



Please ask for Brian Offiler  
Direct Line: 01246 345229  
Fax: 01246 345252  
Email: [committee.services@chesterfield.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@chesterfield.gov.uk)

The Chair and Members of Licensing  
Committee - Group 2  
Councillors Bellamy, Avis Murphy,  
Brunt, Derbyshire, Peter Innes,  
Redihough

27 March, 2018

Dear Councillor,

**AGENDA SUPPLEMENT**

Please see attached the additional documents for the agenda item(s) listed below for the meeting of the LICENSING COMMITTEE - GROUP 2 to be held on WEDNESDAY, 28 MARCH 2018, the agenda for which has already been published.

4. Application for a New Premises Licence by Layals Limited, in respect of The Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Stand Road, Newbold, Chesterfield, S41 8SJ. (LC 170) (Pages 3 - 80)

Yours sincerely,

Local Government and Regulatory Law Manager and Monitoring Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

## For publication

**Application for a New Premises Licence by Layals Limited, in  
respect of  
The Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Stand Road, Newbold,  
Chesterfield, S41 8SJ. (LC170)**

---

Meeting: Licensing Committee

Date: Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> March 2018

Cabinet portfolio: Health and Wellbeing

Report by: Steve Ashby, Licensing Officer

---

## **For publication**

---

### 1.0 **Purpose of report**

- 1.1 This report is submitted in relation to the above committee and is tendered further to my report of 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018.
- 1.2 It includes additional information that has come to light or has been submitted since compilation of the original report was completed.
- 1.3 The purpose of this additional report is to provide Members the opportunity to view the additional information that has been compiled and submitted in respect of this application.

- 1.4 This will further assist the Members in determining the application made by Layals Limited for a new premises licence in respect of

The Cricketers Inn Convenience Store,  
Stand Road,  
Newbold,  
Chesterfield,  
S41 8SJ.

to which a representation has been made by an interested party.

## 2.0 **Additional Information**

- 2.1 On Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2018 the solicitor acting for the applicant in this matter submitted an e-mail to the licensing department which provided additional information in response to the representation made against the application. This e-mail can be seen at Appendix 10.

- 2.2 The e-mail referenced a stated case *Daniel Thwaites Plc v Wirral Borough Magistrates' Court v The Saughall Massie Conservation Society, Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council*  
This will form part of the legal argument to be presented on behalf of the applicant and can be seen at Appendix 11 and 11A.

- 2.3 The e-mail also contained information on previous test purchase operation conducted at premises under the stewardship of the applicant. The letters are attached at Appendices 12 and 12A. They indicate that between 2006 and 2016, these premises were visited some 28 times with test purchases being attempted to buy age restricted products

including alcohol, tobacco and lottery tickets. The sales were refused on each occasion.

2.4 Finally, the e-mail requests information on licensed premises within the vicinity of the premises subject to application.

2.5 The information is sought in respect of premises licences held at the below locations to allow their operating hours and conditions to be reviewed.

- Kandola Food store - 2-4 Occupation Road, S41 8TH
- Spar - 359B Sheffield Road, S41 8LQ
- Premier Whittington Moor - 381-385 Sheffield Road, S41

These 3 stores are under half mile.

- Maans Store - 65 Whittington Hill, S41 9EZ
- Spar - Unit 1, Little Moor centre, S41 8QN
- Mc Colls - 2 Little Moor centre, New bold, S41 8QW

2.6 The information requested was provided by e-mail and this e-mail can be seen at Appendix 13, along with the licence information that was requested at Appendices 13A to 13E.

### 3.0 **Recommendation.**

That the Committee be made aware of this additional information when determining the premises licence application.



Steve Ashby  
LICENSING OFFICER  
26<sup>th</sup> March 2018

For more information on this report please contact the author,  
Steve Ashby on 01246 345780, email  
steve.ashby@chesterfield.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**From:** Elaine Ibbotson [mailto:EIbbotson@john-gaunt.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Patrick Robson  
**Sent:** 23 March 2018 15:05  
**To:** Steve Ashby  
**Cc:** Chesterfield Licensing  
**Subject:** Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Steve

Thank you for letting me know the representor will not be attending.

I will check with my client about any letters of support from local residents but in the meantime, please find attached copies of passed test purchases for premises Mr Singh operated for numerous years.

When I have a moment I will probably produce a summary table of these and a bundle to bring next week.

In addition, my client mentioned that there are a number of other convenience stores in the area as listed below. Please would you be able to provide a copy of the Premises Licence for these so I can review their operating hours and conditions.

I am not intending to serve other licences documents on which to rely but if that is the case I will let you know – if you could supply copies of these licences as soon as possible, that would be appreciated.

Finally, for the moment, you will no doubt be wholly unsurprised that I will be referencing the Thwaites case in the hearing if you needed to make your legal advisor aware.

I attach a copy of the full case as well as an excerpt of the pertinent sections of paragraph 63. I will be referring the requirement of real evidence of issues and relevance and importance of absence of any representation with Responsible Authorities.

#### List of premises

- 1) Kandola Food store - 2-4 Occupation Road, S41 8TH
  - 2) Spar - 359B Sheffield Road, S41 8LQ
  - 3) Premier Whittington Moor - 381-385 Sheffield Road, S41
- These 3 stores are under half mile.
- 4) Maans Store - 65 Whittington Hill, S41 9EZ
  - 5) Spar - Unit 1, Little Moor centre, S41 8QN
  - 6) Mc Colls - 2 Little Moor centre, New bold, S41 8QW

#### Kind Regards

#### Patrick Robson

Associate  
Sent by Elaine Ibbotson

PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk | [www.john-gaunt.co.uk](http://www.john-gaunt.co.uk)  
T: 0114 266 8664 | M: 07841 451 440 | F: 0114 267 9613



Omega Court | 372-374 Cemetery Road | Sheffield | S11 8FT

[Premises Licences](#) | [Personal Licences](#) | [DPS Changes](#) | [Temporary Event Notices](#)  
[APLH Courses](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Due Diligence](#) | [Betting and Gaming](#) | [eLearningPlus](#)

For more details on our services please click on the links above.

**From:** Steve Ashby [<mailto:Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 22 March 2018 16:21

**To:** Patrick Robson <[PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk)>; Steve Ashby <[Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Many thanks for the update Mr Robson.

I'm out of the office on a course this week but back on monday 26th should you need any additional information. (you have probably seen my "out of office reply").

I have been informed that no one is available to attend from the committee making the representation. They will rely on their written submission.

I understood your client might have gathered some letters of support from local residents. If so I can circulate copies of those with the TP information to ensure their acceptance on Wednesday.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can help at all.

Kind regards

Steve

Sent from my Windows Phone

---

**From:** [Patrick Robson](#)

**Sent:** 22/03/2018 14:49

**To:** [Steve Ashby](#)

**Subject:** Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Steve

Just to let you know that I am formally instructed by Layals Limited for the hearing next week for Cricketers Inn convenience Store.

I will look to forward some documents to you proof of past test purchases (at numerous stores) at some point soon.

Currently, the intention is for me to attend with Mr Singh (DPS).

Should you have any queries in the meantime, please let me know.

**Kind Regards**  
**Patrick Robson**

Associate  
Sent by Elaine Ibbotson

[PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk) | [www.john-gaunt.co.uk](http://www.john-gaunt.co.uk)  
**T:** 0114 266 8664 | **M:** 07841 451 440 | **F:** 0114 267 9613



Omega Court | 372-374 Cemetery Road | Sheffield | S11 8FT  
Premises Licences | [Personal Licences](#) | [DPS Changes](#) | [Temporary Event Notices](#)  
[APLH Courses](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Due Diligence](#) | [Betting and Gaming](#) | [eLearningPlus](#)  
For more details on our services please click on the links above.

Partners: Tim Shield (569713) | Michelle Hazlewood (569714) | Christopher Grunert  
Associates: Paul Henocq | Patrick Robson  
Consultants: John Gaunt | Katharine Redford  
Practice Manager: Jonathan Pupius

John Gaunt & Partners authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority - SRA No. 173393

CAUTION

This email is intended to be confidential to the person to whom it is addressed and may be legally privileged.  
If you are not the intended recipient, please contact us by email or telephone and please delete the message from your system immediately.

Any unauthorised disclosure of information contained in this communication is strictly prohibited.

We use the word "partner" to refer either to a partner of John Gaunt & Partners (the "firm"); an office holder in a partner; or an employee or consultant of the firm with equivalent standing and qualifications.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content and is believed to be clean.

◁ This email is confidential, may be legally privileged & may contain personal views that are not the views of Chesterfield Borough Council. It is intended solely for the addressee. Under the Data Protection Act 1998 & the Freedom of Information Act 2000 the contents of this email may be disclosed. Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments. Chesterfield Borough Council reserves the right to monitor both sent & received emails.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content by [MailScanner](#), and is believed to be clean.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content and is believed to be clean.

This page is intentionally left blank

Status:  Positive or Neutral Judicial Treatment

**Daniel Thwaites Plc v Wirral Borough Magistrates' Court v The Saughall  
Massie Conservation Society, Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council**

Case No: CO/5533/2006

High Court of Justice Queen's Bench Division Administrative Court

6 May 2008

**[2008] EWHC 838 (Admin)**

**2008 WL 1968943**

Before: The Honourable Mrs Justice Black

Date: 06/05/2008, Hearing date: 10th March 2008

## Representation

David MW Pickup (instructed by Naphens plc ) for the Claimant.

The Defendant did not appear and was not represented.

David Flood (instructed by Messrs Kirwans ) for the 1st Interested Party.

Matthew Copeland (instructed by Wirral MBC ) for the 2nd Interested Party.

## Approved Judgment

Black J :

1 This is an application by Daniel Thwaites Plc ("the Claimant") for judicial review of a licensing decision made by the Wirral Magistrates' Court ("the Magistrates' Court") on 5 April 2006 and that court's decision on 21 April 2006 concerning the costs of the proceedings. The Claimant seeks an order quashing both decisions. Permission to apply for judicial review was granted by Mr Justice Pitchford on 2 November 2006.

## The factual background

2 The Claimant owns the Saughall Hotel in Saughall Massie, Wirral which it operates as licensed premises ("the premises"). It originally held a licence under the [Licensing Act 1964](#) . In June 2005, it commenced an application to the Licensing Sub-Committee of the Metropolitan Borough of Wirral ("the licensing authority") for the existing licence to be converted to a premises licence under the [Licensing Act 2003](#) and for the licence to be varied simultaneously.

