

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE B HELD ON MONDAY, 19TH DECEMBER, 2016, 7.00pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), David Beacham and James Patterson

8. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to agenda item 1, as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting and Members noted this information.

9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Mallett and Councillor James Patterson substituted.

10. URGENT BUSINESS

None

11. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

12. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

The Chair set out the procedure that the Committee would follow for the hearing which was being considered under the Licensing Act 2003. A copy of the procedure was attached for Members to refer to during the hearing.

13. CHIDOS, 98 WEST GREEN ROAD, LONDON

Introductions: Councillor Carroll[Chair]Councillor Beacham Councillor Patterson Michelle Williams – Principal Lawyer, Daliah Barratt[Lead Officer Licensing], Mr Eastwood [Enforcement Noise Officer] Mr Oliver – [Licensee] Mr Aylott - Licensee Representative, Resident 1 and Resident 2[Local residents]

Topic Headings

Following the Chair's explanation of the procedure rules, the Enforcement Officer advised that he had additional late information for consideration by the Committee. These were letters sent to the licensee in May 2016 about the noise issues with the

premises. Mr Aylott did not agree to this information being presented late, as his client had not had an early opportunity to consider this information.

The Chair considered item 12 of the procedure summary and further questioned why this information had not already been included in the papers. It was agreed that the Officer include in, his verbal presentation, the information contained in this letter and make reference to other documents in the document pack, providing similar information, but without making specific reference to these documents.

Licensing Officers introduction

The Licensing Officer, Daliah Barrett, introduced the report which set out an application for a new premises licence for Chidos, 98 West Green Road London N15. The Licensee had applied for permission to hold regulated entertainment, live music recorded music, and provide late night refreshments. The details of which were set out in the report at agenda item 6, appendix 1.

Representations had been received from local residents and from the police with reference to the licensing objectives: the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and the prevention of noise nuisance. These were set out at agenda item 6 - appendix2.

The petition at page 40 was deemed valid as it provided a good summation of what the signatories were signing up to, in relation to objecting to the license. There were further representations from the Police and Enforcement response team for the Committee to consider. The Police representations had been agreed so their attendance was not required at the meeting tonight.

The Licensing Officer set out the decision making options open to the Committee which were: granting the application, granting the application whilst imposing conditions, or denying the application.

In completing her introduction, the Licensing Officer mentioned the previous review of the license in January, the number of years the license holder had managed the premises [which was 3], the additional documents supplied to Committee members prior to the meeting. These were: a list of representations of where the representations came from, in relation to the proximity to the premises shown on a map, a list of temporary event notices that have been submitted during course of this year, there were events in Feb which had been refused but not shown in the listing, and the Daniel Thwaite case.

Enforcement Officer Representations

The Enforcement Officer Side described the part of West Green Road where the premises was located, and where complaints about noise from residents living above the premises had been made in the past. He had visited premises in the past and sent warning letters. He personally found the premises unsuitable for events/regulated entertainment, as noise reaches to where residents are residing above the premises. On a previous visit to a home above the premises, he could hear shouting and when customers were talking loudly. Overall, Mr Eastwood felt that regulated entertainment was not suitable. However, if the Committee were minded to grant the application then there would need to be conditions attached to the license with strong emphasis on sound monitoring.

Resident's representations

The resident spoke in objection to the license being granted on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and the prevention of noise nuisance. He felt it was a totally unsuitable premises to hold events and it was not suitable for alcohol consumption, let alone entertainment. He reported that local residents felt intimidated by people drinking on West Green road

He continued to inform the Committee that there was no actual parking for customers and event attendees and they would often park on the roads off West Green road or in the public car park nearby where residents were closely located. He felt the increase in event revellers, parking in the car park had exacerbated existing problems in the car park with drug taking and public urination.

The resident was pleased that Haringey Council were taking forward regeneration in the borough but granting this licence would be a backward step to this objective. He felt there were alternative premises around the borough that could be utilised for music events, such as industrial estates. It felt wrong for the Council to not give due consideration to the noise issues for local residents, already a crime area and dreaded what would happen if the license was to be granted.

Resident 2

A second resident spoke of the overspill of people outside the premises who were often smoking as there was no designated area for people to smoke in the vicinity of the premises. Local residents felt intimidated by the congregation of people outside of the premises smoking.

