mail address (optional)

This application to review relates to the following licensing objective(s)

Please tick one or more boxes ✓

- 1) the prevention of crime and disorder
- 2) public safety
- 3) the prevention of public nuisance
- 4) the protection of children from harm

Yes

Please state the ground(s) for review (please read guidance note 2)

On 2nd January 2026 Trading Standards undertook an underage- sales test purchase operation into the sale of alcohol to persons under the age of 18 years of age.

This was part of a joint agency initiative of enforcement and advice to businesses in the Alum Rock area of Birmingham during the month of January 2026.

For the exercise a pair of 16-year-old twins volunteers (one male and one female) were to be observed by officers to see if any of the shops they went to sold alcohol to them and/or what precautions were taken to ensure an illegal sale did not take place.

Just after 11.00 hrs enforcement officer Paul Ellson entered the premises of 7 Star Food & Wine, 105/107 Glenpark Road, Alum Rock, Birmingham, B8 3QL. He noted there was one male serving behind the counter.

A short while later the two 16-year-olds volunteers entered the premises. They selected a bottle of WKD Blue, (3.4% alcohol), and then went to the till. Officer Ellson observed the man behind the counter sell the female volunteer the bottle of WKD. At no time did he ask her age or for any form of identification. Following the purchase the two 16-year-olds and the officer left the premises with the bottle of alcohol.

Once the evidence had been identified and the volunteers secured Trading Standards Officer Rabinder Mander and officer Ellson returned to the premises to explain that an exercise had just taken place. They spoke to the same man who had just sold the alcohol. He gave his name as a Mr SANDHU. He said that the owner of the business was a Mr AJMEET SINGH. Mr SANDHU was told by the officers that the sale of alcohol to minors constituted an offence under section 146 of The Licensing Act 2003 and that the facts would be reported. A formal trader's notice was issued to him to confirm what had occurred. Mr SANDHU signed this and was given a copy to pass on to Mr SINGH.

The officers also filled out an observation form to record the facts. They noted that there was a 'No ID no sale' sign on display but when asked Mr SANDHU could not locate the refusals register. However the till prompt appeared to be working. Mr SANDHU did not have a personal licence and no-one else was on the premises with him who had one.

PLEASE PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS POSSIBLE TO SUPPORT THE APPLICATION

The shop trades as 7 Star Food & Wine and this is the trading name given on the licensing public register. Mr AJMEET SINGH is listed as both the 'Licensee' and the Designated Premises Supervisor, (DPS).

Mr AJMEET SINGH is also one of two directors of 7 Star Food & Wine Ltd, with a correspondence address in London.

Previous history of this shop.

Trading Standards received a complaint in June 2023 that this shop was selling vapes and cigarettes to local children in school uniform. A subsequent visit was made to the shop by a Trading Standards Enforcement officer to warn against

selling age- restricted products to minors and advise on actions needed to be taken and procedures to avoid making such illegal sales.

Recommendations.

There is a concern that the person who sold the alcohol had no personal licence and so was not as well trained as he could have been. This is a busy neighbourhood shop in a residential street occupying a trusted position within a local community.

Trading Standards would wish that at least a period of suspension of the licence for all staff serving to be trained better, (preferably obtaining personal alcohol licences), and procedures improved to avoid sales of alcohol, (as well as all other age-restricted products they sell), is likely the minimum recommendation.

If yes please state the date of that application

Day	Month	Year

If you have made representations before relating to the premises, please state what they were and when you made them

N/A

Please tick ✓ yes

- I have sent copies of this form and enclosures to the responsible authorities and the premises licence holder or club holding the club premises certificate, as appropriate **YES**
- I understand that if I do not comply with the above requirements my application will be rejected **YES**

IT IS AN OFFENCE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003, TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS APPLICATION. THOSE WHO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT MAY BE LIABLE ON SUMMARY CONVICTION TO A FINE OF ANY AMOUNT.

Part 3 – Signatures (please read guidance note 4)

Signature of applicant or applicant’s solicitor or other duly authorised agent (please read guidance note 5). If signing on behalf of the applicant, please state in what capacity.

Signature

.....

Date 14th April 2026

.....

Capacity Martin Williams Chief Inspector of Weight & Measures

.....

Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application (please read guidance note 6)	
Post town	Post Code
Telephone number (if any)	
If you would prefer us to correspond with you using an e-mail address your e-mail address (optional)	

Notes for Guidance

1. A responsible authority includes the local police, fire and rescue authority and other statutory bodies which exercise specific functions in the local area.
2. The ground(s) for review must be based on one of the licensing objectives.
3. Please list any additional information or details for example dates of problems which are included in the grounds for review if available.
4. The application form must be signed.
5. An applicant’s agent (for example solicitor) may sign the form on their behalf provided that they have actual authority to do so.
6. This is the address which we shall use to correspond with you about this application.