3 In essence, the Claimant was seeking to conduct business at the premises for longer hours than were permitted under the original licence. The police did not support the extension of the hours to the extent that the Claimant initially proposed. The Claimant agreed to restrict the hours to those that were acceptable to the police. Accordingly, the licensing authority was asked to grant a licence that would permit music and dancing to 11 p.m. and alcohol sales until midnight on all nights except Friday and Saturday and, on Friday and Saturday nights, music and dancing to midnight and alcohol sales until 1 p.m., with the doors closing one hour after the last alcohol sale every night.

4 The police withdrew their representations against the modified proposals and did not appear before the licensing authority when the matter was heard on 23 August 2005. No representations were made by the Wirral Environmental Health Services either. However, there was opposition to the proposals at the hearing from the Saughall Massie Conservation Society (“the First Interested Party”) and other Saughall Massie residents.

5 The Claimant told the licensing authority at the hearing that the hours of operation at the premises would not vary significantly from the existing hours of operation and that the application for extended hours was to allow flexibility to open later “on special occasions” This was a matter of which the licensing authority took note as is recorded in the minutes of their determination.

6 The licence was granted in the modified terms requested together with an additional hour for licensable activities and an extra 30 minutes for the hours the premises were to be open to the public over Christmas and at the major bank holidays. Special arrangements were also permitted for New Year's Eve. The licensing authority removed certain conditions that had been imposed on the old licence (requiring all alcohol to be consumed within 20 minutes of the last alcohol sale and banning children under 14 from the bar) and imposed other conditions which were obviously aimed at controlling noise, namely that the area outside must be cleared by 11 p.m., that the premises must promote the use of taxi firms which use a call-back system, that all doors and windows must be kept closed when regulated entertainment was provided and that prominent notices should be placed on the premises requiring customers to leave quietly.

7 The Saughall Massie Conservation Society and “others” appealed against the licensing decision to the Magistrates' Court on the ground that the licensing authority's decision “was not made with a view to promotion of and in accordance with the licensing objectives pursuant to [Section 4, Part 2 of the Licensing Act 2003](#)”.

8 The appeal occupied the Magistrates' Court from 3–5 April 2006. The respondents to the appeal were the licensing authority and the Claimant which both defended the licensing authority's decision. Witnesses were called including Saughall Massie residents, Police Sergeant Yehya who dealt with the stance of the Merseyside police, and Mr Miller, the manager of the premises.

9 The justices granted the appeal. Their Reasons run to 3 pages of typescript, one page of which is entirely taken up with setting out the new hours of operation they imposed. These permitted entertainment until 11 p.m. and alcohol sales until 11.30 p.m. on all nights except Friday and Saturday when entertainment would be permitted until 11.30 p.m. and alcohol sales until midnight. The premises could remain open to the public until midnight on all nights except Friday and Saturday when they could close at 1 a.m.. Similar provisions were imposed to those imposed by the licensing authority in relation to later opening at Christmas and major bank holidays and the provisions relating to New Year's Eve and the conditions of the licence remained unaltered.

10 The new licence had come into effect on 24 November 2005 so the new arrangements had been running for several months by the time of the hearing before the Magistrates' Court. There had been no formal or recorded complaints against the premises under the old or the new regime as the justices acknowledged in their Reasons. The residents who gave evidence were fearful of problems if the extended hours were allowed in the summer. The Chairman of the Conservation Society, who gave oral evidence, spoke of people urinating in the gardens and a problem with litter. It appears from the statement filed by the Chairman of the Bench for these judicial review proceedings that evidence was also given of interference with machinery on nearby Diamond Farm. The justices' Reasons make no reference at all to these matters. As to the statements of the “Witnesses of the Appellant”, they say simply that they have read and considered them but attached little or no weight to them.

11 The justices and their legal advisor have filed a considerable amount of material in response to the judicial review proceedings, in all 31 closely typed pages. These comprise their Response to the Claim, statements from Alistair Beere (who was the chairman of the bench), Mary Woodhouse (another of the bench) and Stephen Pickstock (the legal advisor), and what is said in the index to be a document by Mr Beere from which he prepared his statement. There was limited argument before me as to the status of these documents and the weight that I should give to them. It was not submitted that I should decline to have *any* regard to them although I think it is fair to say that it was common ground between the parties, rightly in my view, that I should concentrate principally on the Reasons. It is established by authorities such as [R v Westminster](#)

[City Council ex p Ermakov \[1996\] 2 All ER 302](#) that the court can admit evidence to elucidate or, exceptionally, correct or add to the reasons given by the decision maker at the time of the decision but that it should be very cautious about doing so. The function of such evidence should generally be elucidation not fundamental alteration, confirmation not contradiction. In the circumstances, I have read carefully what the magistrates have provided but approached its role in the judicial review proceedings cautiously.

### **The broad nature of the claim in relation to the licensing decision**

12 The Claimant argues that the Magistrates' Court decision is unlawful for a number of reasons. It is argued that the decision was not in line with the philosophy of the [Licensing Act 2003](#) ("the Act") and imposed restrictions on the Claimant's operation which were not necessary to promote the licensing objectives set out in that Act, that it was based on speculation rather than evidence, that it took into account irrelevant considerations and failed to take into account proper considerations, and that it was a decision to which no properly directed magistrates' court could have come on the evidence. In so far as the court imposed conditions as to the time at which the premises must close, it is submitted that this was not a matter which can be regulated under the Act. It is further argued that the magistrates failed to give adequate reasons for their decision.

### **The legal background**

13 The [Licensing Act 2003](#) was intended to provide a "more efficient" "more responsive" and "flexible" system of licensing which did not interfere unnecessarily. It aimed to give business greater freedom and flexibility to meet the expectations of customers and to provide greater choice for consumers whilst protecting local residents from disturbance and anti-social behaviour.

14 Note 12 of the explanatory notes to the Act gives an indication of the approach to be taken under the Act. It reads:

"12. In contrast to the existing law, the Act does not prescribe the days or the opening hours when alcohol may be sold by retail for consumption on or off premises. Nor does it specify when other licensable activities may be carried on. Instead, the applicant for a premises licence or a club premises certificate will be able to choose the days and the hours during which they wish to be authorised to carry on licensable activities at the premises for which a licence is sought. The licence will be granted on those terms unless, following the making of representations to the licensing authority, the authority considers it necessary to reject the application or vary those terms for the purpose of promoting the licensing objectives."

15 [Section 1](#) of the Act provides:

"S1

(1) For the purposes of this Act the following are licensable activities—

(a) the sale by retail of alcohol,

(b) [clubs]

(c) the provision of regulated entertainment, and

(d) the provision of late night refreshment."

16 To carry on a licensable activity, a premises licence granted under [Part 3](#) of the Act is generally required, [section 2](#) . Application for a premises licence must be made to the relevant

licensing authority, [section 17\(1\)](#) .

17 By virtue of [section 4](#) , the licensing authority must carry out all its functions under the Act (including its functions in relation to determining an application for a premises licence or an application for a variation of a premises licence) with a view to promoting the “licensing objectives”. These are set out in [section 4](#) as follows:

“S 4

(2) The licensing objectives are—

(a) the prevention of crime and disorder;

(b) public safety;

(c) the prevention of public nuisance; and

(d) the protection of children from harm.”

18 In carrying out its licensing functions, by virtue of [section 4\(3\)](#) the licensing authority must also have regard to its licensing statement published under [section 5](#) and any guidance issued by the Secretary of State under [section 182](#) .

19 [Section 182](#) obliges the Secretary of State to issue guidance to licensing authorities on the discharge of their functions under the Act. Guidance was issued in July 2004 (“the Guidance”). It was updated in June 2007 but it is the original guidance that is relevant in this case. In any event, none of the changes made are material to the issues I have to determine.

20 The Foreword says that the Guidance

“is intended to aid licensing authorities in carrying out their functions under the 2003 Act and to ensure the spread of best practice and greater consistency of approach. This does not mean we are intent on eroding local discretion. On the contrary, the legislation is fundamentally based on local decision-making informed by local knowledge and local people. Our intention is to encourage and improve good operating practice, promote partnership and to drive out unjustified inconsistencies and poor practice.”

21 As the Guidance says in paragraph 1.7, it does not replace the statutory provisions of the Act or add to its scope. Paragraph 2.3 says:

“Among other things, section 4 of the 2003 Act provides that in carrying out its functions a licensing authority must have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State under section 182. The requirement is therefore binding on all licensing authorities to that extent. However, it is recognised that the Guidance cannot anticipate every possible scenario or set of circumstances that may arise and so long as the Guidance has been properly and carefully understood and considered, licensing authorities may depart from it if they have reason to do so. When doing so, licensing authorities will need to give full reasons for their actions. Departure from the Guidance could give rise to an appeal or judicial review, and the reasons given will then be a key consideration for the courts when considering the lawfulness and merits of any decision taken.”

22 An application to the licensing authority for a premises licence must be accompanied by an operating schedule in the prescribed form including a statement of the matters set out in [section 17\(4\)](#) which are as follows:

- “(a) the relevant licensable activities,
- (b) the times during which it is proposed that the relevant licensable activities are to take place,
- (c) any other times during which it is proposed that the premises are to be open to the public,
- (d) where the applicant wishes the licence to have effect for a limited period, that period,
- (e) where the relevant licensable activities include the supply of alcohol, prescribed information in respect of the individual whom the applicant wishes to have specified in the premises licence as the premises supervisor,
- (f) where the relevant licensable activities include the supply of alcohol, whether the supplies are proposed to be for consumption on the premises or off the premises, or both,
- (g) the steps which it is proposed to take to promote the licensing objectives,
- (h) such other matters as may be prescribed.”

23 [Section 18](#) deals with the determination of an application for a premises licence. [Section 35](#) deals in very similar terms with the determination of an application to vary a premises licence. It will be sufficient only to set out here the provisions of [s 18](#) .

24 [Section 18\(2\)](#) provides that, subject to [subsection \(3\)](#) , the authority must grant the licence in accordance with the application subject only to:

- “(a) such conditions as are consistent with the operating schedule accompanying the application,
- and
- (b) any conditions which must under section 19, 20 or 21 be included in the licence.”

25 [Section 19](#) deals with premises licences which authorise the supply of alcohol. Such licences must include certain conditions ensuring that every supply of alcohol is made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence and that no supply of alcohol is made when there is no properly licensed designated premises supervisor. [Sections 20 and 21](#) are not relevant to this claim.

