

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF A LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
10 November 2009 (2.35pm – 6.15pm)

Present:**COUNCILLORS:****Conservative**

Georgina Galpin (Chairman)

Pam Light

Residents'

John Mylod

Mr T Phillips, Mr L Fulling and Mr J Restarick, representing the Applicant and Mr J Lopez, legal representative for the Applicant (JRL & Co Ltd) were present.

Councillor Andrew Curtin – on behalf of residents, PC D Leonard on behalf of the Metropolitan Police, Mr J and Mr S Hammond, Mr J Ginley, Mr D Dickenson, Mr N Dawkins, Mr J Webb, Mrs S Lane, Mrs S Saunders and Mrs S Andrews, the interested parties were present.

Also in attendance were the LB Havering Licensing Officer, Mr Paul Campbell, the legal advisor and the clerk to the Sub-Committee. A member of the press and a member of the public were also 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.

PREMISES

“The Brickyard”
 222 South Street
 Romford
 RM1 2AD

DETAILS OF APPLICATION

Application for a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003 (“the Act”).

APPLICANT

JRL & Co Ltd.
 5 Blackhorse Lane
 London
 E17 6DS

1. Details of requested licensable activities

Times the premises is to be open to the public:		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	11:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday to Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Films, Recorded Music, Provision of Facilities for making music and Dancing, the Supply of Alcohol		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	11:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday to Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Live Music		
Day	Start	Finish
Thursday & Friday	19:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Recorded Music		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	18:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday	18:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Friday & Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Performance of Dance		
Day	Start	Finish
Wednesday	18:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday	18:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Friday & Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Late Night Refreshment		
Day	Start	Finish
Thursday to Saturday	23:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	23:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Seasonal variations

There were no seasonal variations applied for in this application

Non-standard timings

The entry made in the application under non standard timings was not specific, so Temporary Event Notices would have to be used for any times not covered if a premises licence were to be granted.

2. Promotion of the Licensing Objectives

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

3. **Comments and observations on the application**

The applicant had acted in accordance with premises licence regulations 25 and 26 relating to the advertising of the application. The required newspaper advertisement had been installed in the Yellow Advertiser on Wednesday 23 September 2009.

4. **Summary and Representations**

There were 15 valid representations against this application from interested parties relating to 10 different addresses. In addition, there were further representations made through Councillor Curtin's submission. Some of those residents who had made personal representation were also included on Councillor Curtin's submission. The interested parties' representations addressed the licensing objective headings.

There was one representation against this application from a responsible authority – the Metropolitan Police. The Metropolitan Police representation stated that it was considered that the Applicant had not satisfactorily addressed the steps he intended to take to promote the four licensing objectives.

There were no representations from the following responsible authorities:

Public Health
 The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
 The Health & Safety Enforcing Authority
 The Trading Standards Service
 Planning Control & Enforcement
 Children & Families Service

5. **Determination of Application**

The Licensing Officer (LO) presented his report which was received without query. The Police representative informed the Sub-Committee that he had been in receipt of an e-mail from the Applicant which addressed most of the objections raised by the Police. He referred to the previous licensee of the premises (then known as "*Giorgio's*") and stated that when it was trading *as a restaurant* there had been few complaints. He then referred to the current application and explained that the character of the premises was not the same as before. The Applicant had not described it as a "restaurant", but as a bar and grill. He noted that the hours requested were not consistent with those of a restaurant, but more akin to a club and as the location of the premises was not within the Romford Town Centre "night time economy" environment. The premises lay just outside the ring road in an environment which could, at best, be described as "mixed" in that there were residential properties in close proximity to the site.

The Police representative described the premises as consisting of two stories (ground-floor and basement) and the ground-floor was extensively

glazed with large sky-lights in addition. The main doors opened towards a residential block and there were no lobbies to muffle sound. Furthermore, the large car park (allegedly having the capacity to hold up to 150 vehicles) suggested that there could be traffic issues at busier times and, with the late closing requested, the potential for noise nuisance was high, unless closely monitored and managed.

