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 TO VARY A PREMISES LICENCE - MED SHISH, 151 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD, RM1 1PL		E C A	Haver London Bord	ing ough
				Licensing Act 200 Notice of Decision	
		PREMISES Med Shish 151 South Street Romford RM1 1PL			
		APPLICANT Mr Muttalib Batkitar			
		Details of Applica Current premises		:	
		Late night refreshm	nent Start	Finish	
		Monday	23:00	02:00	

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision

Tuesday 02:00 23:00 Wednesday 23:00 02:00 Thursday 23:00 02:00 Friday 23:00 02:00 Saturday 23:00 02:00 Sunday 23:00 02:00

Variation applied for:

Late night refreshment hours extension			
Day	Start	Finish	
Friday	23:00	04:00	
Saturday	23:00	04:00	

The applicant acted in accordance with regulations 25 and 26 of *The Licensing Act 2003 (Premis licences and club premises certificates) Regulations 2005* relating to the advertising of the application. The required public notice was installed in the 26 October 2018 edition of the Romfo Recorder.

2. Details of Representations

There were 0 representations against the application from interested persons.

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		There were 2 representations against the application from responsible authorities, namely The Licensing Authority and the Metropolitan Police
		Details of representations
		Valid representations may only address the following licensing objectives:
		 The prevention of crime and disorder The prevention of public nuisance The protection of children from harm Public safety
		The representation from the Licensing Authority related to all four of the licensing objectives.
		The premises were situated within the Romford Town Centre Cumulative Impact Zone.
		In summary the application had declined to provide any rebuttal further to cumulative impact whilst the proposed conditions appeared ill equipped to successfully address the promotion of all four licensing objectives.
		The Licensing Authority's representative advised that he had twice tried to contact the applicant's agent but had received no response. The authority's representative also advised that there were concerns with the quality of the application as there appeared to be a number of erroneous statements contained within the application.
		The representative from the Metropolitan Police advised that the police wished to object under

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		the Crime & Disorder and Public Nuisance objectives.
		The venue was situated in the middle of a busy transport hub only a short distance from numerous licensed venues. The clientele that would be attending the venue in the early hours of the morning would be people that were heavily intoxicated and unpredictable. In the past the venue had been the cause of large scale disorder and anti-social behaviour. Due to the size of the venue it could become over crowded very quickly and with only one or two door supervisors it would not be policed in a safe manner and the fear was that this would lead to confrontation inside and outside the venue.
		The police strongly believed that the any extension in premises' hours would have a direct result in an increase of Anti-Social Behaviour and violent crime at the location and in the nearby area.
		The Police at this time did not have confidence that the venue will run efficiently in accordance with the requested licence conditions. 3. Applicant's response.
		Prior to the hearing the applicant's representative had submitted a statement concerning Cumulative Impact.
		A copy of which is appended to this decision notice.
		In summary the statement dealt with CCTV, incident logs, crime prevention notices and Challenge 25.
		The applicant's agent also confirmed that an additional SIA trained door supervisor would be on duty during the extended hours.

quietly to minimise
nd initiative that was
mes and that rons from the town
committee's decision ed Shish was as set
to promoting the
ce issued under n particular, the Sub- censing Policy.
on 117 of the Crime uman Rights Act
ce n p en

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		5. Decision
		The Sub-Committee must promote the licensing objectives and must have regard to the Revised Guidance issued under s.182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's own Statement of Licensing Policy.
		The Sub-Committee noted that the premises were in a Cumulative Impact Zone and that the presumption against the variation of the premises licence therefore applied.
		The Sub-Committee noted that the premises already enjoyed licensed hours which exceeded the Council's standard times and that, by virtue of licensing policy 7, when dealing with variation applications more favourable consideration was generally given to applications within those times.
		The Sub-Committee was reminded of and noted paragraph 9.12 of the revised statutory guidance which stated:
		The police should be the licensing authority's main source of advice on matters relating to the promotion of the crime and disorder licensing objective, but may also be able to make relevant representations with regard to the other licensing objectives if they had evidence to support such representations. The licensing authority should accept all reasonable and proportionate representations made by the police unless the authority had evidence that to do so would not be appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives.
		The Sub-Committee considered the representations made by the responsible authorities and shared their concerns about extending the hours at a premises located in a crime and anti-

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		social behaviour hotspot. The Sub-Committee considered the submissions made by Mr Sutherland on the applicant's behalf and the package of conditions offered by the applicant, including those submitted at short notice by the applicant's representative. However, on balance the Sub-Committee accepted the evidence of the responsible authorities that if the extension was granted it would likely add to the cumulative impact and adversely affect the licensing objective of the prevention of crime and disorder. The police were already very stretched in the area and the Sub-Committee did not accept the applicant's argument that allowing more licensed premises to remain open until 4.00 a.m. would lead to swifter dispersal of crowds and, consequently, fewer problems. On the contrary, the Sub-Committee found that the extension sought was more likely to lead to greater numbers of drunken people congregating in the area and an increased likelihood of crime, violence and anti-social behaviour. The Sub-Committee did not find that the applicant had sufficiently demonstrated why the operation of the premises involved would not add to the cumulative impact and not impact adversely on the promotion of the licensing objectives, as required by licensing policy 2. The Sub-Committee therefore decided to reject the application pursuant to section 35(4)(b) of the Licensing Act 2003.

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
	I	
		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		
A2		