



HILLINGDON
LONDON



Licensing Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 25
SEPTEMBER 2014

Time: 10.00 AM

Venue: CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH
STREET, UXBRIDGE UB8
1UW

**Meeting
Details:** Members of the Public and
Press are welcome to attend
this meeting

Councillors on the Committee:

Dominic Gilham (Chairman)
David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman)
Lynne Allen (Labour Lead)
Roy Chamdal
Janet Gardner
David Horne
Judy Kelly
Carol Melvin
John Morse
Brian Stead

This agenda and associated reports can be made available in other languages, in Braille, large print or on audio tape on request. Please contact us for further information.

Published: Wednesday, 17 September 2014
Contact: Danielle Watson
Tel: 01895 277 488
Fax: 01895 277 373
Email: dwatson@hillington.gov.uk

This Agenda is available online at:
<http://modgov.hillingdon.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CIId=257&Year=0>

Putting our residents first

Lloyd White
Head of Democratic Services
London Borough of Hillingdon,
3E/05, Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, UB8 1UW
www.hillingdon.gov.uk

Useful information

Bus routes 427, U1, U3, U4 and U7 all stop at the Civic Centre. Uxbridge underground station, with the Piccadilly and Metropolitan lines, is a short walk away. Limited parking is available at the Civic Centre. For details on availability and how to book a parking space, please contact Democratic Services

Please enter from the Council's main reception where you will be directed to the Committee Room. An Induction Loop System is available for use in the various meeting rooms. Please contact us for further information.

Please switch off any mobile telephones and BlackBerries™ before the meeting. Any recording of the meeting is not allowed, either using electronic, mobile or visual devices.

If there is a FIRE in the building the alarm will sound continuously. If there is a BOMB ALERT the alarm sounds intermittently. Please make your way to the nearest FIRE EXIT.



Agenda

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Declarations of Interest in matters coming before this meeting
- 3 Minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2014 **Page 1 - 4**
- 4 To confirm that items marked in Part 1 will be considered in Public

Part 1 - Members, Press and Public

- 5 Regulatory Services Update **Page 5 - 6**
- 6 Film Classifications **Page 7 - 8**
- 7 Mandatory Conditions **Page 9 - 24**
- 8 Interim Steps **Page 25 - 36**
- 9 Recent Decisions **Page 37 - 40**

This page is intentionally left blank



Minutes

LICENSING COMMITTEE

18 June 2014

**Meeting held at Committee Room 4 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Dominic Gilham (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Roy Chamdal, Janet Gardner, David Horne, Carol Melvin, John Morse and Brian Stead</p> <p>Also Present: Ian Wares, Acting Sgt, Metropolitan Police Service</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Stephanie Waterford, Licensing Services Manager, Ian Meens, Licensing Officer Sarah White, Legal Advisor, Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer</p>
4.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received for both Councillors Judy Kelly and Lynne Allen.</p>
5.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
6.	<p>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 17 APRIL 2014 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 17 April 2014 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
7.	<p>MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 5 JUNE 2014 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 5 June 2014 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
8.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT ITEMS MARKED IN PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1 public.</p>
9.	<p>LOCAL AUTHORITIES TO BE GIVEN MORE POWER TO CONTROL BETTING SHOPS (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and updated the Committee on a proposed reform to Planning Legislation to give Local Authorities more scope to refuse Betting Shop applications. There had been problems being able to refuse Betting Shops as they were often the same category as a bank or an estate agent and could open without the need for planning permission.</p> <p>The Government proposed that the changes to the use classes would give Local</p>

Authorities greater power to refuse applications in areas that were already saturated.

Officers also informed the Committee that the Government had tightened up controls on the advertising of gambling and was calling on the trade to take greater responsibility to protect users of gambling facilities. Customers who wished to bet over £50 in one play would have to interact with staff and pay over the counter before they were able to play. Officers informed Members that it would be the responsibility of the Betting Shop staff to control. Larger operators were required to offer and encourage customers to take up accounts so that players could track and monitor their spending via statements.

Proposed changes included implementing a screen on the machine at the start of play where the user would be required to set limits on how much they wish to spend and the duration of the gambling session. Pop up warning messages at regular intervals with pauses would also be introduced to encourage players to be more aware of their gambling. Members were keen to hear that the voluntary self exclusion system was being strengthened so that players could make a single request to be banned from Betting Shops on a wider basis. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport also had plans to strengthen education for 16-24 year olds to prevent underage children being exposed to gambling.

Members questioned how the proposed changes to the voluntary self exclusion system. Officers explained that these would be built into the operator conditions. The licence conditions would be enforced by the Local Authority. Members were concerned at what was classed as saturation. In some areas of the Borough there were more than 5 Betting Shops in a condensed area.

Members sought clarification in relation to the actual figure of Betting Shops as the national figure had not changed dramatically. Nationally there were approximately 9000 Betting Shops. Officers explained to Members that whilst there were a number of Betting Shops opening in Town Centres there were also a number that had closed. For example, a number of Public Houses had been closed due to low trade and Betting Shops which had traditionally been placed near these Public Houses had closed as a result.

Members concluded the discussion on the item by suggesting that Hillingdon's Local Plan needed to be amended to include a policy in relation to Betting Shop premises applications and their proposed location.

Resolved - That the Committee noted the information.

10. **WORLD CUP RELAXATION ORDER** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report detailing the recent legislation introduced by the Government to relax licensing hours for the duration of the World Cup Tournament 2014. Premises Licences and Club Premises Certificates would be extended for a maximum of 4 hours after the kick-off time. The latest kick-off time was at 9pm, meaning that the extension would end at 1am the following morning. Premises wishing to trade later during the World Cup Tournament would still need to apply for a Temporary Event Notice which would be subject to the usual consultation.

Officers informed Members that the legislation was only applicable to games played by the Men's Senior England Football Team as indicated in the report.

	Resolved - That the Committee noted the information.
	The meeting, which commenced at 10.00 am, closed at 10.49 am.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact on 01895. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Change of Structure and remit to the Licensing Service

Committee	Licensing Committee
Officer Contact	Claire Freeman, Residents Services
Papers with report	None
Ward(s) affected	All

SUMMARY

This report is to inform the Committee of the restructure within Public Protection Services which has created a new Regulatory Services Team. This team combines all the licensing activities previously carried out within the Licensing Service and the Environmental Health teams.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee note the information

INFORMATION

A re-structure was carried out in Public Protection Services in May 2014 which resulted in the creation of new team, called the Regulatory Services Team. This team includes all the activities previously carried out within the Licensing Services team and licensing functions previously dealt with by Environmental Health teams within Public Protection.

