

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
9 September 2009 (2.30pm – 5.20pm)

Present:

COUNCILLORS: Georgina Galpin (Chairman)
Pam Light
Robert Benham

Rob Petcher and David Beesley (Applicant) Clare Eames, on behalf of the applicant. Also present were the LB Havering Licensing Officer, Steve Bromely, and PC Dave Leonard. The legal advisor the clerk to the Sub-Committee were also in attendance. In addition, Councillor John Mylod was present.

The Chairman advised those present of action to be taken in the event of emergency evacuation of the Town Hall becoming necessary.

There were no declarations of interest.

APPLICATION TO VARY A PREMISES LICENCE IN RESPECT OF THE HOGSHEAD PUBLIC HOUSE, 14 – 16 STATION LANE, HORNCHURCH RM12 6NP

The Sub-Committee considered the application to vary a Premises Licence under section 34 of the Licensing Act 2003 (“the Act”) for the above premises as follows.

PREMISES

The Hogshead PH
14 – 16 Station Lane
Hornchurch
RM12 6NP

DETAILS OF APPLICATION

Premises Licence variation under the Licensing Act 2003 (“the Act”).

APPLICANT

Town & City Pub Company Ltd.,
Porter Tun House
500 Capability Green
Luton
LU1 3LS

1. Details of existing licensable activities

| Live music, recorded music, performance of dance, provision of facilities for making music, provision of facilities for dancing, late night refreshment, sale of alcohol: | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Monday to Thursday | 10:00hrs | 23:00hrs |
| Friday & Saturday | 10.00hrs | 00.30hrs of the following day |
| Sunday | 12.00hrs | 23.00hrs |
| Late Night Refreshment: | | |
| Friday & Saturday | 23.00hrs | 00.30hrs |

| The opening hours of the premises are: | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Monday to Thursday | 10.00hrs | 23.30hrs |
| Friday & Saturday | 10.00hrs | 01.00hrs of the following day |
| Sunday | 12.00hrs | 23.30hrs |

Supply of alcohol: On & off sales

2. Details of requested licensable activities

| Supply of alcohol: | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 09:00hrs | 24:00hrs |
| Thursday to Saturday | 09.00hrs | 02.00hrs of the following day |

| Films, live music, recorded music, performance of dance, provision of facilities for making music, provision of facilities for dancing : | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 09:00hrs | 00:30hrs of the following day |
| Thursday to Saturday | 09.00hrs | 02.30hrs of the following day |

| Late night refreshment: | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | **09:00hrs | 00:30hrs of the following day |
| Thursday to Saturday | **09.00hrs | 02.30hrs of the following day |

(** This should have been 23.00hrs – see decision)

| Hours premises open to the public: | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 09:00hrs | 00:30hrs of the following day |
| Thursday to Saturday | 09.00hrs | 02.30hrs of the following day |

Seasonal variations:

There were no seasonal variations

Non-standard timings:

An additional hour to the standard and non-standard times on the day when British Summer Time commences.

New-Year's Eve – From the end of permitted hours on New Year's Eve to the start of permitted hours on New Year's day.

One additional hour on the following dates: St David's day, St Patrick's day, St Andrew's Day, Burn's Night, Valentine's Night, Halloween, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday of ALL the Bank Holiday week-ends (including Easter)

3. Promotion of the Licensing Objectives

The applicant has completed an operating schedule which forms part of his application, that he will take the steps set down to promote the four licensing objectives:

4. Details of Representations

Representations Objecting to the Application from Interested Parties

Four valid written representations were received from the following members of the public:

J Smith, 96 Station Lane, Hornchurch RM12 6LX
C Heathwood, 18C Station Lane, Hornchurch RM12 6NJ
R Hardes, 7 Glanville Drive, Hornchurch RM11 3SZ
The Webb family, 2 Fairkytes Avenue, Hornchurch RM11 1XS

Each of the written representations based their objections upon one or more of the four licensing objectives.

There was one representation from the Responsible Authorities.

Responsible Authorities:

Chief Officer of Metropolitan Police ("the Police"): One

London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority ("LFEPA"): None.

Health & Safety Enforcing Authority: None.

