

## Licensing Sub-Committee

Tuesday, 15th November, 2016

**PRESENT:** Councillor R Downes in the Chair

Councillors M Coulson and G Wilkinson

**1 Election of the Chair**

**RESOLVED** – Councillor Downes was elected Chair of the meeting.

**2 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against the refusal of the inspection of documents.

**3 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The agenda contained no exempt information.

**4 Late Items**

With the permission of the Chair, one formal late item of business was added to the agenda – an application for a Temporary Event Notice for Bramley Sports and Social Club for an event proposed for 18<sup>th</sup> November 2016. As the application had attracted representations from West Yorkshire Police, the Authority was required to determine the application as soon as possible and had been added to this agenda as the first available meeting to consider the matter. (minute 10 refers)

**5 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

**6 The E-Den - Application for the grant of a premises licence for The E Den, Arch 3, Church Walk, Leeds, LS2 7EG**

The Sub Committee considered an application for the grant of a premises licence, made by Your Eco Solutions Ltd, for The E Den, Arch 3, Church Walk, Leeds, LS2 7EG. The premises are located within the Cumulative Impact Area for Area 1 – City Centre Green Zone.

In summary the application sought to allow the premises to operate Sunday to Thursday 09:00 until 03:00 and Friday & Saturday 09:00 until 06:00 (to include regulated entertainment to cover customers use of online video gaming stations to play on X Box, PlayStation, PCs etc. with late night refreshment and the sale of alcohol Sunday to Thursday 11:00 until 03:00, Friday & Saturday 11:00 until 04:30)

Representations had been received from LCC Environmental Protection Team (EPT), West Yorkshire Police (WYP), local Ward Councillor M Iqbal and members of the public.

It was noted that the applicant had reached agreements with LCC EPT and the representation had been withdrawn, subject to the agreed measures being included on the Premises Licence should the application be granted. This subsequently amended the application as follows:

Anything of a similar description to that falling within live music, recorded music and performance of dance

Monday to Wednesday 09:00 until 00:30 hours

Thursday to Sunday 09:00 until 01:30 hours

Late night refreshment

Monday to Wednesday 23:00 until 00:30 hours

Thursday to Sunday 23:00 until 01:30 hours

Supply of alcohol

Monday to Wednesday 09:00 until 00:30 hours

Thursday to Sunday 09:00 until 01:30 hours

Furthermore, at the start of the hearing it was noted that the applicant had reached agreements with WYP on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2016; leading to WYP withdrawing their representation, subject to the agreed measures being included on the Premises Licence should the application be granted. The agreements were read out at the meeting:

Sales of alcohol shall be

11:00 until midnight - Monday to Wednesday: premises close at 00:30 hours 11:00

until 01:00 - Thursday to Sunday: premises close at 01:30 hours

Other licensable activities applied for shall be from 09:00 until close

Late night refreshment shall be from 23:00 until close

Premises opening hours shall be from 09:00 until 00:30 on Monday to Wednesdays and 09:00 until 01:30 on Thursdays to Sunday

To supplement the conditions offered in the application and to address police concerns, the following conditions were also agreed:

- There shall be no person under the age of 18 on the premises after 22:00 hours.
- Persons identified by West Yorkshire Police to the management shall be denied entry to the premises.

The Sub Committee noted that the hours of operation agreed between the applicant and WYP further reduced the hours of operation of the premises.

The hearing was attended by:

Mr J Nelson – applicant and Designated Premises Supervisor

Mr T Alston – observer

Ms N Ram – member of the public

Ms J Nicholson – member of the public

Ms B Keeble – member of the public

Mr Nelson, the applicant, explained the proposed style of operation of the premises as primarily a venue where gamers could meet and play electronic and on-line/x-box/PlayStation and PC games. Traditionally gamers played remotely, indoors; and he intended this venue as place where they could meet, socialise and play together. He assured Members that alcohol would be secondary to the main purpose of the venue as a gamers meeting place. He explained that only a very small bar area

would be available with the main refreshments being soft drinks - the alcohol offer would be limited to two draughts - one beer and one cider. There would be no admittance to Under 17s, unless accompanied by an adult and all Under 17s would be required to leave the premises by 22:00 hours. The venue was across two floors with the main gaming area on the first floor – he confirmed he was in talks with West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service about the installation of a stair lift so that disabled players could gain access. A disabled toilet was included in the plans for the venue.

