

**Application for the review of a premises licence or club premises certificate under the Licensing Act 2003**

**PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

Before completing this form please read the guidance notes at the end of the form.  
If you are completing this form by hand please write legibly in block capitals. In all cases ensure that your answers are inside the boxes and written in black ink. Use additional sheets if necessary. You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

**I Robert Smalley**

*(Insert name of applicant)*

**apply for the review of a premises licence under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 for the premises described in Part 1 below**

**Part 1 – Premises or club premises details**

<b>Postal address of premises or, if none, ordnance survey map reference or description</b> Today's Express 17 Duke Street	
<b>Post town</b> Reading	<b>Post code (if known)</b> RG1 4SA

<b>Name of premises licence holder or club holding club premises certificate (if known)</b> Mr Quais Aziz
--

<b>Number of premises licence or club premises certificate (if known)</b> LP2002619
--

**Part 2 - Applicant details**

I am

Please tick ✓ yes

- 1) an individual, body or business which is not a responsible authority (please read guidance note 1, and complete (A) or (B) below)
- 2) a responsible authority (please complete (C) below)
- 3) a member of the club to which this application relates (please complete (A) below)

**(A) DETAILS OF INDIVIDUAL APPLICANT** (fill in as applicable)

Please tick ✓ yes

Mr

Mrs

Miss

Ms

Other title  
(for example, Rev)

**Surname**

**First names**

**I am 18 years old or over**

Please tick ✓ yes

**Current postal  
address if  
different from  
premises  
address**

**Post town**

**Post Code**

**Daytime contact telephone number**

**E-mail address  
(optional)**

**(B) DETAILS OF OTHER APPLICANT**

Name and address

Telephone number (if any)

E-mail address (optional)

**(C) DETAILS OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY APPLICANT**

**Name and address**

Mr Robert Smalley  
o.b.o Reading Borough Council - Licensing Department  
Bridge Street  
Reading  
RG1 2LU

**Telephone number (if any)**

0118 937 2846

**E-mail address (optional)**

Robert.Smalley@reading.gov.uk

**This application to review relates to the following licensing objective(s)**

- 1) the prevention of crime and disorder
- 2) public safety
- 3) the prevention of public nuisance
- 4) the protection of children from harm

Please tick one or more boxes ✓

**Please state the ground(s) for review** (please read guidance note 2)

Reading Borough Council, as a responsible authority under the Licensing Act 2003 and in order to promote the licensing objectives of prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm make an application for the review of Premises Licence No. LP2002619 (attached as **Appendix RS-1**), for Today's Express, 17 Duke Street, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 4SA.

Reading Borough Council Licensing submit this application for review in order to address the following concerns:

1. Failure of the premises licence holder to promote the licensing objectives via their insufficient measures to ensure due diligence or compliance with their licence conditions. These poor processes have led to the regular supply of alcohol to individuals who are involved in street drinking and its related anti-social behaviour in and around the vicinity of the premises. It is also suspected that the majority of the individuals being sold the alcohol are also intoxicated at the time that the sale occurs. **Appendix RS-2 & RS-3** show a regular street drinker exiting the premises with 2 cans of alcohol which are then consumed in Thorn Lane, which is 30 metres northeast of the premises. This location regularly sees street drinkers that get progressively more intoxicated throughout the day and are involved in anti-social behaviour such as littering and disturbing nearby businesses and residents by shouting.

2. Information received from Thames Valley Police raises concerns that the premises is involved with the handling of stolen goods. More information on this is contained in **Appendix RS-4**.
3. On 28/06/2021, Mr Mohammed Naseri threatened a male that was in the premises with a hammer. Mr Naseri can be seen in **Appendix RS-5** following a customer to the door of the premises while holding a hammer. On 18/05/2022, Mr Quais Aziz was involved in an altercation in which he slapped a woman in the face before grabbing her by the neck and throwing her out of the shop. He was later arrested and charged with assault. This incident is currently under active investigation. CCTV of this incident is attached as **Appendix RS-6**.
4. Information received from Thames Valley Police, after having viewed the premises' CCTV footage, reveals that alcohol was sold on this premises beyond the licensed hours. These incidents occurred on 1<sup>st</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> May 2022 and this was viewed by Declan Smyth (TVP). Unfortunately, this footage is no longer available.