To ensure that control was exercised, CCTV was an absolute “must” and patrons outside the premises would have to be managed as well as those within. He reminded the Sub-Committee that the controls expected for a prudent management of a restaurant were not the same as those needed if the establishment were a club and bar. He would expect there to be properly authorised door supervisors, queue management and dispersal procedures, control of noise and vibration within the premises (by sound-proofing and even noise limiters), there would need to be control of light pollution – both emanating from the venue itself and within the car-park.

The Sub-Committee asked what the difficulties were concerning the use of polycarbonate drinking vessels and was informed that the target clientele would not accept polycarbonate – the premises was not a drinking establishment, but would be aiming at the high-end of social eating and drinking. Members also enquired about the lack of detail on the plans – which suggested the whole of the ground floor was a bar. The LO informed the Sub-Committee that unless the furniture was fixed, it was convention not to show it on plans – and Members were also informed that the bulk of the ground floor would be soft-furnishings and dining whilst the basement would be opened more for functions.

In response to a question from Councillor Light, the LO explained that the property next to the venue was a veterinary surgery, but Burnside Court (across South Street, opposite the premises) was residential.

The Sub-Committee then invited the interested parties to make their views known – with the Chairman reminding them to remain focussed on the licensing objectives, to remain brief and not to either refer to the previous occupant, engage in speculation or – where more than one resident spoke – to be repetitive. She added that this was a new application and so the test for objection would be high, but she added that she would explain the options open to residents later in the hearing.

Residents’ objections:

Residents raised a number of points of concern for the Sub-Committee to consider.

- Issues affecting crime and disorder and public nuisance: The venue lay outside the ring road and there were concerns that this would mean a lower level of policing (not within the town centre environment). Concern was expressed that because the premises was remaining open later, people would drift out to take advantage of this. Because it had a large car-park, there would be a temptation to drive there and this could add to drink-drive related incidents, not to mention the strain placed on the road at the entrance/exit point. Further concern was raised about the associated noise (car doors slamming, people talking

in high voices) as well as the light pollution from the car park lighting and car head-lights.

- There were concerns about the protection of children from harm as well as public nuisance: Late noise and lights would have an adverse effect on the homes of residents nearby where children lived. Not only would their sleep be disturbed, but there was a likelihood that there could be scenes of drunkenness, litter and anti-social behaviour – all of which parents considered would be most unwelcome.
- One resident raised a number of reasoned arguments concerning the lack of information provided concerning the almost every aspect of the application; but in particular: the provision of sound-proofing, air-conditioning, light pollution control, the management of traffic flow and how patrons arriving/departing in the early hours were to be managed to ensure residents were not inconvenienced or disturbed.

He maintained that the application was inappropriate for the venue and explained that there was a mixed social environment within close proximity of the premises ranging from elderly, vulnerable people in Burnside Court to families with very young children, also near-by. He referred to the vets practice next to the venue and explained that there was planning permission for it to be demolished and turned into a block of flats – thereby placing people very close to both the premises and – more significantly – the car park. It was pointed out that this was speculation and therefore could not be taken into account.

- A resident raised concerns that the granting of a licence in this instance would be a breach of his human rights and when informed by the Chairman that although a serious consideration, it was rather of a speculative nature as no licence was currently in force and the Sub-Committee had to restrict itself to evidenced objection. He then asked whether he could bring an action against the Council if the night-club became a nuisance.
- Further objection came from residents who asserted that noise (and vibration) was a real issue with the property and stated that when “*Georgio’s*” had first opened there had been no problems as functions took place in the basement. But once the management had started to have regular Thursday evening entertainment, problems began – and they were fearful that this looked as though it could be every night until much later.
- Councillor Curtin then addressed the Sub-Committee. He began by saying that he (and some of the objectors) had taken the opportunity of meeting with the Applicant the previous week, within the venue and that although the intention had been to allay the fears of residents, he was not convinced that this had been achieved. He explained that there had been rain at the time of the meeting and the noise on the sky-lights was considerable. His point was that if external noise was that loud inside the building, what would noise be like outside?

