

## Minutes

### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

12 January 2026

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street,  
Uxbridge, UB8 1UW



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillor Darran Davies (Chair) Councillor Kuldeep Lakhmana Councillor Janet Gardner</p> <p><b>Applicant's representatives:</b> Jeremy Bank – lawyer representing Tesco Hardish Purewal – Licensing at Tesco Wilson Dias – Store Manager</p> <p><b>Interested Party:</b> Ms Shabnam Asgar – Interested Party Miss Asgar – Interested Party's representative</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Chantelle McLeod, Legal Advisor Dan Ferrer, Licensing Team Manager Ryan Dell, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward Councillor Councillor Mohammed Islam, Ward Councillor Councillor Scott Farley, Ward Councillor Georgina Cotterell, Prosecution Lawyer</p>
22.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
23.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
24.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I.</p>
25.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

26. **APPLICATION FOR THE GRANT OF A PREMISES LICENCE: TESCO EXPRESS, 34 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON UB7 7BZ** (*Agenda Item 5*)

The Licensing Team Manager introduced the application submitted by Tesco Stores Ltd under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 for a new premises licence at Tesco Express, 34 Station Road, West Drayton, UB7 7BZ.

The application was for Sale of Alcohol: 06:00–00:00, Monday – Sunday; and Late-Night Refreshment: 23:00–00:00, Monday – Sunday.

The application was received by the Licensing Team on 13 November 2025 and the closing date for representations was 11 December 2025.

A local press notice was published on 19 November 2025, and six blue notices were displayed and verified around the High Street and Ferrers Avenue, meeting statutory advertising requirements.

A petition had been received from the lead petitioner, Ms Shabnam Asgar, on 10 December 2025. The original petition contained 127 signatures; however, only 21 signatures were deemed valid because each sheet must reference the licensing objectives and the premises concerned; and full addresses, including postcodes, must be provided. Verification phone calls were made to signatories. Twenty signatures were from West Drayton residents; one was from Hayes. Ms Asgar is also the current licence holder and Designated Premises Supervisor for West Drayton Convenience Store, 18A Station Road.

No valid representations had been received from Responsible Authorities.

Members asked if any Members Enquiries had been lodged. The Licensing Team Manager confirmed that no enquiries or representations had been received by the deadline of 11 December 2025. An enquiry received after the closing date was not valid and the Ward Councillor was advised accordingly. There were no representations from responsible authorities.

**APPLICANT**

It was noted that individual signatories to the petition did not represent separate representations.

The application related to a Tesco Express, which was Tesco's smallest store format, aimed at local residents and workers purchasing top-up shopping for approximately one to two days.

No responsible authorities had objected to the application.

A late-night refreshment licence was required only because hot drink vending machines used a token payment system. If the Sub-Committee wished to restrict late-night refreshment solely to vending machine usage, Tesco would accept such a condition.

The Licensing Act presumes the granting of applications unless there was evidence-based justification to restrict. Responsible Authorities were experts in their fields; the absence of objections should be given substantial weight.

The Committee was referred to the plans in the agenda papers. Alcohol shelving was positioned in visible monitored areas near tills, and was only a small footprint within the store.

Tesco Express stocked a modest alcohol range (typically 80–120 products), with alcohol representing typically 5–14% of store sales (a notable exception was the store next to Lords Cricket Ground, which sold a high amount of champagne). Alcohol promotions were limited to meal-deal combinations; no standalone alcohol promotions were run in Express stores.

Intended opening hours were 06:00 - 00:00. The applicant noted that Sales of alcohol between 06:00–07:00 accounted for less than 0.01% of total sales in comparable stores. Highest alcohol demand typically occurs between 15:30 - 19:00.

Tesco operated approximately 2,500 Express format stores. Internal processes analysed local demographics and risks before selecting potential sites. If local risk indicators cannot be mitigated, Tesco did not proceed with opening a store.