It is our recommendation that the only way to prevent further undermining of the promotion of the licensing objectives is for the premises licence to be revoked.

Please provide as much information as possible to support the application (please read guidance note 3)

### Thames Valley Police's interactions with the premises:

28/09/2020

PC Wheeler and PC Moore visited the premises in relation to concerns that the premises was involved in the handling of stolen goods. As a result of this an inspection was carried out of the rear stock area of the store whereby large amounts of canned Red Bull were located. At the time these could not be proven as purchased from reputable distributors, and also of concern was the manner in which they were stored i.e. within cardboard boxes belonging to other products and with numerous cans with different batch numbers and designs. PC Wheeler returned later the same day to carry out a full licensing inspection which found that the premises was operating in breach of 5 of the 10 licence conditions. Details of said breaches are as follows:

1. CCTV was shown on the day and appeared to be working \* When recordings were requested the PLH failed to provide. (BREACH)
2. No refresher training was available and the excuse provided was that the DPS/PLH had not been in place for more than three months. However, it was confirmed all individuals had been working at the premises prior to the three month period. (BREACH)
3. An age verification policy was NOT displayed or available. (BREACH)
4. Copies of invoices and receipts for alcohol and tobacco purchases covering the previous six months were NOT available and it was stated they were at the accountants. (BREACH)
5. An incident book was shown which was blank and contained NO information. \*pertinent to this are consequent incidents that occurred for which no record was being made. (BREACH)

PC Wheeler spoke to the premises licence holder about the sale of super strength alcohol and how the sale of such products exacerbates issues of anti-social behaviour. Despite signage in the premises stating that cans must be purchased in packs of at least 4, PC Wheeler witnessed the selling of single cans, including to a known street drinker. The premises licence holder explained that he does not always enforce that rule. If properly enforced, this rule would discourage street drinkers from attending this premises, however, whatever selection method the premises licence holder is using when deciding whom to sell to is evidently ineffective to the extent that it appears to actually be undermining the promotion of the licensing objectives. The letter sent to the premises licence holder by PC Wheeler containing the full details of the inspection is attached as **Appendix RS-7**.

20/10/2020

Thames Valley Police officers attended the premises in order to request

copies of the CCTV relating to 28/09/2020 as well as various times on 20/10/2020 in relation to the handling of stolen goods.

On four of five occasions no handling of stolen goods was observed, however, when viewing the footage within the premises officers noted that known street drinking and prolific begging individuals entered the premises and purchased high strength alcohol (over the 6.5% ABV mark). On one of these occasions the male individual was seen to enter the shop, have an in depth discussion with staff during which he pointed to the stock room where it was suspected goods were often handled.

On the fifth the occasion a prolific town centre shoplifter was seen to enter the store carrying a large rucksack suspected of containing stolen goods. As soon as the male entered the store the CCTV immediately cuts out and does not re-start until he has left the store. This was consistent with the CCTV being switched off at its power source and back on after he had left the store. On viewing the CCTV at the store, officers noted that no other time lapses were observed. The suspicion was that the CCTV was deliberately tampered with at the time of the male's entry. A USB stick was provided in order that all of the requested footage could be downloaded by the premises licence holder as per the GDPR request. Unfortunately, the premises licence holder informed the officers that they were unable to download the footage and that instead the hard drive would be provided. On the 29/10/2020 the premises licence holder provided the premises' hard drive stating that it was being replaced due to a technical error causing the footage to cease recording and skip periods of time. This it was stated was the reason that the video had failed to record all images on the 20/10/2020.

Thames Valley Police have since attempted to interrogate the system but note the following issues with the hard drive as presented to them:

- The outer casing to the system was loose and open.
- The hard drive within the casing had its screws missing and was loose.
- The hard drive port appeared to have a glue like residue within it.

Officers deduced that human intervention had clearly taken place with the hard drive and the system was unable to provide any visual evidence. Unfortunately, this meant that the investigation into the handling of stolen goods could not be pursued and hindered Thames Valley Police's opportunity to either prove or disprove their suspicions relating to the premises.