Mr Nelson addressed the comments made in a recent newspaper article which he stated misrepresented the purpose of the venue. Mr Nelson also highlighted the closing times of other licensed premises in the locality and stated he wished to close his premises half an hour earlier than local bars/pubs as he did not want those patrons seeking to gain entry for “last orders” at this e-gaming venue. He noted that none of those venues employed doorstaff and he hoped that he would not be required to.

During questions from the Sub Committee on the contents of the pro-forma risk assessment included with the application, Mr Nelson provided the following additional information:

- All staff would be Personal Licence Holders and would be instructed on implementing a proof of age scheme
- The venue had a capacity of 70 persons
- A system would be in place whereby the venue would act on information from WYP of possible undesirable persons who they would then prevent from gaining entry
- In order to prevent customers disturbing local businesses/residents, Mr Nelson would seek to prevent people accessing the shared Church Row car park adjacent to the row of business by blocking/cordoning off the access. He noted that all businesses in the row had a key to the car park and it was locked after the last worker left. He also noted that currently, there were difficulties when members of the public accessed that car park after hours
- Mr Nelson acknowledged that this area experienced problems and the concerns of local businesses that this e-gaming venue would attract unruly people, however he stated that they would not gain entry to the venue, such people were not allowed access to any of the other bars/pubs in the area either.

At this point, during questions about the applicants’ non-membership of “Pubwatch” and “BACIL” Mr Nelson confirmed that he had not seen the completed Pro-forma risk assessment although he had discussed some elements of the form with his accountant who completed it on his behalf, he had not seen the document. The Sub Committee commented on this, however Members agreed to adjourn for a short while to allow Mr Nelson and a Licensing Officer to discuss the document. On resuming the hearing, the Licensing Officer confirmed that, having reviewed all of the areas where the applicant had not indicated measures would be implemented, Mr Nelson now offered the following:

7PF003 relating to a CCTV system

7PF013 relating to provision of CCTV information to WYP on request

7PF022 to be amended to refer to the DPS

7PF 026 and 7PF027 relating to searches to be removed as no Doorstaff would be on site to undertake searches  
7PF029 to be removed  
7PF030 to 7PF033 all to be attached as conditions  
7PF044 relating to membership of "Pubwatch"

The Sub Committee then heard from members of the public who had submitted representations about the application.

Ms Ram spoke on behalf of the Twinkles Nursery located within the row of businesses on Church Walk. Ms Ram spoke of her concerns relating to the provision on alcohol within the application. Ms Ram explained that the Church Walk area had experienced incidents of anti-social behaviour in the past and had worked with WYP to combat this. She was concerned that, as Eden would open at 11:00 hours, the staff, children and parents attending the nursery would feel less safe when accessing the walkway. This was a gated area, but people unrelated to the business did still gain access. She expressed concern about the likely increased use of the area later at night. She also reported on the reduction of police presence in the city area and the lack of police capability to arrest people. She noted that the side of the nursery grounds was located under a railway bridge where people congregated and that drug taking and exchanges happened close by. Ms Ram queried how the applicant could guarantee his patrons were safe and not a risk if he could not conduct searches without employing doorstaff. In conclusion, Ms Ram questioned the applicants' decision to propose the venue in this location and what the link was between alcohol and gaming. She stated that any new business in this location would need to be child-friendly, being so close to Twinkles Nursery.

In response to questions from the Sub Committee, Ms Ram provided additional information; clarifying that the arch was currently empty and that there were ongoing problems in the car park, plus other incidents aimed at the nursery – such as a recent firework attack. Following the reduction of the police presence, the number of incidents had increased.

Ms Keeble from Beattie Communications located on Church Walk then addressed the hearing. Ms Keeble stated that safeguarding was a primary concern as the staff comprised of young women and clients often visited the business. Currently, the front door was kept locked as people approached staff or knocked on the door. She believed that Eden would invite more people into the car park which was already misused. Staff used the car park often very early or later at night and she stated that it could feel threatening with people in the shadows and if the gate was open, with people close-by Street drinking, it would not feel safe. Ms Keeble added that she could see the attraction of creating a venue for gaming, however she did not think that alcohol should be adjacent to the gaming area for young people. She felt that this was the wrong location for this venture as it was across the road from the Drug and Alcohol rehabilitation centre and businesses in the Church Walk area had witnessed drug use, anti-social behaviour and street-drinking amongst the service users outside the centre. A new premise such as Eden would attract their interest and without security, the applicant would not be able to keep them out and it would attract trouble. She noted that the Co-op employed security guards and they were not always able to prevent anti-social behaviour. In conclusion, Ms Keeble felt that

the area suffered with anti-social behaviour which needed addressing before this new venue opened.