Tesco adopted age-restriction policies before the Licensing Act 2003 was implemented. Challenge 25 was embedded and enforced through till-locking:

- Age-restricted items trigger the till to lock
- Staff must choose “YES” (customer appears over 25 or provides valid ID) or “NO” (sale refused)

Tills displayed daily prompts showing the date of birth of someone turning 18 that day.

All staff were trained before working on the shop floor. Refresher training was delivered at least twice a year. Supervisory and management staff received conflict-resolution training.

There were quarterly “Safe and Legal” audits by Area Managers and quarterly mystery-shopping tests using independent 18–19-year-olds. Results were shared with police where requested.

Tesco operated a strict “You Say No, We Say No” policy – management will not overturn staff refusals of alcohol sales. No bonuses or incentives were linked to alcohol sales.

Tesco conducted rolling risk assessments every eight weeks. Security guards were employed where risk assessments indicated a need. Body-worn cameras and staff headsets were common. CCTV included approximately 12 cameras with fixed viewpoints on entrances, tills, and alcohol displays. Stores can control entry at the front door when required.

The Tesco “Hub” was a 24/7 support hub in Birmingham where staff can remotely access CCTV to assist staff in real time; and can liaise with local police where necessary.

Tesco employed regional rapid-response security teams. Response time in the Hillingdon area was typically around 15 minutes.

Tesco did not tolerate ASB. Staff asked individuals to leave; if they refuse, police are called. Persistent offenders’ images were added to a “rogues gallery”. Local store managers reviewed ASB trends weekly with area management.

All incidents were logged digitally by shift managers. Tesco often appeared frequently in police incident logs because staff proactively report external issues visible from the store frontage.

Tesco aimed to minimise local impact and maintain positive relationships. Representatives were willing to join local residents' groups. Examples of community involvement include fundraising through "Stronger Start" projects in local schools. The store's management team maintained regular contact with the local Community Safety Team.

Members asked whether the store would have an external cash machine. The applicant confirmed there was no indication of this on current plans; any installation would be a planning matter.

Members asked for further explanation on the Good Neighbour Policy. The applicant described efforts to minimise environmental impact, listen to residents, and engage with local concerns. Tesco representatives confirmed they would not welcome customers who repeatedly caused nuisance.

Members queried how ASB and refusals were logged. The applicant confirmed digital logging via office systems, shared internally and available for police reference.

Members asked whether experienced staff would be deployed at the new store. Tesco committed to appointing an experienced manager (typically with at least two years' experience), supported by three team leaders.

Additional staff would be recruited from local stores or externally, with full training provided before store opening.

The applicant concluded by reaffirming Tesco's commitment to promoting the licensing objectives and operating responsibly within the local community. The Chair thanked the representatives for their detailed submission.

## **INTERESTED PARTIES**

The Interested Party explained that some signatories had not given their full address due to GDPR and privacy concerns. Signatories were local residents.

It was clarified that only signatures meeting the Council's petition policy requirements can be counted. Residents who wished to speak at the hearing would have needed to submit individual valid representations before the statutory deadline. Members of the public present who had not made their own representation could not address the Sub-Committee.

The Interested Party and their representative presented several concerns relevant to the area surrounding the application:

### Parking and congestion

There were only six marked parking spaces in the vicinity of the premises. Many nearby businesses had converted their parking areas to private use, reducing available public parking. The Interested Party had personally received multiple parking fines due to the scarcity of nearby parking. There was concern that a Tesco Express would significantly increase traffic and worsen congestion. The

rear access road was narrow and already difficult for residents to navigate.

#### Existing traffic levels

Traffic in the area had significantly increased since they had moved to the area in 2006. A previous Tesco Express that operated nearby had frequently drew around 15 cars at any given time. The new location lacked capacity to absorb similar levels of demand.

#### Road safety

The Interested Party referenced a recent serious road accident involving a large vehicle and a pedestrian, resulting in severe injury, to illustrate safety concerns for elderly residents and children.