Planning Control & Enforcement: None.

Public Health: None

Children & Families Service:

Trading Standards Service: None

The Magistrates Court: None

5. Determination of Application

At the start of the proceedings, the Chairman asked the Licensing Officer (LO) if the notice concerning the application had been correctly displayed as there had been complaints that it had been placed too high to be seen properly. In response, the LO gave his professional opinion that the notice had been properly displayed, although he conceded that it had been set higher than would be considered “normal” but was still clearly displayed.

Councillor Benham asked about an objection apparently received out of time. This was explained by the LO asserting that it had been received at the end of the notice period, but within time. It had been delayed due to a period of leave.

Having satisfied themselves concerning their enquiries, the members of the Sub-Committee received the Licensing Officer’s report.

PC Leonard presented the objections raised by the Police. In particular that:

- There had been a recent test purchase failure
- On one occasion, there had been a “glassing” incident at the premises. PC Leonard accepted that the Police had received support from the pub’s management, but the fact remained that the incident arose due to lax controls
- The premises was located in a part of Hornchurch where there was a great deal of volatility – especially Friday nights (early hours of Saturday) and Saturday nights (early hours of Sunday). As a Police “hot spot” there was clearly a need to ensure that the venue had much tighter controls in place than had been evidenced.
- The extended hours at the end of the night, if granted, would precipitate a number of applications from other nearby establishments seeking parity and, as the venue (although classed as town centre) was surrounded by residential properties, this would impact on those families living near-by – which would create a public nuisance in addition to concerns already expressed in connection with crime and disorder.
- The management had not appeared to have considered their responsibilities to the community in that not only did they not consider it necessary to ensure that the conditions in place were adequate to ensure the licensing objectives were supported, but they were asking for embedded conditions to be removed.
- Agreed with all the application except the extension in hours.

PC Leonard stated that the Police objected to the extended hours as applied for as the granting of them would be against the provisions of the four licensing objectives and without a considerable increase in the number of conditions to the licence, would prove to be troublesome. He added that the argument being advanced that the “Hogshead” was only seeking parity with “Olivers” and “The Cricketers” did not bear scrutiny as both the other two establishments had far fewer incidents of an anti-social nature associated with them and, if parity was being sought, the application should be for 1am, not 2.30am.

Members of the Panel asked for clarification on some of the statistics PC Leonard’s written submissions contained and were satisfied that, if the application were to be granted as applied for, the Police would be able to “cope” with any incidents, but accepted that this did not mean that the neighbourhood would not be impacted in a negative way.

The applicant’s legal representative then asked the Chairman for clarification as to the nature of the complaints recorded in the CAB/CRIS statistics and observed that some of the claims were, at best, contentious. For example: “crimes” reported could not (for the most part) be shown to

have originated within the pub – nor (if there were disturbances on the pavement) could they necessarily be attributed to patrons of the pub. In response, PC Leonard re-asserted that the Police were satisfied that the details were substantially correct and the period over which they were recorded was accurate.

The applicant's legal representative argued that the figures were too general to be meaningful and that the Police evidence lacked substance. The Chairman replied that these observations would be borne in mind when the Sub-Committee came to make its decisions and that it would only consider substantiated evidence not general impressions and would not take into account the statistical evidence comparison.

Having addressed the concerns of the applicant's legal representative, the Chairman invited other interested parties to present their views to the Sub-Committee.

Mr & Mrs Webb stated that they lived on a transition route and were regularly disturbed by late night revellers. In addition to the noise nuisance, there was litter, vandalism and consequent disturbance from the sirens of the emergency services (including the noise of police helicopters) and although they could not specifically say that this originated from the "Hogshead" they were convinced some of it originated there and as they had lived in the area for 42 years they were able to verify that the situation had been steadily deteriorating over the past few years and if the pub was allowed to open to 2.30am the situation would become untenable.

Mr Heathwood stated that he lived very close to the pub and, over the previous five years had witnessed scenes of violence outside it – especially on Friday/Saturday nights – and had, himself, contacted the Police on at least two or three occasions. His concern was that this was likely to become even worse and go on longer if the Sub-Committee allowed the application.

