

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB - COMMITTEE C - 29 MAY 2019
--

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE C HELD
ON WEDNESDAY 29 MAY 2019
AT 0930 HOURS IN ELLEN PINSENT ROOM,
COUNCIL HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM**

PRESENT: - Councillor Phil Davis in the Chair;

Councillors Martin Straker-Welds and Bob Beauchamp.

ALSO PRESENT:

Bhapinder Nhandra – Licensing Section
Sanjeev Bhopal – Legal Services
Katy Townshend – Committee Services.

NOTICE OF RECORDING

- 1/290519 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

- 2/290519 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 are 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

- 3/290519 No apologies were submitted.
-

APPOINTMENT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

- 4/290519 Members noted the appointment by the City Council of the Committee and Chairman for the Municipal Year 2019/20.

Members were reminded that they 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 Paragraph 6.1 of the Licensing Committee Code of Practice for Councilors and Officers.

5/290519 **MINUTES**

The public section of the Minutes of Meeting held on 29 March 2019 were noted.

The Minutes of Meeting held on 17 April 2019 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

The public section of the Minutes of Meeting held on 1 May 2019 were noted.

The public section of the Minutes of Meeting held on 15 May 2019 were noted.

6/290519 **DELEGATIONS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

The delegations to the Sub-Committee were noted 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.

**LICENSING ACT 2003 PREMISES LICENCE – REVIEW – BLUB 101, 70
HURST STREET, ARCANDIAN CENTRE, BIRMINGHAM, B5 4TD**

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 Premises

John Sambo – Director

Andrew Purvis – Proposed Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS)

Duncan Craig – Representative

On Behalf of the applicant for Review of the Licence

PC Ben Reader – West Midlands Police (WMP)

Those Making Representations

Piers Warne – TLT Solicitor representing L & C Commercial (sat on public gallery)

* * *

The meeting way delayed by some 15 minutes due to technical issues with the projector equipment.

Following introductions by the Chairman, all parties were invited to make any preliminary points. At which stage Duncan Craig, on behalf of the premises advised that he had a preliminary matter.

Mr Craig advised that there had been discussions outside the room prior to the meeting commencing and due to the bank holiday weekend there were documents he intended to serve this morning. However, he had provided copies for the Committee and although they were for Members to read, he would just be making reference to them in the meeting.

He had a bundle of documents 70 pages, 1-14 included the incident reports since the review application was made and was there to show that the premises had taken their responsibilities seriously and were engaging with the authorities. Additionally he had provided the door register, and some emails showing the premises cooperating with the investigation. The premises had been in discussions with the authorities regarding conditions, and although they had managed to make progress, they were yet to reach an agreed position.

Mr Craig invited the Committee to read the documents.

PC Reader confirmed he had no objection to the request by Mr Craig.

At 0956 the meeting was adjourned to allow Members to read the documents. All parties with the exception of the Members, Committee Lawyer and Committee Manager withdrew from the meeting.

At 1007 the meeting was reconvened and all parties were invited to re-join the meeting.

The Chairman outlined the procedure to be followed at the meeting. Bhapinder Nhandra, Senior Licensing Officer outlined the report.

PC Reader on behalf of WMP, made the following statements:-

- a) That he would go through his witness statement and then show the CCTV footage.
- b) That PC Reader had a good relationship with the previous owners of the premises (same company different owners).
- c) The venue was advertised *heavily* as glamorous, staff dancing in cages, sparks on bottles, star tender bar tenders. There was a lot of time and energy into the advertising of the venue which was his concern. Perhaps the venue should have been spending a similar amount of time ensuring

they were complying with the conditions of licence and running the premises well.

