Agenda	Topic	Decision
Item No		

Note: this decision list is for guidance only. The text of the minutes, which may be different, is definitive.

Part A – Items considered in public

A1	APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE - TROPOJA, 99 VICTORIA ROAD, ROMFORD, RM1 2LX	Havering LONDON BOROUGH			
				Licensing Ac Notice of Dec	
		PREMISES Tropoja Cafe & Bar 99 Victoria Road Romford Essex RM1 2LX			
		APPLICANT Mr Adil Haziri and Mr Fa	atjon Qela		
		1. Details of Applicat	ion		
		Supply of Alcohol			
		Day	Start	Finish	
		Monday to Sunday	16:00	23:00	

Agenda Item No	Topic			Decisi	on
Item NO		licences and club premise application. The required Havering Yellow Advertise. The Premises was situated fell just outside of the Curron The applicant, in consultative conditions within the situation of the front door with the front door the front door the same applicant.	cordance es certific public no er. ed just ou mulative I ation with operating doors to r.	Finish 23:30 with regulation rates) Regulation rates regulation rates at the Ring regulation rate was installed the Ring regulation rate at the Police, modern schedule: be closed past	s 25 and 26 of <i>The Licensing Act 2003 (Premis ns 2005</i> relating to the advertising of the ed in the 22 December 2017 edition of the g Road which circled Romford Town Centre so lified the application to include the following 8pm save for persons entering and exiting to 40 persons including staff.
		2. Details of Represent	tations		

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		There was 1 representation against the application from an interested person.
		There was 1 representation against the application from a responsible authority, namely Havering Planning Authority.
		Details of representations
		Valid representations may only address the following licensing objectives:
		 The prevention of crime and disorder The prevention of public nuisance
		 The prevention of public huisance The protection of children from harm Public safety
		The representation from an interested person related to the prevention of crime and disorder, the prevention of public nuisance and public safety.
		The representation from the planning authority related to the prevention of public nuisance objective.
		There was no representative from the planning department present at the hearing.
		The venue did not have planning permission and in operating as a bar may be in breach of planning legislation.
		The venue was situated within a highly residential area, the property itself had a flat

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		above it and it was not known whether the property had adequate soundproofing to prevent ambient noise escaping through the roof.
		3. Applicant's response.
		Mr Hopkins, representing the applicant, addressed the Sub-Committee.
		Mr Hopkins advised that the applicant had amended the hours for selling alcohol to a more moderate level.
		The Sub-Committee was advised that the car wash at the rear of the premises was open until 19.00hrs and those operatives from the car wash would be able use the café after finishing work.
		Mr Hopkins pointed out that no objections had been raised from the Metropolitan Police or Environmental Health. The operating schedule had been amended to show that the applicant would operate the business in a responsible manner and actively promote the licensing objectives at all times. This would include installation of CCTV, promoting Challenge 25 and appropriate signage on the premises reminding patrons about leaving the premises respecting others amenity.
		The premises would operate with "café bar" type conditions allowing customers to buy alcohol without a requirement to have a meal. The "café bar" would cater mainly for the local Albanian community and had only previously been used by the applicant's family and employees of the car wash situated at the rear of the premises.
		Mr Hopkins advised that he had written to the interested person about their concerns but had

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		not received any reply to the correspondence. The Sub-Committee was advised that if the applicant was successful with the licence application the Mr Hopkins would be mentoring the applicant/premises for a period of six months following opening and that the applicant would also be applying for planning permission for the premises. Mr Hopkins advised that the applicant had approximately fifteen years' experience in managing other licensed premises. 4. Determination of Application Consequent upon the hearing held on 2 February 2018, the Sub-Committee's decision regarding the application for a premises licence for Tropoja Café and Bar was as set out below, for the reasons stated: The Sub-Committee was obliged to determine the application with a view to promoting the licensing objectives. In making its decision, the Sub-Committee also had regard to the Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and Havering's Licensing Policy. In particular, the Sub-Committee took into account policies 1, 5, 8 and 9 of the Statement of Licensing Policy.
		In addition the Sub-Committee took account of its obligations under section 117 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and Articles 1 and 8 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		5. Decision
		The Licensing Sub-Committee considered the application for a new premises licence in respect of Tropoja Café and Bar 99 Victoria Road Romford made on behalf of the applicant Adel Haziri and Fatjon Qela.
		Written and oral representations were made by the responsible body for the London Borough of Havering Planning Authority. The Sub-Committee also considered an objection letter form a local resident. The objection raised concerns in relation to the prevention of public nuisance.
		The Sub-Committee heard evidence called on behalf of the applicant. It considered the submissions on behalf of the applicant.
		The Sub-Committee reminded itself that it must promote the licensing objectives and had regard to the Statutory Guidance issued pursuant to 182 of the Licensing Act 2003. The Sub-Committee also considered carefully the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy document. It reminded itself that each decision must be made on its own merit.
		It seems to the Sub-Committee that the licensing policy 6 was there for a good reason. Without the relevant planning permission the granting of the licence would create an uncertainty in terms of the council's overall approach to the licencing of premises. The suitability of the premises ought to be determined before a licence to sell was granted.
		The Sub-Committee found that the application did not adequately deal with the concerns raised

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		by the responsible authority. This included the impact on the character and mix of premises in the area. There was no attempt to deal with the increased vehicle traffic caused by the proposed activity. There was no attempt to deal with the difficulties created by the increased foot fall. There were no adequate controls in place for the consumption of alcohol outside the premises; particularly bearing in mind the application included a request for off sales. The Sub-Committee concluded that the granting of the licence would not in all the circumstances meet the licencing objectives in relation to public nuisance. The application was therefore refused. Appeal Any party to the decision may appeal to the Magistrates Court within 21 days of notification of the decision. On appeal, the Magistrates Court may make an order for costs as it sees fit. Richard Cursons Clerk to the Licensing Sub-Committee
A1		

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
A2		