The Environmental Health licensing functions include:

- Special Treatment Licensing: Tattooing, Body piercing, beauty therapy treatments, spa pools, saunas and sunbed treatments.
- Animal Licensing: Animal Boarding, Dog Breeding establishments, Pet Shops, Riding establishments and Dangerous Wild Animal licences.
- Poisons Licensing

The purpose of putting these licensing activities together was to facilitate a more robust and flexible delivery of these similar activities such that residents and business would be able to deal with one team for many of their licensing requirements.

The Manager of the new Regulatory Services Team is Claire Freeman. She reports directly to the Public Protection Services Manager.

Claire's role is responsible for the day to day management of regulatory, licensing and permitting functions and to ensure competent, timely and efficient administration and enforcement of these processes. In addition, to ensure that committee needs are fully serviced and committee reports are developed in accordance with directorate policy.

Claire's background is in Environmental Health with 18 years experience of special treatments licensing, animal licensing and food health and safety inspections. Her last three years have been spent in the Transformation team managing projects and programme of work across several services within the council. These include; Environmental Health, Building Control, Trees and Landscapes, Property and Construction and Adult Social Care.

Stephanie Waterford has been appointed to the post of Senior Licensing Officer and will continue to be the point of contact for the committee and lead on all matters relating to the Licensing Act, Gambling Act, Street Trading and Sex establishments and Scrap metal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

None

Film Classifications Policy

Committee	Licensing Committee
Officer Contact	Stephanie Waterford, Residents Services
Papers with report	None
Ward(s) affected	All

SUMMARY

To update the Committee on the progress of the Film Classification Policy

RECOMMENDATION

That the committee note the update

INFORMATION

At the meeting of the full Committee in January 2014, Members were provided with information regarding film classifications and the associated powers available to the Licensing Authority under the Licensing Act 2003.

Members were concerned that any requests for film classifications could be complicated without a policy in place. Officers were instructed to investigate the matter further.

Officers have briefed the Cabinet Member for Finance, Property and Business Services on the matter and has now received instruction to start preparing a Film Classification Policy ready for final approval by the Cabinet Member.

Members will receive an update at the next meeting of the full Committee in January 2015.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

Changes to Mandatory Licensing Conditions

Committee	Licensing Committee
Officer Contact	Stephanie Waterford, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1 - Schedule of Mandatory Conditions Appendix 2 - Home Office Guidance
Ward(s) affected	All

SUMMARY

To notify the Committee of the recent and forthcoming changes to the Licensing Act 2003 Mandatory Conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee note the information.

INFORMATION

In May 2014, the Government introduced a Mandatory Condition relating to the permitted price for alcohol. From 28th May 2014, licence holders were required to comply with new conditions relating to the selling price of alcohol. The conditions contain a formula to assist licence holders with calculating the permitted price.

On 1st October 2014, in addition to the permitted price condition, The Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2014 will come into force which replaces the current schedule of Mandatory Conditions. The replacement schedule clarifies and changes the conditions relating to irresponsible drinks promotions. The conditions relating to free drinking water, alcohol measures and age verification still remain mandatory.

Appendix 1 contains a complete list of the current mandatory conditions applicable to Premises Licences.

In line with the most recent changes, the Government has released a guidance document explaining the conditions in more detail. A copy of the guidance is attached as Appendix 2.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

Mandatory Conditions

- 1) (1) The responsible person must ensure that staff on relevant premises do not carry out, arrange or participate in any irresponsible promotions in relation to the premises.
(2) In this paragraph, an irresponsible promotion means any one or more of the following activities, or substantially similar activities, carried on for the purpose of encouraging the sale or supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises—
 - (a) games or other activities which require or encourage, or are designed to require or encourage, individuals to—
 - (i) drink a quantity of alcohol within a time limit (other than to drink alcohol sold or supplied on the premises before the cessation of the period in which the responsible person is authorised to sell or supply alcohol), or
 - (ii) drink as much alcohol as possible (whether within a time limit or otherwise);
 - (b) provision of unlimited or unspecified quantities of alcohol free or for a fixed or discounted fee to the public or to a group defined by a particular characteristic in a manner which carries a significant risk of undermining a licensing objective;
 - (c) provision of free or discounted alcohol or any other thing as a prize to encourage or reward the purchase and consumption of alcohol over a period of 24 hours or less in a manner which carries a significant risk of undermining a licensing objective;
 - (d) selling or supplying alcohol in association with promotional posters or flyers on, or in the vicinity of, the premises which can reasonably be considered to condone, encourage or glamorise anti-social behaviour or to refer to the effects of drunkenness in any favourable manner;
 - (e) dispensing alcohol directly by one person into the mouth of another (other than where that other person is unable to drink without assistance by reason of disability).
- 2) The responsible person must ensure that free potable water is provided on request to customers where it is reasonably available.
- 3) (1) The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder must ensure that an age verification policy is adopted in respect of the premises in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol.
(2) The designated premises supervisor in relation to the premises licence must ensure that the supply of alcohol at the premises is carried on in accordance with the age verification policy.
(3) The policy must require individuals who appear to the responsible person to be under 18 years of age (or such older age as may be specified in the policy) to produce on request, before being served alcohol, identification bearing their photograph, date of birth and either—
 - (a) a holographic mark, or
 - (b) an ultraviolet feature.
- 4) The responsible person must ensure that—
 - (a) where any of the following alcoholic drinks is sold or supplied for consumption on the premises (other than alcoholic drinks sold or supplied having been made up

in advance ready for sale or supply in a securely closed container) it is available to customers in the following measures—

- (i) beer or cider: ½ pint;
- (ii) gin, rum, vodka or whisky: 25 ml or 35 ml; and
- (iii) still wine in a glass: 125 ml;

(b) these measures are displayed in a menu, price list or other printed material which is available to customers on the premises; and

(c) where a customer does not in relation to a sale of alcohol specify the quantity of alcohol to be sold, the customer is made aware that these measures are available.”

Mandatory Condition - Permitted Price

1. A relevant person shall ensure that no alcohol is sold or supplied for consumption on or off the premises for a price which is less than the permitted price.

