

Statutory Licensing Sub Committee

A meeting of Statutory Licensing Sub Committee was held on Monday 29th September 2025.

Present: Cllr Eileen Johnson, Cllr Robert Cook and Cllr Andrew Sherris

Officers: Adam Batemen, Elliott Beevers, Tracy Hyman, Leanne Maloney-Kelly (AH&W), Richard Beddard (R and I G), Natalie Hodgson, Sarah Whaley (CS) and PC Andrew Thorpe (Cleveland Police)

Also in attendance: Mr Muhammed Adnan Rabani (Designated Premises Supervisor), Gill Sherratt (Representative for Dhillon Food and Wine), Louise Lowes (Stockton BID) and Members of the public

Apologies:

SLS/11/25 Evacuation Procedure

The evacuation procedure was noted.

SLS/12/25 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

SLS/13/25 APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE - DHILLON FOOD & WINE, 68 DOVECOT STREET, STOCKTON-ON-TEES, TS18 1LL

Members of the Statutory Licensing Sub Committee of the Council's Statutory Licensing Committee were asked to consider an application for a review of a premises licence from the Licensing Authority for Dhillon Food & Wine, 68 Dovecot Street, Stockton-on-Tees TS18 1LL.

The application related to the undermining of the licensing objectives of:

- Prevention of Crime and Disorder
- Public Safety
- Prevention of Public Nuisance
- Protection of Children from Harm

Representations had also been received in support of the review from Stockton Councils Community Safety team, Public Health, Cleveland Police, the Town Centre management Team, Ward Councillor Paul Rowling, the Arc and Stockton BID, full details of which were contained within the officers' report.

Mr Muhammed Adnan Rabani the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) and his representative Mrs Gill Sherratt were in attendance and were given the opportunity to make representation.

The Chair introduced all persons who were present and explained the procedure to be followed during the hearing.

A copy of the report and supporting documents had been provided to all persons present and to members of the Committee.

The Licensing Team Leader presented the report to the Statutory Licensing Sub-Committee.

Members of the Sub-Committee of the Council's Statutory Licensing Committee heard the above application, full details of which appeared before the Members in their agenda and background papers. Members noted that the review of the premises licence was made at the request of the Licensing Authority. Representations had also been received from other responsible authorities, including Stockton Councils Community Safety team, Public Health, Cleveland Police, the Town Centre management Team, Ward Councillor Paul Rowling, the Arc and Stockton BID in support of the Licensing Authority's application.

The Licensing Officer presented his evidence on behalf of the Licensing Authority to the Sub-Committee, this also included presentation of numerous CCTV footage. It was explained to the Statutory Licensing Sub-Committee that the review application related to the undermining of the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm licensing objectives.

Representatives from Stockton Councils Community Safety team, Public Health, Cleveland Police, the Town Centre Management Team, and Stockton BID submitted their representations to the Statutory Licensing Sub Committee in support of the Licensing Authority's application. Full details of which were contained within the main committee report.

Mrs Sherratt who was representing the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) requested that the Committee considered revised conditions on behalf of her client, copies of which were circulated at the beginning of the hearing.

All parties were given the opportunity to ask questions. The main topics discussed were as follows:

- The ongoing sale of high strength, low-cost alcoholic drinks to known street drinkers which contributed to anti-social behaviour, public intoxication, shouting, swearing and littering and loitering in Stockton town centre.
- It was believed that the hours the premises was allowed to sell alcohol which was from 0600 hours to 2400 hours everyday was contributing to issues within Stockton town centre. The Council's current licensing policy discouraged premises being licensed for alcohol sales before 0900 hours or after 2200 hours in residential areas, however Dhillon Food & Wine had an historic licence that allowed sales from 0600 hours to 2400 hours.
- CCTV footage was viewed by everyone present and an overview of each clip was given by the Licensing Officer as follows:
 - Exhibit EB1 – 11th April 2025 – people seen entering and exiting with cans of cider who appear to the Licensing Officer to be intoxicated.