The Chairman asked whether he could confirm that the violence was actually known to come from the pub, to which he replied that he couldn't say that. He was clear that whenever there was a disturbance, the space immediately outside the pub was where the trouble seemed to be.

Mr Hardes stated that he and his family lived just outside town and therefore whatever time the pubs, clubs and restaurants closed, the family suffered some half an hour or more afterwards. He complained about his concerns about what effect the disturbance and the effects of alcohol and drugs would have on his children and although he could not say it was all connected with the "Hogshead" he was certain that if the pub was given the "go-ahead" to open to the early hours, the other pubs in Hornchurch would soon follow suit and his quality of life – and that of his family – would be harmed. Councillor Benham asked him how long he had lived at his present address and was informed that it was 16 years. Councillor Light observed that the Sub-Committee would bear in mind that there was a "ripple effect" to be added onto any closing time agreed. Whilst those nearest the premises could expect any disturbance to have moved away soon after the establishment had closed, those further out would – or could – be subjected to the effects later.

The Chairman satisfied herself that no-one else wished to speak and then invited Ms Eames to present her client's application. Ms Eames did so by way of a series of questions put to Mr Petcher (the Operations Director for the Town & City Pub Company). He explained that the company had acquired the premises in March 2008 and that it was part of a network of 75 which spanned the country. He stated that it was a management decision to rationalise the trading hours of its premises and that to this end, he was pleased that the "Hogshead's" DPS (Mr Beesley) had built up a good relationship with the Police.

He said that the additional time was requested to allow for a staggered dispersal of patrons and that the request for films was to allow for background – as with the music – there was no intention to use it for sport (which was only meaningful if shown live).

With regard to ensuring the licensing objectives would continue to be met, it was the management's intention to provide all members of staff with additional training and that training would be on-going. Mr Petcher further explained that he had been unaware of distress being caused to neighbours and had they made their feelings known, he would have been able to take whatever steps he could to address the issues. Good relations with neighbours was a priority across the group and now the problems had been identified, he would take appropriate action.

The question of the underage test purchase failure was raised and Ms Eames noted that to date there had been no action taken by Trading Standards, so the applicant could not comment beyond apologising and saying that the matter had been dealt with. In conclusion, Ms Eames stressed that Mr Petcher was keen to set up regular meetings with residents and even set up a "neighbourhood watch" to be based around the pub if this was considered appropriate.

With respect to records, the applicant said that a House Dairy was kept, but as it was loose-leaf, the Chairman observed that it needed to be changed to a bound diary, with all pages consecutively numbered. Other issues raised included capacity: the pub could hold four hundred people. The Chairman asked if there was any capacity for patrons to sit and was informed that there were between 35/40 tables. In addition, the premises used toughened glass drinkware, there was a trained first-aider present in addition to CCTV which met the Police crime reduction standard. Challenge 21 was employed and, fully trained, SIA approved door supervisors were employed – and had already won praise for their professionalism.

The Chairman asked Ms Eames whether her client had any objections to any of the conditions which had been proposed by the Police. There were none. Councillor Light raised the matter of smoking and asked whether the applicant would consider moving the smoking "area" (currently at the front of the premises) to the rear as it would remove smokers from not only non-smokers entering the pub, but also passers-by. The applicant replied that they couldn't allow the back to be used for this purpose. Ms Eames proposed that the applicant would, should the Sub-Committee be minded to grant the additional hours requested, provide signage to the effect that there would be no new customers after the current times had been reached; nor would drinks be allowed outside.

Councillor Benham asked for clarification about the timings associated with late night refreshment, why it had been requested to run to closing time. In response, Ms Eames explained that this was merely to allow people to finish and leave in a manner that would ease dispersal. In summary Ms Eames stated that Mr Beesley had been at the premises for five years during which time there had been no challenges from Environmental Health, there were good relations with the Police, the door staff were of a high calibre (award winning) and had been in place for 5/6 months. The management was proactive in its approach to reaching out to local residents as they could possibly be its customers and it was important to it that they should feel safe.