Member's questions to the residents

In response to a question from the Committee, the residents had been living in the area for 6 years and the venue was already there when they arrived but was not open until 2am in the morning and they did not think it had an alcohol license. In relation to understanding the increase in crime, the resident attributed this to the premises opening hours.

The residents did not think that having additional conditions such as door staff, after 9pm, would stop people congregating outside the premises.

License Holder Response to the representations

Mr Aylott reminded the Committee that the Licensing Officer had made clear that the premises were licensed. Mr Oliver has been at premises for last 3 years, knew the clientele, and had already been granted a full quota of TENS [Temporary Event Notice] for the year. There had only been one TENS not agreed and this had been managed by another legal firm. All the ones that Mr Aylott's firm had managed were agreed for events taking place until 3am.

In responding to the objections and issues, Mr Aylott drew attention to the proposed conditions for the application for Chidos Lounge put forward and set out at page 27-28 of the report pack:

- Public safety which ensures safety of users in their premises. This section was about people using the premises, ensuring their safety is paramount.
- Conditions for safety were set out and the license holder does have an additional door supervisor as well.
- The premise has a telephone to enable patrons to phone for a taxi company and this insinuates that customers are not going outside to make calls.
- The premises license holder employed a SIA at a rate of 1 [Sunday to Thursday] and 2 on [Friday and Saturday] 9pm until closure to assist in crime and disorder representations which related to condition 14.
- Where the Police Officer had raised concerns about dispersal a doorman was employed for the remainder of the week. This was agreed with Police to assist with dispersal of clients.
- In relation to the Protection of children, Mr Aylott referred to pages [28 paragraphs 7] and the challenge 25 scheme in operation.
- Mr Aylott referred to Prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective the in 2.1 and the guidance at 9.12 essential sources of information –and disputed that this objective had not been met. Police were content if the conditions at page 27-28 are included in the operating schedule.
- Mr Aylott referred to the information on public nuisance at paragraph 2.1 4 which was important in considering the licensing promotion's focus on the effect at the licenses affect on persons living and working in the area. Mr Eastwood was suggesting that people living above the premises were affected. I.e. noise issues, noxious smells, litter. Mr Aylott contended that there was consideration given to the control of noise with doors and windows kept closed .Mr Oliver would agree to some soundproofing and would work with the Noise team on the extent of the sound proofing required, also in conjunction with residents.
- Mr Aylott expressed that Noise limiters were expensive, and the small size of this venue should be considered.
- Mr Aylott referred to the complaints about people leaving premises and discussed the assistance that can be provided by the licence holder with dispersal. He expressed that this was a finite area and beyond the vicinity of the premises, there was responsibility for the person in their own right to be sensible with their behaviour.
- He questioned the distance from the premises, from which a doorman can assist with dispersal?
- It was important to note that West Green Road was already a busy and noisy road and asked the Committee to consider whether the noise could solely be attributed to people leaving these premises?
- Since a review of premises license in Jan 2016 there has been one complaint of noise, on the 12th of May.
- The Committee had previously modified the conditions and added two additional conditions - since then full quota of Temporary Event notices had been provided– Mr Aylott's firm had managed the events which had a duration until 3am .Therefore there was evidence that the license holder was able to have the premises open up to 3am in the morning. This application was for fewer hours and with regulated entertainment.
- Mr Aylott contended that, if the Police thought there was an issue with the application, they would be at the hearing tonight.

- Mr Aylott also asked the Committee to consider the small number of objectors attending the meeting tonight. In relation to the written objectors, it was not known, from the papers, how far away they lived from the premises, and the Enforcement Officer had suggested the people above had made complaints. However, it was not known from considering the paper work if the objectors lived above the premises and this would be helpful to know.

Mr Aylott concluded his presentation by contending that there were no other complaints, other than those mentioned in page 4. It was important for the Committee to note that West Green Road was a 24/7 arterial road, and there were other premises, close to the license holder premises, that attracted noise i.e. the betting shops and off license. Mr Aylott advised that a lot of people use this Off -license to buy cans of alcohol and the license holder only sold bottles.

Mr Aylott referred to the plan of Holly Court – which was 2 blocks away from the premises and where a majority of the signatures to the petition about noise had been submitted from. Mr Aylott contended that this area was not affected by noise. The objectors had suggested that the premises will be a night club but the premises would be run as a pool club with a wine bar at the front and no charge for admission.