- d) That there were incidents as far back as 2017. A large scale incident in November 2017 whereby people ended up with stab wounds, the incident was linked back to Club 101.
- e) That one of the males arrested was let in the venue with a knife on him.
- f) That door staff didn't get involved; that was not promoting the licensing objectives.
- g) That groups continued to fight outside and security just returned back into the venue.
- h) That it was a *large scale disorder*.
- i) That on 21st January 2018 there were employees involved in the disorder (page 8 of the evidence bundle), officers witnessed someone shouting *get Sasha back inside*.
- j) Females and males all walked off and then another disorder broke out, it carried on through Arcadian and a vast amount of police were needed to calm the situation down.
- k) People were leaving the venue with bottles of spirits.
- l) That there was another referral from PC Barnes; his email concerned the manner of events and the security staff. His email stated that 101 didn't operate how it should and he was monitoring them.
- m) There was a lack of control in the venue; no control of queuing outside, no control of searches. It was shocking.
- n) That anyone the door staff knew didn't get searched.
- o) That between midnight and 0300 hours the capacity of the venue was exceeded by 30.
- p) That there were people on the balcony, one person dropped a massive bottle of vodka over the edge and nearly hit someone.
- q) That the correspondence from DC Kettering explained that there was a firearm at the venue. The investigation was hindered by door staff at the venue who would not give statements. They would have seen the firearm.
- r) Then there was a final email which stated they were still having issues with obtaining statements from door staff and were struggling to get the names of the other door staff that were on duty that night.
- s) That the person was sentenced to 8 years but there was no evidence in the form of witness statements from anyone at the venue.

- t) That the incidents spanned from November 2017- March/April 2019.
- u) That he didn't want to go too far back, he was just trying to show that it was not just a recent thing.
- v) That due to the number of incidents in the night time economy, reports of Nitrous Oxide in the South Side area and concerns from other responsible authorities they already had another review for another venue. So he was aware of the issues.
- w) That he visited a number of venues to see if he could witness any drug taking or balloons. He went to 101 and there was a male in front of them with two balloons, they were shocked. They approached him and spoke with him, he eventually told them that a male had approached him and given him the balloons. WMP found the explanation strange, so when they got back they asked John for an incident report. John replied the following day saying he had spoken with security asking them to carry out more thorough searches at the door and sent the incident report – which indicated it was a smooth night.
- x) They still didn't have a thorough understanding of the balloon incident and therefore requested CCTV to see if the male had been approached. The response was that he would prepare the footage on USB and they would get it the following night. However that didn't happen. Then in the interim period he got a referral from Sgt Piper who said a male had been located with injuries and refused to make a statement, he said he was assaulted by security at 101 Club. Therefore WMP were requesting CCTV from the balloon incident and this night.
- y) When the CCTV was requested John said that they were having issues with CCTV therefore, could not get any CCTV footage and sent an engineer report.
- z) That there were now two investigations that could not proceed due to lack of CCTV evidence, and statements. That if the CCTV was available it may have shown Nitrous Oxide being supplied and security staff assaulting someone.
- aa) That it was concerning that CCTV was not available.
- bb) That the incident report was available on page 16 of the bundle and simply said that 2 males were involved, door staff tried to sort it out but the males wouldn't listen and were told to go in a polite way. They were rather intoxicated and it took longer than usual to get them to leave. The other group went towards the exit and both were escorted to the balcony exit. They began to take coats off and get boisterous. The door staff were called for assistance on the matter. The males attacked the door staff with belts and they had no choice but to use force – so there was acknowledgement from the venue that the door staff used force. However from a criminal point of view they can't even look at CCTV to see if it was a proportionate response.

cc) That they had concerns over the CCTV so they went to the premises and spoke to Denel.

dd) That they had bodycam footage.

At 1029 the CCTV footage was played; firstly the bodycam footage.

PC Reader made comments relating to the CCTV footage in order to aid Members:-

- That the blue notice was removed from the front door as the external promoter thought it created a bad vibe so they moved it to a private area.
- Denel did not have the password to the CCTV but he did put a call in to get the code.
- There was old hard drives on the shelf so PC Reader went through them and the memory was no longer in there.
- He asked Denel questions.
- He asked him what the 4 licensing objectives were and tried to prompt him, but he didn't seem to know what they were.
- He tried to get the signing in sheet and profiles.
- Before he exited he asked a member of staff some questions.
- He asked the doormen some questions including how many door staff were from his company, what the hierarchy was but he didn't know.
- That the engagement he had with door staff didn't fill him with confidence.
- That he was going to show more CCTV footage of an incident which would highlight the fragmented security approach.
- That it was difficult to know who was in charge.
- That the footage from 7th April on Saturday night and the early hours of Sunday morning it was hard to see who security was.
- That someone threw a bottle.
- That the officer found it hard to work out who was security.
- That the other view was the Arcadian camera.
- That the guy punching was a heavy set lad with a beard.
- People flying in and out, clearly something happening.

