

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Meeting held – 6th July 2016

Present: Councillor Mary Malin (Chair)
Councillor Lloyd Bunday
Councillor Greg Titcombe

Also Present James Chadwick (Legal Services)
Russ Howell (Health Services Manager- KBC)
David Pope (Committee Administrator)

PC David Bryan (Northamptonshire Police)
PC Anthony White (Northamptonshire Police)
PS Tony Cotton (Northamptonshire Police)
PS Peter Winterflood (Northamptonshire Police)
Insp Adam Ward (Northamptonshire Police)

Stephen Marks (NCC Public Health & Well-being Directorate)

Mr Colin Hobbs (Legal Representative for Licence Holder)
Mr Surrinder Duggal (Licence Holder)
Mr Ahmet Rejdeb (Licence Holder's Head of Security)

16.LC.01 **APOLOGIES**

None

16.LC.02 **MATTERS OF URGENCY**

None

16.LC.03 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

16.LC.04

TO DETERMINE AN APPLICATION FOR A REVIEW OF THE PREMISES LICENCE FOR AQUA, 64-70 GOLD STREET, KETTERING (A1)

The Committee was asked to consider an application from Northamptonshire Police for a review of the premises licence for Aqua, 64-70 Gold Street, Kettering.

The application for a review related to concerns regarding disorder on and off the premises, underage persons being on the premises contrary to conditions forming part of the premises licence and concerns regarding the management of the premises.

The Committee noted that following receipt of the review application from Northamptonshire Police, the statutory consultation period was undertaken, with two further representations received, one from Professor Akeem Ali, Director of Public Health and the other from Alex Hopkins, Director for Children, Families and Education at Northamptonshire County Council. These representations had been included as appendices to the committee report.

It was noted that following the publication of the original agenda date, scheduled for 27th June, Mr Colin Hobbs, the legal representative for licence holder and Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) had contacted KBC to state that Mr Duggal would be unavailable to attend that particular date due to a pre-arranged absence from the country. It had been decided that in order to allow for Mr Duggal to be present and provide representation to the Committee, the original meeting date needed to be rescheduled. This had been agreed by all parties.

It was further noted that since the publication of the agenda, a number of additional incident reports and witness statements relating to the premises had been supplied by Northamptonshire Police and supplied to all parties involved.

PC Bryan explained the reasoning behind the police request for a licence review and referred to both statutory guidance and case law. He asserted that in order for a decision to be made favouring the police stance, recordings detailing the environment in the immediate area around the premises needed to be shown. It was noted that this was the only town centre premises selling alcohol after 4am and it was more than likely that any incidents in the immediate area could be attributed to this venue.

PC Bryan advised the Committee that at no point in the

Licensing Act 2003, or in Section 182 guidance, was a premises-by-premises approach mentioned and that consideration be given to the local context of a premises in terms of a review, rather than in isolation and therefore it was important to bear in mind the effect on law and order and the impact on the lives of those living and working in the vicinity.

The police requested that one of two options be pursued as an outcome to the review:-

1. The premises licence be revoked; or
2. Licensable activity be restricted to 0300hrs and the Designated Premises Supervisor be removed.

A number of incidents in and around the premises had been submitted and were detailed by PC Bryan as follows:-

1. 6th November 2015 – 0645hrs – Police attended the area to deal with a domestic-related incident involving a male and a female. The female (aged 17) admitted to drinking in Aqua prior to the incident. As part of the conditions contained on the premises licence, no person under the age of 18 should be present at the premises during opening hours.
2. 6th March 2016 – 0415hrs – Two males were assaulted in the rear garden of the premises and then placed, unconscious in the alleyway adjacent to the premises by a member of staff. Footage of the incident would later be shown to the Committee.
3. 19th March 2016 – A male, previously issued with a Section 35 Order entered Aqua, thereby breaching the order. Police found the male in the company of a female who had no ID and was stated to be 17 years old. Management were spoken to and were apparently unconcerned.
4. An underage female, reported as a missing person was located and interviewed confirming she had been present within Aqua that night.
5. 16th March 2016 – A male patron, upon being ejected from the premises used pepper spray on door-staff. Although a search policy was in place, the spray had not been located prior to his entry to the venue.
6. A further incident of an underage person being found on

the premises was outlined.