PC Wheeler then recommends that the premises licence holder update the conditions on their licence in order to prevent further undermining of the licensing objectives. To date, no application to amend the premises licence conditions has been received by Reading Borough Council. The performance letter sent to the premises licence holder by PC Wheeler is attached as **Appendix RS-4**.

**Reading Borough Council's interactions with the premises:**

**19/01/2021**

Reading Borough Council Licensing Officer, Robert Smalley, visited the premises following information from Thames Valley Police about their concerns that the premises was not promoting the licensing objectives. During this inspection the following 7 breaches were identified:

1. Part A of the premises licence could not be produced. The premises licence holder explained that he had not been sent a copy since transferring the licence in August 2020. A copy of the premises licence was included with a copy of this inspection's results letter, however, it should be noted that the premises licence holder had not made any attempts to contact the council in order to request a copy of the licence, following PC Wheeler's visit in September 2020.
2. Part B of the premises licence could not be produced. The premises licence holder explained that he had not been sent a copy since transferring the licence in August 2020. Please see point 1 above.
3. The premises licence holder could not demonstrate that his staff were authorised to sell alcohol.
4. Condition (c) on page 7 of the licence in respect of staff training was not being complied with. Staff training records were located, however, this was simply a sheet signed by a member of staff to state that they had had training, but it was not clear through questioning what, if any, training had taken place. Template training materials were provided with this inspection's results letter.
5. Condition (f) on page 7 of the licence in respect of displaying the premises' age verification policy was not being complied with. A template policy was provided with this inspection's results letter.
6. Condition (g) on page 7 of the licence in respect of invoices was not being fully complied with. Invoices for alcohol and tobacco purchases for the months of October, November and December 2020 were not available.
7. Condition (h) on page 7 of the licence in respect of signage at the premises was not being fully complied with. There were no 'No Proof of Age, No Sale' signs on shelves containing alcohol.

This inspection highlights that, despite the assistance provided by Thames Valley Police, the premises licence holder was not able to operate the premises within the conditions of their licence. A letter was sent to the premises licence holder containing a list of the condition breaches and with some template policy and training materials in order to assist them to promote the licensing objectives. This inspection results letter is attached as **Appendix RS-8**.

**28/01/2022**

Reading Borough Council Licensing Officer, Robert Smalley, visited the premises to follow up on the inspection that took place in 2021. During this

inspection the following 4 breaches were identified:

1. Condition (a) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to CCTV was not being fully complied with. There were not 31 days of recordings. There was no date and time stamping. The premises licence holder was not able to proficiently operate the CCTV system, and therefore couldn't provide data recordings.
2. Condition (c) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to staff training was not being complied with. There were materials in the licensing folder that had been provided by officer Smalley after the previous inspection, however, the premises licence holder had not been undertaking 3 monthly training refresher sessions.
3. Condition (g) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to having available true copies of invoices etc. for all tobacco and alcohol purchases in the previous 6 months was not being fully complied with. Only 2 months' worth of invoices were able to be produced. The invoices were not stored in a neat, chronological order, as had previously been advised, and the premises licence holder was unsure of where other records were, explaining that they were at home, or with their accountant, or possibly in the shop.
4. Condition (i) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to using an incident book was not fully complied with. There was a general lack of information and there was no recording of the names of the members of staff that had dealt with any incidents.

Other concerns identified during this inspection were:

5. A 22 year old fire extinguisher was produced when the premises licence holder was asked to show the officer the premises' firefighting equipment. The pressure gauge needle was within the green segment; however, the extinguisher had not been inspected since 2012. The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 states that extinguishers must be serviced every year and an extended life service must be carried out every 5 years.
6. The premises licence holder did not have a written fire risk assessment in place. The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 states that every licensed premises must have a written fire risk assessment. The assessment should identify any fire risks and how those risks are being mitigated.
7. The emergency escape route was blocked with a metal roll cage stock trolley. The officer explained that, in the event of a fire, this could impede escape.

This inspection highlights that, despite the assistance provided by both Thames Valley Police and Reading Borough Council, the premises licence holder was still not able to operate the premises within the conditions of their licence. In fact, the premises licence holder doesn't seem to be able to maintain compliance between inspections. For example, During PC



Wheeler's inspection in September 2020, breaches with the CCTV were highlighted, but then, during officer Smalley's inspection in 2021, the CCTV condition was complied with, finally however, during the next inspection in 2022, the system was once again the cause of a breach. A letter was hand delivered to the premises licence holder at the premises containing a list of the condition breaches and is attached as **Appendix RS-9**.