2. For the purposes of the condition set out in paragraph 1—

(a) “duty” is to be construed in accordance with the Alcoholic Liquor Duties Act 1979(6);

(b) “permitted price” is the price found by applying the formula—

$$P = D + (D \times V)$$

where—

- (i) P is the permitted price,
- (ii) D is the amount of duty chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the duty were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol, and
- (iii) V is the rate of value added tax chargeable in relation to the alcohol as if the value added tax were charged on the date of the sale or supply of the alcohol;

(c) “relevant person” means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a premises licence-

- (i) the holder of the premises licence,
- (ii) the designated premises supervisor (if any) in respect of such a licence, or
- (iii) the personal licence holder who makes or authorises a supply of alcohol under such a licence;

(d) “relevant person” means, in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a club premises certificate, any member or officer of the club present on the premises in a capacity which enables the member or officer to prevent the supply in question; and

(e) “value added tax” means value added tax charged in accordance with the Value Added Tax Act 1994(7).

3. Where the permitted price given by Paragraph (b) of paragraph 2 would (apart from this paragraph) not be a whole number of pennies, the price given by that sub-paragraph shall be taken to be the price actually given by that sub-paragraph rounded up to the nearest penny.
4. (1) Sub-paragraph (2) applies where the permitted price given by Paragraph (b) of paragraph 2 on a day ("the first day") would be different from the permitted price on the next day ("the second day") as a result of a change to the rate of duty or value added tax.
(2) The permitted price which would apply on the first day applies to sales or supplies of alcohol which take place before the expiry of the period of 14 days beginning on the second day.

This page is intentionally left blank



Home Office

Guidance on Mandatory Licensing Conditions

For suppliers of alcohol and enforcement
authorities in England and Wales

September 2014

Contents

Introduction

- 1) Overview: Mandatory Licensing Conditions
- 2) October 2014 changes
- 3) Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the mandatory conditions at premises

Section 1: Irresponsible promotions

- 4) Drinking games
- 5) Provision of alcohol for a fixed or discounted fee
- 6) Rewards for consumption of alcohol
- 7) Promotional posters
- 8) Dispensing alcohol directly into the mouth

Section 2: Potable water

- 9) Provision of potable water

Section 3: Age verification

- 10) Age verification policy
- 11) Acceptable identification

Section 4: Small measures

- 12) Provision of small measures
- 13) Making customers aware

Annexes

Annex A: Model age verification policy

Introduction

Overview: Mandatory Licensing Conditions

The Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) Order 2010 (“the 2010 Order”) set out five new conditions that apply to all premises in England and Wales authorised to supply alcohol under a premises licence or club premises certificate. The first three of these conditions came into force on 6 April 2010, with the remaining two (which relate to premises applying an age verification policy and making available smaller measures of drinks) coming into force six months later to give premises more time to prepare.

On 28 May 2014, a new mandatory condition, banning the sale of alcohol below the cost of duty plus VAT, came into force. This means there are currently six mandatory licensing conditions.

October 2014 changes

The draft Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2014 (“the 2014 Order”) amends the 2010 Order to make provision to replace the mandatory conditions prescribed in the 2010 Order with the conditions prescribed in this order. The conditions will apply to all relevant premises licences and club premises certificates which authorise the supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises, with the exception of the age verification condition, which will **also** apply to licences and certificates which permit the supply of alcohol for consumption off the premises.

This will tighten the existing mandatory licensing conditions relating to irresponsible promotions, the provision of free water, the adoption and application of age verification policies and the provision of small measures at licensed premises.

The condition prohibiting the dispensing of alcohol directly by one person into the mouth of another (other than where that other person is unable to drink without assistance by reason of a disability) will cease to be a standalone condition and will instead be a part of the condition relating to irresponsible promotions. The 2014 Order is intended to result in a total of five mandatory conditions applying.

This order also removes the exception for table meals from the prohibition on irresponsible promotions relating to the provision of unlimited or unspecified quantities of alcohol for free or for a discount. However, this will not apply to an activity falling within the existing table meal exception that is available to an individual who holds a ticket or other written invitation in respect of that activity which was purchased by, or given to, that individual on or before 30 September 2014, and the activity takes place on or before 5 April 2015.

Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the mandatory conditions at premises

Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the mandatory conditions prescribed in the 2014 Order will, unless different provision is made in the legislation, fall to a ‘responsible person’. This is defined as:

- (a) in relation to licensed premises:
 - (i) the holder of a premises licence in respect of the premises,
 - (ii) the designated premises supervisor (if any) under such a licence, or

- (iii) any individual aged 18 or over who is authorised for the purposes of section 153 (4) of the Licensing Act 2003 by such a holder or supervisor,
- (b) in relation to premises in respect of which there is in force a club premises certificate, any member or officer of the club present on the premises in a capacity which enables him to prevent the supply in question.

In respect of the condition governing age verification, there are specific duties relating respectively to the holder of the premises licence or club premises certificate and designated premises supervisor.

Section 1: Irresponsible promotions

The 2014 Order states that the responsible person must ensure that staff on relevant premises do not carry out, arrange or participate in any irresponsible promotion, as listed below, where that promotion is carried on for the purpose of encouraging the sale of alcohol on the premises.

Drinking games

This includes any game or activity that requires or encourages (or is designed to require or encourage) individuals to drink a quantity of alcohol within a time limit, or to drink as much as possible. This does not include “drinking up time”, shortly before the end of licensed hours.

The application of this prohibition is not subject to a judgment of risk, and so any game or activity that falls within it would be in breach of the condition.

Examples of this type of activity include drinking relay races and drinking challenges based on quantity.

Provision of alcohol free or for a fixed or discounted fee

This prohibits the provision of an unlimited or unspecified quantity of alcohol for free or for a fixed or discounted fee if there is a significant risk that such provision would undermine a licensing objective.

Rewards for consumption of alcohol

The new conditions ban the provision of free or discounted alcohol or any other thing as a prize to encourage or reward the consumption of alcohol over a period of 24 hours or less if there is a significant risk that such provision would undermine a licensing objective.

‘Significant risk’

The application of these prohibitions is subject to an assessment in any case about whether the activity in question would give rise to a significant risk of breaching one or more of the four licensing objectives:

- The prevention of crime and disorder;
- Public safety;
- The prevention of public nuisance; and
- The protection of children from harm.

Factors that may be considered when deciding if a promotion is irresponsible may include:

- Type of promotion:
 - How big is the discount?
 - For how long does the discount apply?
- Potential customers:
 - Is there likely to be a significant increase in the number of customers?
 - What is the profile of the customer base?
- Type of premises:
 - Is it a high-volume vertical drinking establishment or a community pub?
- History of premises:
 - Have previous promotions been handled responsibly?