The Chairman asked PC Leonard to sum up and he reiterated that Hornchurch was not Romford Town, it had a much different character. It was true that, on the whole, the Police had a good relationship with the DPS, but that did not mean the pub could change to suit itself as it was likely that there would be problems. He accepted that good door staff could ensure that any trouble could be diffused or controlled at the premises, but once people had moved away, the pub would have no control and indeed, the pub would not accept liability.

Members expressed views on various aspects of the application: They accepted the offer to decline admittance to late-comers – but were unsure how this could be managed. They still had reservations about whether people leaving restaurants might not swell the clientele (or that drinkers might not leave other pubs slightly earlier in order to secure entry into an establishment where they could drink for much longer. Mr Petcher replied that this was a mechanism employed in a number of other establishments owned by the group and was found to be quite effective. He accepted that there was the occasional instance of customers flouting the arrangements, but this applied to a very small number.

Councillor Benham asked why the pub had not first sought to use its TENs to see how late nights would turn out and was informed that as there was such a limited number of TENs available, they would be needed elsewhere. PC Leonard asked whether the applicant would be prepared to restrict the opening, but Mr Petcher replied that closing at (say) 12.30 would not be reasonable, he felt the pub ought to be granted the additional hours as requested to provide it with the flexibility needed to implement its business plan.

Councillor Light observed that the granting of additional hours would have not only an impact on members of the public, but also Councillors. To which Ms Eames replied that the licensing objectives would be upheld by her client and she urged the Sub-Committee to look at the application in discreet areas – where there had been no objections raised and, where there had, to bear in mind whether the objections had been shown to have related specifically to the venue, or whether they were of a more general nature. She contended that the Police evidence was, at best inconclusive.

The Chairman replied that the Sub-Committee would, as a matter of course, bear these factors in mind; to which Ms Eames reminded the Sub-Committee of the principles in “*Thwaite’s case*” that the decision should be proportionate and reasonable and that reference to, or comparison with, any other premises was irrelevant.

Decision

Consequent upon the hearing held on 9 September 2009, the Sub-Committee’s decision regarding the application to vary a Premises Licence for the Hogshead Public House is set out below, for the reasons shown:

The Sub-Committee was obliged to determine this application with a view to promoting the licensing objectives, which are:

- The prevention of crime and disorder
- Public safety
- The prevention of public nuisance
- The protection of children from harm

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 addition, the Sub-Committee took account of its obligations under s17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, and Articles 1 and 8 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Having considered the oral and written submissions on behalf of the applicant, objectors (in particular taking the experience of the Police into account and not just relying on the statistics) and the licensing officer, the Sub-Committee **granted** the application in part (set out below),

The Sub-Committee stated that in arriving at this decision, it took into consideration the licensing objectives as contained in the Licensing Act 2003, the Licensing Guidelines as well as Havering Council's Licensing Policy.

| Hours premises open to the public: | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 09:00hrs | 23:30hrs |
| Thursday to Saturday | 09.00hrs | 01.00hrs of the following day |

The following licensable activities are permitted within the hours the premises are open to the public:

| Sale of Alcohol, films, live music, recorded music, performance of dance, provision of facilities for making music, provision of facilities for dancing : | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 09:00hrs | 23:30hrs |
| Thursday to Saturday | 09.00hrs | 01.00hrs of the following day |

| Late night refreshment: | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Day | Start | Finish |
| Sunday to Wednesday | 23:00hrs | 23:30hrs |
| Thursday to Saturday | 23.00hrs | 01.00hrs of the following day |

The following conditions were applied to the licence:

MANDATORY CONDITIONS

It is a requirement of the 2003 Act that certain mandatory conditions must be included on Premises Licences where the licence authorises the sale of alcohol, authorises the exhibition of films or where there is a condition requiring the use of security staff.

Section 19 Licensing Act 2003, Mandatory conditions: where the licence authorises the sale of alcohol

- M1 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.

- M2 Every supply of alcohol under the Premises Licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a Personal Licence.