### 17/03/2022

Reading Borough Council Licensing Officer, Robert Smalley, visited the premises to follow up on the inspection that took place in January 2022. During this inspection the following 3 breaches were identified:

1. Condition (a) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to CCTV was not being fully complied with. Only 22 of the required 31 days of recordings were able to be produced. There was date and time stamping, however, the time stamp was 8 hours behind. When playing back footage there appeared to be gaps in the footage as seen by the time stamps. The premises licence holder explained that the cameras were only recording motion which is a breach of this condition which requires the CCTV system to continually record whilst the premises are open to the public. The premises licence holder was not able to proficiently operate the CCTV system, and therefore couldn't provide data recordings.
2. Condition (c) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to staff training was not being complied with. The materials were in the licensing folder and they had been signed, however, when questioned on when any training sessions had taken place and what the contents of the training were, the premises licence holder was unable to provide an answer. This indicates that the documents had been signed in an attempt to appear compliant with the licence conditions, but, in actuality, no training of any form had taken place.
3. Condition (i) on page 7 of the premises licence in relation to using an incident book was not fully complied with. There was a general lack of information and there was no recording of the names of the members of staff that had dealt with any incidents.

This outcome of this inspection once again confirms what has previously been stated; the premises licence holder does not appear able to operate a licensed premises within the conditions stated on the premises licence. Where problems are identified and the premises licence holder rectifies the issue, they then appear incapable of maintaining compliance. This is indicative of a licensee that has no intention of continuing to work at ensuring compliance. Many conditions appear as breaches across multiple inspections (CCTV, Staff Training, invoices). The conditions on the licence are not disproportionate, inappropriate or onerous. A letter was hand delivered to the premises licence holder at the premises containing a list of the condition breaches and is attached as **Appendix RS-10**.

## Summary

Reading Borough Council and Thames Valley Police have, over the last 2 years, attempted to work with the premises licence holder to improve their standards and compliance with their premises licence via inspections and providing recommended conditions and various other materials. The premises licence holder has failed to engage with either the council or the police and unfortunately proof of this can be seen with the persistent state of non-compliance. It is apparent, given the evidence provided in this review application that the premises licence holder is incapable of operating the premises in line with the conditions on the licence.

Furthermore, the violence displayed by the premises licence holder and his employee, as witnessed in the CCTV footage, is gravely concerning. Assuming that they were the only 2 incidents, either could have resulted in serious injury or death. It is not conceivable that a licensee capable of such actions could ever be considered to be promoting the licensing objectives.

Reading Borough Council Licensing consider that the combination of the premises licence holder's poor, inconsistent record of compliance with their premises licence conditions, suspected handling of stolen goods, the very serious and concerning threats of, and actual violent acts carried out by staff, the selling of alcohol to street drinkers and the sale of alcohol outside the hours authorised by the premises licence seriously undermine the licensing objectives of Prevention of Crime and Disorder, Public Safety, Prevention of Public Nuisance and the Protection of Children from Harm.

It is our recommendation that the only measure that the licensing sub-committee can take to prevent further undermining of the licensing objectives is for the premises licence to be revoked.

We appreciate that the determination of this review is solely down to those members of the sub-committee at the hearing, however, we respectfully provide the following breakdown of the powers available to the sub-committee, each accompanied by an explanation as to whether we consider the power appropriate or not to address the current undermining of the licensing objectives:

- **the modification of the conditions of the premises licence;**

We do not consider the addition or amending of the conditions attached to the licence to be a pragmatic solution due to the premises licence holder's inability to comply with the current licence conditions which, themselves, are not onerous. The addition of further conditions that are likely to be breached will not assist in the promotion of the licensing objectives.

- **the exclusion of a licensable activity from the scope of the licence;**

There is only 1 licensable activity on the licence and therefore this option would render the licence redundant and, in practice, would have the same effect as revocation.

- **Revocation of the licence;**

For the previously stated reasons, we believe this is the only way to prevent further undermining of the licensing objectives.

