Agenda	Торіс	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 VARIATION TO A PREMISES LICENCE - SHISH MEZE, 2 BERTHER ROAD, HORNCHURCH, RM11 3HS UNDER SECTION 34 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003.	LICENSING ACT 2003 Notice of Interim Decision
		PREMISES         Shish Meze Restaurant         2 Berther Road         Hornchurch         RM11 3HS         DETAILS OF APPLICATION         The application for a variation of a premises license was made under section 34 of the Licensing Act 2003 ("the Act)         APPLICANT         Mr Bilal Nadir Gul         2 Berther Road         Hornchurch         RM11 3HS

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
-------------------	-------	----------

1. Details of requested	licensable activities		
Details of the application			
Current premises licence h	ours:		
Supply of alcohol (inter	nal areas)		7
Day	Start	Finish	
Monday to Sunday	10:00	23:00	
Day Mandauta Cundau	<b>Start</b> 12:00	<b>Finish</b> 21:00	_
Monday to Sunday	12.00	21.00	
Late Night Refreshment All bank holidays, Valentir Opening Hours			 23:00 to 00:00
Late Night Refreshment All bank holidays, Valentir			 23:00 to 00:00
Late Night Refreshment All bank holidays, Valentir Opening Hours	ie's Day, Christmas E	ive, New Year's Eve–	 23:00 to 00:00

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
-------------------	-------	----------

All bank holidays, Valentin	e's Day, Christmas	Eve, New Year's Ev	re – 1000 to 00:00
(external area 21.00)			
Variation applied for:			
Supply of alcohol (interna	al areas)		
Day	Start	Finish	
Monday to Sunday	11:00	23:00	
Opening Hours			
Day	Start	Finish	
Monday to Sunday	11:00	23:30	
<ul> <li>2. Promotion of the Licer</li> <li>The applicant acted in acc (Premises licences and of advertisements of the appli 2016 edition of the Yellow Ar</li> <li>At the suggestion of the Licer Conditions 1,3,4,5,6 could be issued by the Government.</li> <li>3. Details of Representate</li> </ul>	ordance with regulat club premises certif cation. The required dvertiser. ensing Authority it was e removed; this in lin The applicant had ag	icates) Regulations I public notice was i s put forward that Pr e with the section 18	2005 relating to the installed in the 3 August remises Licence Annex 2, 22 Licensing Act guidance

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
-------------------	-------	----------

r	
	There were six representations against the application from interested persons. These representations were based on the grounds of Public Safety and the Prevention of public nuisance.
	There was a representation against the application from a responsible authority; Planning Enforcement based on the grounds of Prevention of public nuisance.
	4. Determination of Application
	Mr Sam Cadman representing the Council's Planning Services stated that a representation was placed on the application as the applicant had earlier indicated to vary the operating hours past the hours agreed on the planning condition.
	The planning condition detailed that the internal areas of the premises shall not be used for the purposes hereby permitted other than between the hours of 10:00 and 22:00 on Monday to Friday and between 10:00 and 23:00 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank or Public holidays. The external seating areas shall not be used for the purposes hereby permitted other than between the hours of 10:00 and 22:00 on Monday to Sunday and Bank or Public holidays.
	The Sub-Committee was informed that following the withdrawal of this part of the application Planning Services had no further objection to the remaining parts of the application; that was to licence two additional outside areas of the premises.
	Mr David Hopkins, a local resident addressed the Sub-Committee stating that he and other resident from Tilier Court were opposed to the application to vary the premises license for the additional area outside the premises on the grounds of Public Safety and the Prevention of public nuisance. He informed the Sub-Committee that his apartment overlooked the premises, that the premises was currently not abiding by its current licence to cease the use of the

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision

,	
	outside area by 21:00 hours. Mr Hopkins stated that customers at the restaurant were still eating and drinking after 21:00 hours. He was of the opinion that extending the hours would mean noise from the premises emanating to his apartment and other residents. Mr Hopkins was of the view that the situation had only got worse since the original licence was granted. He also stated that it was impossible to have a quiet evening with the windows open in the spring and summer without the noise from the restaurant interfering especially on evenings when there was music in the restaurant in addition to the outside area the doors to the inside were kept open and people inside the restaurant talking clapping and singing happy birthday. The Sub-Committee was informed that there were customers outside the premises after 21:00 hours been served alcohol, people urinating in the street along the path in to the station. Mr Hopkins was of the opinion that the premises was not been well managed.
	<b>In response</b> the applicant's agent, Mr Graham Hopkins addressed the Sub-Committee stating that the premises was a popular and busy restaurant. Mr Hopkins confirmed to the Sub-Committee in answer to a question, that the application was, inter alia, for a variation of the premises licence to include an additional 2 external areas for the supply of alcohol and that the application to extend the hours for the supply of alcohol for the existing external area was not being pursued.
	The intention of the application was to bring the opening hours in line with the drinking hours. He added that in response to the photograph submitted by one of the objectors, the photograph indicated that all four parking bays were correctly in use. The Sub-Committee was informed that the application was only to licence the two additional areas specified in the drawings circulated at the meeting. The additional area will allow the premises to expand by 25 persons. The sub-Committee noted that the variation will bring the total capacity for the restaurant to 191.
	It was also the intention of the premises to operate the Challenge 25 as proof of age policy. In

Agenda	Торіс	Decision
Item No		

reply to the issue raised by Mr Hopkins that customers were seen with drink in the outside
area. Mr Graham Hopkins replied that the restaurant allowed for customers waiting for a table to be served drink as they wait for a table to be available. The premises was also in support of
the parking restrictions on Berther Road. Mr Graham Hopkins informed the Sub-Committee that the premises was now aware of the
need to provide additional toilets for its customers.
Mr Graham Hopkins informed the Sub-Committee that there was no evidence of a public nuisance as the Police and the council's Environmental Health (Noise) team had not raised an objection to the application. It was also the intention of the premises to have a staff member at the door to advise customers to leave the premises and surrounding areas quietly. Mr Hopkins stated that there was no date and time of the public nuisance incident detailed in the representation. It was also the intention of the premises to display a telephone number in the window of the restaurant for local resident to contact the premises in case there was an issue. He urged the Sub-Committee to grant the licensing hours for the additional areas as outlined.
Further to a question by the Sub-Committee, Mr Hopkins stated that the premises would voluntarily offer to close doors and windows and cease the use of the outside area by 22:00 hours.
The Sub-Committee was obliged to determine the 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

Agenda Item No	Торіс	Decision
-------------------	-------	----------

to the licensing objectives. The Sub-Committee was of the view that the application was unclear as the Licensing Officer's report did not detail the application for consideration. The Sub-Committee was also of the view that the description in the advert placed in the Yellow Advertiser was unclear but during questioning Mr David Hopkins accepted that he was aware of the detail of the application. His and other residents from Tilier Court were opposed to the application to vary the premises license for the additional area outside the premises on the grounds of Public Safety and the Prevention of public nuisance.
The Sub-Committee was of the view that there was a need to seek absolute clarity of the application from the applicant and Licensing Authority.           Decision
The Sub-Committee determined that there were a number of matters relating to the variation application that had now changed following the end of consultation and today's hearing and the appointment of Mr Hopkins as the applicant's agent. The Sub-Committee was of the view that the original application and what was outlined at the hearing had changed and an adjournment was necessary for the Licensing Authority to clarify the details of the application to

Item No
---------

A2