Section 20 Licensing Act 2003, Mandatory condition: exhibition of films

M3 Where a programme includes a film in the 12A, 15 or 18 category no person appearing to be under the age of 12 (and unaccompanied in that case), 15 or 18 as appropriate shall be admitted to any part of the programme; and the licence holder shall display in a conspicuous position a notice in the following terms –

PERSONS UNDER THE AGE OF [INSERT APPROPRIATE AGE] CANNOT BE ADMITTED TO ANY PART OF THE PROGRAMME.

Where films of different categories form part of the same programme, the notice shall refer to the oldest age restriction.

This condition does not apply to members of staff under the relevant age while on duty provided that the prior written consent of the person's parents or legal guardian has first been obtained.

Section 21 Licensing Act 2003, Mandatory condition: door supervision

M4 A minimum of [number] Door Supervisors, all individually registered with the Security Industry Authority, shall be on the premises [*at all times*] [between [hh:mm] and [hh:mm] on [days] when] the premises are open for any licensable activity.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO CRIME AND DISORDER

CD1 All staff shall be suitably trained for their job function for the premise. The training shall be written into a programme, ongoing and under constant review, and must be available to a relevant Responsible Authority when called upon.

CD6 A Premises Daily Register shall be kept at the premise. This register will be maintained and kept for a minimum of 12 months. This register should record the name of the person responsible for the premise on each given day. The Premises Daily Register shall record all calls made to the premises where there is a complaint made by a resident or neighbour of noise, nuisance or anti social behaviour by persons attending or leaving the premises. This shall record the details of the caller, the time and date of the call and the time and date of the incident about which the call is made and any actions taken to deal with the call. The Premises Daily Register will be readily available for inspection by an Authorised Person throughout the trading hours of the premise. The Premises Daily Register will also record all incidents in relation to the use of any force by staff or Door Supervisors in the removal of persons from the premises. It shall record the time and date of the occurrence, name or brief description of the person removed, and details of the staff involved.

CD7 All Door Supervisors shall enter their full details in the Premises Daily Register at the commencement of work. This shall record their full name, home address and contact telephone number, the Door Supervisor's SIA registration number and the time they commenced and concluded working. If the Door Supervisor was supplied by an agency, details of that agency will also be recorded including the name of the agency, the registered business address and a contact telephone number.

Bottle and glasses

CD10 Drinks shall be served in containers made from toughened glass (tempered glassware).

Note. Weights and measures legislation requires the use of “stamped glasses” where “meter-measuring equipment” is not in use.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO PUBLIC SAFETY (Including Fire Safety)

First aid

PS22 An adequate and appropriate supply of first aid equipment and materials shall be available on the premises.

PS23 At least one trained first-aider shall be on duty when the public are present.

PS24 Notices detailing the availability of first aid equipment shall be prominently displayed and shall be protected from damage or deterioration.

CCTV

CD15 A properly specified and fully operational CCTV system shall be installed or the existing system maintained to a satisfactory standard. The system will incorporate a camera covering each of the entrance doors and be capable of providing an image which is regarded as ‘identification standard’ of all persons entering and/or leaving the premises. All other areas of risk identified in the Operational Requirement shall have coverage appropriate to the risk.

CD16 The installation or upgrading of any CCTV system shall comply with current best practice. In addition the documentation listed below shall be included in a ‘System File’ which should be readily available for inspection by the relevant authority;

Site plan showing position of cameras and their field of view.

Code of Practice.

Performance specification e.g. storage capacity, image file size, IPS for each camera and purpose of each camera position

Operational requirement.

Incident log.

Maintenance records including weekly visual checks.

CD17 To obtain a clear head and shoulders image of every person entering the premises on the CCTV system, persons entering the premises should be asked to remove headwear, unless worn as part of religious observance.

CD18 The CCTV system shall incorporate a recording facility and all recordings shall be securely stored for a minimum of one calendar month. A system shall be in place to maintain the quality of the recorded image and a complete audit trail maintained. The system will comply with other essential legislation, and all signs as required will be clearly displayed. The system will be maintained and fully operational throughout the hours that the premises are open for any licensable activity. For premises using

a video recording system, the cassette tapes shall be used on no more than 12 occasions to maintain the quality of the recorded image.

- CD19 The positions of all CCTV cameras shall be clearly shown on a set of plans which should form part of the 'System File'. Any alteration to the system should only be carried out after consultation with and written approval of Havering Police and the Licensing Authority.

