

Licensing Act 2003 – responsible authority representation

This representation is made by a responsible authority for the London Borough of Havering concerning a premises licence application for the premises as detailed below.

Applicant: Moonshine Entertainment Limited
Premises: Jukebox 72-74 South Street Romford RM1 1NL
Name: Paul Jones
Organisation: London Borough of Havering Licensing Authority
Address: c/o Town Hall Main Road Romford RM1 3BD
Email: paul.jones@haverling.gov.uk
Telephone no.: 01708 432692

Objection summary:

Jukebox is located in Havering's most prominent cumulative impact zone (CIZ), Romford Town. This application is effectively to extend the hours of operation authorised by the premises licence currently in force at the site. The hours of operation in place already extend beyond Havering's licensing policy guideline hours; this application therefore seeks to extend terminal hours even further beyond the hours the policy deems reasonable. The risk this presents is that the premises will add to the cumulative impact (CI) of licensed premises in the CIZ and adversely impact upon the promotion of the licensing objectives, namely the prevention of public nuisance, the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety.

Policy considerations:

4. Expectations of applicants

4.5 Where specific policies apply in the area (for example, a Cumulative Impact Policy), applicants are also expected to:

- Demonstrate an understanding of how the Policy impacts on their application,
- Identify any measures they will take to mitigate the impact, and
- Confirm why they consider their application should be an exception to the Policy.

6. Cumulative Impact

6.3 For areas where a cumulative impact policy is adopted, it creates a rebuttable presumption that applications for new premises licences, club premises certificates, or variation applications that will add to the existing cumulative impact, will normally be refused, unless the applicant can demonstrate why the operation of the premises involved will not add to the cumulative impact and not impact adversely on the promotion of the licensing objectives. The exception to this policy may be for applications for restaurants where alcohol is sold ancillary to a table meal.

8. Special Cumulative Impact Policy for Romford Town Centre

8.5 On the basis of the above evidence the Licensing Authority is of the view that the number, type and density of premises selling alcohol for consumption on and off the premises and the provision of late night refreshment within the ring road is having a cumulative impact and undermining the licensing objectives. It is likely that granting further licences would be inconsistent with the authority's duty to promote the licensing objectives and a cumulative impact policy has been adopted in this area.

12. Licensing Hours

12.1 When dealing with new and variation applications the Licensing Authority may give more favourable consideration to applications with the following closing times:

Public Houses and Bars – 23:00 hours Sunday to Thursday
Midnight Friday and Saturday

Nightclubs – 01:00 hours Sunday to Thursday
02:00 hours Friday and Saturday

Restaurants and Cafes – 23:00 hours Sunday to Thursday
Midnight – Friday and Saturday

Off licences – 23:00 Monday to Sundays

Hot food and drink supplied by takeaways, fast food premises
Midnight – Sunday to Thursdays
01:00 Friday and Saturday

Hotel residents only – 24 hours sale of alcohol for on sales only

12.2 Consideration will also be given to the type of area that the premises is located in with regulated activities normally being permitted until 23.30 in residential areas and 00.30 in mixed use areas.

12.4 The above hours are intended to guide applicants on the Licensing Authority's expectations when preparing their operating schedules.

17. Noise

17.1 The Licensing Authority is committed to protecting the amenity of residents and businesses in the vicinity of licenced premises, particularly when late hours have been sought. Where relevant representations are received, the Licensing Authority will request appropriate restrictions or controls on the licence to support the prevention of undue noise disturbance from licensed premises.

17.2 The Licensing Authority will seek to balance the protection of residents from undue disturbance against noise and the activity that is the natural by-product of people going about their business, entertainment or leisure.

17.3 The Licensing Authority expects that premises intended for the provision of noise-generating licensable activities are acoustically controlled and engineered to a degree where the noise from the premises when compared to the ambient noise level will not cause undue disturbance.

Representation

As mentioned in my objection summary, this premises already benefits from a premises licence the hours of which are outside those guideline hours detailed in licensing policy 12 (LP12). The premises' website – <https://jukeboxldn.com> – describes the premises as “a high-energy bar and late-night party venue.” Given that the premises defines itself as a *bar* LP12's policy hours further to public houses and bars might appear appropriate; however, the current licence hours extend beyond those considered reasonable for nightclubs which are traditionally late-night venues. This application seeks to extend the hours during which licensable activity may be provided (including the provision of live and recorded music) even further into the early hours of the morning. This is, of course, of concern to the licensing authority.

LP4.5 expects an applicant to confirm why their application should be considered an exception to the CI policy. While section 18 of the application refers to the CI policy there appears to be no explicit rebuttal of the policy. The closest comment to a rebuttal appears to be:

- The business has been running for 6 years without under [*sic*] this licence and successfully within the conditions of their current licence.

This statement, along with the contents of the application, appears to suggest that current compliance with the extant licence should be accepted as confirmation of future compliance under the new licence and hence provide reassurance as to any potential impact upon the promotion of the licensing objectives. I will address the issue of current compliance shortly.

LP6 and LP8 address cumulative impact. Given that the premises already benefits from a premises licence which permits the provision of licensable activity beyond the guideline terminal hours of LP12 we might feel inclined to reason this licence, which will presumably replace the current version if the application is granted, would not add to CI. We should, however, consider that the premises will be able to remain open until 04:00 every Friday and Saturday and on multiple non-standard days, including mid-week, with customer dispersal occurring beyond 04:00, which has the potential to add to CI and to adversely impact upon the promotion of the licensing objectives.