7. 22nd April 2016 – 0330hrs – A clearly intoxicated male made his way towards Aqua and was admitted without being challenged by door staff.
8. 24th April 2016 – 0600hrs – With customers exiting the premises and forming a large crowd on the street, fighting broke out and door staff were nowhere to be seen, therefore not implementing the dispersal policy.
9. 24th April 2016 – 0700hrs – Another fight outside the premises, police only notified by council CCTV operators. One male with serious injuries following an altercation the licence holder's brother.

The committee was then presented with a compilation of visual recordings taken from police officer body-worn devices, council CCTV recordings and two from the CCTV system within Aqua itself. The footage comprised various incidents both inside and in the vicinity of the premises involving assaults between customers, intoxicated individuals, allegations of assaults on customers by door staff and an alleged stabbing incident with a knife.

PC Bryan noted that in the majority of the footage, registered door staff were not wearing hi-viz jackets, which was a condition for all SIA registered door staff working on a main entrance from 2300hrs.

In response to their questions, the Committee heard that capacity of the club was approximately 300 persons and that door staff were employed through an external company and not directly by the premises.

Mr Colin Hobbs, the licence holder's legal representative, asked questions of the police regarding certain incidents depicted in the footage, specifically regarding the alleged stabbing incident, the arrest of a volatile female suspect and whether an individual alleging an assault by door staff on 28th February was well known to police.

Following a question from the Chair, PC Bryan asserted that the dispersal policy of the venue was not being implemented effectively to clear the street following the closing of the premises. He further stated that had police been informed of a number of the incidents shown in the footage there was the possibility they could have been prevented from escalating.

The licence holder's legal representative stated that in the previous two months a new door staff company had taken over the operation of security at the premises and queried whether police had seen any impact in the level of issues arising from the premises.

PS Cotton stated that the police were aware of the new security team and in fairness there had been an improvement in the number of incidents associated with the premises. The owner of the security team was clearly professional and a zero-tolerance admissions policy in relation to ID had been introduced. However, it was noted that a fake ID seizure scheme in place had not yielded a single hand-in from Aqua in the time it had been operating and staff at the premises rarely booked on or off of the Pubwatch radio system.

Insp Ward addressed the Committee as the sector commander with a responsibility for local and community policing in Kettering and the surrounding borough. He stated that outside of Northampton, Kettering was the busiest area in terms of the volume of crime. He noted that the force was working with KBC and other partner agencies to make Kettering a safer place with less crime and disorder. He further noted that towns of a similar size did not suffer the same levels of Night Time Economy incidents.

The Committee was told that 40% of all violence in the borough occurred on Friday and Saturday nights, with a disproportionately high level attributable to Kettering's Night Time Economy. On those nights when police resources could be deployed elsewhere, nearly all available resources were used dealing with incidents such as those seen in the visual recordings.

Stephen Marks of Northamptonshire County Council's Public Health and Well-being Directorate addressed the Committee and noted that that Public Health had established a more structured process for responding to such licensing consultations. A series of indicators of alcohol-related harm had been mapped across the county, detailing A&E presentations and incidents of violence through to treatment data. This allowed for a good picture to be produced, indicating areas of high alcohol harm. The area the premises in question was located was an area of high alcohol harm both in Kettering and for the county. It was considered that given this fact it was important for Public Health to support the licensing review application and to make a representation. NCC had recently done a lot of work regarding child safeguarding and this premises raised some

fairly fundamental issues regarding the safeguarding of young people.

Mr Hobbs was then provided with the opportunity to address the Committee.

Mr Hobbs provided the Committee with some background information regarding the premises, noting that they had been operated by Mr Surrinder Duggal (also known as Tino) since October 2014. Mr Duggal had been in the licensing trade since 2008, previously operating premises (since closed for financial reasons) in Corby.

Mr Duggal was aware that there had been problems in the operation of Aqua and had questioned why things had gone wrong and what could be improved. It was noted that although the premises held a licence permitting opening hours of 1100 to 0600hrs, the venue did not open until 0200hrs as there was no customer demand prior to that. The premises closed at 0600hrs and was therefore a very late-night venue.

Mr Duggal did not deny that there had been incidents at the premises, some of which had not been well handled and evidence of that had been shown to the Committee. The main issue for the licence holder was how incidents were dealt with going forward. It was heard that the previously employed door-staffing company was at fault for a large proportion of the issues raised in relation to the premises and had acted in an unprofessional manner despite being SIA registered.