#### Impact on local businesses

The Interested Party operated a long-standing local business (since 2006) which opened from 5am–2pm. A Tesco Express would significantly affect trade for small independent businesses. Tesco, as a large corporation, would be unaffected by local competition, but smaller businesses could suffer.

#### Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour

Shoplifting was already a problem in the area; Tesco Express stores were vulnerable to crime and may attract individuals likely to shoplift; and increased crime would negatively impact the neighbourhood.

#### Existing licensed retailers

Multiple shops on the road already held alcohol licences and sold similar products. They argued there is no need for an additional premises selling alcohol, particularly as existing shops begin sales at around 08:00; and a larger Tesco store is a nine-minute walk away.

#### Noise pollution

A new store would add to noise pollution.

#### Notification issues

The Interested Party reported that some residents did not receive notification informing them of the Tesco application. They only became aware when a planning notice was observed on the door of 34 Station Road while walking past.

The Chair reiterated that the Sub-Committee can only consider matters relevant to the licensing objectives, not planning issues or commercial competition. Examples of issues outside the Sub-Committee's remit included parking allocation; general planning concerns; commercial competition between businesses; and traffic not directly linked to licensing activities

The Interested Party suggested that their shop would be willing to install an ATM to meet community need, noting that a previous local ATM had been removed. The Interested Party stated that they already provide cashback services to support local residents.

The Chair thanked the Interested Party for attending.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Chair asked the Licensing Team Manager to confirm the requirements for petition validity. The Licensing Team Manager confirmed that names and full addresses were required to verify that signatories reside within the borough.

It was confirmed that six statutory notices were displayed and the application was advertised in a local newspaper. Therefore, all statutory advertising obligations had been fulfilled.

Members referenced the petitioner's comments about existing noise issues and asked whether these had been reported to the police, and how far their property was from the proposed licensed premises. The Interested Party noted that their property was three shops away from the proposed Tesco. Noise complaints had been made previously to the Council by residents and neighbours. Issues included noise from shop shutters, fans and activity at night. The Licensing Team Manager confirmed that no noise-related representations had been submitted by Environmental Health or any other Responsible Authority.

No Ward Councillor complaints had been recorded.

It was reiterated that the Sub-Committee must assess the application strictly against the four licensing objectives. Issues such as general parking scarcity, road layout, traffic pressures, and delivery arrangements, fell under planning regulations, not licensing legislation. Only where such matters directly relate to public nuisance or crime and disorder arising from licensable activity could they be relevant.

Members highlighted the petitioner's references to 'need' and commercial competition. The Chair clarified that 'need' was not a licensing consideration. Even if many licensed premises already exist in the area, the Sub-Committee cannot evaluate whether an additional store is necessary.

Members asked, if the area experiences a high prevalence of street drinkers or anti-social behaviour, why the police had not submitted any representation. The Chair emphasised that the Sub-Committee must rely on evidence, particularly from Responsible Authorities. The petitioner reiterated concerns about existing alcohol-related issues. The Licensing Team Manager confirmed that the police had made no representation, and therefore no official concerns had been raised regarding crime and disorder in relation to this application.

## **CLOSING REMARKS**

### Licensing Team Manager

The Licensing Team Manager summarised that the petition was the only representation received before the closing date. No Responsible Authorities had submitted representations.

When the petition was received, the Licensing Team had contacted individuals where possible. Some signatories voluntarily provided postcodes and were therefore included within the 21 valid signatures. Others declined to give full details and were therefore excluded in accordance with Council policy. The Licensing Team ensured no individual was included unless they consented to providing the required information.

### Interested Party

The Interested Party reiterated their objection to the application. Over 100 residents had originally opposed the proposal, and the petitioner maintained that local residents

did not need an additional premises selling alcohol. The petitioner expressed concerns about increased anti-social behaviour, additional nuisance, and the fact that there was no shortage of alcohol availability in the area.