LP17 addresses noise which may result from the provision of licensable activity at licensed premises. The area in which the premises is located is one of mixed-use which means that there are commercial *and* residential properties in the immediate vicinity. While the appropriate responsible authority may have comments to make upon the potential for noise nuisance, we might reasonably examine the application's stance on noise prevention.

This application largely repeats the contents of the current premises licence. The conditions from the current licence's annex 2 have been broadly duplicated in this application with some amendments which the licensing authority feels are detrimental to the promotion of the licensing objectives.

In relation to LP17 the current licence requires the following compliance via condition 19:

- Noise or vibration shall not emanate from the premises which could cause a nuisance to nearby properties.

Proposal 19 in section 18 of this application is as follows:

- The licence holder shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that noise and vibration emanating from the premises do not give rise to a public nuisance at nearby residential properties.

As we can see, the current condition requires a *prevention* of noise emanation affecting nearby properties; the new proposal appears to require the applicant to try their best to prevent noise emanation. The proposal also appears to accept that noise and vibration *will* be emanating from the premises while the applicant must take all reasonable steps to ensure it does not give rise to a public nuisance. A public nuisance is one which affects a large group of people rather than a particular individual. This proposal might therefore remain in compliance even if a small number of people were to be directly affected by noise emanating from the premises. Given the application is to extend the period in which regulated entertainment may be provided until 03:30 we might reasonably expect the current condition to be enhanced rather than diminished.

Section 18 proposal 6 repeats the 'Challenge 21' requirement of current condition 6; however, Challenge 21 has largely been abandoned for the current industry standard of Challenge 25 as it provides a larger margin for error when assessing a potential customer's age, thereby enhancing the licence holder's due diligence further to preventing under-age alcohol sales.

Current condition 13 requires:

- All door supervisors working outside the premises or whilst engaged in the dispersal of patrons at the close of business shall wear 'hi-visibility clothing.'

whereas proposal 13 states:

- All door supervisors working outside the premises or whilst engaged in the dispersal of patrons at the close of business shall be dressed in professional, smart and appropriate attire, so as to be readily identifiable, and shall wear their SIA identification badges in a clearly visible position at all times.

Removing the requirement for high-visibility clothing and replacing it with a requirement to wear 'professional, smart attire' might appear to make door supervisors *less* discernible than the current licence condition commands. The requirement to wear an SIA identification badge is already compelled by the relevant provisions of the Private Security Industry Act 2001 so its inclusion here might appear superfluous. Indeed, paragraph 1.16 of the s.182 Guidance to the Licensing Act 2003 reminds us that licence conditions *should not duplicate other statutory requirements or other duties or responsibilities placed on the employer by other legislation*.

Current condition 22, which proposal 22 repeats, requires:

- The premises licence holder shall ensure that the designated premises supervisor or other nominated person shall hold a National Certificate of Drugs Awareness qualification run by the BII or similar accredited body.

On 29th July 2026 we requested from the applicant's representative sight of the required drugs awareness qualification. On 30th July 2026 the following document was provided:



Drugs Awareness

This is to certify that



completed an e-learning course in the above subject.

The key areas covered:

- Drug classification and legislation
- Signs of drug use on licensed premises
- Commonly used drugs and their effects
- Environmental factors can contribute to preventing drugs on premises

Date: 30/07/2026

Signed on behalf of: *CPL Learning*



As can be seen, this certificate was issued on 30th July 2026, the day *after* I requested evidence of the licence holder's compliance with condition 22. We might reasonably conclude that since the licence was transferred to the applicant in February 2020 this condition has not been in compliance. The person who gained the qualification is not the DPS so is presumably a nominated person while the certificate is issued by an organisation which is not accredited under the Act. Accredited qualification providers offer an industry standard which, in turn, provides reassurance that any qualification issued by the accredited body is worthy of its name. Qualification issuing bodies which are not accredited do not provide such reassurance. I queried these matters with the applicant's representative on 30th July 2026 and again on 13th August 2026 but have yet to receive a response.

Conclusion

The matters provided above might suggest that this premises causes the licensing authority concern further to its current operation; however, this is not the case. The licensing authority is reassured that the premises is run largely in accordance with its duty to promote the licensing objectives within the current permitted hours. The last complaint we have on record was further to noise and was made in July 2021. The absence of complaints about this premises suggests that the current licence is fit for purpose and working successfully for which the operators should receive due credit.

By repeating the provisions of the current licence in a new application to extend terminal hours we might reasonably conclude that the applicant's position is one where compliance with the current licence is intended to provide reassurance of future compliance with a new licence. Based upon this, responsible authorities might reasonably assess current compliance as a guide to predicting future compliance. What seems to be the case is that the new set of proposals have been somewhat diluted with the apparent intended effect of removing certain responsibilities from the licence holder. We seem to be left with an application which seeks to increase the permissions afforded by the licence while simultaneously decreasing the responsibilities of the premises' operator. These two positions might appear in conflict.

Given that this premises is in a CIZ and seeks to operate to hours far beyond our policy guideline hours the licensing authority is, unfortunately, unable to support the application. We respectfully suggest that the application is not in accordance with the aims of LPs 6, 8 and 12 and should therefore be refused.

Complaint and inspection history

None

Other documents attached

None

Signed: *Paul Jones*

Date: 19th August 2026