



Havering

LONDON BOROUGH

Licensing Act 2003 Notice of Decision

PREMISES

The Drinks Seller
59 Chippenham Road Romford
RM3 8HL

APPLICANT

Mr Oisin Daly
Public Protection Officer for the London Borough of Havering

Details of the application

The application to review a premises licence is made by Mr Oisin Daly, Public Protection Officer for the London Borough of Havering, under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003. The application was received by Havering's Licensing Authority on 26th February 2026.

Summary

During the section 51 review application's consultation period the Police and the Home Office Immigration Service provided representations supporting Mr Daly's application.

Determination of application to review a premises licence

1. The Licensing Sub-Committee considered an application for a review of the premises licence for The Drinks Seller situated at 59 Chippenham Road, Romford, RM3 8HL
2. The review application was submitted by a member of the Council's Licensing team, Mr Oisin Daly. The application followed the licensing authority's receipt of an email from Mr Salih Maden (the premises licence holder at that time) in which Mr Maden advised that he had ceased operating the premises at some point in 2025. A response email seeking clarification was sent to the licence holder but it received no response. As a result, a compliance visit was made on 26th February 2026 by Mr Daly to seek to establish whether Mr Maden was still in control at the premises. Based upon his findings during this visit Mr Daly submitted this application to review the licence. Mr Daly's findings included

witnessing a staff member, who apparently had no knowledge of the licensing regime, selling alcohol in the presence of Mr Daly immediately after being told to cease trading. That same staff member stated Mr Maden had left the business and provided details of the new owner: Mr Hakimzada. The issues were exacerbated by the fact the premises is situated in a cumulative impact area.

3. The review application was supported by the Metropolitan Police who stated that the Police have real concerns with the operation of the premises licence in that Mr Maden had left the business around early 2025 and no transfer application was made to the licensing authority. The premises, on balance, had been supplying alcohol without Mr Maden being present or overseeing the licence. The Police also echoed the serious concerns raised by the council's licensing team in respect of the staff member openly selling alcohol after being told not to so by Mr Daly. In addition, the staff member positively confirmed that Mr Hakimzada is operating the premises and not Mr Maden. The Police added that, in their view, Mr Hakimzada is not fit to operate the licence given he had previously had a premises licence, which was situated in Ealing, suspended and eventually revoked after it was found he continued to provide licensable activity during the period of suspension.
4. The review application was supported by the Home Office's Immigration Enforcement Team. The aforementioned employee had provided to Mr Daly a contact number for the new owner, that being Mr Hakimzada. Home Office records show Mr Hakimzada has been subject to Immigration Enforcement for offences in July 2016 and February 2022. These offences were for employing individuals who held no legal right to work in the UK.
5. The members were cognisant that in deciding which powers to invoke in the review process, the expectation was that it should so far as possible seek to establish the cause or causes of the concerns that the representations identify. Therefore, any remedial action taken should be directed at these causes and should always be no more than an appropriate and proportionate response to address the causes of concern that instigated the review.

6. The members were cognisant of the powers available to them which were to take no action, to issue a warning, to add, remove, or modify licence conditions, to suspend the licence or to revoke the licence.
7. The members were cognisant of the Secretary of State's statutory guidance which states each responsible authority will be an expert in their respective field, and in some cases it is likely that a particular responsible authority will be the licensing authority's main source of advice in relation to a particular licensing objective.
8. The members were further cognisant of the Council's statement of licensing policy, in particular paragraph 13, which sets out the Council's expectations regarding the standards of management by a licence holder.

Decision & Reasons:

9. After having taken into consideration all written and oral submissions, considered the relevant sections of the Licensing Act 2003, assisted by the paragraphs of the S182 Guidance stated above, and the council's statement of licensing policy, the sub-committee found that the only appropriate and proportionate remedial action was to revoke the premises licence.
10. The members noted that all three responsible authorities sought revocation of the premises licence to promote the four licensing objectives and the premises licence holder did not contest any points made by the authorities.
11. The members noted that the premises licence holder was very candid in stating that he admitted he had transferred the control of the business to Mr Hakimzada in March 2025 and would only occasionally visit the premises thereafter whilst working as an Addison Lee employee. The premises licence holder submitted

some mitigation which was that he had been trading for over 24 years and in that period he did not have any issues at the premises.

12., The Licensing Sub-Committee, however, found these representations very worrying ;, Mr Maden, by his own admission, had no real control of the premises nor the operation of the licence which was entrusted to him. The employee of the business appeared to be the employee of Mr Hakimzada and Mr Maden had apparently left the business, abandoning his legal responsibilities as the premises licence holder.

13. To heighten the members' concerns, Mr Maden was asked what are the four licensing objectives but he was unable to provide a response and could not state what was the council's cumulative impact area in which this premises is situated). Mr Maden appeared to have minimal understanding of the licensing regime.

14. The members considered the other remedial steps available to them (as stated in paragraph 6 above) but found that only revocation of the licence to be the necessary and proportionate step. Mr Maden did not demonstrate any responsibility or competency as a premises licence holder; he had handed over his business to another individual in March 2025 and only notified the council of this in March 2026. When the council conducted its compliance visit, the employee at the premises continued to sell alcohol in the presence of a council licensing officer when explicitly told that he must stop. The employee then provided details of Mr Hakimzada, the person who appeared to have control over the premises, and who had had a licence revoked for providing licensable activity whilst the licence was suspended and who was also subject to Home Office enforcement for employing illegal workers. The Immigration Officer also added that this employee's immigration status was unknown and, in their

professional opinion having read Mr Daly's evidence, he possessed a likelihood of being an illegal worker. The Police provided evidence that Mr Hakimzada had a premises licence that was subject to suspension and, due to further breaches during the suspension, subsequent revocation. The members found that not only did the premises licence holder abandon the premises and its licence but had also handed the premises to an irresponsible person as the de-facto premises licence holder. This is all whilst the premises is situated in a problematic area with the occurrence of street drinking. The members were satisfied that any decision other than revocation would bring the whole regulatory licensing regime into disrepute and therefore revoked the premises licence.

Right of Appeal

Any party who has made a relevant representation may appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of notification of the decision.

On appeal, the Magistrates' Court may:

1. Dismiss the appeal; or
2. Substitute the decision for another decision which could have been made by the Sub Committee; or
3. Remit the case to the Sub Committee to dispose of it in accordance with the direction of the Court; and
4. Make an order for costs as it sees fit.

Taiwo Adeoye
Clerk to the Licensing Sub-Committee