- Exhibit EB4 – 5th June 2025 – people who appear to the Licensing Officer to be intoxicated outside of the premises drinking cans of high strength alcohol at 0639 hours.
- Exhibit EB7 – 2nd July 2025 – seventeen customers entered the premises within a one-hour period and four of them, who appeared to the Licensing Officer to be intoxicated, bought cans of high strength alcohol.
- Exhibit EB8 – 3rd July 2025 – the Council received information that people under the influence of alcohol were purchasing alcohol from the premises. One young-looking female was not challenged as per the mandatory “Challenge 25” licence condition. Twenty-five people entered the shop and seventeen of them purchased alcohol.
- Exhibit EB8 – 31st July 2025 – Council CCTV Control Room monitor recorded an intoxicated female being abusive.
- Exhibit EB9 – 31st July 2025 – 0557 hours – The Licensing Officer stated that a colleague from the Street Cleansing team advised him that drunk people attended the premises to purchase alcohol at 0600 hours when the store opens. The footage showed seven people outside the store, five of them entered the premises and purchased alcohol at 0601 hours.
- Exhibit EB11 – 9th September 2025 – The footage showed a male entering the premises who the Licensing Officer believed to be unsteady on his feet.
- Discussion was had around one of the premises current conditions which required all alcoholic drinks containers to be labelled with the premises name and that Dhillon Food and wine was the only premises in Stockton town centre with that licence condition however there were other premises within the borough with such a condition.
- It was highlighted that the sale of alcohol to street drinkers was not an offence, but the sale of alcohol to drunk people was, and that the premises had responsibilities in that regard.

The DPS’s representative Mrs Sherratt referred to four of the CCTV evidence clips and questioned the Licensing Officer as follows:

- Exhibit EB1 – 11th April 2025 – Mrs Sherratt submitted that the people seen on the footage were not outside the premises, but on the steps next to the premises. The Licensing Officer stated that they were as close as they could get to the premises. Mrs Sherratt stated that she could not see intoxication here; The Licensing Officer stated that a male was leaning on the barrier and appeared to him to be intoxicated.
- Exhibit EB4 – 5th June 2025 – Mrs Sherratt submitted that the people seen on the footage were not outside the premises, and the Licensing Officer stated, again, that these people were as close as they could get to the premises. The Licensing Officer stated that it was likely that the can of what appeared to be high strength cider as this was the only shop that was open at this time, and he was outside the shop drinking it. Mrs Sherratt described a female seen on the footage as a “feisty lady”.
- Exhibit EB7 – 2nd July 2025 – Mrs Sherratt asked the Licensing Officer to identify the people who appeared on the footage that he believed to be drunk. The Licensing Officer pointed out a male swaying at the counter with his eyes shut, a male in green

who could not stand still, and a female dressed in red who was unsteady on her feet. Mrs Sherratt disagreed with the Licensing Officers assessment of drunkenness; The Licensing Officer stated that those people appeared to him to be drunk.

- Exhibit EB11 – 9th September 2025 – Mrs Sherratt disagreed with the Licensing Officers assertion that a male on the footage appeared to be intoxicated. The Licensing Officer stated that the male in question who entered and exited the premises was unsteady on his feet and appeared to be stumbling.

- Members heard from PC Thorpe who confirmed that Cleveland Police were fully supportive of the Licensing Authority's review application. PC Thorpe told the Sub-Committee that Dovecot Street was an area that suffered due to anti-social behaviour, and that people and businesses were impacted by this, they were also informed that the DPS was resistant to changes that would help the area, such as agreeing not to sell strong cheap alcohol and that these issues could be easily remedied, however this had not been possible due to the DPS's non-engagement.

- Public Health submitted their representation who fully supported the review application and explained that the premises was situated in the Town Centre ward and fell within the lowest deprivation decile nationally and was one of the most deprived areas of Stockton-on-Tees, with a high proportion of hospital admissions in the borough. There was a negative perception of the area within which the premises was situated, which had a negative impact on resident wellbeing and the local economy. Members heard that the Town Centre ward has the highest crime and violent crime rates in the borough, with drug and alcohol misuse being understood to be the reason for this.

- The representative for the Community Safety Team submitted their representation who fully supported the review application particularly due to evidence provided by the civic enforcement and licensing teams in relation to sales of alcohol to people who were drunk.

- The representative for the Community Safety Team told the Sub-Committee that the premises had long been associated with selling alcohol to street drinkers, contributing to anti-social behaviour within Stockton town centre and despite the DPS taking over in April 2025, the situation appeared to have escalated.

- The representative for the Community Safety Team told the Sub-Committee that this was the only store in the area selling alcohol between 0600 hours and 0800 hours on weekdays, which he felt contributed significantly to early morning anti-social behaviour from street drinkers. The Community Safety team received regular complaints highlighting street drinking, public nuisance, and intimidation of residents and visitors in the area. It was also highlighted that the DPS was dismissive in relation to concerns, claiming customers were "always in that state" and that the DPS and his staff had a blasé attitude in relation to the issues highlighted

- The representative for the Community Safety Team felt that the premises fuelled anti-social behaviour within the town centre and significantly profited from the addictions of its customers through breaches of the Licensing Act; the sale of alcohol to people who were drunk and the premises was not supporting overall community safety aims, as it undermined all four licensing objectives.