The meeting heard that Certified Security Personnel (CSP) had taken over door security at the premises within the previous two months. The operator of CSP (who was present at the meeting) had introduced usage of the Club Scan system requiring all patrons to provide photographic ID to enter, in this case drivers' licence or passport. The system took a photo of customers and noted their name and address, so should any incidents occur individuals responsible could be identified. CSP operated security at 120 clubs across the UK and had used the Club Scan system to great effect, noting its use both as a deterrent for violence and also as a method of preventing intoxicated individuals from entering the premises.

In addition to the usage of Club Scan, CSP had introduced a stricter door policy, utilised barriers at the front of the venue to allow for better crowd control and all door staff working at

the main entrance wore hi-viz tops. The location of door staff within the venue had been reviewed in order to pre-empt issues and prevent possible incidents from escalating.

The Committee heard that CSP went out of their way to disperse crowds following club-closing and that there had been no significant incidents of violence or disorder since the company had started operating door security at the premises.

It was heard that Mr Rejdeb, as owner of CSP was present at the venue on a couple of occasions each month and at other times left security in the operation of his head doorman who had held that role for the past 16 years. All other door staff had a minimum of 5 years in the role.

The Committee stated that operation of Club Scan had been a condition of the existing licence and should therefore have been in place well before CSP took over security at the premises.

PS Winterflood confirmed that there had been improvements in terms of incidents of disorder at the premises but highlighted a head-butting incident shown as part of the visual footage where the Head Doorman could be seen not wearing a hi viz jacket

PC White also confirmed that there had been a reduction of incidents within the premises, but noted that there were still issues with intoxicated individuals that had exited the premises.

Mr Rejdeb commented on the head-butting incident, noting that the Head Doorman had not been wearing a hi-viz jacket as he had been working inside the premises and was therefore not required to. He considered that the actions of the Head Doorman to be proactive in defusing the incident.

Mr Rejdeb stated that CSP did use police radio and signed on and off at the beginning and end of shifts. He noted that generally, his staff would attempt to deal with incidents without police assistance as he was aware of the stretched nature of police resources, but contact would be made if assistance was required.

Mr Rejdeb stated that since CSP had commenced security operations at the premises, the company had gone out of their way to work with the police, especially in terms of intelligence sharing. A page-numbered log book for door staff to sign in and out had been introduced so it was clear who

was working at specific times. Both minor and major incidents were now logged, with door staff writing full statements for incidents of a more serious nature. The Committee heard that the premises and its operator were aware that there was a duty of care towards customers, not just in preventing violence, but to ensure people were safe and had a good time.

The Committee heard that random searches were carried out on patrons by door staff and were logged, although PS Winterflood disputed that he had ever witnessed a single customer being searched either under the current or previous security operation. The Committee queried whether all customers should not be searched prior to entry, but were advised by Mr Rejbed that since CSP had been in operation at the premises it had not been considered necessary. It was heard that currently, from a security point of view, the premises was the best it was going to be. It would be impossible to prevent any incidents from occurring at all, but everything had been done to minimise the likelihood of disorder. It was further heard that since CSP had operated security at the premises, it could be guaranteed that not one underage customer had entered the premises.

PC Bryan queried whether CSP utilised any female door staff. It was noted that the company employed 7 female door staff, although none of these worked at Aqua. PC Bryan then asked how searches of female patrons were carried out. Mr Rejbed confirmed that females were not searched by door staff, as this was not permissible by law, however they were asked to remove items from handbags and jackets.

Mr Duggal was asked whether he was a member of Pub Watch and confirmed that he was, although he did not attend meetings. Representatives had been sent to meetings in the past and he did receive posters of banned individuals. He stated he had not previously put anyone forward for a Pub Watch ban, but this would change going forward.

The Committee requested to see copies of incident records and door staff logbooks. It was noted that these were secured inside the club and Mr Rejbed left the meeting at this point in order to obtain these for the Committee's perusal.