In response to the Sub Committee's queries, Ms Keeble provided additional information; including her personal experience of threatening behaviour in the car park when a man had approached her and exposed himself to her. Although she did not have a log of incidents at the hearing, there would be records of the liaison undertaken between Beattie Communications and Network Rail (who owned the arches). Church Walk was a no-through road; the car park was open through the day and locked when businesses closed.

Mr Nelson then concluded his submission by addressing the comments made by the objectors and responding to queries:

- Beattie Communications, Manchester office was located adjacent to a gaming centre
- Each arch business was allocated two parking permits in the car park; however he had seen more than 8 Twinkles Nursery parents using the car park
- There was no relationship between alcohol and gaming, however this would be a venue where Over 18s attended
- He queried the authority by which the pedestrian gate to Church Walk was locked
- He agreed that the area was getting worse in respect of anti-social behaviour but he felt one way to improve it would be to self-police the area as WYP did not have the resources
- Blocking/cordoning off the car park was a measure he felt could discourage misuse of the car park at night
- Drug taking and street drinking already occurred in the area, but not actually on Church Walk
- Wines and spirits may be provided at the venue in the future
- He anticipated the patrons would largely fall in the 18 to 50 years age range
- He would employ doorstaff if it was necessary, but felt that this could increase intimidation, additionally, none of the bars/pubs in the area employed doorstaff

The Sub Committee carefully considered the application before them, alongside the written and verbal submissions from the applicant and members of the public. Members also noted the amended operating schedule subsequent to the agreements reached between the applicant and the Responsible Authorities prior to the hearing and the measures offered by the applicant at the hearing from consideration of the pro-forma risk assessment to address the licensing objectives.

The Sub Committee noted the location of the premises and the existing experience of anti-social behaviour in the area. Members noted the likely clientele of the venue and noted that other licensed premises in the area did not employ doorstaff and that WYP had not required this of the applicant.

Balancing the application with the submissions made, the Sub Committee felt that the operation of this e-gaming venue would not negatively impact on the anti-social behaviour already experienced in the area. The Sub Committee felt that this applicant would conscientiously adhere to the licensing objectives. The Sub Committee therefore

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application, subject to the amended operating schedule.

To clarify:

- The measures included within the pro-forma risk assessment and those offered at the hearing will now be included as conditions on the premises licence.
- The measures agreed with LCC EPT and WYP shall also be included on the Premises licence with the following hours of operation:

Sales of alcohol

11:00 until 00:00 - Monday to Wednesday (premises close at 00:30hours)

11:00 until 01:00 - Thursday to Sunday (premises close at 01:30 hours)

Other licensable activities from 09:00 until close

Late night refreshment from 23:00 until close

Premises opening hours

09:00 until 00:30 on Monday to Wednesdays

09:00 until 01:30 on Thursdays to Sunday

**7 Papa Johns - Application for the grant of a premises licence for Papa Johns, 54 Austhorpe Road, Cross Gates, Leeds, LS15 8DX**

The Sub Committee considered an application for the grant of a premises licence, made by Mr G Singh, for Papa John's 54 Austhorpe Road, Cross Gates, Leeds, LS15 8DX. This would be the first premises licence for this address. In summary the application sought provision of Late Night Refreshment until 01:00 Sunday to Thursday and until 03:00 on Friday and Saturday.

Representations had been received from LCC Environmental Protection Team (EPT) and Planning Services in their capacity as responsible authorities along with 22 individual letters of objection which opposed the application on the grounds of all four licensing objectives.

The following attended the hearing:

Mr G Singh – the applicant; and Mr B Dhawan

Mr G Mann and Mr J Tootle – LCC EPT

Ms L Hart and Mr D Jones – LCC Planning Services

Professor E Judge and Mr Furness – members of the public

Not all members of the public who made a representation attended the hearing, the Sub Committee resolved to take their written representations into consideration and to proceed with the hearing in their absence.

Mr Singh addressed the Sub Committee, explaining that this premises was one of 15 Papa John's franchises he owned, all of which opened until 03:00 or 05:00 hours. He stated that this premises would employ twelve staff in total. Signs were erected

reminding customers to leave quietly and there was a litter-picking policy. CCTV was installed to protect against incidents of crime which recorded 24 hours per day, with the recordings held for 28 days which could be provided to West Yorkshire Police (WYP) on request.