26 [Section 18\(3\)](#) provides that where relevant representations are made, the authority has certain specified obligations. In so far as is relevant to this appeal “relevant representations” are defined in [section 18\(6\)](#) as follows:

- “(6) For the purposes of this section, “relevant representations” means representations which—
- (a) are about the likely effect of the grant of the premises licence on the promotion of the licensing objectives,
- (b) meet the requirements of subsection (7),
- (c) ....”

27 [Subsection \(7\)](#) provides:

(7) The requirements of this subsection are—

(a) that the representations were made by an interested party or responsible authority within the period prescribed under section 17(5)(c),

(b) that they have not been withdrawn, and

(c) in the case of representations made by an interested party (who is not also a responsible authority), that they are not, in the opinion of the relevant licensing authority, frivolous or vexatious.

28 Where relevant representations are made, the authority must hold a hearing to consider them unless the authority, the applicant and each person who has made representations agrees that a hearing is unnecessary. By virtue of [section 18\(3\)\(b\)](#) , the authority must also:

“(b) having regard to the representations, take such of the steps mentioned in subsection (4) (if any) as it considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives.”

29 [Section 18\(4\)](#) provides:

“(4) The steps are—

(a) to grant the licence subject to—

(i) the conditions mentioned in subsection (2)(a) modified to such extent as the authority considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives, and

(ii) any condition which must under section 19, 20 or 21 be included in the licence;

(b) to exclude from the scope of the licence any of the licensable activities to which the application relates;

(c) to refuse to specify a person in the licence as the premises supervisor;

(d) to reject the application.”

30 Conditions are modified for the purposes of [subsection \(4\)\(a\)\(i\)](#) if any of them is altered or omitted or any new condition is added.

31 During the currency of a premises licence, by virtue of [section 51](#) , an interested party (broadly speaking, a local resident or business) or a responsible authority (police, fire, environmental health etc.) may apply to the relevant licensing authority for a review of the licence on a ground which is relevant to one or more of the licensing objectives. By virtue of [section 52](#) , a hearing must be held to consider the application and any relevant representations and the authority must take such steps from a specified list as it considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objective. The steps range from modifying the conditions of the licence to suspending it or revoking it completely.

32 The Act makes provision in [Part 5](#) for “permitted temporary activity” which, loosely speaking, is a form of ad hoc licensing to cover licensable activities which are not covered by a more general licence. The system involves proper notification of an event to the licensing authority and the police. Provided the applicable number of temporary event notices has not been exceeded and the police do not intervene, the event is automatically permitted. Temporary event notices can

only be given in respect of any particular premises 12 times in a calendar year and the period for which each event lasts must not exceed 96 hours.

33 [Section 181](#) provides for appeals to be made against decisions of the licensing authority to a magistrates' court which is, of course, how the decisions in relation to which judicial review is sought in this case came to be made.

### The detail of the claim

34 The Claimant submits that in making its decision to allow the appeal in relation to the premises licence, the Magistrates' Court failed in a number of respects to take account of the changes that the new licensing regime has made and failed to adopt the approach required by the Act. It is further submitted that the magistrates failed properly to consider and take into account the Guidance.

35 There is no doubt that the Guidance is relevant in the magistrates' decision making. As I have set out above, [section 4\(3\)](#) requires the licensing authority to "have regard" to the Guidance. By extension, so must a Magistrates' Court dealing with an appeal from a decision of the licensing authority. The Guidance says:

"10.8 In hearing an appeal against any decision made by a licensing authority, the magistrates' court concerned will have regard to that licensing authority's statement of licensing policy and this Guidance. However, the court would be entitled to depart from either the statement of licensing policy or this Guidance if it considered it is justified to do so because of the individual circumstances of any case."

36 Mr Pickup submits that although the Guidance is not binding and local variation is expressly permitted, it should not be departed from unless there is good reason to do so.

37 Mr Flood for the First Interested Party submits that the Guidance simply serves to provide information for the magistrates and provided that they have had regard to it, that is sufficient. He also points out that, in some respects (as is clear from the wording of the Guidance), the Guidance is a statement of Government belief rather than proved fact. Inviting attention to the judgment of Beatson J in *J. D. Weatherspoon plc v Guildford Borough Council* [2006] EWHC 815 (Admin), he identifies that different policy elements in the Guidance may pull in different directions in a particular case, flexibility and customer choice potentially conflicting with the need to prevent crime and disorder. He submits that provided that the magistrates consult the Guidance, they do not need to use it as "a decision making matrix that the deciding Court has to sequentially address in making its decision in the manner it would if considering a section of a statute".

38 There is no doubt that regard must be had to the Guidance by the magistrates but that its force is less than that of a statute. That is common ground between the parties. The Guidance contains advice of varying degrees of specificity. At one end of the spectrum, it reinforces the general philosophy and approach of the Act. However, it also provides firm advice on particular issues, an example being what could almost be described as a prohibition on local authorities seeking to engineer staggered closing times by setting quotas for particular closing times. I accept that any individual licensing decision may give rise to a need to balance conflicting factors which are included in the Guidance and that in resolving this conflict, a licensing authority or magistrates' court may justifiably give less weight to some parts of the Guidance and more to others. As the Guidance itself says, it may also depart from the Guidance if particular features of the individual case require that. What a licensing authority or magistrates' court is not entitled to do is simply to *ignore* the Guidance or fail to give it any weight, whether because it does not agree with the Government's policy or its methods of regulating licensable activities or for any other reason. Furthermore, when a magistrates' court is entitled to depart from the Guidance and justifiably does so, it must, in my view, give proper reasons for so doing. As paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance says in relation to the need for licensing authorities to give reasons:

"When [departing from the Guidance], licensing authorities will need to give full reasons for their actions. Departure from the Guidance could give rise to an appeal or judicial

review, and the reasons given will then be a key consideration for the courts when considering the lawfulness and merits of any decision taken.”

This is a theme to which the Guidance returns repeatedly and is a principle which must be applicable to a magistrates' court hearing an appeal as it is to a licensing authority dealing with an application in the first instance. I agree with Mr Flood for the First Interested Party that the magistrates did not need to work slavishly through the Guidance in articulating their decision but they did need to give full reasons for their decision overall and full reasons for departing from the Guidance if they considered it proper so to do.

39 In this case, Mr Pickup submits that proper attention to the Guidance would have helped the magistrates to come to a correct and reasonable decision and that they have failed to adhere to it without proper reason and failed to carry out their licensing function in accordance with the Act.

40 The foundation of the Claimant's argument is that the Act expects licensable activities to be restricted only where that is *necessary* to promote the four licensing objectives set out in [section 4\(2\)](#). There can be no debate about that. It is clearly established by the Act and confirmed in the Guidance. For example, in the Act, [section 18\(3\)\(b\)](#), dealing with the determination of an application for a premises licence, provides that where relevant representations are made the licensing authority must “take such of the steps mentioned in [subsection \(4\)](#) (if any) as it considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives” (the steps in [subsection \(4\)](#) include the grant of the licence subject to conditions). [Section 34\(3\)\(b\)](#), dealing with the determination of an application to vary a premises licence, is in similar terms. The Guidance repeatedly refers, in a number of different contexts, to the principle that regulatory action should only be taken where it is *necessary* to promote the licensing objectives. In particular, it clearly indicates that conditions should not be attached to premises licences unless they are necessary to promote the licensing objectives, see for example paragraph 7.5 and also paragraph 7.17 which includes this passage:

“Licensing authorities should therefore ensure that any conditions they impose are only those which are necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives, which means that they must not go further than what is needed for that purpose.”

41 The Guidance also refers a number of times to the need for regulation to be “proportionate”. This is not a term contained in the Act but if a regulatory provision is to satisfy the hurdle of being “necessary”, it must in my view be confined to that which is “proportionate” and one can understand why the Guidance spells this out.

42 Mr Pickup submits, and I accept, that the Act anticipates that a “light touch bureaucracy” (a phrase used in paragraph 5.99 of the Guidance) will be applied to the grant and variation of premises licences. He submits that this means that unless there is evidence that extended hours will adversely affect one of the licensing objectives, the hours should be granted. A prime example of this arises when an application for a premises licence is made and there are no relevant representations made about it. In those circumstances, [s 18\(2\)](#) obliges the licensing authority to grant the licence and it can only impose conditions which are consistent with the operating schedule submitted by the applicant. Mr Pickup says that such a light touch is made possible, as the Guidance itself says, by providing a review mechanism under the Act by which to deal with concerns relating to the licensing objectives which arise following the grant of a licence in respect of individual premises. He invites attention also to the existence of other provisions outside the ambit of the Act which provide remedies for noise, for example the issue of a noise abatement notice or the closure of noisy premises under the [Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003](#). The Guidance makes clear that the existence of other legislative provisions is relevant and may, in some cases, obviate the need for any further conditions to be imposed on a licence. Paragraph 7.18 from the section of the Guidance dealing with attaching conditions to licences is an illustration of this approach:

“7.18 It is perfectly possible that in certain cases, because the test is one of necessity, where there are other legislative provisions which are relevant and must be observed by the applicant, no additional conditions at all are needed to promote the licensing objectives.”

43 The Guidance includes a section dealing with hours of trading which the Claimant submits further exemplifies the philosophy of the Act. It begins with paragraph 6.1 which reads:

“This Chapter provides guidance on good practice in respect of any condition imposed on a premises licence or club premises certificate in respect of hours of trading or supply.”

44 It continues:

“6.5 The Government strongly believes that fixed and artificially early closing times promote, in the case of the sale or supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises, rapid binge drinking close to closing times; and are a key cause of disorder and disturbance when large numbers of customers are required to leave premises simultaneously. This creates excessive pressures at places where fast food is sold or public or private transport is provided. This in turn produces friction and gives rise to disorder and peaks of noise and other nuisance behaviour. It is therefore important that licensing authorities recognise these problems when addressing issues such as the hours at which premises should be used to carry on the provision of licensable activities to the public.

6.6 The aim through the promotion of the licensing objectives should be to reduce the potential for concentrations and achieve a slower dispersal of people from licensed premises through longer opening times. Arbitrary restrictions that would undermine the principle of flexibility should therefore be avoided. We will monitor the impact of the 2003 Act on crime and disorder and the other licensing objectives. If necessary in the light of these findings, we will introduce further legislation with the consent of Parliament to strengthen or alter any provisions.”

45 The Claimant submits that in imposing shorter hours than it requested for the supply of alcohol and for entertainment, the magistrates went beyond that which was necessary for these premises and failed to take into account that, as the Guidance explains, longer opening times would in fact reduce the potential for problems arising from licensed premises whereas curtailing operations could run counter to the licensing objectives.