Mr Duggal addressed the Committee and admitted that things had clearly gone wrong at the premises as identified earlier in the meeting, although he was trying to rectify these issues to the best of his ability. He had noted issues with the existing security company from December 2015 onwards and was then in contact with various potential replacement companies. Contact was made with CSP in February, although they could not commence operation until April. The previous security team had been unsuccessful in using the Club Scan system and on one occasion had allowed an underage person in that Mr Duggal had challenged at the bar, CCTV footage was available if required to prove this. Even though the previous security team had been weak, Mr Duggal was aware that this was a problem on his part as DPS

Mr Duggal confirmed an incident where door staff had walked away from their posts, which had led to their sacking from the security company previously operating at Aqua. He stated that he had made a concerted effort to get the best security team on-board so incidents did not occur in future. The new team now provided Mr Duggal with full feedback on the evening's events at the end of the night. Mr Hobbs reminded Mr Duggal that just by employing a door company, this did not alleviate Mr Duggal's responsibilities as DPS.

Mr Hobbs noted that inference had been made that CCTV was regularly not provided or footage was wiped. Mr Duggal stated that he would not lie to police or delete CCTV footage. Footage, when requested by police, had been provided in every instance bar two, one being a technical issue and the other being after a police representative had spoken to him rudely.

Mr Hobbs requested that Mr Duggal explain the incident involving Mr Duggal's brother, footage of which had been shown to the Committee earlier in the meeting.

Mr Duggal stated that the injured party and his brother were known to each other and that he had been outside dispersing crowds following the premises closing. A small number of customers remained in the club waiting for lifts following closing. He had overheard an argument in the VIP area of the premises and had seen the injured party attempted to hit his brother and slip. He stated he had panicked and frozen and noted that security staff had failed to break up the fight as they feared losing their licence. He noted that he had lost control of the premises and was attempting to regain control by putting new procedures in place, such as not allowing the public to wait in the venue once closed.

Mr Duggal concluded by admitting that he knew things had gone wrong, that he was attempting to address areas of concern and that he had been a DPS for 8 years and involved in the bar industry for 20 and would like the opportunity to put further policies in place to improve the premises.

The Committee and police were provided with an opportunity to ask questions of Mr Duggal.

The meeting heard that the premises only opened on Friday and Saturday nights, with 5 bar staff employed at the venue.

Insp Ward queried how Mr Duggal made such a big mistake with a venue given his level experience in the trade. He noted that Mr Duggal had largely cast the blame onto the previous security company. It was important to understand why such mistakes had been made and how it could be proved that so much had changed in such a short period of time that there would be no reoccurrence of incidents in future.

Mr Duggal confirmed that he was no longer directly involved in the security of the premises which was solely operated by CSP. He stated from October 2015 onwards he had been pre-occupied with a personal issue which had led to less involvement in the premises. He felt he had no choice but to step forward and take responsibility to address issues with the premises going forward.

PC Bryan question whether Mr Duggal would accept that risks to the licensing objectives were higher for premises that opened later. Mr Duggal accepted that this was the case, but that these risks could occur at any hour during opening.

Mr Duggal confirmed he was also the DPS for Remis, another premises located within Kettering Town centre. He agreed that the majority of his customers had been drinking elsewhere before they arrived at Aqua, but the premises operated a Challenge 21 scheme and would not take payment from an individual's hands or from the bar top, to ensure that no intoxicated persons were served.

Inspector Ward stated that if all premises closed at 2am, 35-40% of all violence borough-wide could be eliminated.

PC Bryan provided a statement in conclusion where he asserted that the current licence holder and DPS did not

promote the licensing objectives. Relevant representations from police and public health had been received in addition to graphical and statistical data, visual CCTV footage, statements and verbal representations. There was no requirement for the Committee to make a decision using large amounts of factual evidence and an evaluative judgement could be formed. On the balance of probability, the police considered that the licensing objectives were not being promoted. Breaches of the premises licence had been disclosed, which coupled with the representations made identified an overall issue affecting the management of premises.

Two options were presented to the Committee by police for consideration.

The first was revocation of the premises licence.

The second was the removal of the DPS. Guidance indicated that the DPS should have day-to-day involvement with the premises in terms of licensable activity. A new DPS could ensure licensing objectives were addressed. It was considered that removal of the DPS be in conjunction with another sanction, a reduction in hours of licensable activity to 0300hrs.

PC Bryan referred the Committee to consider various areas of licensing guidance in relation to the promotion of licensing objectives in the local community. Policing of the NTE was a drain on local police resources and there was a need to balance individual freedom with the negative consequences that arose from it.