At 1059 hours the meeting was adjourned to allow everyone to have a short comfort break. All parties with the exception of the Members, Committee Manager, and Committee Lawyer left the meeting.

At 1105 the meeting was reconvened and all parties were invited to re-join the meeting.

PC Reader continued with his representation:-

- a) That having gone through the CCTV it came back to the point around management being more about advertising and making money and not around the licensing objectives.
- b) That they were not proactive.
- c) There were some photos at the back of the evidence pack to show the advertising and also the trip advisor reviews about disrespectful and aggressive door staff.
- d) That the regime of multiple door companies caused him concern; there was no consistency.
- e) That there was an overall lack of professionalism from door staff and venue management.

PC Reader answered questions from Members:-

- a) That the premises had cameras outside and at the entry points of the venue.
- b) That it was not an issue of cameras but more an issue of retention of footage.
- c) That if venues had lots of staff then they sometimes delegate the CCTV, but Dannel did put a call in and get the code to access it.
- d) That if door staff were more identifiable then perhaps it would act as a deterrent.
- e) That the Arcadian had their own security staff who were SIA trained, but they do not act as additional door staff for venues.
- f) That they were still confused as to how many door staff were working.
- g) That the venue probably had more door staff than most venues because he thought they accepted that some of the events they held were high risk.
- h) That notification of events would be around new promoters, he had liaised with Duncan Craig already regarding it.
- i) That it wasn't a situation where there was a changing demographic; it was more the lack of professionalism and the poor operation/security.

- j) That he had been discussing a number of conditions with the licence holder which would ensure more accountability.
- k) That it would be useful to hear from the Licence Holder and New DPS first.

Mr Duncan Craig on behalf of the premises, made the following points:-

- a) That they accepted there had been a lack of prevailing command structure around the door, that needed manifesting and tightening up.
- b) That they had improved and there was an increase in the level of professionalism and that would continue to improve.
- c) That John was a man from a humble background. He was an excellent promoter and had come to realise that it was not the most important part of running the venue and that's why the proposals were being made.
- d) That they proposed that the Committee exercised 2 powers; remove the DPS and put Mr Purvis as DPS before any licensable activity can take place and then add the targeted conditions to the licence.
- e) When formulating conditions he had been mindful of WMP's concerns regarding security and CCTV retention. Therefore there were conditions specifically to cover those aspects.

Mr John Sambo made the following points:-

- a) That the CCTV situation was one that only happened every few years and was simply down to technology. He went to download the CCTV as normal in order to put it onto the USB and it kept crashing, he gave it to professionals who came out and they told him that sometimes the devices don't have that function.
- b) He wasn't sure how good the system was as it came with the venue.
- c) That it had never really happened before.
- d) They thought it might be the DVR box, so they got a new one and it still didn't work, so they tried again with a new hard drive.
- e) He had been able to download CCTV for other incidents, but just wasn't able to on this occasion.
- f) That they were now compliant with the conditions.

Mr Duncan Craig added:

- a) That there was recognition that there had been lack of organisation and structure and that needed addressing going forwards.