- Discussion was had with Mrs Sherratt and the representative from the Community Safety Team disputing whether the people that were seen on the CCTV footage were congregating directly outside of the premises. Mrs Sherratt strongly disagreed, stating that it was a different address, one metre from the premises. Mrs Sherratt challenged the Community Safety representative on the basis that he referenced 66 Dovecot Street, rather than the premises address of 68 Dovecot Street, and that both premises sold low cost, high strength alcohol. The Community Safety representative confirmed that he believed that the people seen on the footage of 11th April were outside of the premises.

- The Town Centre Manager submitted his representation and confirmed his support for the review application. The Town Centre Manager stated that within his role, he witnessed a lot of issues that stem from alcohol dependency within the town centre, in particular groups of people drinking alcohol around the fountain area, with black cans and other high strength alcoholic drink containers. People congregating around the fountain area could be loud, rude, often swear and fight with each other, and were very intimidating to market traders, the public and businesses in the area. The intoxicated people openly urinated around the fountain area and in doorways to business and alleyways, causing the town centre cleansing operatives to have to clean these areas frequently.

- The Town Centre Manager told the Sub-Committee of the amount of littering around the fountain area, particularly of alcoholic drinks containers, and the impact of this on the town centre cleansing operatives, he also expressed his concerns in relation to the poor perception that drinking, shouting, swearing and other alcohol related anti-social behaviour had upon the borough's residents, who would choose not to visit the town centre due to these issues.

- A representative from Stockton BID (Business Improvement District), expressed her support for the review application. The representative told the Sub-Committee that the sale of alcohol to vulnerable people from 0600 hours fuelled further drinking throughout the day and directly contributed to anti-social behaviour, public disorder and an unsafe atmosphere within the town centre. Anti-social behaviour discouraged shoppers and visitors, which was damaging the reputation of Stockton-on-Tees as a welcoming destination, and placed an additional burden on responsible businesses who were working hard to improve the town's image and trading environment.

- Stockton BID and its business community strongly believed that the premises licence should be revoked, and no new licences should be issued to similar kinds of business who sought to profit from vulnerable people

- Mrs Sherratt made her submission on behalf of the DPS. Mrs Sherratt explained that her client was a serious businessman with significant experience, with three premises in Stockton-on-Tees and one in Durham. Mrs Sherratt explained that at the DPS's Yarm Lane store, he had passed test purchase checks and had a good relationship with the authorities.

- There was a specific issue with the premises due to its location, and that the DPS had only ran this store since April 2025 with his brother, and employed three other staff members, who are all appropriately trained. Mrs Sherratt explained that her client was co-operating with the authorities to a point, however the relationship had failed as her client felt that he had not been treated fairly in relation to this premises.

- Mrs Sherratt told the Sub-Committee that there were only twenty people that were causing issues within Stockton town centre and that the total sales per day at the premises amounted to approximately £1,500, and that approximately £600 of this came from alcohol sales. Mrs Sherratt stated that not only street drinkers purchased alcohol from the premises, but some sales were also from hardworking people who purchased alcohol after work.
- Mrs Sherratt asked the Sub-Committee to disregard any information before them that preceded April 2025, as this was before her client's involvement with the premises. In relation to the failure on 3rd July 2025, to comply with the "Challenge 25" premises licence condition, Mrs Sherratt confirmed that this individual was a regular customer who was 22 years old. The DPS told the Sub-Committee that he knew where this female lived.
- Mrs Sherratt told the Sub-Committee that her client accepted that the intoxicated male seen on CCTV footage dancing with the sales assistant should have been prevented from purchasing alcohol. The Sub-Committee heard from Mrs Sherratt that her client strenuously disputed the Licensing Officers assertions in relation to all other customers who appeared to the Licensing Officer to be under the influence of alcohol, who were sold alcohol.
- The Sub-Committee and all parties present were presented with additional footage by the premises, which appeared to have been filmed on a mobile device, details as follows:-
 - Footage 1 – Mrs Sherratt explained the footage showed that people standing outside were outside the neighbouring food bank, not outside the premises. The Sub-Committee were told that this was at a time when the premises were not selling high alcohol by volume drinks.
 - Footage 2 – Mrs Sherratt said that this was recorded at a time that the premises had stopped selling high alcohol by volume drinks. Staff from the premise could be heard asking people to leave the area as the Council were giving the store a hard time, or words to that effect.
 - Footage 3 – Mrs Sherratt said the footage showed a customer who had been refused alcohol at the premises walking into the neighbouring premises to purchase alcohol. The Sub-Committee were told that this was at a time when the premises were not selling high alcohol by volume drinks.
- Mrs Sherratt explained that her client had become frustrated that, in his view, the premises next door was not complying with their obligations, and therefore he withdrew his cooperation with authorities. Mrs Sherratt asked the Sub-Committee to consider varying the premises licence to remove all the current conditions, and to replace them with their proposed conditions. Mrs Sherratt explained that her client did not like the condition that required all alcoholic products to be marked or labelled with the premises name.
- Mrs Sherratt explained that her client accepted that he had a part to play in resolving the issues at the premises, however he resisted a lot of what had been said. Mrs Sherratt told the Sub-Committee that this could be easily remedied without the need for the premises licence to be revoked, as had been suggested by Cleveland Police.