It was considered that there was a case for a reduction of the premises licensable hours as there was a higher risk to licensing objectives the later it operated. The existing licence had been assessed and no further conditions could be offered. Licensing Authorities should look to the police as their main provider of advice in relation to crime and disorder and in this instance police were recommending a reduction in hours to assist them in carrying out their duty.

PC Bryan stated that until the incident involving the brother of the licence holder, revocation had not been a consideration. The licence holder had sought to show that failings were due to the previous security company, but why had it taken the commencement of the review process for change to be made? The new security company had been not in place long enough to evaluate whether the licensing objectives were affected.

PC Bryan concluded by reconfirming the two options the police felt most appropriate given the weight of representation before members.

At 6.15pm, the Committee adjourned to discuss the evidence it had heard and to consider whether it would be possible to produce a completed decision that evening.

At 6.25pm the meeting reconvened and it was announced that members had decided, under Regulation 26 of the 2005 Hearing Regulations to avail themselves of the opportunity to make a decision on the review application before them within 5 working days. The meeting heard that the Committee would continue its deliberations and the final decision and written reasons for it would be issued within 5 working days, to be communicated to all parties.

RESOLVED

That the Premises Licence for Aqua shall be amended as follows;

- The times the licence authorises the carrying out of all licensable activities authorised by the premises licence shall be;

Monday to Wednesday – 11:00 – 02:00

Thursday to Sunday – 11:00 – 04:00

- Late night refreshment shall be provided as follows;

Monday to Wednesday – 23:00 – 02:00

Thursday to Sunday – 23:00 – 04:00

- The opening hours of the premises shall be;

Monday to Wednesday – 11:00 – 02:30

Thursday to Sunday – 11:00 – 04:30

- All non-standard timings and additional hours on specified dates during which licensable activities may be carried out on the premises shall be removed from the premises licence and licensable activities carried out in accordance with the premises licence shall only be authorised during the above times.

The premises licence for Aqua shall be suspended for four calendar weeks.

Evidence considered

The sub-committee considered all oral submissions made at the hearing by Northamptonshire Police officers and Steven Marks of Northamptonshire County Council. It considered a substantial amount of video recorded and CCTV footage of a variety of crime and disorder related incidents occurring inside and outside of the premises in 2015 and 2016, the information contained in the written application for a review by Northamptonshire Police dated 29th April 2016 and representations made by Professor Akeem Ali, Director Public Health at Northamptonshire County Council and Alex Hopkins, Director for Children, Families and Education at Northamptonshire County Council.

Further documentation submitted by Northamptonshire Police on 20th June 2016 was also considered. This consisted of a letter from Licensing Constable D. Bryan to the Premises License Holder Mr Duggal dated 5th October 2015, multiple Northamptonshire Police records of incidents at licensed premises reports relating to the premises between July 2015 and April 2016 and witness statements of PC Antony White dated 19th May 2016, Aaron Marr (CCTV Supervisor at KBC CCTV) dated 22nd May 2016 and Police Sergeant Tony Cotton dated 8th June 2016.

The Premises Licence Holder (PLH), Surrinder Duggal, attended and was represented by Colin Hobbs of Cartwright King Solicitors. The sub-committee heard oral submissions by both individuals as well as from a representative from Certified Security Personnel. This is the company that the PLH instructed in May 2016 to undertake door supervisor and security functions at the premises. This representative also provided written records regarding records of door supervisors working on each particular night and refusals regarding entry and the supply of alcohol.

Facts upon which the decision is based

The sub-committee was satisfied as to the following;

- The review was called by Northamptonshire Police in relation to a failure to uphold the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder and protecting children from harm.

- Great weight was given to the video recorded / CCTV footage taken inside or on the pavement outside the front of the premises introduced by Northamptonshire Police as well as the witness statements of PC Antony White, Aaron Marr and Police Sergeant Tony Cotton. This evidence demonstrated serious failures on the part of the PLH to uphold the licensing objectives of preventing crime and disorder and protecting children from harm.

- The sub-committee also took into account the representations made by the PLH and his legal representative, as well as those made by the representative of Certified Security Personnel. Weight was given to representations that demonstrated a commitment by the PLH to improve the standard of door supervisors working at the premises and it was agreed that, to a certain extent, instances of crime and disorder that had occurred inside or immediately outside had been reduced due to the involvement of door supervisors provided by Certified Security Personnel since May 2016. It was accepted by the PLH that Aqua was a destination club that customers arrive from one or more other licensed establishments in the town.