46 The magistrates' Reasons record their acceptance that there had been no reported complaint in regard to public nuisance and that the extended hours had operated without any incidents. The magistrates also record in the Reasons, as I have already said, that they had attached little or no weight to the statements from witnesses of the appellant. Nothing is said about difficulties mentioned in evidence by the witnesses. As it was clearly incumbent on the magistrates at least to advert in broad terms to those matters that they took into account, it is fair to conclude in the circumstances that they proceeded upon the basis that there was no reliable evidence of actual problems linked to the premises either under the old licence or under the new revised licence. This was in line with the oral evidence of Police Sergeant Yehya (as recorded in the rather truncated notes of the legal advisor):

“1 reported incident for the site. No other incidents or complaints have been received. There are none in my file. There are no incidents we can directly link to the Saughall Hotel since previously open. There have been incidents locally but not linked to these premises.”

47 To judge by the Reasons therefore, what led the magistrates to impose restricted hours of operation was their forecast as to what would occur in the future in association with the premises, notwithstanding the absence of reliable evidence of past problems. The First Interested Party observes that the manager of the premises had given evidence that he intended in the summer to “make hay while the sun shines” and submits, correctly in my view, that the magistrates were entitled to take this apparent change of emphasis into account. However, Mr Flood further submits that the evidence of what had happened in the winter months was therefore of “little evidential value” in determining what was likely to happen in the future and I cannot wholly agree with him about this. Undoubtedly the fact that the Claimant intended in future to make more use

of the extended hours reduced the value of the premises' past record as a predictor of the future but it could not, in my view, be completely discarded by the magistrates. They still had to take into account that there had been extended hours for some months without apparent problems.

48 It is plain that the magistrates' particular concern was "migration" rather than problems generated by those coming directly to the premises for their evening out. Under the heading "The Four Licensing Objectives", they say that they accept that there have been no formal or recorded complaints against the premises "but feel that because of the concept of migration that public nuisance and crime and disorder would be an inevitable consequence of leaving the hours as granted by the Local Authority". Under the heading "Migration/Zoning" they begin:

"The Saughall Hotel due to its location and the fact that a number of license premises in the surrounding area have reduced hours to that of the Saughall Hotel we believe that as a consequence of this would be that customers would migrate from these premises to the Saughall Hotel. [sic]"

and end:

"We appreciate that the extended hours have been in operation for several months without any incidents but have taken into consideration this was during the Winter months and inevitable numbers will increase in the Summer causing nuisance/criminality."

49 They reiterate their concern under the heading "Nuisance (Existing/Anticipated)" saying that they "feel that public nuisance will be inevitable".

50 The Claimant complains that the magistrates' treatment of the issue of "migration" was fundamentally flawed on a number of grounds.

51 Firstly, it submits that there was no evidence on which the magistrates could find that customers *would* come to the premises when other premises in the vicinity closed or cause trouble and their concerns were no more than inappropriate speculation. The Claimant's position was that there was no evidence of migration to their premises. There were no recorded complaints of any kind about the premises let alone specifically about migration. Ms Lesley Spencer who lives opposite the premises and is the Secretary of the Saughall Massie Conservation Society gave evidence of her fear that customers would migrate but said that she did not think there had been any migration.

52 Apart from their own local knowledge, the only material on which the magistrates could possibly have formed their views about migration was what Police Sergeant Yehya said in evidence. According to the legal advisor's notes, whilst being cross-examined by Mr Kirwan, the sergeant gave evidence about the other licensed premises operating in the vicinity (which I have seen marked on a local map and which were within walking distance of the premises) and their closing hours and said that there were three assaults each week at one of the premises. The legal advisor records that he also said,

"We have staggered closing. This could cause problems it has the potential to cause difficulties in the area. I have a list of considerations but none would rank as high as crime, not even noise. No complaints have been made to me even regarding noise. One concern was dispersal. We gave people one hour to disperse and therefore reduced from 2.00 a.m. to 1.00 a.m.. 1.00 a.m. closing at 2. 280 people leaving premises. Other premises subject to high levels of crime *migration not an issue* ." [my italics]

53 I appreciate that this evidence acknowledged that staggered closing *could* cause problems but, had migration been a significant issue as opposed to a mere possibility, one can, I think, assume that the police would have made representations on that score, particularly given that they had plainly considered the impact of trading hours specifically and *had* initially objected to the even longer hours originally proposed by the Claimant. It is noteworthy that even when they were in opposition to the plans, it was never on the basis of migration of disruptive characters from other licensed premises and always simply on the basis of late noise from ordinary

customers of the premises dispersing. The absence of police objections before either the licensing authority or the Magistrates' Court seems to have surprised the magistrates who said so in their Reasons, commenting:

“We were surprised that the Police originally objected to the application but withdrew that objection after a slight variation of the terms.”

In so saying, they convey, in my view, not only their surprise about the Police approach but also their disagreement with it.

54 It was not open to the magistrates, in my view, to elevate what Sergeant Yehya said in the witness box to evidence that a problem with migration could reasonably be expected, nor do they say anything in their reasons which suggests that they did rely on his evidence in this way. The only concerns about migration were therefore the magistrates' own with perhaps some fears expressed by local residents though not on the basis of firm historical examples of migration to the premises.

55 It is clear from the Guidance that drawing on local knowledge, at least the local knowledge of local licensing authorities, is an important feature of the Act's approach. There can be little doubt that local magistrates are also entitled to take into account their own knowledge but, in my judgment, they must measure their own views against the evidence presented to them. In some cases, the evidence will require them to adjust their own impression. This is particularly likely to be so where it is given by a responsible authority such as the police. They must also scrutinise their own anxieties about matters such as noise and other types of public nuisance particularly carefully if the responsible authorities raise no objections on these grounds. These magistrates did recognise the absence of police objections which caused them surprise and they chose to differ from the police in reliance on their own views. The Claimant submits that in so doing they departed into the realms of impermissible speculation not only in concluding that there would be migration but also in concluding that in this case it would generate nuisance and disorder. The First Interested Party is correct in submitting that the Guidance accepts a link between migration and a potential breach of the licensing objectives but it is also clear from the Guidance that each case must be decided on its individual facts so the magistrates could not simply assume that if people came from other premises, there would be trouble.

56 The Claimant complains that the magistrates' treatment of the migration issue also flies in the face of the Guidance because firstly it was an improper attempt to implement zoning and secondly it ignored the general principle of longer opening hours.

57 Zoning is the setting of fixed trading hours within a designated area so that all the pubs in a given area have similar trading hours. The problem created by it, as demonstrated by experience in Scotland, is that people move across zoning boundaries in search of pubs opening later and that causes disorder and disturbance. The Guidance says, at paragraph 6.8:

“The licensing authority should consider restricting the hours of trading only where this is necessary because of the potential impact on the promotion of the licensing objectives from fixed and artificially-early closing times.”

It stresses that above all, licensing authorities should not fix predetermined closing times for particular areas.

58 I am not convinced that the magistrates' limiting of the Claimant's operational hours can properly be described as implementing zoning which, in my view, is a term that is more appropriate to describe a general policy imposed by a licensing authority for a defined area than an individual decision of this type, albeit made with reference to the opening hours of other premises in the vicinity and having the effect of imposing the same hours as those premises.

59 What has more weight, however, is the Claimant's submission that the magistrates failed to give proper weight to the general principle of later opening hours and to the intention that the approach to licensing under the Act would be to grant the hours sought for the premises unless it was necessary to modify them in pursuit of the licensing objectives. The Reasons include a heading “Flexibility” under which the magistrates say simply:

“We have considered the concept of Flexibility.”

In so saying, they may be referring to the sort of flexibility to which reference is made, for example, in paragraph 6.6 of the Guidance (see above) but their shorthand does not enable one to know to what conclusions their consideration of the concept led them in this case nor whether they had reliably in mind that the starting point should be that limitations should not be imposed upon the licence sought unless necessary to promote the licensing objectives rather than that the licensing authority or the court should form its own view of what was necessary for the premises and only grant that.

60 The Claimant was seeking to have the freedom to open later on certain occasions when the trade justified it or, as the magistrates put it, “the application for extended hours was to allow *flexibility* to open later on certain occasions”. As the First Interested Party would submit, the magistrates may have inferred from Mr Miller's comment about making hay that the premises would *often* be open late rather than this happening only infrequently in accordance with the picture presented to the licensing authority. If this was their inference, however, it is odd that they considered that the Claimant could deal with the position by applying for a temporary certificate because this would have allowed the premises to open later on only a limited number of occasions. They make no express finding in their Reasons as to the frequency on which they considered the Claimant intended to keep the premises open late. This was material not only to the degree of disturbance that might be caused generally by late opening but also specifically to the issue of whether there would be migration. It would seem unlikely that customers from nearby pubs would bother to walk or even drive to the Saughall Hotel in search of another drink at the end of their evenings unless the Saughall Hotel was open late sufficiently frequently to lead them to a reasonable expectation that their journey would be worthwhile.

61 The magistrates' comment about the temporary certificate also seems to me to be an example of a failure by them to adopt the lighter approach that the Act dictated and to allow flexibility to those operating licensed premises unless the licensing objectives required otherwise. Temporary certificates would be a cumbersome and restricted means of achieving flexibility, not responsive to the day to day fluctuations in business, only available a limited number of times, and not in line with the philosophy of the Act.

62 There is no consideration in the magistrates' decision of whether the imposition of conditions to control noise or other nuisance (which were going to be imposed) would be sufficient to promote the licensing objectives without reducing the operating hours of the premises. Given that the Act dictates that only such steps as are necessary should be taken with regard to the variation of the terms of operation sought, such consideration was required.

## **My overall conclusions**

63 It would be wrong, in my judgment, to say that the magistrates failed to take account of the licensing objectives. At the outset of their Reasons, they correctly identify those which are relevant. Similarly, as the First Interested Party submits, whilst they did not *articulate* that the curtailment of the hours sought was “necessary” to promote those objectives, it is implied in their decision that they did take this view and it can also be inferred from their comment that because of the concept of migration, public nuisance and crime and disorder would be “an inevitable consequence” of leaving the hours as granted by the Local Authority. However, in my view their approach to what was “necessary” was coloured by a failure to take proper account of the changed approach to licensing introduced by the Act. Had they had proper regard to the Act and the Guidance, they would have approached the matter with a greater reluctance to impose regulation and would have looked for real evidence that it was required in the circumstances of the case. Their conclusion that it was so required on the basis of a risk of migration from other premises in the vicinity was not one to which a properly directed bench could have come. The fact that the police did not oppose the hours sought on this basis should have weighed very heavily with them whereas, in fact, they appear to have dismissed the police view because it did not agree with their own. They should also have considered specifically the question of precisely how frequently the premises would be likely to be open late and made findings about it. They would then have been able to compare this to the winter opening pattern in relation to which they accepted there had been no complaints and draw proper conclusions as to the extent to which the summer months would be likely to differ from the winter picture. Having formed a clear view

of how frequently late opening could be anticipated, they would also have been able to draw more reliable conclusions about the willingness of customers from further afield to migrate to Saughall Massie. They proceeded without proper evidence and gave their own views excessive weight and their resulting decision limited the hours of operation of the premises without it having been established that it was necessary to do so to promote the licensing objectives. In all the circumstances, their decision was unlawful and it must be quashed.