Questions to the applicant

In response to a question on the type operation that Mr Oliver would like to run, he envisaged his premises as a social club, split in two with a pool table area and sitting area.

In relation to Mr Eastwood experience of noise heard by residents living above the premises, this was related to people watching football and getting excited. Mr Oliver was ready and able to work with Mr Eastwood on the noise issues.

Responding to the Chair's question on recorded music having the potential to not meet one of license objectives, soundproofing had been looked into. The Chair contended that the services of an acoustic engineer would help ensure the premises were properly sound proofed. The cost of this was estimated to be £1500 to £2000. Mr Aylott contended that this should not be put as a condition but suggested that his client works with Mr Eastwood to ensure he is content with sound proofing being put in place, and then he may not need the services of an acoustic engineer.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Principal Lawyer advised the Committee that it can impose a condition on soundproofing and requiring engineer's advice.

The Chair explored the License holder's commitment to soundproofing and stressed soundproofing was expensive to complete properly and this would be difficult for the premises license holder to do if the financial turnover was not available. The license holder acknowledged this.

In response to a Councillor question about accepting the Enforcement Officer conditions at pages 5 and 6, paragraphs 1 to 23, of the supplementary pack Mr Aylott responded on behalf of Mr Oliver as follows:

- Prevention of noise from noise vibration – all doors remain closed, fitted with self closing devise – Agreed by Mr Oliver.
- Staff making sure door open as briefly as possible –Agreed by Mr Oliver.

- Lobby - costs money small premises- Mr Aylott asked the Committee to consider that if there is a person at the door, do you need a lobby area?
- Entire premises sound proofed? – Mr Oliver accepted this condition could be reworded following acoustic engineer representations.
- Regulated entertainment - already in operating schedule – Accepted by Mr Oliver.
- Doors and windows closed .Agreed by Mr Oliver.
- Rear side door alarm – Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Speakers freestanding – Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Sound limits - this is in condition [site boundary of premises] acceptable – Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Next two - either /or Client representations are to have noise limiter - in house system [last condition on the page 2]
- Outside areas not music for benefit of patrons – Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Equipment in exterior or foyer happy to accept this - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Signage - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Number of persons to use area outside. Agreed 5 [max is already 4 to
- Regular liaison meetings requested at review meetings - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Accept complaints book - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition
- No queuing, where people do queue SIA supervise. [Added condition] Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Already have condition from review that Signs communicate respecting local community. - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- SIA manage egress - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- A licensed door supervisor will be positioned on the exit door to ensure, as far as reasonably practical, so that patrons do not leave **with** drinks - Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Function of door supervisor covered by police **but nothing wrong with putting forward role of the SIA** .Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Door sign agreed- Mr Oliver agreed with this condition.
- Mr Oliver agreed a maximum of 5 customers allowed outside the premises, not 10 as set out in the report.

The Chair referred to [item 6 of page 28 proposed conditions for Chidos Lounge] which related to controlling noise at the premises. This condition was not as strong as Mr Eastwood's condition.

In response to the complaints about noise, Mr Aylott, responded on behalf of his client Mr Oliver. Having regard to the total number of complaints, there was not a great deal of evidence to support this issue. It was also not clear if the residents, living upstairs to the premises, had complained. Mr Aylott asked the Committee to consider the evidence to warrant the condition concerning making use of the services of an acoustic engineer. There were a lot of conditions in excess of the schedule and the Committee would need to consider their proportionality.

Mr Aylott concluded that a majority of the conditions set out by Mr Eastwood were in place – or could be dealt with easily. The only issue was the sound limiter and soundproofing.

Objections to the applicant - the Enforcement Officer – Mr Eastwood

The Enforcement Officer's overall response was that there needed to be good quality insulation of the premises as the noise from the premises would be significantly louder than general living noise. In Mr Eastwood's personal experience, he expected this cost to be 5 figures. It was useful to employ an acoustic engineer who would understand the type and level of noise that the sound proofing would need to mitigate.

Mr Aylott responded and contended that the cost to Mr Oliver, to make his premises soundproof, needed to be considered.

The Chair was clear with Mr Aylott that deliverability of the soundproofing would be considered.

Mr Aylott continued to stress that residents living upstairs to the premises had not attended the meeting.

Mr Aylott responded to an example of a breach of the licence indicated by Mr Eastwood on 14.05.2016 which was 22.35pm. Mr Aylott advised that timing of the event was not in breach of any conditions so no question of breach due to time.