- The sub-committee noted the representations made by Northamptonshire Police that the issue of policing resources ought to be taken into account when reaching their decision. The sub-committee had sympathy with the Police view that dealing with the frequent crime and disorder issues associated with the premises after 2am on Saturday and Sunday mornings was unacceptably diverting police resources from elsewhere in the borough and that this ought to be taken into account when determining the review. However, the sub-committee felt that the present legislation, statutory guidance and case law precluded them from giving great weight to these particular representations in the decision making process.

Reasons

The sub-committee had regard to the Licensing Act 2003 as amended, the March 2015 revised guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and the Kettering Borough Council Statement of Licensing Policy for Regulated Entertainment, Late Night Refreshment and the Sale of Alcohol (1st January 2015 to 31st December 2019). In particular, Paragraph 2.1 of the statutory guidance states that "Licensing authorities should look to the police as the main source of advice on crime and disorder".

The only appropriate and proportionate way to achieve the promotion of the licensing objectives of preventing crime and disorder and protecting children from harm given the evidence before them of persistent failures to prevent crime and disorder in or immediately outside the premises, as well as the admittance of underage persons to the premises, is to take the steps outlined in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 above (and clarified further at 4.7 and 4.8 below) in relation to the premises licence.

It is not proportionate to take no further action or issue a warning to the PLH, given the evidence and submissions presented to it by Northamptonshire Police and the fact that the PLH admitted to the sub-committee on more than one occasion that he had taken his eye off of the ball when managing the premises. Revocation of the premises licence would not be proportionate given the evidence and submissions made by PLH and his representatives regarding the steps that have been taken to improve the quality of door supervisors working at the premises since May 2016. The PLH had taken responsibility for the door supervisor situation prior to May 2016 and the steps taken since then but this did not negate what had happened in the past.

Having examined the evidence and taken account of the Council's statement of licensing policy and the statutory guidance, the sub-committee is unable to conclude that imposing any extra conditions on the premises licence or modifying any existing conditions would be sufficient to further the licensing objectives of preventing crime and disorder and protecting children from harm.

The management of the premises fell below the high standards expected of it as a licensed premises operating exclusively in the early hours of the morning. An example of this was that although the premises had a Club Scan system installed as a condition of the premises licence, it was not used until the new door supervisor company took over in May 2016. The sub-committee conclude that the PLH exhibited a disregard towards the promotion of the licensing objectives prior to May 2016.

It is not appropriate in the circumstances to remove the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) because this person is also the owner of the premises and would therefore have substantial involvement in the day to day management and operation regardless of whether he was the DPS or not. This step would not achieve greater promotion of the licensing

objectives.

The written evidence, video recorded / CCTV footage and representations indicated that the majority of the incidents involving crime and disorder, including those taking place after the involvement of Certified Security Personnel at the premises, occurred and continue to occur after 04:00. The sub-committee also heard from the Certified Security Representative that the security situation was now the best it was going to be, despite continuing incidents of crime and disorder at or in the immediate vicinity of the premises, and that it would be unrealistic to expect all incidents of crime and disorder to be eliminated. This gave the sub-committee cause for concern.

Consequently, it is appropriate and proportionate to reduce the times the premises licence authorises the carrying out of all licensable activities on Friday to Sunday from 11:00 - 06:00 to 11:00 - 04:00 hours in order to prevent the likelihood of further instances of crime and disorder occurring in future. It is also appropriate and proportionate to reduce the times the premises licence authorises the provision of late night refreshment on Saturday and Sunday from 23:00 to 05:00 to 23:00 to 04:00 for the same reason. In addition and also for the same reason, all Non-Standard Timings / additional hours on specific dates currently listed in the Premises Licence are to be revoked. The opening hours of the Premises on Friday to Sunday shall also be reduced from 11:00 to 06:30 to 11:00 to 04:30.

The evidence presented to the sub-committee justifies a suspension of the premises licence for a period of four calendar weeks. This is required in order to allow the PLH time to review management practices with a view to preventing future persistent incidents of crime and disorder.

(The committee exercised its delegated powers to act in the matters marked)*

(The meeting started at 2.00pm and ended at 7:45pm)

Signed.....
Chair

djp