In addition to endorsing the views already expressed, he added his own concerns about the lack of detail in the application and argued that it

would not be proper to grant the application until all the concerns of residents had been fully addressed and that meant the Applicant providing answers to each of the concerns expressed.

- One of the residents reiterated the issue about noise and maintained that the issues surrounding the lack of detail concerning how light and sound-proofing was to be managed raised considerable anxiety about the intention and integrity of the Applicant. The proposals were too vague to provide sufficient assurance to residents that the granting of a licence would either be appropriate or reasonable.

By way of assurance to the interested parties that their views had been noted and would be addressed, the Chairman reminded them of what she had said earlier: that because this was a new application, there were few grounds on which it could be refused. However, that was not to say that the Sub-Committee could not impose conditions (so far as was “reasonable and proportionate”) and that any breach of those conditions would leave the Applicant open to a Review – which could be brought by the residents as long as it was supported by evidence. She then called on the Applicant to respond to the interested parties.

Applicant’s arguments:

Counsel for the Applicant introduced the other people present with him and then referred to the previous Friday’s meeting at which about ten of the objectors were present. He explained that the application was a “rolling process” and that his clients were experienced businessmen and would not have embarked on this venture without having considered the practical issues to be addressed prior to the venue opening its doors. He also pointed out that there had been no objection from the Environmental Health Service to the proposals. However, he accepted that residents would be more closely affected and he would seek to address their concerns and allay their fears and prejudices.

The Applicant’s legal representative stated that the Applicant had agreed to the conditions proposed by the Metropolitan Police (with the exception of that relating to polycarbonate-ware) and would ensure that prior to opening, those conditions which the Sub-Committee imposed (such as sound-proofing) would be in place and that the Licensing Authority was fully satisfied of compliance.

He then provided those present with a brief background concerning his clients’ interests and intentions for the area and touched on the meeting held the previous Friday, citing it as an example of how his clients wished to work with the community. He reminded the Sub-Committee that their decision must be proportionate and address necessity. He explained why it would be inappropriate for the Sub-Committee to impose a condition concerning polycarbonate drinking vessels – it would not be conducive to the prospective target clientele. He outlined his clients’ proposals to fully sound-proof the premise before opening its doors to trade – in other words, they were not looking for a quick Christmas/New Year period profit, but would take as long as necessary to ensure that everything agreed was in place before opening for business. In short, they were in it for the long-term.

During his statement, the Applicant's legal representative argued that the proposals for the premises included:

- The closure of all doors at the front of the premises at 9.00pm after which entry/exit would be via a side entrance – or the rear (for a valet service car-parking or a dedicated taxi service, a contract for which had already been negotiated).
- Entrances would be protected by the construction of appropriately sound-baffled lobbies.
- After 8.00pm only those over the age of 21 would be allowed onto the premises.
- The Applicants would apply – and adhere to – Challenge 25.
- If the Sub-Committee saw fit, accredited door supervisors would be employed (although he also argued that their use would be limited to the busier periods of the week, and he asked the Sub-Committee to consider allowing low visibility clothing).
- Noise tests would be made – in company with the Environmental Health Service and their recommendations would be applied.
- Noise limiters would be installed and
- The Applicants would ensure that CCTV was installed in accordance with Police recommendations and (externally) lighting would be placed to ensure clear pictures would be provided as well as minimising the risk of pollution to near-by properties.
- A personal licence holder would be on site all the time licensable activities were taking place.

In addition, there would be:

- No music played outside.
- Smoking would be located at the rear of the premises and no drinks would be permitted outside.
- The outside would be patrolled and monitored.
- There would be no “off-sales” at the premises and although there might be the occasional part consumed bottle being taken away, he argued that the clientele envisaged at the establishment would not be such as would cause difficulties for neighbours.

With regard to expressed fears about the number of cars at the premises and the potential for problems for residents at closing time, Counsel explained that this was never likely to happen because:

- This was not a night-club but a place for people to dine or to socialise.
- Because a contract had been set up with a local cab company, he envisioned patrons to make use of this.
- Patrons would come (and go) at different times during the evening depending on whether they were eating before an evening's entertainment, afterwards or simply dining.