64 I have said little so far about what appears in the magistrates' response for the judicial review proceedings. The various documents comprising the response did nothing to allay my concerns about the magistrates' decision. Indeed quite a lot of what was said reinforced my view that the magistrates had largely ignored the evidence and imposed their own views. They refer in their response to incidents about which the residents had given evidence and to the residents not having complained formally for various reasons, for example because it was Christmas or because there was thought to be no point. If the magistrates considered these matters to be relevant, it was incumbent on them to say so clearly in their reasons whereas they there recorded their acceptance that there had been no formal or recorded complaints, that the extended hours had been in operation for several months without incidents and that they had attached little or no weight to the statements of the witnesses of the appellant. They also refer extensively in their response to their thoughts on migration, including that people may come from further afield than the pubs in the vicinity in cars. Particularly concerning is that they refer repeatedly to a perceived issue over police resources which is not something that, as far as I can see, had been raised by Sergeant Yehya or explored with him in evidence. Mr Beere says in his statement for example, "... there is also the question of Police resources and their ability to effectively police this area especially at weekends with already stretched resources being deployed in Hoylake".

65 Reference is made in the response documents to the court feeling that the Brewery's proposed opening hours contradicted the acceptable activities of a family pub and that the Saughall Hotel is "a village pub and not a night spot in the centre of town". For the court to take matters such as this into account seems to me to be an interference with the commercial freedom of the premises of a type that was not permissible under the Act unless it was necessary to promote the licensing objectives. I appreciate that the magistrates' response seems to suggest that they feared that a different type of customer was being courted or would invite themselves once it got too late for families but this does not seem to have been founded on anything that was given in evidence so was really not much more than speculation.

66 Mr Beere's statement ends with a reference to the Brewery wanting to make hay while the sun shines, of which he says, "I believe that this statement was indicative of the Brewery's attitude to local residents and to the general management of the premises.". Given that problems with or in the vicinity of the premises had been almost non-existent and that the magistrates had not seen fit to make reference in their Reasons to any difficulties caused by the Hotel, it is hard to see how this belief could be justified but it does perhaps exemplify the approach of the magistrates.

67 I have considered quite separately the argument as to whether the hours of opening can be regulated as part of the licensing of premises as opposed to the hours during which licensable activities take place. It was suggested during argument that there was no power to regulate the time by which people must leave the premises. I cannot agree with this. Clearly keeping premises open (as opposed to providing entertainment or supplying alcohol there) is not a licensable activity as such. However, the operating schedule which must be supplied with an application for a premises licence must include a statement of the matters set out in [section 17\(4\)](#) and these include not only the times when it is proposed that the licensable activities are to take place but also "any other times during which it is proposed that the premises are to be open to the public". On a new grant of a premises licence, where there are no representations the licensing authority has to grant the application subject only to such conditions as are consistent with the operating schedule. I see no reason why, if it is necessary to promote the licensing objectives, these conditions should not include a provision requiring the premises to be shut by the time that is specified in the operating schedule. If representations are made and the licensing authority ultimately grants the application, it can depart from the terms set out in the operating schedule when imposing conditions in so far as this is necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives. It must follow that it can impose an earlier time for the premises to be locked up than the applicant wished and specified in its operating schedule. It is important to keep in mind in this regard that the role of the licensing authority and, if there is an appeal, the court, has two dimensions: the fundamental task is to license activities which require a licence and the associated task is to consider what, if any, conditions are imposed on the applicant to ensure the

promotion of the licensing objectives. A requirement that the premises close at a particular time seems to me to be a condition just like any other, such as keeping doors and windows closed to prevent noise. I see no reason why a condition of closing up the premises at a particular time should not therefore be imposed where controlling the hours of the licensable activities on the premises (and such other conditions as may be imposed) is not sufficient to promote the licensing objectives.

### **The costs argument**

68 In the light of my conclusion that the magistrates' decision is unlawful and therefore must be quashed, it is not appropriate for me to consider the arguments in relation to their costs order further. The appellants had given an undertaking to the Licensing Authority that they would not seek costs against the Licensing Authority and they sought the entirety of their costs of the appeal from the Claimant. The magistrates granted that order and the Claimant submits that that was not an order that was open to them. Whatever the merits of that argument, the magistrates' order in relation to costs cannot now stand. The basic foundation for the order for costs was that the appeal had succeeded and the Claimant had lost. That position has now been overturned and the costs order must go along with the magistrates' main decision. The magistrates would have had no reason to grant costs against the Claimant if the appeal had been dismissed.

Crown copyright

© 2017 Sweet & Maxwell



Approved Judgment

Double-click to enter the short title



Neutral Citation Number: [2008] EWHC 838 (Admin)

Case No: CO/5533/2006

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE COURT**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 06/05/2008

**Before:**

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE BLACK**

**Between:**

<b>Daniel Thwaites Plc</b>	<b><u>Claimant</u></b>
- and -	
<b>Wirral Borough Magistrates' Court</b>	<b><u>Defendant</u></b>
- and -	
<b>The Saughall Massie Conservation Society</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Interested Party</b>
- and -	
<b>Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Interested Party</b>

**David MW Pickup** (instructed by Naphens plc) for the **Claimant**  
**The Defendant did not appear and was not represented**  
**David Flood** (instructed by Messrs Kirwans) for the **1<sup>st</sup> Interested Party**  
**Matthew Copeland** (instructed by Wirral MBC) for the **2<sup>nd</sup> Interested Party**

Hearing date: 10<sup>th</sup> March 2008

**Approved Judgment**

I direct that pursuant to CPR PD 39A para 6.1 no official shorthand note shall be taken of this Judgment and that copies of this version as handed down may be treated as authentic.

Approved Judgment

63. It would be wrong, in my judgment, to say that the magistrates failed to take account of the licensing objectives. At the outset of their Reasons, they correctly identify those which are relevant. Similarly, as the First Interested Party submits, whilst they did not *articulate* that the curtailment of the hours sought was “necessary” to promote those objectives, it is implied in their decision that they did take this view and it can also be inferred from their comment that because of the concept of migration, public nuisance and crime and disorder would be “an inevitable consequence” of leaving the hours as granted by the Local Authority. However, in my view their approach to what was “necessary” was coloured by a failure to take proper account of the changed approach to licensing introduced by the Act. Had they had proper regard to the Act and the Guidance, they would have approached the matter with a greater reluctance to impose regulation and would have looked for real evidence that it was required in the circumstances of the case. Their conclusion that it was so required on the basis of a risk of migration from other premises in the vicinity was not one to which a properly directed bench could have come. The fact that the police did not oppose the hours sought on this basis should have weighed very heavily with them whereas, in fact, they appear to have dismissed the police view because it did not agree with their own. They should also have considered specifically the question of precisely how frequently the premises would be likely to be open late and made findings about it. They would then have been able to compare this to the winter opening pattern in relation to which they accepted there had been no complaints and draw proper conclusions as to the extent to which the summer months would be likely to differ from the winter picture. Having formed a clear view of how frequently late opening could be anticipated, they would also have been able to draw more reliable conclusions about the willingness of customers from further afield to migrate to Saughall Massie. They proceeded without proper evidence and gave their own views excessive weight and their resulting decision limited the hours of operation of the premises without it having been established that it was necessary to do so to promote the licensing objectives. In all the circumstances, their decision was unlawful and it must be quashed.
64. I have said little so far about what appears in the magistrates’ response for the judicial review proceedings. The various documents comprising the response did nothing to allay my concerns about the magistrates’ decision. Indeed quite a lot of what was said reinforced my view that the magistrates had largely ignored the evidence and imposed their own views. They refer in their response to incidents about which the residents had given evidence and to the residents not having complained formally for various reasons, for example because it was Christmas or because there was thought to be no point. If the magistrates considered these matters to be relevant, it was incumbent on them to say so clearly in their reasons whereas they there recorded their acceptance that there had been no formal or recorded complaints, that the extended hours had been in operation for several months without incidents and that they had attached little or no weight to the statements of the witnesses of the appellant. They also refer extensively in their response to their thoughts on migration, including that people may come from further afield than the pubs in the vicinity in cars. Particularly concerning is that they refer repeatedly to a perceived issue over police resources which is not something that, as far as I can see, had been raised by Sergeant Yehya or explored with him in evidence. Mr Beere says in his statement for example, “....there is also the question of Police resources



FAO Designated Premise Supervisor,  
**Premier,**  
 Nodder Road,  
 Woodthorpe,  
 SHEFFIELD.  
 S13.

Date: 28/10/2010

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
 DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 27/10/2010, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

.....  
 Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

**PLACE**  
**Business Strategy and Regulation**

Director : Mick Crofts  
**Sheffield Trading Standards**  
2-10 Carbrook Hall Road  
Sheffield  
S9 2DB

**Sheffield**  
City Council



E-mail: trading.standards@sheffield.gov.uk  
Fax No. (0114) 273 6248  
Officer: Greg Ward  
Ref: ARSTP\ 070561

Tel: 0114 273 6241  
Date: 25/2/2011

The Manager  
Premier Store  
3 Nodder Road  
Sheffield  
S13 8DB

Dear Sir/Madam

**AGE-RESTRICTED SALES - TEST PURCHASE RESULTS.**

As an agency responsible for the enforcement of age-restricted sales legislation, Sheffield Trading Standards periodically carries out test purchasing exercises on local businesses to check for compliance with the law.

We are pleased to inform you that in our latest series of test purchases on the 23 February 2011 relating to the sale of cigarettes / tobacco a test purchasing volunteer was unsuccessful in purchasing cigarettes from your premises. We would like to congratulate and commend the members of staff involved for their diligent and responsible attitude in refusing to sell age-restricted products to our volunteer. Well done, and keep up the good work of refusing to sell age-restricted products young customers.

Please continue to be vigilant and remember that if you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, and requesting identification it would be wise to decline a sale.

