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 AGAINST INTERIM STEPS - CIRCUIT	Romford RM1 1B DETAIL Applicat applicat held on APPLIC Dadds S On beha 36/38 N Romford RM1 1B	orth Street d H S OF APPLICATION ion against the interim step m ion was received by Havering 16 May 2016. ANT Solicitors alf of the Buddha RT Ltd t/a Corth Street	d's Licensing Auth	on 53A of the Licensing Act 2003. nority on 12 May 2016 and the he	
			Supply of alcohol. Day	Start	Finish	
			Monday to Tuesday	11:00	00:00	
			Wednesday to Thursday	11:00	01:00	
			Friday to Saturday	11:00	03:45	
			Sunday	11:00	00:30	

Agenda	Topic	Decision
Item No		

Film, Live Music, Recorded Music, performance of dance, anything of a similar description to music or dance			
Day	Start	Finish	
Monday to Tuesday	11:00	00:00	
Wednesday to Thursday	11:00	02:00	
Friday to Saturday	11.00	04.00	
Sunday	11:00	01:30	

Late Night Refreshment				
Day	Start	Finish		
Monday to Tuesday	23:00	00:00		
Wednesday to Thursday	23:00	02:00		
Friday to Saturday	23:00	04.00		
Sunday	23:00	01:30		

2. Grounds for Review

The application for an expedited premises licence review had been served under section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003. A formal notice of representation under section 53B (6) was made in accordance with section 53B (9) (c) on following grounds:

- That the interim steps to suspend the licence was disproportionate and not necessary, and
- That the premises holder wished to have an opportunity to be heard and to make further representations and provide the aforementioned at a hearing

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		The application stated that the premises "Circuit" was failing to promote at least three of the licensing objectives namely; prevention of crime & disorder, protection of the public safety and prevention of public nuisance. The Police were primarily concerned about the lack of regard the premises licence holders had in the promotion and upholding of the licensing conditions. Additionally it was alleged that errors and breaches of the licence conditions existed whilst violence on the site had occurred.
		3. Requirements upon the Licensing Authority
		This application was made under the provisions of s.53A of the Act. As such, s.53A(2)(a) required that within 48 hours of the receipt of the application the licensing authority considers whether it was necessary to take interim steps pending the determination of the review application. A first interim hearing was heard within the 48 hour time frame and took place on the morning of 12 May 2016. It was the licensing sub-committee's decision to exercise its discretion with regard to the provisions of s.53B (2) and to not give the premises licence holder an opportunity to make representations to the licensing authority at that stage.
		Subsequent to Police representation the licensing sub-committee decided to suspend the licence from midday 12 May 2016 pending the full review hearing in line with its powers under s.53B(3)(d). The relevant decision notice was provided to the premises licence holder on 12 May.
		The premises licence holder made representation to the licensing authority against this interim decision on 12 May 2016 and in line with its duty under s.53B(6) the licensing authority organised the hearing within 48 hours. The hearing was therefore to enable the premises licence holder to make representation against the interim decision to suspend the licence pending the full hearing.

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
		4. Details of Representation Metropolitan Police At the beginning of the hearing the sub-committee was informed that both legal representatives for the premises and on behalf of the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service were in discussion on the interim decision seeking a common ground to present to the sub-committee. Mr Dadds requested for a twenty minutes adjournment in order for negotiation to be completed with James Rankin and PC Oisin Daly, on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service. The Sub-Committee agreed to the request and adjourned until 11.05 am. At the resumption of the hearing, Mr James Rankin was invited to summarise his submission of 12 May 2016. The Sub-Committee was informed that there had been serious breaches of the Licensing objectives and Licence conditions at the premises. Having spoken with Mr Dadds, various proposals had been put forward by the premises to enable the venue re-open subject to a full review.

Topic	Decision
	Mr Rankin detailed the following amendment conditions that had been agreed between both parties:
	 All patrons to the premises shall be scanned for entry. Fifteen door staffs shall be employed at all times the premises is open for business. The VIP area; Alcohol shall be supplied only by a waiter/waitress. (There shall be no self service) All VIP areas shall be monitored by at least one SIA security personnel. PC Oisin Daly would be allowed to brief all SIA door personnel from the new company at 21:00 hours on 20 May 2016 No door staffs present on the incident of 2 May 2016 are to be re-employed at the premises. CCTV shall be installed in the male and female toilet and focussed on the toilet attendant. (As a result of the drug abuse concern at the premises) Mr Rankin concluded stating that even though the Police were acceptable to the conditions in order for the premises to re-open, the decision was in the hands of the Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee was informed that the Police reserved their position for the full
	review hearing to seek a revocation of the Premises Licence.
	5. Applicant's Reply
	Mr Dadds (legal representative to the applicant) addressed the Sub-Committee stating that is was most usual for the premises not to be allowed to respond to an expedited review of the premises licence hearing as was the case on 12 May 2016.
_	Topic

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		Mr Dadds made the following submissions in respect of the conditions outlined by Mr Rankin (legal representative for the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service)
		 Disputed that a camera had been removed from its location at the back of the premises. The premises was in agreement with the conditions agreed with the Police
		following negotiation. The premises was in agreement with the conditions agreed with the Folice following negotiation. The premises voluntarily offered the club scan system following a previous review.
		 The SIA company that was contracted to the premises had previously received a commendation for the work practise. Following this incident the contract had been terminated.
		 Steps had been taken to employ a new SIA registered company to be in place for Friday, 20 May 2016.
		 A representative of Dadds Solicitors would be briefing the new company personnel
		 Suggested that the decision of the Sub-Committee must be evidence based and proportionate to the issues.
		 The objectives of this step were to provide the premises with an opportunity to talk to the Police and take steps to remedy any concern.
		 Suggested that there were no drug issues as all patrons were searched before entry in to the venue.
		 That historically, there had been a good relationship between the premises and the Police.
		That the premises always cooperated with the Police.
		The Chairman addressed all parties present that its decision to not allow any representations from the premises licence holder was taken following legal guidance.

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		The Sub-Committee decided to exercise its discretion with regard to the provisions of s.53B (2) to not give the premises licence holder an opportunity to make representations at that stage. The Sub-Committee noted that the premises had not submitted a revised CCTV plan to the responsible authorities. It was clarified to the Sub-Committee that a doorman will be dedicated to each of the VIP areas and the daily register will be made available for inspection.
		 6. Determination of Application Consequent upon the hearing held on 16 May 2016 the Sub-Committee's decision regarding the expedited review of the premises licence for Circuit, 36-38 North Street, Romford, RM1 1BH 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

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
		and Disorder Act 1998, and Articles 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998.
		Decision:
		The Sub-Committee stated that following careful consideration of all information including the offer of agreed additional conditions, the sub-committee remain of the view that the interim suspension is an appropriate and proportionate decision given the concerns that the current licensing conditions are not being fully met, for example evidence of an initial reluctance to release CCTV footage requested to the Police in a timely manner and an initial insistence that it be viewed at the premises with representatives of the licence holder and as the sub-committee had heard today, evidence of overt drug taking.
		The gravity of the incidents which occurred on 2 May and the apparent lack of an acceptable response led the sub-committee to have concerns regarding the public safety and crime & disorder licensing objectives.
		Therefore the sub-committee's decision was to continue the interim suspension of the premise licence pending the full review.
		7. Right of Appeal
		The premises licence holder may make representations within 48 hours, by Wednesday 18 May 2016 against the interim step to suspend the premises licence.

Agenda Item No	Topic	Decision
	<u> </u>]
A1 A2		