The point was that the location was excellent for public transport (apart from taxis, there were busses and trains). Some patrons would undoubtedly walk, but it was highly unlikely that the car park would ever be more than part full – and late at night, there would not be that many customers staying until closing time – the late time was purely to facilitate late travellers.

The Sub-Committee asked a number of questions of Counsel on aspects of his presentation, eliciting clarification of certain practical and management matters. Members determined that the establishment was not a formal restaurant, and the Applicant's legal representative did not accept the suggestion that it was an "American" style bar either. The Sub-Committee inferred that the premises was an informal mix of bar, lounge and restaurant as "bar and grill" seemed to suggest.

Counsel confirmed that on the ground floor, there would be a mixture of soft furnishings/coffee tables, a bar area and tables for dining. The basement would be similarly set out, but could be let out for private functions – and where it would be most likely that any dancing would take place. Copies of a sample menu was made available along with pictures of similar establishments.

Some residents raised concerns about the prospect of dancing as there were fears that this was a suggestion of the premises leaning towards being a night club. The Applicant's legal representative sought to reassure those residents and the Sub-Committee that the problem lay with the wording of the Licensing Act itself in that applicants could not "tailor" it to their needs but it was either *have* a particular activity or do not have it – in which case, he explained, simply "moving with the music" would be in breach of the licence if "dancing" had not been requested and granted. Merely having the facility for dancing did not mean that the establishment was going to be a night club.

The Chairman asked about the provision of door supervisors and was informed that the accepted level was 2:100, but that the Applicants preferred to have more than the minimum and so six would be on the premises – mostly to meet and greet, patrol the outside areas and oversee the valet service.

The Police representative stated that in general terms, had the application been for a normal restaurant where the lay-out was for conventional table meals, there would be fewer issues to contend with than where a less formal arrangement was being proposed. He expressed satisfaction that the Applicants had accepted the Police recommendations and had explained in detail their proposals. However, he warned that once a licence had been granted, it could be immediately sold on and if there was provision for it to operate as a night-club, it could do so.

Residents remained cautious about the proposals and Councillor Curtin stated that he remained wary of what was being suggested, principally because it appeared "vague". It was not *quite* a restaurant, it was not *quite* a bar, it was not *quite* a night-club but appeared to have elements of all and no guarantee that the worst fears of the residents would not be realised – other than the promises of the Applicant.

Counsel sought to allay suspicions by reiterating that his clients were serious about working with the authorities and becoming a benefit to the local community, but clearly the project needed to have a chance to become a reality and that required the application being granted. He reminded the Sub-Committee that his clients had already accepted the recommendations made by the Police and were prepared to work with

Environmental Health, the Licensing Service and all other agencies that were felt to be necessary. In addition, he stated that it would not make any business sense if, having spent a large amount of money in ensuring compliance with the licence requirements, let alone equipping and furnishing the premises, that the licence was put in jeopardy (by way of a review) because the conditions were not being followed.

Decision

Consequent upon the hearing held on 10 November 2009, the Sub-Committee's decision regarding the application for a Premises Licence for "The Brickyard", 222 South Street, Romford, 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's legal representative, objectors, Police and the licensing officer, the Sub-Committee **granted** the application in part (as set out below).

Times the premises is to be open to the public:		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	11:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday to Saturday	11:00hrs	02:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning

Films, Recorded Music, Provision of Facilities for making music and Dancing, the Supply of Alcohol		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	11:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday to Saturday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	24:00hrs

Live Music		
Day	Start	Finish
Thursday & Friday	19:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Saturday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	24:00hrs

Recorded Music		
Day	Start	Finish
Monday to Wednesday	18:00hrs	23:00hrs

Thursday	18:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Friday & Saturday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	24:00hrs

Performance of Dance		
Day	Start	Finish
Wednesday	18:00hrs	23:00hrs
Thursday	18:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Friday & Saturday	11:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	11:00hrs	24:00hrs