If you require any additional information on age restricted sales or are interested in joining our free Responsible Retailer Scheme please contact Greg Ward on 0114 2736241.

Yours faithfully,

Philip Glaves  
Chief Trading Standards Officer

Large print versions of this letter are available by telephoning  
0114 2736284



Private & Confidential



**The Manager  
Hollinsend Food & Wi  
2 Nodder Road  
Woodthorpe  
S13 8DB**

**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN

**Ref: RCTP/3979603**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at Hollinsend Food & Wi, 2 Nodder Road, S13 8DB  
Retailer Number 466376**

On 05/07/2011 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager**

On behalf of:  
Camelot UK Lotteries Limited

*Please call 01344 418565 if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter. Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call 01923 425 000 and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Operation Child in general.*



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier Store  
Nodder Road  
Manor  
Sheffield

Date:17/11/2011

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 3/11/2011, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

South Yorkshire Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

**Memo – Addendum to Letter**



10/05/2012

Dear Retailer,

Unfortunately due to an administrative error you were sent a letter that did not include the correct date and time we conducted a visit to you as part of our operation child test purchase programme

The visit date and time has now been rectified and enclosed is the letter you received a few days ago revised with the correct date and time

Apologies for any confusion caused

Yours faithfully

Camelot Test purchase Team  
REL Field Marketing  
01344 418565

Private & Confidential



10/05/2012

**The Manager  
Hollinsend Food & Wi  
2 Nodder Road  
Woodthorpe  
S13 8DB**

**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

**Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN**

**Ref: RCTP/5037028**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at Hollinsend Food & Wi, 2 Nodder Road, S13 8DB  
Retailer Number 466376**

On 2/4/2012 at 16:34 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A 1st visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager**

**On behalf of:  
Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

*Please call 01344 418565 if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter. Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call 01923 425 000 and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Operation Child in general.*

Private & Confidential



**The Proprietor  
Hollinsend Food & Wi  
2 Nodder Road  
Woodthorpe  
Sheffield  
S13 8DB**

**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN

**Ref: RCTP/6598695**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at Hollinsend Food & Wi 2 Nodder Road Sheffield  
S13 8DB**

*Retailer Number 466376*

On 03/05/2013 at 18:00 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A 1st visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager**

On behalf of:  
Camelot UK Lotteries Limited

*Please call 01344 418565 if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter.  
Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call 01923 425 000 and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Child in general.*



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier Store,  
Nodder Road,  
Woodthorpe,  
Sheffield,  
S13.

Date: 21/03/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 20/03/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier Store,  
Nodder Road,  
Woodthorpe,  
Sheffield,  
S13.

Date: 27/03/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 25/03/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

This page is intentionally left blank



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**  
JUSTICE *with* COURAGE

APPENDIX 12A



Amarjit Loyal  
**Hollinsend Food & Wine**  
57 Alnwick Road  
Intake  
Sheffield  
S12 2GE

4<sup>th</sup> August 2006

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Licensee

On the 27<sup>th</sup> of July 2006 a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by a 15 or 16 year old young person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

PS 858 Chris Brown  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing  
South Yorkshire Police  
Castle Green Annexe  
Snig Hill, Sheffield  
S3 8LY

Tel: 0114 252 3617  
Fax: 0114 252 3688

 Tel: 0114 252 3294



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**  
JUSTICE *with* COURAGE



Armajit Singh Loyal,  
**Hollinsend Food & Wine,**  
57 – 59, Alnwick Road,  
Intake,  
SHEFFIELD.  
S12 2GE

1<sup>st</sup> November, 2006

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Licensee

On the 2nd of October, 2006, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by a 15 or 16 year old young person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale:

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

PS 858 Chris Brown  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing  
South Yorkshire Police  
Castle Green Annexe  
Snig Hill, Sheffield  
S3 8LY

Tel: 0114 252 3617

Fax: 0114 252 3688

 Tel: 0114 252 3294

17 January 2007

**Private & Confidential**  
**To be opened by Addressee Only**  
**The Manager**  
**Hollinsend Food & Wine**  
**57-59 Alnwick Road**  
**Sheffield**  
**S12 2GE**



**Camelot Group plc**  
Tolpits Lane Watford WD18 9RN  
Telephone: 01923 425000  
Facsimile: 01923 425150  
[www.camelotgroup.co.uk](http://www.camelotgroup.co.uk)

**Ref:JB/LP/(057089)696/06**

Dear Sir or Madam

**Retailer No: 434910**

You will be aware following a previous visit that National Lottery retailers are being tested to establish whether they are employing the appropriate safeguards to prevent under age sales.

I can inform you that a second visit was recently made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Your staff must remain vigilant, however, and do everything possible to prevent sales to persons under 16 years.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**John Branscombe**  
**Director, Security & Facilities**

09 September 2008

**Private & Confidential**  
**To be opened by Addressee Only**  
**The Manager**  
**Hollinsend Food & Wine**  
**57-59 Alnwick Road**  
**Sheffield**  
**S12 2GE**



**Camelot Group plc**  
Tolpits Lane Watford WD18 9RN  
Telephone: 01923 425000  
Facsimile: 01923 425150  
[www.camelotgroup.co.uk](http://www.camelotgroup.co.uk)

**Ref:GC/LH/(74431)542-08**

Dear Sir or Madam

**Retailer No: 434910**

You may be aware that National Lottery retailers are being visited and tested to establish whether they are employing the appropriate safeguards to prevent under age sales.

I can inform you that one such visit was recently made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Your staff must remain vigilant, however, and do everything possible to prevent sales to persons under 16 years.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Geoff Comb**  
**Head of Security**



06 January 2011

**Private & Confidential**  
**To be opened by Addressee Only**  
**The Manager**  
**HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE**  
**57-59 ALNWICK ROAD**  
**S12 2GE**

**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

Tolpits Lane Watford WD18 9RN  
Telephone 01923 425000  
Fax 01923 425150  
Web [www.camelotgroup.co.uk](http://www.camelotgroup.co.uk)

**Ref: RCTP/3734541**

Dear Sir or Madam

**Retailer No: 434910**

On 03/01/2011 you were tested to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards to prevent under age sales.

I can inform you that a first visit was recently made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Your staff must remain vigilant, however, and do everything possible to prevent sales to persons under 16 years.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin**  
**Security Operations Manager**

Private & Confidential



**The Manager  
HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE  
57-59 ALNWICK ROAD  
S12 2GE**

**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN

**Ref: RCTP/4010098**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE, 57-59 ALNWICK ROAD, S12  
2GE  
Retailer Number 434910**

On 01/06/2011 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager**

On behalf of:  
**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

*Please call 01344 418565 if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter. Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call 01923 425 000 and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Operation Child in general.*



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier  
Hollinsend  
Alwick Road  
SHEFFIELD

Date: 27/07/2011

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 22/07/2011, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

South Yorkshire Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier Store,  
Alwick Road,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 24/01/2012

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 17/01/2012, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire

**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Hollinsend Food & Wine  
Alwick Road  
Sheffield  
S12

Date: 26/03/2012

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 23/03/2012, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

South Yorkshire Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

Private & Confidential



Camelot UK Lotteries Limited

**The Proprietor  
HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE  
57-59 ALNWICK ROAD  
SHEFFIELD  
S12 2GE**

Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN

**Ref: RCTP/5319750**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE 57-59 ALNWICK  
ROAD SHEFFIELD S12 2GE**

*Retailer Number 434910*

On 12/07/2012 at 12:05 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A 2nd visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager

On behalf of:  
Camelot UK Lotteries Limited

*Please call 01344 418565 if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter.  
Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call 01923 425 000 and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Operation Child in general.*

**Private & Confidential**



**Camelot UK Lotteries Limited**

**The Proprietor  
HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE  
57-59 ALNWICK ROAD  
SHEFFIELD  
S12 2GE**

Tolpits Lane  
Watford  
WD18 9RN

**Ref: RCTP/6598595**

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Premises at HOLLINSEND FOOD & WINE 57-59 ALNWICK  
ROAD SHEFFIELD S12 2GE**

*Retailer Number 434910*

On 08/05/2013 at 10:39 you were tested, as part of our Operation Child test purchase programme, to establish whether you are employing the appropriate safeguards effectively to prevent under age sales.

A 1st visit was made to your premises using a young person and I am pleased to say that your staff refused to sell a National Lottery ticket on that occasion. Please could I ask you to continue to remind your staff to remain vigilant and do everything possible to prevent sales to under sixteens.

Congratulations once more and keep up the good work.

Yours faithfully

**Stephen Gavin  
Security Operations Manager**

On behalf of:  
Camelot UK Lotteries Limited

*Please call **01344 418565** if you have any queries regarding the visit details within this letter.  
Office hours 9am – 5pm*

*Please call **01923 425 000** and ask for Security Operations if you have any queries regarding Operation Child in general.*



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier Store,  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 21/03/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 20/03/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Hollinsend Food & Wine,  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 27/03/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 25/03/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Hollinsend Food And Wine,  
Alnwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 02/07/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 25/06/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier,  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 02/12/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 27/11/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier (Hollinsend Convenience Store),  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 16/12/2014

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 13/12/2014, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Layals Convenience Store,  
Hollinsend,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 05/11/2015

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 04/11/2015, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Hollinsend Food & Wine,  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 14/01/2016

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 14/12/2015, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



South Yorkshire  
**POLICE**

FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Hollinsend Food & Wine,  
Alwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 01/02/2016

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 13/01/2016, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under-aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.



FAO Designated Premises Supervisor,  
Premier,  
Alnwick Road,  
Intake,  
Sheffield,  
S12.

Date: 26/07/2016

**RECENT TEST PURCHASE OPERATION  
DECLINED TO SELL ALCOHOL TO A PERSON UNDER THE AGE OF 18 YEARS**

Dear Sir/Madam,

On the 22/07/2016, a Police operation relating to the sale of intoxicants to under- aged persons took place in various districts of Sheffield. The above premises, of which you are the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was one of those premises visited by an underage person, who attempted to make a purchase of alcohol from you or a member of your staff.

I am pleased to inform you that no such sale was made, and you or your staff at that time made a correct decision in identifying this person as being under age to purchase alcohol.

Please pass on our congratulations to the member of staff concerned and highlight this success to the rest of your staff members.

Sheffield Liquor Licensing Department record all known test purchase passes and fails, and firm action is taken against those premises which fail to come up to an acceptable standard.

Please continue to be vigilant and use the 'Challenge 21' initiative. If you or your staff have any doubt about the age of a young customer after challenging them, it would be wise to decline a sale.