- Has the licence been reviewed recently?
- Have sufficient security measures been taken for any potential increase in the number of customers?

If there is any doubt as to whether the promotion you are planning to run falls foul of this new mandatory condition, we strongly recommend that you discuss your proposals with your local licensing authority and/or police before running the promotion.

Promotional posters

The 2014 Order prohibits the sale or supply of alcohol in association with promotional material on, or in the vicinity of, the premises which can be reasonably considered to condone, encourage or glamorise antisocial behaviour or refer to drunkenness favourably.

This includes all posters and flyers that may be used to publicise a promotion or event.

Dispensing alcohol directly into the mouth

The 2014 Order prohibits activities that involve alcohol being poured directly into the mouth of a customer by a member of staff. This includes activities such as the “dentist’s chair”.

This prohibition does not apply where a person is not able to drink without assistance because of a disability.

Section 2: Potable water

The 2014 Order provides that the responsible person must ensure that free potable water is provided on request for customers where it is reasonably available.

Many premises already offer free tap water. This condition means that responsible persons at all premises must ensure customers are provided with potable (drinking) water for free if they ask for it. It does not need to come from a tap. This helps people to space out their drinks and not become intoxicated quickly, which reduces the risk of crime and disorder occurring.

What is meant by “reasonably available” is a question of fact; for example, it may not be reasonable to expect free water to be available in premises for which the water supply had temporarily been lost because of a broken mains supply and where no alternative (for example, bottled water) is available.

In this section, the term ‘customer’ has its plain English definition.

Section 3: Age verification

Age Verification Policy

The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder must ensure that an age verification policy applies to the premises in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol.

This must as a minimum require individuals who appear to the person serving alcohol to be under the age of 18 years of age to produce on request (before being served alcohol) appropriate identification.

Where there is a designated premises supervisor, they have responsibility for ensuring that the sale of alcohol is carried on in accordance with the age verification policy in place.

This condition does not exclude best practice schemes such as Challenge 21 or Challenge 25 which require individuals who appear to be under an age which is greater than 18 to provide ID.

The condition does apply to companies that sell alcohol remotely (for example, online or by mail order). Since the condition requires that identification is produced on request, before alcohol is served, photo ID should be shown at or before the point of service.

An example age verification policy is available at Annex A. Please note, the model policy is intended to provide an example of a policy that meets the new mandatory condition. While responsible persons can fill in this model for their own premises in order to meet the condition, it is also acceptable for them to instead use a different age verification policy, as long as it meets the criteria set out in the legislation

Acceptable identification

Identification which is accepted as proof of age must bear the holder's photograph, date of birth, and either a holographic mark or ultraviolet feature. Examples of acceptable ID include photo card driving licences, passports, military identification or proof of age cards bearing the PASS hologram, although other forms of ID which meet the criteria laid out above are also acceptable.

Section 4: Small measures

Provision of small measures

The responsible person must ensure that the following drinks if sold or supplied for consumption on the premises are available in the following measures:

- beer or cider - half pint
- gin, rum, vodka or whisky - 25ml or 35ml
- still wine in a glass - 125ml

Making customers aware

As well as making the drinks available in the above measures, the responsible person must also make their availability clear on menus, price lists or other printed material, and ensure that these are available to customers on the premises (for example, at the bar).

Where a customer orders a drink listed above but does not specify the alcohol measure, the customer should be made aware of the range of measures available. This can be either verbally or by ensuring they have seen the printed materials on which their availability is listed. If the responsible person is satisfied that the customer has been made, and continues to be, aware of the range of measures available, the responsible person does not need to repeat that information in relation to each sale.

The above condition does not apply if the alcohol in question is sold or supplied having been made up in advance ready for sale or supply in a securely closed container. For example, if beer is only available in pre-sealed bottles the condition to make it available in ½ pints does not apply.

Annex A – Model Age Verification Policy

Premises Age Verification Policy

This policy applies in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol on the following premises

Name and address of premises

.....
.....
.....

Name of premises licence holder

.....

Name of designated premises supervisor

.....

1. This policy applies in relation to the sale or supply of alcohol on these premises.
2. For this policy the responsible person is one of the following:
 - the holder of the premises licence;
 - the designated premises supervisor;
 - a person aged 18 or over who is authorised to allow the sale or supply of alcohol by an under 18; OR
 - a member or officer of a club present on the club premises in a capacity which enables him or her to prevent the supply in question
3. Staff serving alcohol on the premises must require any individuals who appear to the responsible person to be under the age of 18 years of age to produce on request, before being served alcohol, identification bearing their photograph, date of birth, and a holographic mark.
4. Examples of appropriate identification include:
 - A passport
 - A photo card driving licence
 - A proof of age card bearing the PASS hologram
 - A military identification card
5. The premises licence holder or club premises certificate holder will ensure that staff are made aware of the existence and content of this policy.

Signed.....

PREMISES LICENCE HOLDER / CLUB PREMISES CERTIFICATE HOLDER

Licensing Act 2003 - Interim Steps

Committee	Licensing Committee
Officer Contact	Stephanie Waterford, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1: Court Orders in respect of the Victoria Public House Appendix 2: A selection of articles on the matter of Interim Steps
Ward(s) affected	All

SUMMARY

To inform the Committee of the recent conclusion to the Judicial Review application concerning the Victoria Public House, Hayes.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee note the information

INFORMATION

Members will be aware of the recent Summary Review case concerning the Victoria Public House where, following a complex summary review, the Licensing Sub-Committee South resolved to revoke the premises licence. The Sub-Committee also determined that the suspension imposed at the expedited review hearing, continue throughout the appeal period.

The point regarding the interim suspension prompted the licence holders to lodge an application with the High Court for a Judicial Review to challenge the duration of the suspension. The application was lodged on 11th July 2014.

On 17th July, the High Court granted the licence holders an 'Interim Relief Order' which allowed the Victoria to re-open pending the outcome of the Judicial Review.

The Council challenged this order and made submissions to the Court, including statements and legal arguments.

On 27th August 2014, the High Court refused permission for the Judicial Review to go ahead which also meant that the interim relief order was overturned. The Victoria Public House was ordered to close.

The Licence Holders of the Victoria Public House have lodged an appeal against the Council's decision with the Magistrates Court. The 23rd September 2014 has been set for a preliminary hearing. Members will be updated on this verbally at the meeting.