Mr Dhawan explained that the purpose for the premise licence was to facilitate a pizza delivery service after 23:00 hours; the applicant did not necessarily envisage customers attending the shop in the early morning. He provided statistics stating that prior to 21:00 hours, 80% of sales were delivery based and that rose to 95% of sales after 23:00 hours. Additionally, the delivery drivers were requested not to slam car doors, rev engines or play music loudly whilst they were waiting to collect orders ready to deliver. Mr Dhawan also noted that the three Leeds Domino's Pizza premises opened until 03:00 hours and that this proposed Papa John's premises would be located next to Livorno pizza shop.

Mr G Mann, LCC EPT, then addressed the Sub Committee commenting on the location of this Papa John's, which had been open since February 2016, in an area of mixed commercial and residential use. Most of the nearby shops closed by 18:00 hours and some of these had residential flats above. In fact, the upper two floors of this premise had recently been the subject of a planning application for a House in Multiple Occupation/flats although this had now been withdrawn and the upper two floors were used for storage. Mr Mann explained concerns over the impact of late night use of the premise by patrons on existing and future residents, in terms of noise from vehicles, people talking and congregating. Such noise could be intermittent and that LCC EPT could not deal with noise generated outside the curtilage of a premises so this type of noise could be frustrating for residents seeking to resolve the issue. Additionally, there would be the increased potential for disturbance from delivery vehicles/drivers and from the kitchens through the use of extractors and ventilation systems, particularly in summer months when residents may open their windows. In conclusion, Mr Mann expressed concern that should the hours of operation be granted as applied for, the 03:00 hours closing could set a precedent in the locality for other premises to consider extending their operating hours, which would lead to a greater impact on residential amenity through noise and disturbance at later hours.

In response to a query regarding the location of this premises being next door to an existing pizza restaurant with 02:00 hours closing time at weekends, Mr Mann stated he was not persuaded by this. An additional late night premises in this location would create additional noise and disturbance in the area. However, Mr Mann did confirm that no noise complaints had been received by LCC EPT.

The Sub Committee then heard from Ms L Hart, LCC Planning Services. Ms Hart confirmed that planning permission allowing the premises to operate as a restaurant had been granted in September 2015. At that time, conditions were included on the permission which restricted the hours of opening to 08:30 until 23:30 hours in the interests of the amenity of nearby residents. A condition also prevented car parking on the frontage of the premises. She confirmed that a planning application for residential use of the upper floor of premises had been withdrawn and noted that there were houses nearby and flats above other premises in this shopping parade.

Mr D Jones also provided the Sub Committee with an overview of the residential nature of the upper floors of other premises in the locality and concern over the timing of this premises licence application at the same time the residential use planning application had been withdrawn.

In response to questions from the Sub Committee, Mr Jones confirmed that at the time planning permission was granted for restaurant use, LCC Planning Services was aware that the adjacent Livorno's premises operated until 02:00 hours at weekends. That was a long-standing permission from the 1970's and although an 02:00 hours application would not be supported now due to concerns of amenity, the Livorno permission could not be revisited.

Mr Furness then addressed the Sub Committee; he spoke on behalf of the Crossgates Residents and Professor Judge who was also in attendance. Mr Furness expressed local residents concerns over the potential for disturbance which could be generated by the premises, due to its location close to residential properties and the flats above the shops. He noted that the frontage of the shops had double yellow lines to restrict on-street car parking and suggested that this was why the planning permission restricted the delivery vehicles to the rear of the premises. Due to the shortage of parking for customers, he suggested that they would aim to park in the residential streets nearby.

Mr Furness explained that this was an area where there not a lot of footfall. He noted that both Livorno and Oceans fish and chip shop were nearby however, littering was a different problem with pizza take-aways as customers discarded the packaging differently and despite the applicants assurance about litter picking, Mr Furness stated he still found empty pizza boxes in his garden. Mr Furness also highlighted the possible impact on residents' sleep by the proposed later opening hours and referred to data showing how noise reduced across Crossgates through the night. He felt that the proposed later opening hours would disturb sleep patterns which could have a health impact.