- **the suspension of the licence for a period not exceeding 3 months;**

We do not believe that this option would serve as anything other than a punitive measure with the premises likely to return to how it currently operates at the end of the suspension period.

- **the removal of the designated premises supervisor;**

There are currently only 2 people that work at this premises, both personal licence holders, and, as seen in the evidence submitted with this review, neither are capable of promoting the licensing objectives. This option would likely require the hiring of new staff, however, those new staff would still report to the current premises licence holder. See 11.22 of the Secretary of State's section 182 guidance.

**I submit the following sections from the current Secretary of State's section 182 guidance and the Reading Borough Council statement of licensing policy as relevant to our review application.**

#### **Secretary of States Section 182 Guidance**

11.19 Where the licensing authority considers that action under its statutory powers is appropriate, it may take any of the following steps:

- modify the conditions of the premises licence (which includes adding new conditions or any alteration or omission of an existing condition), for example, by reducing the hours of opening or by requiring door supervisors at particular times;
- exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence, for example, to exclude the performance of live music or playing of recorded music (where it is not within the incidental live and recorded music exemption);
- remove the designated premises supervisor, for example, because they consider that the problems are the result of poor management;
- suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months;
- revoke the licence.

11.20 In deciding which of these powers to invoke, it is expected that licensing authorities should so far as possible seek to establish the cause or causes of the concerns that the representations identify. The remedial action taken should generally be directed at these causes and should always be no more than an appropriate and proportionate response to address the causes of concern that instigated the review.

11.22 Equally, it may emerge that poor management is a direct reflection of poor company practice or policy and the mere removal of the designated

premises supervisor may be an inadequate response to the problems presented. Indeed, where subsequent review hearings are generated by representations, it should be rare merely to remove a succession of designated premises supervisors as this would be a clear indication of deeper problems that impact upon the licensing objectives.

11.23 Licensing authorities should also note that modifications of conditions and exclusions of licensable activities may be imposed either permanently or for a temporary period of up to three months. Temporary changes or suspension of the licence for up to three months could impact on the business holding the licence financially and would only be expected to be pursued as an appropriate means of promoting the licensing objectives or preventing illegal working. So, for instance, a licence could be suspended for a weekend as a means of deterring the holder from allowing the problems that gave rise to the review to happen again. However, it will always be important that any detrimental financial impact that may result from a licensing authority's decision is appropriate and proportionate to the promotion of the licensing objectives and for the prevention of illegal working in licensed premises. But where premises are found to be trading irresponsibly, the licensing authority should not hesitate, where appropriate to do so, to take tough action to tackle the problems at the premises and, where other measures are deemed insufficient, to revoke the licence.

11.24 A number of reviews may arise in connection with crime that is not directly connected with licensable activities. For example, reviews may arise because of drugs problems at the premises, money laundering by criminal gangs, the sale of contraband or stolen goods, the sale of firearms, or the sexual exploitation of children. Licensing authorities do not have the power to judge the criminality or otherwise of any issue. This is a matter for the courts. The licensing authority's role when determining such a review is not therefore to establish the guilt or innocence of any individual but to ensure the promotion of the crime prevention objective.

11.25 Reviews are part of the regulatory process introduced by the 2003 Act and they are not part of criminal law and procedure. There is, therefore, no reason why representations giving rise to a review of a premises licence need be delayed pending the outcome of any criminal proceedings. Some reviews will arise after the conviction in the criminal courts of certain individuals, but not all. In any case, it is for the licensing authority to determine whether the problems associated with the alleged crimes are taking place on the premises and affecting the promotion of the licensing objectives. Where a review follows a conviction, it would also not be for the licensing authority to attempt to go beyond any finding by the courts, which should be treated as a matter of undisputed evidence before them.

11.26 Where the licensing authority is conducting a review on the grounds that the premises have been used for criminal purposes, its role is solely to determine what steps should be taken in connection with the premises licence, for the promotion of the crime prevention objective. It is important to recognise that certain criminal activity or associated problems may be taking place or have taken place despite the best efforts of the licence holder and the staff working at the premises and despite full compliance

with the conditions attached to the licence. In such circumstances, the licensing authority is still empowered to take any appropriate steps to remedy the problems. The licensing authority's duty is to take steps with a view to the promotion of the licensing objectives and the prevention of illegal working in the interests of the wider community and not those of the individual licence holder.