This and another 2 cases on the matter of interim steps over the summer have attracted much attention from the industry. A number of articles discussing the issue are annexed as Appendix 2.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Nil

PART 1 - MEMBERS, PUBLIC AND PRESS

This page is intentionally left blank



**In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division
Administrative Court**

CO Ref:

CO/3240/2014

In the matter of [an application for Judicial Review]

The Queen on the application of JASBINGER SINGH SARAI

versus

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

On the application for

Following consideration of the documents lodged by the claimant

Order by the Honourable Mr Justice Mostyn on 17 July 2014

1. The interim steps decisions of 23 May 2014 and 11 June 2014 concerning the licence of the Victoria Public House, 32 North Hyde Road, Hayes UB3 4NE are stayed until determination of the application for permission to seek judicial review or further order in the interim.
2. The order at para 1 above shall be reconsidered at the permission determination or at an earlier hearing on paper pursuant to para 3 below
3. There shall be liberty to the defendant or the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police to apply for an earlier hearing on paper to vary or discharge the order at para 1 above.
4. This order shall be served on the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police as an interested party and he shall be at liberty to make written submissions for the purposes of the permission determination.

REASONS

5. The law concerning the award of interim injunctions requires the court to have regard to (a) the underlying merits of the main claim and (b) whether any irreparable damage would be caused were the injunction not to be granted.
6. As to the merits I say no more than it seems to me that it is arguable that the claim would be arguable at the permission hearing. Certainly the statutory provisions concerning the evanescence (or otherwise) of interim steps is unhappily framed and has given rise to inconsistent judicial decisions. The controversy ought to be resolved. For what it is worth it seems to me that the approach of *Dingemans J* is logical.
7. Further it does seem as though the procedure adopted on 23 May 2014 was questionable to say the least.
8. If the interim steps are not lifted pro tem it seems highly likely that the claimants will suffer irreparable and severe economic damage.

Vincent Mostyn

Signed

Sent to the claimant, defendant and any interested party / the claimants, defendants, and any interested party's solicitors on:

17 JUL 2014

FORM 13 MPA v MARCH 2014 - Miscellaneous Paper, Application

Ref CON/PKD/JR/SARAI



**In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division
Administrative Court**

CO Ref:3240 /2014

In the matter of an application for Judicial Review

The Queen on the application of
SARAI
versus
London Borough of Hillingdon

**Application for permission to apply for Judicial Review
NOTIFICATION of the Judge's decision (CPR Part 54.11, 54.12)**

Following consideration of the documents lodged by the Claimant [and the Acknowledgement(s) of service filed by the Defendant and / or Interested Party]

Order by the Honourable Mr Justice Collins

Permission is hereby refused.

Reasons:

1. While the papers were put before me as a result of the defendant's application to set aside Mostyn J's order, it was obviously sensible to consider whether permission should be granted. I have decided that it should not and so the order of Mostyn J is inevitably discharged.
2. I have sympathy with the concerns about the conduct of the 23 May 2014 hearing. However, the committee for reasons which cannot be said to be arguably unlawful decided on 11 June 2014 that the licence should be revoked. This was based not only on serious crime but a breach of the licence conditions by public nuisance.
3. The legislation is badly drafted and is by no means clear. Whatever the true construction, there clearly should be a procedure which enables there to be a possibility of suspending the effect of a determination or of any Interim order pending appeal. Section 53B(1) enables an Interim order to be made 'pending the determination of the review', but s.53C(2)(c) makes clear (if it is to be given any sensible meaning) that such an Interim order may extend to when the determination comes into effect. However, s.53V(2)(b) enables the committee to modify any interim order by imposing different and perhaps less onerous measures. In this case it decided to revoke the licence so that the suspension would inevitably continue in force. The committee clearly also decided that the licence should continue to be suspended. That it was on whatever is the true construction of the statutory provisions entitled to do.
4. There is undoubtedly a serious lacuna in the legislation since it was in my view be disproportionate in terms of Article 1 Protocol 1 if there were no power to suspend an adverse decision pending appeal or a fortiori no power to give immediate effect to a decision that the application under s.53A was not made out albeit an Interim order had been made. S.53C(2)(c) does indeed seem to be an unnecessary provision since s.53B(1) makes clear that interim steps are what they say, namely steps taken pending determination and once a determination has come into effect they will automatically lapse. However, it must be assumed that Parliament meant s.53C(2)(c) to have some effect and in my judgment it only makes sense if it implies and must enable justice to be done carry within it by the words in brackets a power to vary or indeed to remove any interim steps pending the expiry of 21 days or any appeal.
5. If the magistrates have no power to suspend, as to do justice they should have, it is clearly essential that a hearing takes place as soon as possible and the magistrates court must pull out all stops to ensure a speedy hearing.
6. I recognise that the provisions are far from clear and it may be a judicial decision is needed. But this is the wrong case since it is clear beyond doubt that for good reason the committee decided that the suspension should remain pending appeal. This therefore is not the case for the matter to be determined since the facts are against the claimants.

Signed: Sir Andrew Collins

Sent / Handed to the claimant, defendant and any interested party / the claimant's, defendant's, and any interested party's solicitors on (date): **27 AUG 2014**

Solicitors:

Ref No. **CON / PKD / JR / SARAI**

Notes for the Claimant

If you request the decision to be reconsidered at a hearing in open court, you must complete and serve the enclosed FORM within 7 days of the service of this order - CPR 54.12

News: Another opportunity missed.

Date: 01/09/2014

Author/Solicitor: Nick Walton

I wrote in July about the Interim Steps issue and Judge Roscoe's decision (you can read that eNews [here](#)).

A further development has arisen over the summer.

The Victoria Pub in Hayes was subject to a summary review by the Police alleging significant issues with drugs and, at a subsequent Interim Steps hearing, the Premises Licence was suspended. This was followed by revocation of the Premises Licence at the substantive hearing. A representations hearing followed to vary the interim steps to allow the premises to open pending the appeal hearing. The request was refused and an immediate claim for a Judicial Review followed partly because of alleged irregularities at the interim steps hearing. At the same time an interim application to allow the premises to reopen was placed before Mostyn J. A decision regarding the request for Judicial Review was deferred pending submissions from the Police and Licensing Authority however Mostyn J did grant an order lifting the interim steps because of the claimants potential to 'suffer irremediable and severe economic damage'.