Councillor questions to the applicant

In response to a question on why the application had attracted objections that are lengthy, Mr Oliver replied that the objections were not from residents living near premises. The premises were not a night club and this allegation had caused undue anxiety among residents. Also a lot of letters were on the same template with same message, i.e. nightclub opening near your home and imploring people to make objections. Mr Oliver suggested that incorrect facts about the premises being a night club had been circulated and was not how the premises would operate. The number of conditions put forward at page 27-28 of the pack suggested this maybe the way forward to alleviate concerns.

The Licensing Officer explained that quite a few of residents were from near Grove Park road. She had the originals which showed a majority from Grove Park road, West Green road, Holly Court, Citron road. Majority were from Grove Park road and there was no intention to mislead the Committee about the proximity of the residents to the premises.

Responses to Questions from Mr Aylott to Objectors

- In relation to the petition, this was an acceptable practice for concerned residents to undertake.
- There was no requirement for Mr Oliver to surrender a licence but he could do if he chose to.
- Mr Eastwood had personally visited premises several months ago.
- Residents worried about providing their addresses as worried about repercussions. Mr Aylott assured the resident that he was simply acting in his role as a lawyer challenging evidence. If addresses were not known then

cannot challenge adequately. Mr Oliver was willing to work with residents and neighbours and could provide a telephone number for them to call. If he was not aware of issues then he cannot deal with this.

- Residents in building hear noise 10 yards away and there was more noise when customers were parking in car park. Some other residents frightened to complain to Council let along go to premises and do this.

Mr Aylott advised that residents can make representations in confidence and keep a diary.

Closing addresses

Objectors

The residents attending were concerned about large numbers of people leaving the premises, at the same time, at 2am in the morning. This would be a significant issue for residents living near the car park. It was hoped that resident's views taken into consideration and they were amazed that this application has come forward.

Mr Eastwood – Enforcement Officer felt the premises were not suitable for regulated entertainment and the amount of work needed to implement the required quality sound proofing would be substantial in cost.

Applicant

Mr Aylott disagreed with Mr Eastwood, and reiterated that the decision has to be evidenced based. He referred to: the full quota of TEN's completed, disputed the 12th May complaint, reminded the Committee that the last visit to the premises by the Enforcement Officer was several months ago, and no other responsible authority had made a complaint. Mr Aylott stressed that the conditions put forward be proportionate and evidence based.

Mr Aylott contended that Mr Oliver had taken into account concerns of residents and tried to alleviate concerns. However, local resident's opposition had been galvanised due to incorrect night club story circulation.

Chair - adjourned meeting for resolution

RESOLVED:

The Committee carefully considered the new premises application for CHIDOS, representations made by the applicant, the Enforcement Response Team, resident's representations, as well as the Council's statement of licensing policy, and the guidance under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003.

Having considered the written representations and heard evidence from the applicant, the Enforcement Response Officer and 2 local residents, the Committee RESOLVED to grant the application as follows:

Opening Hours

Monday to Thursday 1000 to 0030 hours

Friday to Sunday 1000 to 0230 hours

Regulated entertainment: Live Music, Anything of a similar description to Live Music, Recorded Music or performance of Dance

Friday to Saturday

1900 to 0130 hours

Recorded Music

Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 0000 hours

Friday to Saturday 1000 to 0200 hours

Late Night Refreshment

Sunday to Thursday 2300 to 0000 hours

Friday to Saturday 2300 to 0200 hours

Supply of Alcohol

Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 0000 hours

Friday to Saturday 1000 to 0200 hours

For Consumption ON and OFF the premises

The Committee took into account the many representations about public nuisance and crime and disorder as submitted by local residents. These, in the main, related to an increased number of people congregating outside the premises drinking, urinating in the street, creating noise outside by loud talking and swearing, selling drugs, littering and abusive behaviour. The Committee felt that these concerns about nuisance caused outside the premises could not be ignored but felt that they could be adequately addressed and it could promote the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder and public nuisance by imposing the condition proposed by the police that the applicant employ SIA registered staff at the venue, together with the conditions proposed by the applicant at pages 27 and 28 of the agenda pack numbers 1-5 and 7- 13 and those proposed by Enforcement Response.