Once again, well done to you and your staff.

Regards

Lucy Adams  
Police Liquor Licensing Dept.

**From:** Emma Marriott  
**Sent:** 26 March 2018 11:17  
**To:** 'Patrick Robson'  
**Cc:** Steve Ashby  
**Subject:** FW: Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Please find attached premises licences as requested.

The premises you have listed below as Kandola Food Store is currently licensed under the name Virk Food & Wine Store. McColls, 2 Littlemoor Centre, Newbold do not have a licence.

Regards  
Emma

Emma Marriott  
Licensing Officer  
Chesterfield Borough Council  
85 New Square, Chesterfield, S40 1AH  
T: 01246 35740

**From:** Steve Ashby  
**Sent:** 26 March 2018 08:50  
**To:** Emma Marriott  
**Cc:** Patrick Robson ([PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk))  
**Subject:** FW: Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Emma  
I have been allocated to interviews today.  
Would you please have a look at the below for me.  
I will try to pick up the bulk of it at lunchtime but if you could look at the request for premises licence information that would be a great help as it is a time-bound task.  
Thanks very much  
Steve

Steve Ashby  
Licensing Officer  
Chesterfield Borough Council,  
Customer Service Centre,  
85 New Square, Chesterfield. S40 1AH  
01246 345780

**From:** Elaine Ibbotson [<mailto:EIbbotson@john-gaunt.co.uk>] **On Behalf Of** Patrick Robson  
**Sent:** 23 March 2018 15:05  
**To:** Steve Ashby  
**Cc:** Chesterfield Licensing  
**Subject:** Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Steve

Thank you for letting me know the representor will not be attending.

I will check with my client about any letters of support from local residents but in the meantime, please find attached copies of passed test purchases for premises Mr Singh operated for numerous years.

When I have a moment I will probably produce a summary table of these and a bundle to bring next week.

In addition, my client mentioned that there are a number of other convenience stores in the area as listed below. Please would you be able to provide a copy of the Premises Licence for these so I can review their operating hours and conditions.

I am not intending to serve other licences documents on which to rely but if that is the case I will let you know – if you could supply copies of these licences as soon as possible, that would be appreciated.

Finally, for the moment, you will no doubt be wholly unsurprised that I will be referencing the Thwaites case in the hearing if you needed to make your legal advisor aware.

I attach a copy of the full case as well as an excerpt of the pertinent sections of paragraph 63. I will be referring the requirement of real evidence of issues and relevance and importance of absence of any representation with Responsible Authorities.

#### **List of premises**

- 1) Kandola Food store - 2-4 Occupation Road, S41 8TH
  - 2) Spar - 359B Sheffield Road, S41 8LQ
  - 3) Premier Whittington Moor - 381-385 Sheffield Road, S41
- These 3 stores are under half mile.
- 4) Maans Store - 65 Whittington Hill, S41 9EZ
  - 5) Spar - Unit 1, Little Moor centre, S41 8QN
  - 6) Mc Colls - 2 Little Moor centre, New bold, S41 8QW

#### **Kind Regards**

#### **Patrick Robson**

Associate  
Sent by Elaine Ibbotson

[PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk) | [www.john-gaunt.co.uk](http://www.john-gaunt.co.uk)  
**T:** 0114 266 8664 | **M:** 07841 451 440 | **F:** 0114 267 9613



**Omega Court** | 372-374 Cemetery Road | Sheffield | S11 8FT

[Premises Licences](#) | [Personal Licences](#) | [DPS Changes](#) | [Temporary Event Notices](#)  
[APLH Courses](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Due Diligence](#) | [Betting and Gaming](#) | [eLearningPlus](#)

For more details on our services please click on the links above.

**From:** Steve Ashby [<mailto:Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 22 March 2018 16:21

**To:** Patrick Robson <[PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRObson@john-gaunt.co.uk)>; Steve Ashby <[Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.Ashby@Chesterfield.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Many thanks for the update Mr Robson.

I'm out of the office on a course this week but back on Monday 26th should you need any additional information. (you have probably seen my "out of office reply").

I have been informed that no one is available to attend from the committee making the representation. They will rely on their written submission.

I understood your client might have gathered some letters of support from local residents. If so I can circulate copies of those with the TP information to ensure their acceptance on Wednesday.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if I can help at all.

Kind regards

Steve

Sent from my Windows Phone

---

**From:** [Patrick Robson](#)  
**Sent:** 22/03/2018 14:49  
**To:** [Steve Ashby](#)  
**Subject:** Cricketers Inn Convenience Store, Chesterfield

Steve

Just to let you know that I am formally instructed by Layals Limited for the hearing next week for Cricketers Inn convenience Store.

I will look to forward some documents to you proof of past test purchases (at numerous stores) at some point soon.

Currently, the intention is for me to attend with Mr Singh (DPS).

Should you have any queries in the meantime, please let me know.

**Kind Regards**  
**Patrick Robson**

Associate  
Sent by Elaine Ibbotson

[PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk](mailto:PRobson@john-gaunt.co.uk) | [www.john-gaunt.co.uk](http://www.john-gaunt.co.uk)  
**T:** 0114 266 8664 | **M:** 07841 451 440 | **F:** 0114 267 9613



**Omega Court** | 372-374 Cemetery Road | Sheffield | S11 8FT  
Premises Licences | [Personal Licences](#) | [DPS Changes](#) | [Temporary Event Notices](#)  
[APLH Courses](#) | [Reviews](#) | [Due Diligence](#) | [Betting and Gaming](#) | [eLearningPlus](#)  
For more details on our services please click on the links above.

Partners: Tim Shield (569713) | Michelle Hazlewood (569714) | Christopher Grunert  
Associates: Paul Henocq | Patrick Robson  
Consultants: John Gaunt | Katharine Redford  
Practice Manager: Jonathan Pupius

CAUTION

This email is intended to be confidential to the person to whom it is addressed and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact us by email or telephone and please delete the message from your system immediately.

Any unauthorised disclosure of information contained in this communication is strictly prohibited.

We use the word "partner" to refer either to a partner of John Gaunt & Partners (the "firm"); an office holder in a partner; or an employee or consultant of the firm with equivalent standing and qualifications.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content and is believed to be clean.

◁ This email is confidential, may be legally privileged & may contain personal views that are not the views of Chesterfield Borough Council. It is intended solely for the addressee. Under the Data Protection Act 1998 & the Freedom of Information Act 2000 the contents of this email may be disclosed. Although the Council has taken reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are present in this email, the Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments. Chesterfield Borough Council reserves the right to monitor both sent & received emails.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content by [MailScanner](#), and is believed to be clean.

--

This message has been scanned for viruses and dangerous content a

**Spar**

Littlemoor Centre, Newbold, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, S41 8QW

**Premises Licence PL/VF/0060 from from 21/03/2018 to indefinite****Licence holder(s)**

<b>Full Name</b>	A.F. Blakemore & Son Ltd (trading as Blakemore Retail)
------------------	--

**Designated Premises Supervisor**

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lesley Ann Metcalfe
------------------	-------------------------

**Permitted Activities**

- the sale by retail of alcohol

**Premises Open Hours Requested**

	<b>Time From</b>	<b>Time To</b>
Monday to Sunday	06:00	23:00

**Activities - Times Requested**

	<b>Time From</b>	<b>Time To</b>
<b>M. The sale by retail of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises only</b>		
Monday to Sunday	06:00	23:00

**Additional Conditions**

- ANNEX 1 - MANDATORY CONDITIONS**

**The Licensing Act 2003 (Mandatory Conditions) Order 2014**  
**Conditions in force from 28<sup>th</sup> May 2014**

(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). In this condition:-

- a. "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;
- b. "duty" is to be construed in accordance with the Alcoholic Liquor Duties Act 1979;
- 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.

(3). Where the permitted price would not be a whole number of pennies, the permitted price shall be taken to be the price rounded up to the nearest penny.

(4). Where the permitted price 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, 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.

**The Licensing Act 2003  
(Mandatory Licensing Conditions) (Amendment) Order 2014  
In force from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2014  
Mandatory Licensing Conditions**

**Retailing of Alcohol**

1. No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence -

- (a) at a time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or
- (b) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended.

2. Every supply of alcohol under the premises licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.

**Age Verification**

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.

- **ANNEX 2 - CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THE OPERATING SCHEDULE**

As this was a conversion of an existing licence(s) ANNEX 1 contains the embedded conditions from the converted licence(s) (with amendment, where necessary).

- **ANNEX 3 - CONDITIONS ATTACHED AFTER A HEARING BY THE LICENSING AUTHORITY**

There was no hearing in relation to this application, so no conditions were imposed by the Licensing Authority.

- **ANNEX 4 - PLAN**

An application for a Minor Variation was submitted to the Council on 04.09.2015 to change the layout of the premises to erect a door and wall in the rear area of the store.

The Plans relating to the Premises Licence are referenced as KB1/SPAR/PLVF0060/21.09.2015.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Maan Stores**

65 Whittington Hill, Old Whittington, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, S41 9EZ

**Premises Licence PL/VF/0013 from from 24/11/2005 to indefinite****Licence holder(s)**

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Amarjit Kaur Maan
------------------	-----------------------

**Designated Premises Supervisor**

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Amarjit Kaur Maan
------------------	-----------------------

**Permitted Activities**

- the sale by retail of alcohol

**Activities - Times Requested**

	<b>Time From</b>	<b>Time To</b>
<b>M. The sale by retail of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises only</b>		
Monday to Saturday	08:00	23:00
Sunday	10:00	22:30

**Additional Conditions**

- 

**ANNEX 1****MANDATORY CONDITIONS**

1

No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence -

- ( ) at any time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or
- ( ) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended.

2 Every supply of alcohol under the premises licence must be made or authorised  
by a person who holds a personal licence.

## **EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS**

### **A. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 1964**

#### **1 PERMITTED HOURS**

Alcohol shall not be sold or supplied except during permitted hours.

In this condition, permitted hours means:

- a. On weekdays, other than Christmas Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m.
- b. On Sundays, other than Christmas Day, 10 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- c. On Christmas Day, 12 noon to 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- d. On Good Friday, 8 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.

The above restrictions do not prohibit:

- (a) during the first twenty minutes after the above hours, the taking of the alcohol from the premises, unless the alcohol is supplied or taken in an open vessel;
- (b) the ordering of alcohol to be consumed off the premises, or the despatch by the vendor of the alcohol so ordered;
- (c) the sale of alcohol to a trader or club for the purposes of the trade or club;
- (d) the sale or supply of alcohol to any canteen or mess, being a canteen in which the sale or supply of alcohol is carried out under the authority of the Secretary of State or an authorised mess of members of Her Majesty's naval, military or air forces;

#### **2 CONSUMPTION**

Alcohol shall not be sold in an open container or be sold for consumption in the licensed premises.