On 27 August 2014 Collins J considered the papers from both sides in his deliberation regarding the outstanding claim for a Judicial Review. In discharging the order made by Mostyn J and refusal of the claim for the Judicial Review he did however make some encouraging comments for the future prospects in respect of a Judicial Decision regarding Interim Steps.

Collins seemed to suggest that in his judgment that in his view 'Interim Steps are what they say, namely steps taken pending determination and once determination has come into effect they will automatically lapse' but then went on to say:

'However, it must be assumed that Parliament meant s.53C(2)(c) to have some effect and in my judgment it only makes sense if it implies and must enable justice to be done carry within it by the words in brackets a power to vary or indeed to remove any interim steps pending the expiry of 21 days or any appeal.'

He further went on to say that 'the legislation is badly drafted and is by no means clear. Whatever the construction there clearly should be a procedure which enables there to be a possibility of suspending the effect of the determination or of any interim order pending Appeal'.

Is this one step further forward in getting a Judicial decision or one step back? The grant of the Judicial Review proceedings which will determine the Interim Steps issue is still only going to happen when an 'appropriate' case comes along. Who knows when that will be however, until the issue is decided we will continue to live with the uncertainty generated from these alternative decisions.

To view this story and our other E news, download the Poppleston Allen MyLicence App. This contains many easy to use features including a Temporary Event Notice Calculator, a search facility for your local licensing office and a facility for storing your licence details. Download the App for free [here](#)

For more information please contact: [Nick Walton](#)

Source: Poppleston Allen

[Copyright](#), [Terms & Privacy](#) | [Cookie Policy](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Client Zone](#)

Authorised and Regulated by the [Solicitors Regulation Authority](#) (SRA No 78244)

Nottingham (0115) 953 8500

London - (020) 7936 5869

subscribers@popall.co.uk

twitter.com/popall



search

barrister by surname ▼

barrister by practice area ▼

search

"top quality"
The Legal 500

Summer-Y Justice?

The heat goes to the head in the High Court dealing with Summary Reviews

In two cases over the summer the High Court granted injunctions staying the effect of interim steps imposed on a summary review of a premises licence. Readers will be familiar with the controversy over the effect of the interim steps in the summary review procedure set out in sections 53A-53C of the Licensing Act 2003. This has gone on since 2011 when DJ Knight declared in [Oates](#) that section 53C(2)(c) was "incapable of understanding by any human being".

In **R (Saral) v LB Hillingdon** the premises licence of the Victoria Public House was suspended at the interim steps stage and then revoked at the full review hearing. According to the approach taken in [R \(93 Feet East Ltd\) v Tower Hamlets](#) [2013] EWHC 2716, the interim steps remain in place until any appeal has been disposed of, therefore the premises should have stayed closed. But an application to the High Court produced an injunction which allowed the premises to reopen.

In an apparently copy-cat action, a similar injunction was obtained by the British Luxury Club in **R (Tennic Ltd) v LB Camden**. The injunction allowed the premises to open under its pre-review licensing conditions and hours pending appeal to the magistrates against the decision on review.

Licensing authorities will see this as a worrying development. There were serious issues at stake in both cases: the Victoria had been the subject of a drugs raid, with 9 arrests; at British Luxury Club the police were concerned that a vicious attack on a bouncer had been deliberately targeted and might lead to further attacks. Yet in both cases the injunction was granted on the papers, without any consideration of the views of the licensing authority and the police.

The problem with this is that getting an injunction is often a good deal easier than getting it set aside. This is made worse during the High Court summer vacation because judges are in short supply, so just getting the matter listed can be difficult. Sadly not much has changed since Munby J.'s resounding quotation from Magna Carta in **R (Casey) v Restormel BC** [2007] EWHC 2254. In Camden's case it took a week to get the court to consider its views; with Hillingdon it was 41 days. That is a long time for a premises to operate unregulated after a senior police officer has certified it is associated with serious crime or disorder. This delay was not through want of effort by the authorities, but rather lack of court resources.

In both cases the injunctions were stopped as soon as the views of the licensing authority and the police were taken into account. In both cases permission to apply for judicial review was refused on the papers, meaning that the underlying claims were not arguable. This only highlights the concern over the time it took for a balanced consideration of the claims.

A number of the judges dealing with these cases suggested that the meaning of the legislation needs further consideration in court, but ultimately these cases were not right on their facts for a test case. It is certain that this will not be the last time that this issue appears in the High Court.

[Rory Clarke](#) acted for the London Borough of Camden in the British Luxury Club case and for Tower Hamlets in 93 Feet East Ltd.

One Interim Step Forward - Two Steps Back

Published Date: 29/Aug/2014

Collins J refuses permission for judicial review and rules that the legislation is badly drafted and contains an omission.

What a summer it has been for the interim steps debacle. With cases coming out of the woodwork all year, in a shock decision this week, the High Court has thrown the whole question of interim steps out of Court and back into turmoil. In a short judgment refusing permission for judicial review, Collins J also confirmed that: "The legislation is badly drafted and is by no means clear." and "There is undoubtedly a serious lacuna in the legislation". However, he stated that the case before him on its facts was not the case to address these issues:

"I recognise that the provisions are far from clear and it may be a judicial decision is needed. But this is the wrong case since it is clear beyond doubt that for good reason the committee decided that the suspension should remain pending appeal. This therefore is not the case for the matter to be determined since the facts are against the claimants."

On the 15 May 2014 the Metropolitan Police made an application for a summary review under s53A LA2003 against the Victoria Pub in Hayes. The Police made a series of allegations against the premises relating to drug dealing by patrons which were hotly contested.

In an ex-parte first hearing by the Police, the Licensing Committee suspended the licence. The Licensees made representations, and after some initial issues in getting the Council to list the matter within 48 hours, the representations against the interim step of suspension were heard in a second interim steps hearing on 23 May 2014. The Police were notified of this hearing, but did not attend and were not represented.

The second hearing for the Licensees' representations against their suspension was given a time allocation of five minutes. Part of the Judicial Review claim was that this in itself had breached the Licensees' human rights. This was hotly denied by the Council, who filed evidence with the Court to contradict the Licensees' claim that they had only been afforded five minutes to make their case.

According to that evidence, the original five minute allocation had in fact been further extended to afford an additional two minutes in closing, if the Police turned up to make representations. The Police were only to be given three minutes. (As it happens, the Police did not turn up, so this extended time appeared unnecessary to the Council.)