- b) They would be carrying out their own SIA website checks and taking screen captures and recording it.
- c) There would be weekly incident report, and up to date door staff records.
- d) All door staff would be required to wear bodycams for the duration of the evening.
- e) The venue had a capacity for 500 patrons and venues usually had door staff 1 to every 100 patrons, but they exceeded that.
- f) That all door staff must wear hi vis and have their individual identification number of display and then wear a bodycam. This would make it easier to verify complaints, provide a higher level of accountability and ultimately record incidents and therefore, promote the prevention of crime and disorder and the protection of the public.
- g) That he hoped PC Reader felt the conditions met his concerns.
- h) That if incidents occurred they would be better managed and also recorded in a manner which ensured WMP could investigate it properly.
- i) That there was no suggestion that the blue notice had been removed by John.
- j) That every time he has been to the venue the blue notice had been visible. However, it had been taken down on that night, which was unfortunate.
- k) That the premises had engaged with the review process and PC Reader after the review was submitted. It was not a case where the premises had stuck head in the sand.
- l) That the cameras were to WMP's satisfaction.
- m) That there had been training in the last month and subsequently Mr Purvis had delivered more training on Saturday.
- n) That it was right to say that what was seen of Denzel in the footage was not acceptable and that he should be aware of the licensing objectives.
- o) That he agreed with PC Reader that the ultimate responsibility lay with the licence holder, but also DPS needed to be a responsible person as they were selling alcohol.
- p) That he had given the DPS some recommendations and shadowed him for an evening. Some of the recommendations had already been put into place.
- q) That they needed to find an alternative DPS which is what they had done.
- r) That he didn't think Denzel was beyond redemption of learning.

- s) That the proposal was to replace Denzel.
- t) That in terms of the incident on the 7th April the door staff were wearing hi-vis and it was 0315 in the morning – the premises was closed.
- u) That the condition was ambiguous, they should wear hi-vis, so he had made it clear to the premises. It needed to continue all night and when the premises were empty.
- v) That if the door staff were wearing hi-vis he thought the incident would have been less likely to happen as it would have been easier to see who was who and to assert them. It would further give the public confidence that the door staff were dealing with the incident, if they were easily identifiable.
- w) That they couldn't attach weight to trip advisor reviews as there was no way of testing or filtering them.
- x) That Mr Purvis would be taking over as DPS – that was their proposal.

Mr Andrew Purvis made the following points:-

- a) That he had spent the last 20 years in Birmingham working in bars and hospitality and it was a career for him.
- b) That he had known PC Reader for a number of years and would like to think they have a good working relationship with no major problems.
- c) That the current premises he was managing was a large warehouse with capacity for 1000 people. He was the DPS for that venue; they held lots of different events with different music styles and ran different configurations depending on the promoters. He liked to think that they had catered for every sort of music genre and cultural background possible.
- d) That previous he took over music 13 on South Side as it was poorly ran previously and was also poorly attended. He reviewed it from the ground upwards and changed policies and handpicked the door team, and used good quality promoters.
- e) That in the year he was there he made positive strides and the premises now seemed successful.
- f) He had also previously co-owner Alfie Birds, with a late night licence until 6am. There were no major issues there and they had a good strong door team. It was always a focus in late night venues.
- g) He had also held a licence for large scale events at Que club, Mitchells and Butlers, All Bar Ones, Gastro Chains, his background covered all bases and he had to necessary skills to take over the venue successfully.
- h) That if he was appointed as DPS he would be able to take some responsibility from the PLH. He liked to think he helped control all aspects

of the club, but mainly alcohol. However, he would be looking at all aspects and indeed the security.

- i) The WMP reports showed that the previous security was shambolic and loose. He would put in the basics; strong leadership, structure and better CCTV system. That it was basic school boy stuff.
- j) That he would put more professionalism and leadership into the venue.

Mr Duncan Craig made the following comments:-

- a) That the incident reports and door registers, everything was nearly there, and everything was always evolving.
- b) That towards the back event of 19th April PC Rohomon was contacted and was concerned about the incident; the premises responded through Mr Craig and revised the risk assessment.
- c) That the premises weren't promoting licensing objectives prior to review, but the premises had provided evidence of an improving picture.
- d) That hopefully with the experience new DPS in place and new conditions they could persuade the committee that they would be sufficient steps in order to tackle the concerns.