### **Reading Borough Council Statement of Licensing Policy**

9.1 It is the responsibility under the Act for all responsible authorities; licence holders and prospective licence holders to actively promote the four licensing objectives. The Council along with partner agencies, has a wider responsibility to protect the public as a whole and prevent crime, harm or nuisance from taking place.

9.15 Licensed premises that have a history of non-compliance over a period of months and years and/or incidents of serious crime taking place at that premises, will likely find that the Authority will initiate a review with a view to asking for the licence to be considered for revocation.

9.16 When considering what enforcement action to take, the Authority will always consider what is the most appropriate and proportionate step to promote the licensing objectives. The Authority is not required to wait for offences to occur before deciding it needs to take appropriate action. Case law - notably *East Lindsey District Council v Abu Hanif* - states that the promotion of the licensing objectives requires a prospective consideration of what is warranted in the public interest having regard to the twin considerations of prevention and deterrence. Similarly, the Secretary of State's Guidance to the Licensing Act makes clear that there is no requirement for the Authority to wait for the outcome of any criminal proceedings before it initiates any enforcement action. This is the approach that the Authority will take when considering what, if any, action should be taken when condition breaches and other criminal activity is found at licensed premises.

### **Relevant Case Law for Consideration**

*East Lindsey District Council v Abu Hanif (t/a Zara's Restaurant) (2016)* this underpins the principles widely acknowledged within the Licensing Act 2003 that the licensing objectives are prospective, and that the prevention of crime and disorder requires a prospective consideration of what is warranted in the public interest, having regard to the twin considerations of prevention and deterrence.

### **Appendices**

**Appendix RS-1: Current Premises Licence**

**Appendix RS-2: Video of Street Drinker**

**Appendix RS-3: Photo of Street Drinker**

**Appendix RS-4: Thames Valley Police Performance Letter - 12/12/2020**

**Appendix RS-5: Video of Hammer Incident**

**Appendix RS-6: Video of Assault Incident**

**Appendix RS-7: Thames Valley Police Inspection Results Letter -  
28/09/2020**

**Appendix RS-8: Reading Borough Council Inspection Results Letter -  
19/01/2021**

**Appendix RS-9: Reading Borough Council Inspection Results Letter -  
28/01/2022**

**Appendix RS-10: Reading Borough Council Inspection Results Letter -  
17/03/2022**

**Please tick ✓ yes**

Have you made an application for review relating to the premises before

If yes please state the date of that application

Day    Month    Year

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**If you have made representations before relating to the premises please state what they were and when you made them**

--

Please tick ✓ yes

- I have sent copies of this form and enclosures to the responsible authorities and the premises licence holder or club holding the club premises certificate, as appropriate
- I understand that if I do not comply with the above requirements my application will be rejected

**IT IS AN OFFENCE, UNDER SECTION 158 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003, TO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT IN OR IN CONNECTION WITH THIS APPLICATION. THOSE WHO MAKE A FALSE STATEMENT MAY BE LIABLE ON SUMMARY CONVICTION TO A FINE OF ANY AMOUNT.**

**Part 3 – Signatures** (please read guidance note 4)

**Signature of applicant or applicant’s solicitor or other duly authorised agent** (please read guidance note 5). **If signing on behalf of the applicant please state in what capacity.**

Signature 

.....

Date 12/12/2022

.....

Capacity **Licensing Enforcement Officer**

.....

<b>Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application</b> (please read guidance note 6)	
<b>Post town</b>	<b>Post Code</b>
<b>Telephone number (if any)</b>	
<b>If you would prefer us to correspond with you using an e-mail address your e-mail address (optional)</b>	

**Notes for Guidance**

1. A responsible authority includes the local police, fire and rescue authority and other statutory bodies which exercise specific functions in the local area.
2. The ground(s) for review must be based on one of the licensing objectives.
3. Please list any additional information or details for example dates of problems which are included in the grounds for review if available.
4. The application form must be signed.
5. An applicant’s agent (for example solicitor) may sign the form on their behalf provided that they have actual authority to do so.
6. This is the address which we shall use to correspond with you about this application.