

LICENSING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE 2 MINUTES - 7 MARCH 2019

the Licensing Authority could amend, alter or refuse an application should it be deemed appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The report set out paragraphs 1.5, 8.41-8.49, 9.11-9.13, 9.42-9.43, 10.4-10.5, 10.15 and 10.27-10.28 from the Secretary of State's guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (April 2018) and paragraphs 2.11-2.14, 3.2, 6.1-6.2, 6.11-6.13, 6.16 and 7.6-7.13 from the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy (October 2018).

The applicant submitted some additional documents which had been circulated to the Sub-Committee.

The applicant was represented by Mr Thomas Griffiths, Barrister, Citadel Chambers, who addressed the Sub-Committee on the application and responded to questions. Mr Inderjeet Singh Malhotra, the applicant, was present and responded to questions from the Sub-Committee and was accompanied and assisted by Mr Surendra Panchal, Personal Licence Courses Ltd and Mr Amjit Singh.

Peter Narancic, Senior Licensing Officer, Reading Borough Council and Declan Smyth, Licensing Officer, Thames Valley Police, were both present and addressed the Sub-Committee on their representations regarding the application as stated in the report. An officer from Reading Borough Council's Trading Standards Service was not present at the hearing but their representations regarding the application as stated in the report were taken into account by the Sub-Committee.

Resolved -

That, in order to promote the licensing objectives, and having regard to the oral and written representations made, the Secretary of State's guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (April 2018) and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of Local Food and Wine, 441 Basingstoke Road, be refused. The Sub-Committee's reasons were:

- (a) the Sub-Committee was not content that this was a genuine transaction at arms-length, as Mr Gurmit Singh Gurwara, the former licence holder, remained the named person on the leasehold for the premises and there was no evidence to show that any transfer document would be signed;
- (b) the applicant was currently operating in the premises while Mr Gurmit Singh Gurwara remained the leaseholder, demonstrating that Mr Gurmit Singh Gurwara continued to maintain a clear interest in the premises;
- (c) the applicant seemed not to have fully understood his own application and did not seem to understand the licensing objectives or how to promote them;
- (d) the documents submitted by the applicant i.e. the appraisal, were not sufficient to show a valid transaction, despite a deposit having been paid for goods;
- (e) the Sub-Committee did not feel confident in relying on the proposed condition number 16 at Appendix 4, as no lease agreement had been signed;

LICENSING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE 2 MINUTES - 7 MARCH 2019

- (f) the applicant, having been made aware of the history of the premises during the hearing, could not demonstrate how he would tackle issues raised in the report so as to promote the four licensing objectives.

(The meeting started at 9.35am and finished at 11.50am)