Mr Singh concluded his submission and addressed some of the comments made. He stated that he had received no complaints about noise from local residents since the premises opened in February 2016. The premise used a sound suppresser – a similar system as that operated in the other nationwide Papa John's premises. Mr Singh stated that he would take on board the residents' concerns and try to be more community minded. He confirmed that staff did undertake litter picks but acknowledged that they couldn't collect everything.

The hearing concluded with a discussion about whether conditioning delivery drivers to only use the rear of the premises during the evening would be beneficial. Mr Furness stated that the rear of the premises was very restricted and busy. Drivers did not use the rear entrance currently and he did not foresee them doing so in the future. Ms Hart emphasised the current planning conditions which restricted parking and delivery to take place at the rear of the building in the off-site garage facility with no parking at all to take place on the shop frontage at all times. Mr Singh confirmed there were 6 parking spaces to the rear of the premises with the garage planned for demolition. Mr Singh stated that the drivers would use only the rear entrance for deliveries in the future and he was reminded that to undertake any deliveries from



the front of the premises would be in breach of the planning permission for the premises.

The Sub Committee carefully considered the application before them, alongside the written and verbal submissions from the applicant, the responsible authorities and members of the public.

Balancing the application and the views of local residents and responsible authorities, the Sub Committee noted that another licensed premises in the locality – Livorno's – operated until 02:00 hours and that there had been no complaints made about this premises. The Sub Committee therefore concluded that operation until 02:00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays only would be more in keeping with the locality. In terms of Sunday to Thursday, the Sub Committee was aware that other premises operated until 00:00 midnight and indeed residents, in their written representations, had expressed the view that Papa John's already operated to 00:30 hours when this was not the case. In view of this, Members felt that the premises could operate until 00:00 midnight, subject to appropriate conditions.

**RESOLVED** – To grant the application in the following terms:

Provision of Late Night Refreshment

Sunday to Thursday – 23:00 until 00:00 midnight

Friday and Saturday – 23:00 until 02:00 hours

Owing to the concerns raised in respect of public nuisance and in line with the planning conditions, coupled with Mr G Singh's agreement to only permit deliveries from the rear of the building, a condition of the premises licence will state that there will be no deliveries from the front of the premises.

Additionally, the applicant was firmly reminded that planning permission was required before the hours granted on this premises licence could be operated. Residents were also reminded that, should they feel that deliveries continued to operate from the front of the premises in contravention of both the planning permission and the Premises Licence, they should report and evidence this to Leeds City Council and seek to bring a Review of the Premises Licence.

**8 Church - Application to vary a premises licence held by Church (Formerly Halo & The Joint) 177 - 179 Woodhouse Lane, Woodhouse, Leeds, LS2 3JT**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda in its entirety by the applicant prior to the meeting.

**9 Black Orchid - Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Black Orchid, Second Floor and Third Floor, 64 Call Lane, Leeds, LS1 6DT**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda in its entirety by the applicant prior to the meeting.

**10 LATE ITEM - Temporary Event Notice for Bramley Sports and Social Club Live Boxing Show at the Villagers Community Club, 340 Broad Lane, Bramley, Leeds, LS13 2HF**

The Head of Elections, Licensing and Registration submitted a Late Item of business to the agenda – a report on an application for a Temporary Event Notice,

The Villagers Community Club, 340 Broad Lane, Bramley, Leeds, LS13 2HF. In summary the TEN sought the sale of alcohol and provision of Late Night Refreshment on Friday 18th November 19:30 - 23:00 hours. The maximum capacity of the event is 450.

The Sub Committee accepted the item as the application related to a proposed event on 18th November 2016 and as West Yorkshire Police (WYP) had served an objection notice to the TEN on the grounds of crime and disorder, the Authority was required to determine the application as soon as possible.

Mr P Owen, the applicant and Designated Premises Supervisor attended the hearing accompanied by Mr A Taylor, the event manager. Ms C Sanderson of WYP also attended.

Mr Taylor addressed the Sub Committee explaining that £10,000 of sponsorship had already been secured for the proposed Charity Boxing night in aid of the Candlelighters children's cancer charity. He added that there had been trouble at previous charity events. A world famous referee had been commissioned to referee this event.