Part 2

Name, (registered) address, telephone number and email (where relevant) of holder of premises licence Mr Ajmeet Singh	
Post town:	Post Code:
Telephone Number:	
Email	

Registered number of holder for example company number or charity number (where applicable) N/A

Name, address, telephone number of designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorises for the supply of alcohol Mr Ajmeet Singh	
Post town:	Post Code:
Telephone Number:	

Personal licence number and issuing authority of personal licence held by designated premises supervisor where the premises licence authorises for the supply of alcohol	
Licence Number 03907	Issuing Authority EALING COUNCIL

Dated 14/06/2016

SHAID YASSER
Senior Licensing Officer
For Director of Regulation and Enforcement

Annex 1 – Mandatory Conditions

No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence (a) at a time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or (b) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended.

Every retail sale or supply of alcohol made under this licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.

The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder must ensure that an age verification policy is adopted in respect of the premises in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol. The designated premises supervisor in relation to the premises licence must ensure that the supply of alcohol at the premises is carried on in accordance with the age verification policy. The policy must require individuals who appear to the responsible person to be under 18 years of age (or such older age as may be specified in the policy) to produce on request, before being served alcohol, identification bearing their photograph, date of birth and either— (a) a holographic mark, or (b) an ultraviolet feature.

(1) A relevant person shall ensure that no alcohol is sold or supplied for consumption on or off the premises for a price which is less than the permitted price. (2) In this condition:— (a) “permitted price” is the price found by applying the formula $P = D + (D \times V)$, where— (i) P is the permitted price, (ii) D is the amount of duty chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the duty were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol, and (iii) V is the rate of value added tax chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the value added tax were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol; (b) “duty” is to be construed in accordance with the Alcoholic Liquor Duties Act 1979; (c) “relevant person” means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a premises licence— (i) the holder of the premises licence, (ii) the designated premises supervisor (if any) in respect of such a licence, or (iii) the personal licence holder who makes or authorises a supply of alcohol under such a licence; (d) “relevant person” means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a club premises certificate, any member or officer of the club present on the premises in a capacity which enables the member or officer to prevent the supply in question; and (e) “value added tax” means value added tax charged in accordance with the Value Added Tax Act 1994. (3) Where the permitted price would not be a whole number of pennies, the permitted price shall be taken to be the price rounded up to the nearest penny. (4) Where the permitted price on a day (“the first day”) would be different from the permitted price on the next day (“the second day”) as a result of a change to the rate of duty or value added tax, the permitted price which would apply on the first day applies to sales or supplies of alcohol which take place before the expiry of the period of 14 days beginning on the second day.

Annex 2 – Conditions consistent with operating schedule

2a) General conditions consistent with the operating schedule

All staff shall be trained with regards to the Licensing Act 2003.

2b) Conditions consistent with, and to promote the prevention of crime and disorder

The premises licence holder shall install and maintain a CCTV system at the premises.

A refusal book shall be maintained and kept at the premises.

All staff training regarding to the Licensing Act will be documented and signed by both the trainer and trainee. No staff will be allowed to serve in the premises without this document training with the exception of personal licence holders. This training will be made immediately available to any of the responsible authorities on request.

CCTV to be installed to the recommendations and specifications of West Midlands Police. CCTV will record throughout the whole of the licensable activity, with a storage capacity of at least 28 days. CCTV will be downloadable and made immediately available to any of the responsible authorities on request.

Challenge 25 signage to be prominently displayed on the entrance door and point of sale.

No alcohol in open containers allowed on the premises, no consumption of alcohol on the premises.

2c) Conditions consistent with, and to promote, public safety

No enforceable conditions identified from operating schedule.

2d) Conditions consistent with, and to promote the prevention of public nuisance

Prominent signs will be displayed requesting customers to have regard for local residents when leaving the premises.

2e) Conditions consistent with, and to promote the protection of children from harm

The premises shall operate a 'challenge 25' policy.

Annex 3 – Conditions attached after hearing by licensing authority

3a) General committee conditions

N/A

3b) Committee conditions to promote the prevention of crime and disorder

N/A

3c) Committee conditions to promote public safety

N/A

3d) Committee conditions to promote the prevention of public nuisance

N/A

3e) Committee conditions to promote the protection of children from harm

N/A

Annex4/Plans