The evidence also pointed out that Counsel for the Licensees had turned up with a ten page note of submissions. According to the Council's evidence, the Licensees were further accommodated in that the Committee took "at least four to five minutes reading while they were waiting to see if the Police turned up."

Further, according to the evidence, Claimant's counsel "was in fact given over five minutes to speak; between six or seven minutes", and this was noted down in the Minutes by the clerk.

The evidence goes on to point out that the sub-committee spent, in estimation, "no less than six minutes" deliberating on this matter in private before giving their decision to continue the suspension. And it was also pointed out that the Police had only needed five minutes at the original hearing to convince the sub-committee to impose the suspension in the first place, so parity would appear to have been satisfied.

At the conclusion of the allotted time the Chair of the Committee left the room. The 23rd May 2014 was local council

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Chair of the Committee for the 10th July 2014, was held on election day. The decision to suspend was upheld.

Thereafter, in a lengthy full review hearing, on the 11th June, the evidence was thoroughly disputed, and both versions of events fully canvassed. The Committee made a decision to revoke the licence, based upon the Police version of events, and also made a separate decision to continue the suspension of the licence as an interim step, pending any Magistrates' Court appeal.

The Licensees appealed to the Magistrates', and to date, the matter has not yet even been listed for directions. In the meantime, the Licensees lodged an immediate Claim for Judicial Review with the Court, to stay the decision of the Sub-Committee to impose the interim step of suspension in the first place, making complaint about the procedure in the hearing of 23rd May 2014, and also challenging the interpretation of the statute that sees interim steps extending beyond review, and seeking judicial guidance on that important point generally.

At the same time, the Licensees made an application for emergency interim relief from the Court, to stay the determination of the Committee, and to allow them to carry on trading, pending the determination of the Court on the substantive Judicial Review Claim.

In an Order dated 17th July 2014, the Honourable Mr Justice Mostyn allowed that interim application, and re-opened the premises, giving his reasons as follows:

"5. The law concerning the award of interim injunctions requires the court to have regard to (a) the underlying merits of the main claim and (b) whether any irreparable damage would be caused were the Injunction not to be granted.

6. As to the merits I say no more than it seems to me that it is arguable that the claim would be arguable at the permission hearing. Certainly the statutory provisions concerning the evanescence (or otherwise) of Interim steps is unhappily framed and has given rise to inconsistent judicial decisions. The controversy ought to be resolved. For what it is worth it seems to me that the approach of *Dingemans J* is logical.

7. Further it does seem as though the procedure adopted on 23 May 2014 was questionable to say the least.

8. If the interim steps are not lifted pro tem it seems highly likely that the claimants will suffer irreparable and severe economic damage."

The premises started to trade again.

On 25th July, the London Borough of Hillingdon (Gerald Gouriet QC acting) the Metropolitan Police (Gary Grant acting) put in responses and applications to close the premises down again, stating that, on the matter of clarification of the statute, all was clear, and there was: "no serious issue to be tried". Accordingly, the Court was urged to refuse permission for the Claim.

Heavy reliance was placed upon the recent case of *Metropolitan Police –v- Mayfair Realty Ltd* in the Westminster Magistrates' Court before District Judge Roscoe on the 22nd July 2014.

This case is also respectfully suggested to have added a touch more heat than light to the whole debate.

In *Mayfair Realty*, the District Judge stated that:

"23. The intention of section 53B is, in my view clear. It is to set out the requirement of and procedure for a LA to consider if it is necessary to take interim steps. Although a LA is obliged to consider whether or not it should take interim steps under section 53A(2), it is not obliged to take such steps. It states: "... whether it is necessary to take interim steps pending the determination of the review applied for...". My understanding of that is the phrase "pending the determination of the review..." relates to the period in which it may take such interim steps. It does not relate to the longevity of those steps."

Collins J in the latest judgment would appear to disagree with that particular piece of statutory interpretation:

“S.53C(2)(c) does indeed seem to be an unnecessary provision since s.53B(1) makes clear that interim steps are what they say, namely steps taken pending determination and once a determination has come into effect they will automatically lapse.”

In *Mayfield Realty*, DJ Roscoe went on:

“29. If one allows for my interpretation of the meaning of section 53B(1) it allows the meaning of section 53C(2)(c) to become clearer. There is no other provision that deals with the lapse or expiry of the interim steps. Accordingly, section 53C(2)(c) deals with that. It makes it clear that the LA has a duty to resolve what happens to the interim steps. Its responsibility is to terminate the interim steps (the only exception being if the effect of the interim steps continues by virtue of the determination made by the LA). Put simply it must either terminate or ratify the interim steps. That decision does not take effect, however, until the expiry of the period set out in 53C(11).”

Again, it is respectfully suggested that if the decision to ratify the interim steps did not ‘take effect’ until the expiry of the period set out in 53C(11), then we wouldn’t be arguing about it. That was, essentially, one of the arguments before *Dingemans J* in *93 Feet East*, which he found “interesting”, but declined to resolve.

Back to *The Victoria*. Upon consideration of the application of the Council and Police to close the Victoria Pub again, and to refuse permission for Judicial Review, the Honourable Mr Justice Collins made his decision on the papers alone, without hearing argument on 27th August 2014.

He said:

‘Reasons:

1. While the papers were put before me as a result of the defendant’s application to set aside Mostyn J’s order, it was obviously sensible to consider whether permission should be granted. I have decided that it should not and so the order of Mostyn J is inevitably discharged.

2. I have sympathy with the concerns about the conduct of the 23 May 2014 hearing. However, the committee for reasons which cannot be said to be arguably unlawful decided on 11 June 2014 that

the licence should be revoked. This was based not only on serious crime but a breach of the licence conditions by public nuisance.

3. The legislation is badly drafted and is by no means clear. Whatever the true construction, there clearly should be a procedure which enables there to be a possibility of suspending the effect of a determination or of any Interim order pending appeal. Section 53B(1) enables an Interim order to be made ‘pending the determination of the review’, but s.53C(2)(c) makes clear (if it is to be given any sensible meaning) that such an interim order may extend to when the determination comes into effect. However, s.53C(2)(b) enables the committee to modify any interim order by imposing different and perhaps less onerous measures. In this case it decided to revoke the licence so that the suspension would inevitably continue in force. The committee clearly also decided that the licence should continue to be suspended. That it was on whatever is the true construction of the statutory provisions entitled to do.