Mr Owen then addressed the concerns expressed in the written representation submitted by WYP. He stated that the objection stemmed from a few previous boxing events which had attracted disorder amongst youths, although 18 similar events in total had been held. Mr Owen explained that the 18/11/16 event would be very different – this would be a charitable evening and would attract more mature attendees. The organisation and style of this event would be very different - the event is a ticketed only event, a large proportion of the ticket holders were known to the DPS; boxing would be just one of a number of entertainments on offer including a singer, a comedian and an auction of sporting memorabilia with an MC to compere the event. ProTech Security would provide 6 SIA registered doorstaff for the event. Mr Owen stated that he was confident that the 18/11/16 event would not attract disorder issues as most of the attendees belonged to the same friendship group and the boxing featured would be non-competitive.

Ms Sanderson then addressed the Sub Committee on behalf of WYP. She confirmed that the objection had been made due to the inclusion of boxing on the programme of the event and the history of disorder associated with boxing events at the premises. Ms Sanderson explained that a boxing club operated from the ground floor of the Community Club and events had been held there previously. In February 2014 a serious incident occurred after a boxing event and after the doorstaff had been sent home when patrons who had left the venue tried to re-gain entry. After an event in September 2015, a group of up to 100 people were fighting and blocking Broad Lane. Ms Sanderson noted that the venue attracted anti-social behaviour involving youths and due to the disorder which had occurred at some of the events, provision of boxing had been removed from the premises licence for the Community Club.

Since then, Temporary events had been held on the 11th March, 1st July and 28th October 2016. The activities requested were the sale by retail of alcohol and the provision of regulated entertainment. As no objections had been received, these TENs went ahead – however the October 2016 event also resulted in fighting. Ms

Sanderson noted that Mr Owen had asked to meet with WYP to discuss the 18/11/16 event and he had stated that this would include 'white collar' boxing matches, however she felt that Mr Owen could not guarantee the clientele as it was known that boxers would sell their own batch of tickets. Additionally, although she was pleased that ProTech Security had been engaged, she was concerned that local youths who were used to gaining entry to the venue would still try to attend the event and possibly cause disorder.

During discussions with the applicant, the following information was provided:

- At the 2014 event, Mr Owen confirmed that once the event had finished, he had sent the doorstaff home but then people came back.
- He had learned from this earlier mistake and had had meetings with WYP and removed boxing from the Premises Licence
- Three TEN events had been held this year, two successfully and one not so. Mr Owen stated that the person arrested on that night was already known to WYP.
- Mr Owen agreed that at that time, he had told WYP that he would not hold a boxing event again

Members, noting that that they could only attach conditions to the TEN which already existed on the current Premises Licence and were relevant to the activities stated on the TEN sought input from Ms Sanderson on whether there was anything else the applicant could do. In response Ms Sanderson reiterated her concern that the applicant could not guarantee that only over 25's would attend the event. Fighters sold tickets wherever they wanted, so attendees may bring children and youths to the event. Historically, it tended to be family and friends at boxing matches who caused trouble between the groups of supporters. It was unfortunate that this venue also attracted disorder from youths unconnected to this particular event.

In response Mr Owen clarified that all ticket purchasers' names had been recorded for this event. Family and friends of the boxers due to fight at the event would actually have had to purchase tickets from one supplier. Mr Owens also explained the events which caused WYP concern. Previously the Community Club had hosted a 13th and 15th year old birthday party, however the 15 year old advertised the party on Facebook and 250 attendees arrived, some with foreign alcohol. Even though that alcohol was confiscated and those attendees were barred, disorder occurred. Mr Owen stated he had not held similar youth events again. He went onto explain that usually local boxers with local families attended the clubs' boxing events; and that is what attracted the local youths. This Candlelighters event proposed for 18/11/16 would be different, with only 30 minutes of boxing included during the evening – 5 rounds of 2 minutes each – as opposed to the usual 18 concurrent fights. He also added that he advised local ward Councillors of the proposed events and no issues had been raised.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the steps available which it considered appropriate to promote the licensing objectives and noted the submissions made by the applicant and the representative of WYP both in writing and at the hearing. The Sub Committee noted the summary provided of the proposed event, including the entertainment to be offered – of which boxing was only part. Members also noted the

management of ticket sales and that this event had been marketed as a charity event to persons over 25 years old.

**RESOLVED** – Not to issue a Counter Notice in order to allow the event to go ahead - subject to all relevant conditions which are currently attached to the premises licence for the Hall.

In conclusion the Sub Committee commented that the employment of 6 doorstaff for the 18/11/16 event was welcomed. Additionally, Members clarified that this application for the charity event had been judged on the basis of what was presented to them and should not be seen as an indication of consideration of any future applications for the venue.