The Committee considered that these conditions, which include restricting the number of people outside, signage about appropriate behaviour and measures to reduce the number of people congregating, would be appropriate and proportionate to address resident's concerns and to promote all four licensing objectives but especially the prevention of crime and disorder and public nuisance.

The Committee heard the evidence from residents about the public nuisance that would be caused by persons using the car park near Holy Court, some 2 blocks away, but did not consider[having regard to the s182 guidance] that the applicant could be held responsible for this nuisance as it was beyond the vicinity of the premises.

The Committee carefully considered the evidence from the applicant that the premises were applying for a license for regulated entertainment but that the intention was not to operate a night club as suggested by some of the representations. Evidence was

presented of Temporary Event Notices that had been issued from May 2016 with some for events up to 3 a.m. and the fact that there had been no objections or complaints of noise arising from those events. The Committee gave this evidence very little weight as there had been no licensed regulated entertainment at those times.

The Committee carefully considered the evidence from the Enforcement Response Team about the likely public nuisance caused by airborne entertainment noise, structure borne noise or vibrations from entertainment.

The Enforcement Response Officer provided evidence that there had been complaints of noise nuisance and that he had visited the premises and the property above the premises and did not consider the premises to be suitable for regulated entertainment because of the age of the building and the proximity to residents above. He advised the Committee that the transmission of noise is bad from the TV, talking loudly and shouting. However, the Committee noted that only 2 complaints of noise from the premises were cited over the period of more than a year and that he had last visited, for a noise complaint, several months ago.

The Committee considered the Officer's professional opinion that the property was not suitable for regulated entertainment at all, noted the applicant's offer to install some sound proofing and noise limiters and the Noise Team's recommendations that these be installed if the Committee was minded to grant the application. The Committee considered that in this instance where there were grave concerns about whether any measures could make the property suitable for regulated entertainment and because of the lateness of the hours being applied for, it was appropriate to require the applicant to engage the services of an acoustic engineer to design a suitable scheme to be approved by the Council's Noise team. The applicant had offered to do so, although he did not want this to be a condition of the license. The Committee considered whether such a condition would be proportionate to prevent public nuisance. Given the costs involved, they decided that it would be, as in this case the feasibility and effectiveness of the measures were in question due to the type of premises, and the premises are located very close to residential premises which are likely to be significantly affected by regulated entertainment up to 1.30 a.m. or 2.00 a.m.

The Committee considered the alternative of not granting the license for regulated entertainment but based on the evidence felt that with appropriate and robust conditions the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance could be promoted. The conditions proposed are extensive but appropriate and proportionate for the residential location of the premises and the hours of the licensee activities applied for.

The Committee considered all of the conditions being proposed by the Enforcement Response Team and noted that the majority were agreed by the applicant which the Committee welcomed.

For the reasons given above, the Committee considered it appropriate and proportionate to impose the following conditions for the promotion of the licensing objectives of the prevention of public nuisance and crime and order and the protection of children from harm.

Conditions

Preventions of nuisance from noise/vibration

All doors and windows will remain closed during the licensed regulated entertainment activities or in any event after 11pm. The entrance door will be fitted with a self-closing device and staff required to ensure that it is not propped open. A member of staff or SIA shall be made responsible to ensure the door is opened for a brief period as possible. Where necessary adequate and suitable mechanical ventilation should be provided to public areas.

Entry/Exit to the premises will be restricted to the front door entrance opening to West Green Road.

A scheme of sound installation works and noise limiting equipment should be commissioned and implemented on those parts of the building envelope and fittings where noise breakout is occurring. The scheme should be designed in accordance with the recommendations of a competent acoustic engineer and be designed to a specification suitable to provide an effective level of sound to the building relative to its use. No regulated entertainment to take place until the scheme is approved by the Noise Team, installed and implemented.

The entire premises to be used for regulated entertainment will be sound proofed to prevent noise disturbance to neighbours.

The regulated entertainment licensable activity shall conclude 30 minutes before the premises is due to close to prevent excessive noise breakout as the premises empties.

The rear side fire door will be fitted with an alarm that alerts staff when the door has been opened.

Structure borne noise

All speakers are free standing, mounted on anti-vibration mats to prevent vibration transmission of sound energy to adjoining properties. No speakers will be attached to the structural walls.

Sound limits

The licensee shall ensure that no music is played in the licensed premises is audible at or within the site boundary of any residential property.