### **B. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS ACT 1933**

The Premises Licence is subject to the restrictions contained in the Children and Young Persons Act 1933 to the extent that any of those restrictions were imposed on the use of the premises for the existing licensable activities under the relevant existing licence or licences.

- **ANNEX 2 - Conditions Consistent with the Operating Schedule**

As this was a conversion of an existing licence(s) ANNEX 1 contains the embedded conditions from the converted licence(s)

- **ANNEX 3 - Conditions Attached After a Hearing by the Licensing Authority**

No hearing took place as there was no police objection to this conversion.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Premier**

383 - 385 Sheffield Road, Whittington Moor, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, S41 8LL

**Premises Licence PL/VF/0308 from from 08/05/2017 to indefinite****Licence holder(s)**

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Pirathys Constantine Manualpillai
------------------	--------------------------------------

**Designated Premises Supervisor**

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Pirathys Constantine Manualpillai
------------------	--------------------------------------

**Permitted Activities**

- the sale by retail of alcohol

**Premises Open Hours Requested**

	<b>Time From</b>	<b>Time To</b>
Monday to Sunday	08:00	23:00

**Activities - Times Requested**

	<b>Time From</b>	<b>Time To</b>
<b>M. The sale by retail of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises only</b>		
Monday to Sunday	08:00	23:00

**Additional Conditions**

- ANNEX 1 - MANDATORY CONDITIONS**

**Retailing of Alcohol**

These Conditions will be in force from 1st October 2010

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

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 a holographic mark.

2. The responsible person shall 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; and
- (b) customers are made aware of the availability of these measures.

- **ANNEX 2 - CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THE OPERATING SCHEDULE**

An application to vary the Premises Licence was submitted to the Council on 9th March 2011 to change the store layout due to structural alteration, and to relocate the counter.

The following text is from the Operating Schedule:-

**General**

In respect of shop fitting and merchandising, the premises will be completed to the highest standards demanded by the premises licence holder. This ensures that the premises are suitable for the purpose of a retail specialist off licence in relation to appearance, layout and security.

The store staff are trained in three ways:-

1. The company run BII NCPLH courses on average, once a month. These courses are well attended, and it is strongly recommended that stores should have a number of Personal Licence holders in addition to the DPS.
2. New Franchisees or their Managers are initially trained at the premises licence holders Head Office and at the company-owned store in Sandbach. The training encompasses management, sales and dealing with age-restricted goods. This is complemented by a training guide, which can be used for reference.
3. All staff who come face to face with the public should be trained using the premises licence holders Distance Training Package and DVDs. This is a one month course after which, the member of staff is signed off by their trainer. There are examinations at the end of each week and the member of staff must complete each weekly module. Additional questions are produced on a quarterly basis, so that training is ongoing.

**Prevention of Crime and Disorder**

The premises licence holder maintains a 21 Policy. The object is that any person who appears to be under the age of 21 years will be asked for identification before alcohol is sold to them. The only acceptable forms of identification are those which contain both a date of birth and a photograph.

Passport, photographic driving licence or a PASS approved Proof of Age Card.

The premises licence holder offers a reward for persons who give information which leads to the conviction of adults who are purchasing alcohol and then supplying it to people under the age of 18.

The shop and storage areas will be extensively alarmed under a monitored system. This will include a personal attack alarm button sited in the till and store areas. All doors and windows will be included in the alarm system.

A multi CCTV system will be installed covering the sales and till areas. The cameras will be linked to a recording system and images will be made available to the police on their request.

Roller shutters are installed at the premises for out of hours use.

It is proposed that in addition to the DPS, a number of full-time and part-time staff posts will be created. This will ensure that there are always two personnel on duty in the shop after 6.00 pm.

No shop assistant under the age of 18 will be employed to serve alcohol.

### **Public Safety**

If reasonable recommendations are made by the fire service, these will be complied with.

### **Prevention of Public Nuisance**

No matters relating to the prevention of public nuisance have been identified by the applicant in preparing this application.

### **Protection of Children from Harm**

The premises licence holder maintains a 21 Policy. The object is that any person who appears to be under the age of 21 years will be asked for identification before alcohol is sold to them. The only acceptable forms of identification are those which contain both a date of birth and a photograph. Passport, photographic driving licence or a PASS approved Proof of Age Card.

The premises licence holder offers a reward for persons who give information which leads to the conviction of adults who are purchasing alcohol and then supplying it to people under the age of 18.

- **ANNEX 3 - CONDITIONS ATTACHED AFTER A HEARING BY THE LICENSING AUTHORITY**

There was no hearing in relation to this application, so no conditions were imposed by the Licensing Committee.

## Spar Store

359b Sheffield Road, Whittington Moor, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, S41 8LQ

### Premises Licence PL/VF/0055 from from 12/04/2016 to indefinite

#### Licence holder(s)

Full Name	Mr Benjamin Stewart Holmes
Full Name	Mr Timothy Holmes

#### Designated Premises Supervisor

Full Name	Mr Benjamin Stewart Holmes
-----------	----------------------------

#### Permitted Activities

- the sale by retail of alcohol

#### Activities - Times Requested

	Time From	Time To	
<b>M. The sale by retail of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises only</b>			
Monday to Saturday	08:00	23:00	See Annex 1
Sunday	10:00	22:30	See Annex 1

#### Additional Conditions

- 

#### ANNEX 1

##### MANDATORY CONDITIONS

1

No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence -

- ( ) at any time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or
- ( ) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended.

2 Every supply of alcohol under the premises licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.

## **EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS**

### **A. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 1964**

#### **1 PERMITTED HOURS**

Alcohol shall not be sold or supplied except during permitted hours.

In this condition, permitted hours means:

- a. On weekdays, other than Christmas Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m.
- b. On Sundays, other than Christmas Day, 10 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- c. On Christmas Day, 12 noon to 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- d. On Good Friday, 8 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.

The above restrictions do not prohibit:

- (a) during the first twenty minutes after the above hours, the taking of the alcohol from the premises, unless the alcohol is supplied or taken in an open vessel;
- (b) the ordering of alcohol to be consumed off the premises, or the despatch by the vendor of the alcohol so ordered;
- (c) the sale of alcohol to a trader or club for the purposes of the trade or club;
- (d) the sale or supply of alcohol to any canteen or mess, being a canteen in which the sale or supply of alcohol is carried out under the authority of the Secretary of State or an authorised mess of members of Her Majesty's naval, military or air forces;

#### **2 CONSUMPTION**

Alcohol shall not be sold in an open container or be sold for consumption in the licensed premises.

### **B. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS ACT 1933**

The Premises Licence is subject to the restrictions contained in the Children and Young Persons Act 1933 to the extent that any of those restrictions were imposed on the use of the premises for the existing licensable activities under the relevant existing licence or licences.

•

### **ANNEX 2 - CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THE OPERATING SCHEDULE**

As this was a conversion of an existing licence(s) ANNEX 1 contains the embedded conditions from the converted licence(s) (with amendment, where necessary).

- 

**ANNEX 3 - CONDITIONS ATTACHED AFTER A HEARING BY THE LICENSING AUTHORITY**

There was no hearing in relation to this application, so no conditions were imposed by the Licensing Authority.

- **ANNEX 4 - MINOR VARIATION TO PLAN (120416)**

Minor variation to amend floor plan.

Received on 12.04.16.

Identifies entire shop floor as licensed for sale and supply of alcohol.

Plan referenced as SA / Spar Sheffield Road / PL/VF/0055

This page is intentionally left blank

## Virk Food & Wine Store

4 Occupation Road, Newbold, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, S41 8TH

### Premises Licence PL/VF/0082 from from 24/11/2005 to indefinite

#### Licence holder(s)

Full Name	Amrik Virk
-----------	------------

#### Designated Premises Supervisor

Full Name	Amrik Virk
-----------	------------

#### Permitted Activities

- the sale by retail of alcohol

#### Activities - Times Requested

	Time From	Time To	
<b>M. The sale by retail of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises only</b>			
Monday to Saturday	08:00	23:00	See Annex 1
Sunday	10:00	22:30	See Annex 1

#### Additional Conditions

- 

#### ANNEX 1

##### MANDATORY CONDITIONS

1

No supply of alcohol may be made under the premises licence -

- ( ) at any time when there is no designated premises supervisor in respect of the premises licence, or
- ( ) at a time when the designated premises supervisor does not hold a personal licence or his personal licence is suspended.

2 Every supply of alcohol under the premises licence must be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.

##### EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS

## **A. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 1964**

### **1 PERMITTED HOURS**

Alcohol shall not be sold or supplied except during permitted hours.

In this condition, permitted hours means:

- a. On weekdays, other than Christmas Day, 8 a.m. to 11 p.m.
- b. On Sundays, other than Christmas Day, 10 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- c. On Christmas Day, 12 noon to 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. to 10.30 p.m.
- d. On Good Friday, 8 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.

The above restrictions do not prohibit:

- (a) during the first twenty minutes after the above hours, the taking of the alcohol from the premises, unless the alcohol is supplied or taken in an open vessel;
- (b) the ordering of alcohol to be consumed off the premises, or the despatch by the vendor of the alcohol so ordered;
- (c) the sale of alcohol to a trader or club for the purposes of the trade or club;
- (d) the sale or supply of alcohol to any canteen or mess, being a canteen in which the sale or supply of alcohol is carried out under the authority of the Secretary of State or an authorised mess of members of Her Majesty's naval, military or air forces;

### **2 CONSUMPTION**

Alcohol shall not be sold in an open container or be sold for consumption in the licensed premises.

## **B. EMBEDDED RESTRICTIONS UNDER THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PERSONS ACT 1933**

The Premises Licence is subject to the restrictions contained in the Children and Young Persons Act 1933 to the extent that any of those restrictions were imposed on the use of the premises for the existing licensable activities under the relevant existing licence or licences.

•

## **ANNEX 2 - CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THE OPERATING SCHEDULE**

As this was a conversion of an existing licence(s) ANNEX 1 contains the embedded conditions from the converted licence(s) (with amendment, where necessary).

- 

**ANNEX 3 - CONDITIONS ATTACHED AFTER A HEARING BY THE LICENSING AUTHORITY**

There was no hearing in relation to this application, so no conditions were imposed by the Licensing Authority.

This page is intentionally left blank