Misuse of drugs

- CD20 The Licence Holder shall implement a written Drugs Policy. This shall detail the strategies to minimise the use and supply of illegal drugs within the premises. The Drugs Policy shall include a structured training programme covering the issues relevant to the misuse of drugs in relation to licensed premises, which will be delivered to all staff. This Policy shall be approved in writing by Havering Police.
- CD21 The Designated Premises Supervisor shall hold a National Certificate of Drugs Awareness qualification, run by the BII or similar accredited body.
- CD22 All staff shall be trained in dealing with persons who are incapacitated through the use of drugs or the combined effect of drugs and alcohol.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO THE PREVENTION OF PUBLIC NUISANCE

- PN17 Entertainment is to be held internally only and no music or speakers shall be provided to external areas of the premises.
- PN22 Staff shall be given adequate training to prevent them causing unnecessary noise when they leave the premises and prominent, clear notices displayed at all points where staff leave the building must instruct them to respect the needs of local residents and leave the premises and the area quietly.
- PN26 The specification, and orientation of all speakers shall be agreed with the Licensing Authority / Responsible Authority.

GOOD PRACTICE GUIDANCE

Proof of age

- CDGPG2 All members of staff at the premises shall seek "credible photographic proof of age evidence" from any person who appears to be under the age of 21 years and who is seeking access to the premises or is seeking to purchase or consume alcohol on the premises. Such credible evidence, which shall include a photograph of the customer, will include a passport, photographic driving licence, or Proof of Age card carrying a "PASS" logo.

Door supervisors

- CDGPG9 Premises which have a policy that includes the searching of persons shall have Door Supervisors of both sexes on duty at all times.
- CDGPG10 All Door Supervisors working outside the premises or whilst engaged in the dispersal of patrons at the close of business shall wear 'High Visibility Clothing'.

Queue Management and Dispersal Procedures

- PNGPG1 The Licence Holder shall implement a written queue management policy. All queuing outside the premises shall be managed in such a way that prevents noisy or rowdy behaviour and therefore minimises disturbance or nuisance to neighbours. The policy shall be approved in writing by the Licensing Authority.
- PNGPG2 The Licence Holder shall implement a written dispersal policy, to move customers from the premises and the immediate vicinity in such a way as to cause minimum disturbance or nuisance to neighbours, both residential and business, and to make the minimum impact upon the neighbourhood in relation to potential nuisance, antisocial behaviour, crime and disorder. The policy shall be approved in writing by the Licensing Authority.

The reasons for the decisions taken are that the Sub-Committee:

- Had concerns that the hours requested would lead to an increase of public nuisance, have a negative impact on the sleep patterns of those residents living nearby – or on dispersal routes – and there was especial concern about the effect on children.
- Welcomed the announcement that there was now a clear training programme for all staff, but nevertheless, there had been a recent failed test purchase and the Sub-Committee remained of the opinion that the management of the venue had still not demonstrated that it had overcome past problems.
- Evidence of a violent incident involving a glass assault which emanated from within the pub, did not incline the Sub-Committee to agree with the applicant that the management were in control of the establishment.
- Accepted information provided from personal experience by residents living close to the premises of incidents involving anti-social behaviour, noise and violence as well as the practice of allowing patrons to stand on the pavement in front of the venue, smoking, gave rise to concern by the Sub-Committee that insufficient consideration for the welfare of the general public was being given by the management of the pub.
- Was not persuaded that the management of the pub – despite its best intentions – was capable of ensuring that the licensing objectives would be addressed in a manner that currently assured the Sub-Committee that the general public would be safe. The Sub-Committee accepted that in time – and with the right conditions in place – this might change.

In forming these opinions, the Sub-Committee was not relying on the statistical evidence submitted, but took into consideration the long personal experience of PC Leonard in and around Hornchurch town centre. It accepts his evaluation that incidents on or around the "Hogshead" were of a nature and frequency which suggests the management of the establishment needed to demonstrate much better control of clientele than hitherto demonstrated.


.....

CHAIRMAN

Date: 13.10.09
..... 2009