#### Applicant

Tesco considered itself an excellent operator and had demonstrated multiple examples of implementing and promoting best practice. The applicant believed the proposed premises will not undermine the licensing objectives, and the Sub-Committee had heard evidence of the systems and safeguards in place. There were no objections from any Responsible Authority, which the applicant emphasised as a significant factor. The applicant acknowledged the concerns raised by the petitioner, but noted that the primary objections related to need and competition, which were not relevant licensing considerations.

The applicant reminded the Sub-Committee that the premises was not yet open. If any of the concerns expressed today were ever realised, the Licensing Act provided a mechanism for a review of the licence. On that basis, the applicant asked the Sub-Committee to grant the application.

### **COMMITTEE DELIBERATION**

All parties were asked to leave the room while the Sub-Committee considered its decision.

All parties were invited back to the meeting for the Chair to announce the decision of the Sub-Committee.

### **CONSIDERATIONS**

The Sub-Committee noted that this was an application for the grant of a new premises licence for the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises and late-night refreshment in the form of hot drinks, ancillary to the business.

The Sub-Committee considered all relevant evidence made available to it and in doing so took the following into account:

- Licensing Objectives, Licensing Act 2003
- Hillingdon's Licensing Policy
- Guidance issued by the Secretary of State under S.182 of the Licensing Act 2003

### **THE DECISION**

The Sub-Committee resolved to **GRANT** the application for a new premises licence as applied for.

#### **Reasons for Decision:**

The Sub-Committee noted that no representations had been received from any Responsible Authorities, nor had any objections been submitted by local residents (other than the single representation received), Members' Enquiries, or ward councillors within the statutory timeframe.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Interested Party, who had operated a business in

the locality for approximately 20 years. Concerns were raised regarding potential anti-social behaviour, increased lorry movements, parking pressures, deliveries, and possible noise nuisance from air conditioning units.

After careful consideration, the Sub-Committee concluded that the concerns presented were largely speculative and unsupported by substantive evidence. Many issues raised related to matters of planning control, commercial competition, or general business impact, rather than matters falling within the remit of the licensing objectives.

In accordance with paragraphs 9.3 and 9.4 of the Section 182 Guidance, the Sub-Committee placed no weight on arguments concerning commercial competition, market demand, or the potential impact on another business, as these are not relevant considerations under the Licensing Act 2003.

The Sub-Committee further noted that the petition referred to by the Interested Party formed part of their representation and therefore constituted one single representation only.

The Sub-Committee was not persuaded that the concerns raised could be directly attributed to the grant of the premises licence, particularly given:

- the absence of objective supporting evidence; and
- the lack of any representations from Responsible Authorities particularly, the Police, Environmental Health or the Planning Authority.

The Sub-Committee recognised that matters such as planning, parking, highway safety, deliveries, and noise associated with commercial premises are primarily addressed by other regulatory regimes and fall outside the licensing remit unless there is clear evidence that they would directly undermine the licensing objectives.

Given the overall lack of evidential basis, the Sub-Committee was unable to attach significant weight to the concerns raised.

The Sub-Committee was satisfied that the application demonstrated robust management measures to promote the licensing objectives, including staff training, supervision, digital refusal logs, and access to the internal support hub.

On balance, the Sub-Committee concluded that granting the premises licence would not undermine the licensing objectives.

## **Appeal**

The relevant applicant for the premises licence or any other person who made relevant representations to the application may appeal against the Council's decision to the Justices Clerk at the Uxbridge Magistrates Court. Such an appeal may be brought within 21 days of receipt of this Notice of Decision.

No decision made by the Council will have effect during the time period within which an appeal may be brought and until such time that any appeal has been determined or abandoned.

The Sub-Committee advises as a comfort to residents and a warning to the licensee that the licence may be reviewed and could potentially be revoked if licence conditions are not adhered to and/or if the premises are managed in a manner which does not uphold the licensing objectives

	<p>The Applicant will be deemed to have received this decision letter, two days after the date on the accompanying letter, which will be posted by 1st class mail.</p> <p>This Decision Notice will be circulated to all parties within 5 working days.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 10.00 am, closed at 11.40 am.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services - email: [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk) on . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**