Late Night Refreshment		
Day	Start	Finish
Thursday to Saturday	23:00hrs	01:00hrs the following morning
Sunday	23:00hrs	24:00hrs

The underlying rationale for this decision was that residents had concerns about the likelihood of late night noise nuisance and general disturbance and that the Sub-Committee had concerns that the locality, although mixed in character, still contained a number of residents with children as well as elderly and vulnerable adults. The applicant's legal representative had asserted that his client was anxious to be seen as a good neighbour and would work closely with the various authorities (such as Police, Licensing and Environmental Health) to ensure that the venue would be considered to be an asset to the area. To this end he had volunteered to accept the recommendations contained within the Police representation and the Sub-Committee confirmed this by adding the conditions below to the licence as well as further conditions relating specifically to noise as they appeared reasonable and proportionate and addressed the public nuisance, prevention of crime and protection of children from harm objectives.

The Sub-Committee was pleased to note that the Applicant had stated that all measures agreed would be put in place – **and accepted by the appropriate agencies** – prior to the premises opening for business and this would include the completion of the proposed sound-proofing (including the construction of lobbies at the entrances). In addition it was pleased that the Applicant had volunteered to accept Challenge 25 and that under 21 year olds would be excluded from the premises after 8pm Monday to Sunday inclusive.

The Sub-Committee noted that the Applicant had confirmed that a **personal licence holder** would be on the premises at all times it was open to the public. It welcomed the fact that he had agreed to employ SIA approved door staff for the premises and noted the Applicant's argument that they would be on the premises from 9pm to closing **only** for Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

With regard to the external aspect of the premises, the Sub-Committee directed that lighting in the car park area should be consistent with public safety and to permit the effective use of CCTV. The Sub-Committee noted the Applicant's intention to provide a small area for smokers to the rear of the premises and that after 11pm **nightly** the front entrances would be closed, sound-and light proofed, and patrons entering and leaving (unless to access the car park or using the taxi service) would do so via the side doors.

The Sub-Committee directed that there should be **no outside consumption of alcohol**, and that the proposed modest outside smoking area should be monitored by staff.

Finally, the Sub-Committee accepted the assurances given to it that all staff would receive proper training and that copies of all training manuals would be provided to the Police and Licensing Service. In addition, the Sub-Committee sought, and was given, assurances that the premise would not begin to trade until **all the conditions** were either in place or had been complied with.

The following conditions from the Pool of Conditions (modified where appropriate) to be added to the licence were:

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 21 Licensing Act 2003, Mandatory condition: door supervision

- M4 A minimum of one Door Supervisor, registered with the Security Industry Authority, shall be on the premises on Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday between 21:00hrs and closing time when the premises are open for any licensable activity.

NON-MANDATORY CONDITIONS

A **personal licence holder** shall be on the premises at all times when alcohol was being sold to the public.

There shall be **no outside consumption of alcohol**.

At 11pm **nightly** the front entrances will be closed, sound-and light proofed, and patrons entering and leaving (unless to access the car park or using the taxi service) would do so via the side doors.

- 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.

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.
- Police advice and assistance shall be sought and that the CCTV system will comply with their recommendations.

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.

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.

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 **25** 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 and be either a passport or photographic driving licence.

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.

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.

Noise and Vibration

PN1 No nuisance shall be caused by noise emanating from the premises or by vibration transmitted through the structure of the premises.

PN6 A noise limiting device shall be installed, fitted and maintained in such a manner as to control all sources of amplified music or speech at the premises. The installation must be in accordance with the guidance and approval of the Environmental Health Service, noise pollution officers.

PN8 No licensable activities shall take place until a scheme of soundproofing to the premises has been submitted to and approved by the Licensing Authority/Environmental Health Service. The work must be completed to the Licensing Authority’s satisfaction prior to any licensable activity taking place.

PN9 Sound trap lobbies / acoustic doors / automatic door closers shall be installed to the entrances/exits at the front and side of the premises.

- PN17 Licensable activities/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.

.....

CHAIRMAN

Date: 2009