In answer to Members questions Mr Purvis and Mr Craig made the following points:-

- a) Mr Purvis stated that the queuing situation was difficult due to the location the premises was situated, it was on a corner and it would therefore be down to the training of door staff in getting people in safely. Currently the approach was disjointed and lacked leadership.
- b) Mr Craig advised that people needed to know who they were reporting to.
- c) Mr Purvis communicated that in relation to searches, it was a general retrain procedure to ensure everyone was aware of the expectations and so they knew the levels of searching. Posters would be up to ensure customers knew that "no search no entry" was in operation.
- d) That security would use metal wands.
- e) Mr Craig informed the Members that it was normal to receive calls from WMP with intelligence about events and that they would always take them seriously and respond in the normal way.
- f) Mr Purvis would do a general tidy up of the office and do refresher training with all staff. They would be operating a challenge 25 police and would be fully compliant with all legislation.
- g) That they were continually moving forwards and refining things to try and rectify all the issues.

- h) Mr Craig responded to Cllr Straker-Welds that they had been in discussions with WMP and submitted a minor variation, it would be wrong to categorise them the premises as ignorant of their responsibilities.
- i) That the premises had acknowledged they had fallen short and were not ignoring responsibilities.
- j) Mr Craig stated that any licence holder had to balance the commercial side of the business and the licensing objectives. That clearly the focus had been off on this occasion but they had recognised and that's why Purvis had been brought in to assist.
- k) That it was really important to get it right on the door and deal with the outside first.
- l) That concerns had been raised about the balcony and they were happy to listen to WMP's suggestions.
- m) That there was nothing from WMP to say that they were concerned about the main security company provided; it was more a concern of structure. Therefore they hadn't addressed that as WMP hadn't raised it.

In summing up PC Reader made the following points:-

- a) That the balcony had been raised and having had a quick look at the risk assessments, he thought one way to mitigate those concerns would be for the venue to produce risk assessment with specific details about the balcony, whether it's closed or how it will be managed. The risk assessment should identify it as a high risk area.
- b) That Mr Craig had gone through everything with them and they were in a position whereby the venue wanted to move forward and Andrew was a significant change.
- c) That if Denzel was still going to be DPS then the conditions would have no weight as they would have no confidence in Denzel to enforce them or promote them.
- d) That they had confidence in Mr Purvis however, what would happen if Mr Purvis walked out?
- e) That they wanted a management structure review to be documented and sent to WMP and Licensing so when they do visits they know who they need to speak to and who's in charge.
- f) That they absolutely needed to be checking and recording door staff details.
- g) That checking the website for active status was also a good additional compliance.
- h) That the biggest condition would be weekly reports sent to licensing.

- i) That bodycams was a good measure.
- j) That door staff having numbers was an important one.
- k) That the CCTV had been a problem in terms of the investigation so they wanted to be clear that it couldn't happen again, therefore back up was important so it didn't reoccur.
- l) That the conditions were positive, but the most positive thing was Andrew.

In summing up Mr Craig made the following points:-

- a) That it was right to say that PC Reader had pointed out that the submissions revolved around Andrew.
- b) That they were dealing with the issues and the premises had served to concentrate the issues to their minds.
- c) That it wasn't always about punishment, review gave them the chance to review the way they ran the business.
- d) That with further steps they felt the situation was improving and would continue.
- e) That they were asking the Committee to add the conditions to the licence and remove the DPS and they would apply for a DPS transfer.

At 1221 the meeting was adjourned and all parties withdrew from the meeting with the exception of the Members, Committee Lawyer and Committee Manager.

At 1305 the meeting was reconvened and all parties were invited to re-join the meeting in order for the Sub Committee to announce the decision as follows:-

07/290519

RESOLVED:-

That, having reviewed the premises licence held under the Licensing Act 2003 by JHAG Entertainment Limited in respect of **Club 101, 70 Hurst Street, Arcadian Centre, Birmingham, B5 4TD** upon the application of the West Midlands Police, this Sub-Committee hereby determines to **Modify the Conditions of Licence and to remove the Designated Premises Supervisor ("DPS")**.

That the conditions of the premises licence be modified in accordance with the proposed additional conditions put forward by the legal representative of the Premises Licence Holder, as agreed with West Midlands Police at the meeting in order to promote the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety objectives in the Act.