The level of amplified regulated entertainment shall be controlled by means of a limiting device set at a level which upon request may be agreed with the licensing authority. It will be a responsibility of the premises license holder to request assistance, in writing and to ensure that the limiter is working effectively.

Outside Areas

No music will be played in, or for the benefit of patrons in external areas of the premises.

No form of loudspeaker or sound amplification equipment is to be sited on or near the exterior premises or in or near any foyer, doorway, window or opening to the premises.

Signs shall be displayed in the external areas/on the frontage requesting patrons to recognise the residential nature of the area and conduct their behaviour accordingly. The management must reserve the right to ask patrons to move inside the premises or leave if it is felt that they could be disturbing neighbours.

The number of person permitted to utilise the external area/frontage will be restricted to a maximum of 5 and only to the front in the West Green Road.

Plant and machinery

All plant and machinery is correctly maintained and regularly serviced to ensure that it is operating efficiently and with minimal disturbance to neighbours arising from noise.

Dealing with complaints

A complaints book will be held on the premises to record details of any complaints received from neighbours. The information is to include, where disclosed, the complainant's name, locations. Date time and subsequent remedial action undertaken. This record must be made available at all times for inspection by Council Officers.

Regular liaison meetings will be held where specifically requested by residents to enable neighbours to raise concerns about any aspect of the licensed activities.

Where people queue to enter the premises a licensed door supervisor shall supervise and ensure the potential patrons behave in an acceptable manner.

Signs should be displayed requesting patrons to respect the neighbours and behave in a courteous manner.

The premise license holder shall ensure that prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at all exits requesting the public to respect the needs of local residents and to leave the premises and area quietly.

Door supervisors

The premises license holder shall ensure SIA registered staff will be employed at the venue, a minimum of one Sunday to Thursday and two Friday and Saturday, from 2100 hours until venue has closed to control entry to the venue, prevent crime/disorder in the venue and assist in the dispersal of clientele at closure of the venue.

The SIA registered staff will be positioned on the exit door to ensure, as far as reasonably practical, that patrons do not leave with drinks.

When the premises turn out, the SIA registered door supervisor shall supervise patrons and ensure they leave in a prompt and courteous manner, respecting neighbours.

A SIA registered door supervisors will patrol the cartilage of the premises to prevent patrons urinating in the public areas in the vicinity of the premises.

Prevention of nuisance from light

With regards to prevention of nuisance from light, illuminated external signage shall be switched off when the premises are closed.

CCTV

The premises License holder shall ensure that the premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system;

All entry and exit points will be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition. Includes coverage of all internal areas to which the public have access [except individual toilet cubicles] and external areas.

All recording shall be made available immediately upon the request of Police or authorised Officer throughout the preceding 31-day period.

The CCTV system should be updated and maintained according to the police recommendations.

A staff member from the premises who is conversant with the operation of the CCTV system shall be on the premises at all times when the premises are open to the public. This staff member must be able to show a police or authorised Council Officer recent data or footage when requested. The Premise License holder shall ensure that an incident log shall be kept at the premises, and made available immediately upon request by an authorised Officer of the Council or the Police, which will record the following:

- All crimes reported to the venue
- All ejections of patrons
- Any complaints received from neighbours
- Any incidents of disorder
- All seizures of drugs or offensive weapons
- Any faults in the CCTV system
- Any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service

The information should include, where disclosed, the complainant's name, locations, date time and subsequent remedial action undertaken.

The premise license holder shall ensure telephone calls for Taxis may be made for customers without charge on request.

The premise license holder and /or designated premises Supervisor shall encourage patrons awaiting collection to wait inside the premises.

Protection of children from harm

The 'Challenge 25 Scheme' shall be operated and relevant material shall be displayed at the premises. Only passport, photographic driving licenses or ID with the PASS logo [proof of Age Standards Scheme] may be accepted.

The premise license holder shall ensure that children under the age of 18 shall not be admitted to the premises after 21:00 unless they are accompanied by an adult.

Training

The premise license holder shall ensure that all relevant staff shall receive induction and refresher training relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises license. The training shall be recorded, ongoing and under constant review and made available to a relevant Responsible Authority upon reasonable request. Refresher training shall be undertaken by the relevant staff every 12 months and documented as above.

Refusals

The premise licence holder and/or DPS shall ensure that a written record of all refused sales is kept on premises. This record shall be made available to Police and/or local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.

14. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair

Date