4. There is undoubtedly a serious lacuna in the legislation since it was in my view be disproportionate in terms of Article 1 Protocol 1 if there were no power to suspend an adverse decision pending appeal or a fortiori no power to give immediate effect to a decision that the application under s.53A was not made out albeit an Interim order had been made. S.53C(2)(c) does indeed seem to be an unnecessary provision since s.53B(1) makes clear that interim steps are what they say, namely steps taken pending determination and once a determination has come into effect they will automatically lapse. However, it must be assumed that Parliament meant s.53C(2)(c) to have some effect and in my judgment it only makes sense if it implies and must enable justice to be done carry within it by the words in brackets a power to vary or indeed to remove any interim steps pending the expiry of 21 days or any appeal.

5. If the magistrates have no power to suspend, as to do justice they should have, it is clearly essential that a hearing takes place as soon as possible and the magistrates court must pull out all stops to ensure a speedy hearing.

6. I recognise that the provisions are far from clear and it may be a judicial decision is needed. But this is the wrong case since it is clear beyond doubt that for good reason the committee decided that the suspension should remain pending appeal. This therefore is not the case for the matter to be determined since the facts are against the claimants.”

All wording is precisely as it appears on the Order.

This is a salutary ruling for those who have scoffed that the legislation is clear, and that they understand it completely. If the clear meaning of anything eludes Collins J, then it is obscure beyond dispute, and those who claim to have mastered it entirely have obviously stopped thinking too early.

It brings to mind the much maligned District Judge Knight in the almost forgotten Gary Oates case in which she said: “I will not claim to understand section S53C(2)(c) because I think it defies understanding by any human being”.

We now, therefore, have four cases on the table: Gary Oates; 93 Feet East; Mayfair Realty and now, The Victoria.

It appears to be recognised that there is a question that needs answering, and an answer to be had – but this is comfortless with no hint as to what it might be, or when it might come.

Licensees must continue to endure the frustration of the National Interim Steps Lottery.

Licensing Authorities must make their decisions in the teeth of conflicting interpretations of legislation now judicially

acknowledged to be a mess, in the knowledge that one of these cases, one of these days will have all the right ingredients to be the Golden Ticket back to the High Court again.

Just to make the game more interesting, Mayfair Realty and Gary Oates have now both approved, apparently, multiple challenges to interim steps decisions, including after the full review hearing has concluded. The principles said to be behind this facility, and the way in which it is to be exercised are, of course, entirely different, but there seems to be some agreement that it is possible and proper. This will give rise to some interesting situations.

It looks as though Interim Steps just took another step away from resolution.

Sarah Clover

Kings Chambers

29th August 2014

(Sarah Clover was instructed by S Z Solicitors for the Claimant Licensees).

Post a comment

Name:

Email:

 (optional)

Comment:

Gerald Gouriet QC - Interim Steps

Published Date: 04/Sep/2014

The assertion in Sarah Clover's news article ("One Interim Step Forward, Two Steps Back", 29.8.14) that the decision of Collins J in *Sarai v London Borough of Hillingdon* came as a "shock" should perhaps be taken with a pinch of salt. There have been two decisions by district judges on the duration of interim steps, and three by High Court judges. The decision by District Judge Roscoe in the *Amika* appeal was fully argued by Queen's Counsel on both sides: the Judge (in a reserved judgement) came to the conclusion that on the plain meaning of the words of the statute interim steps lasted until final determination of the section 53C review, i.e. until the disposal of any appeal. A contrary decision was taken by a district judge in *Halton Magistrates' Court*, but one who confessed that she did not understand the meaning of section 53(2)(c), and was of the opinion that it defied any human understanding. Happily, *Dingemans J* did not labour under any such difficulty in the *93 Feet Street East* decision, and although he found the provisions for interim steps clumsily worded, he ruled that it was unarguable that they fell away at the first section 53C hearing, and he refused permission to bring a judicial review accordingly. A second High Court Judge, *Mostyn J* said (on a paper application) that he found *Dingeman J's* approach to the construction of section 53C "logical" – not quite a ringing endorsement for the proposition that *Dingeman J* was wrong. A third High Court judge (*Collins J*; again on a paper application) has now refused permission to judicially review the same point as arose in the *Hillingdon* case, insisting (with respect, quite rightly) that s. 53(C), however badly drafted, has to be given meaning, and that meaning necessarily implies that interim steps remain in force pending any appeal against a s. 53C review decision. The potential for injustice, so I read his short judgment, is cured by inferring a power to vary interim steps at the review hearing if justice requires it.

I speak from a personal view-point only, and with a perhaps flawed memory of the facts (I am on holiday!), but I find myself entirely unshocked by the latest decision, which not only accords with the words of the section (however badly drafted) but with common sense. In sporting terms we have two judges who heard full argument, teamed with two judges who decided on the papers, versus one judge who candidly admitted she didn't understand the provision in question. Not what I would call a score-draw.

Gerald Gouriet QC
Francis Taylor Building
3.9.2014

Post a comment

Name:

 *

Email:

 (optional)

Comment:

// *

Recent Decisions

Committee	Licensing Committee
Officer Contact	Stephanie Waterford, Residents Services
Papers with report	Appendix 1 - Schedule of Licensing Sub-Committee Decisions
Ward(s) affected	All

SUMMARY

To inform the Committee of recent licensing decisions made by Licensing Sub-Committees

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee note the information

INFORMATION

Appendix 1 contains recent cases determined by Licensing Sub-Committees.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Nil

This page is intentionally left blank

A list of recent Licensing Sub-Committee decisions

Date Determined	Application details	Reason for Hearing	Decision
28 February 2014	Application for a Personal Licence	Police objection	Refused
28 February 2014	Variation to Club Premises Certificate for Ickenham Cricket Club	Objections from local residents on public nuisance grounds	Granted with conditions
19 May 2014	Expedited Review Application for The Victoria Public House	Expedited review application made by the Chief Officer of Police for the borough due to serious crime/disorder	Licence suspended pending full review
23 February 2014	Representations Hearing against the Interim Suspension for The Victoria Public House	Representations against interim steps must be made to the Licensing Sub-Committee only	Suspension of licence to remain in force
11 June 2014	Full premises licence review following the expedited review for The Victoria Public House	Full review following expedited review	Licence revoked
08 August 2014	Cancellation of Gaming Machine Permit	Non-payment of annual fees	Permit cancelled
08 August 2014	Application for a Street Trading Licence for Asha London Ltd, Marlborough Parade, Uxbridge Road, Hillingdon	Objections from Ward Councillors	Licence Granted

This page is intentionally left blank