Volunteered and agreed (with West Midlands Police) Conditions

The Premises Licence Holder will conduct an ongoing review of the existing management structure, with regular refresher training provided to all staff on the promotion of the four licensing objectives and the conditions of the premises licence. This review will also include all relevant policies which the Premises currently implements.

The Designated Premises Supervisor, or his nominated deputy, shall check and record details of the SIA Licence held by any member of door staff engaged by the Premises Licence Holder. This check shall be carried out each day a member of door staff reports for duty at the premises. Door Staff will not be allowed to enter their own details into the record book.

The Designated Premises Supervisor or his nominated deputy shall check the SIA website and confirm the 'active' status of any SIA Licence produced by door staff, each day the door staff member is engaged at the premises. If the SIA website is not operating on any given day, then this fact shall be recorded at the premises.

The Designated Premises Supervisor or his nominated deputy shall make a 'screen capture' of the relevant page from the SIA website, to demonstrate that the door supervisor engaged at the premises is authorised to carry out licensable activities by the SIA. The screen captures will be printed and maintained in a file at the premises, and this file shall be produced for inspection upon the request of any authorised officer of a Responsible Authority.

The Premises Licence Holder shall ensure that weekly incident reports are sent to Birmingham Central Licensing Team (West Midlands Police). The reports shall include details of any incidents which have occurred at the premises, and also the details of the Door Staff who were on duty at the premises that week.

All security staff employed at the premises shall wear body cameras for the duration of their duty. The body cameras must be capable of recording images and audio at all times.

Each member of door staff (whether working outside the premises, in the main reception or in the licensable area) shall clearly display a unique number for the purposes of distinguishing them from other members of the door security team working that evening. Each member of the door security team will have the number allocated to them when they sign on duty and this shall be recorded and retained by the premises.

The premises shall have two hard drives for the purposes of retaining CCTV images and providing an automatic backup facility should the primary hard drive fail

The Sub-Committee considers the conditions imposed to be appropriate, reasonable and proportionate to address concerns raised but did also consider the imposition of a suspension of the premises licence as well but were persuaded on balance on this occasion not to impose this sanction at this time.

In addition to the above conditions, those matters detailed in the operating schedule and the relevant mandatory conditions under the Licensing Act 2003 will continue to form part of the licence issued.

The Sub-Committee's reasons for imposing these conditions and removing the designated premises supervisor are due to concerns by West Midlands Police in relation to various incidents which had been linked to the premises since 2017, but had culminated in those set out within the Review Application necessitating today's hearing.

The Sub-Committee noted that West Midlands Police expressed concern about the DPS and his ability to properly promote the licensing objectives. These concerns seemed to be evidenced in CCTV footage which was shown at the meeting, in particular those parts where the Police questioned the DPS about what the licensing objectives were and how these should be promoted. The inability of the DPS to answer these basic questions was of concern to the Police and it was their view that the DPS did not have the strengths required to manage a high profile night time economy venue in Birmingham.

In any event, the licence holder's legal representative had volunteered to the removal of the DPS as part of the measures which were submitted to the Sub-Committee to address the Police's concerns including the conditions which were subsequently agreed with the Police. The new proposed DPS was known to Licensing officers at West Midlands Police, and had by all accounts established a good working relationship with him given his previous management experience at similar venues.

The raft of additional conditions volunteered and agreed with the Police, would address the other substantive concerns raised by the Police, particularly the use, management and deployment of SIA door staff at the venue, and capture and retention of CCTV in accordance with the Conditions of licence, and the training of all staff on the promotion of the licensing objectives and the review of all current policies. The use of the first floor balcony area within the premises in the future would be captured in risk assessments the premises were obligated to send the Police and no further submissions were made beyond this to Sub-Committee.

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 review, the written representations received and the submissions made at the hearing by the West Midlands Police, the premises licence holder, their legal adviser, and other persons.

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 determination of the Sub-Committee does not have effect until the end of the twenty-one day period for appealing against the decision or, if the decision is appealed against, until the appeal is disposed of.

08/290519 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no matters of urgent business.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

09/290519

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:-
(Paragraphs 3 & 4)