- In response to questions from the Sub-Committee, the DPS confirmed that he had not sold high alcohol by volume drinks since the application for the premises licence review was received. The DPS also confirmed that what appeared to be drug paraphernalia was stocked by the premises before he managed it and confirmed that this had since been removed from the premises.

- In response to a question about the DPS's decision to no longer sell high alcohol by volume drinks since the review application was received, Mrs Sherratt confirmed that this was due to her advice and reiterated that her client would like a level playing field. Mrs Sherratt also told the Sub-Committee that her client felt that the premises next door should also be under review, as he did not feel that they were being treated equally. A query was raised in relation to the different submissions made in respect of the premises' takings; in interview, the DPS indicated that over fifty percent of his sales came from high strength alcoholic drinks, however Mrs Sherratt had told the Sub-Committee that forty percent of the premises' sales come from the sale of all types of alcohol, not just high strength. Mrs Sherratt confirmed that alcohol sales account for less than fifty percent of the premises' total sales. The DPS stated that he would be out of business if he relied solely upon the profit made from alcohol sales.

The Licensing Officer and Mrs Sherratt were given an opportunity to sum up their cases as detailed below:

- The Licensing Officer told the Sub-Committee that he believed that the licensing objectives had been undermined, especially by the sale of alcohol to people who were drunk, despite the DPS being advised that this constituted a criminal offence. The Licensing Officer also told the Sub-Committee that the premises licence conditions had been breached, particularly in relation to the DPS's refusal to provide CCTV from the premises and the failure to comply with the mandatory "Challenge 25" requirements. The Licensing Officer drew Members attention to the fact that the CCTV footage clearly showed a sales assistant actively engaging and dancing with a person who appeared to be very intoxicated, which was not considered to be responsible retailing.

- The Licensing Officer informed the Sub-Committee that the DPS's deflective approach, failure to accept responsibility and his subsequent non-engagement had exacerbated issues, repeatedly attributing issues to neighbouring premises, including another local store and a charity. In relation to the assertions regarding the other premises nearby, the Licensing Officer told the Sub-Committee that all complaints in relation to any premises were dealt with appropriately and in line with the Council's procedures. The Licensing Officer expressed his concern that the DPS's attitude of 'this is what Stockton is like' and 'it cannot be changed' was not conducive to promoting the licensing objectives.

- Mrs Sherratt then reiterated to the Sub-Committee that she did not accept that there was any evidence of sales from the premises to drunk individuals, apart from potentially one, and that in her view, the CCTV demonstrated alcohol sales to street drinkers.

- Mrs Sherratt told the Sub-Committee that her client was trying his best, and that the conditions that they had proposed would, in her view, resolve the issues. Mrs Sherratt requested that the Sub-Committee allow her client to move on in the understanding that any further issues would lead to him appearing before the Sub-Committee again.

- Mrs Sherratt reminded the Sub-Committee that her client had remained compliant and co-operative in relation to his other stores but had become frustrated in relation to this premises, although the Licensing Officer disputed this.

- The Licensing Officer told the Sub-Committee that extensive officer resources had been spent with the DPS, with attempts to engage with him, explain concerns to him, and encourage his compliance, before the review application was made.

- Members of the Licensing Sub-Committee of the Council's Statutory Licensing Committee considered the above application carefully, including everything that they had read and heard from each of the parties.

- Members of the Licensing Sub-Committee carefully considered those matters brought before them and, in reaching their decision, had regard to their powers under the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 (as amended by the Violent Crime Reduction Act 2006), the relevant paragraphs of the Guidance Issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (as amended) and the Council's Licensing Policy.

- The Sub-Committee had regard to the statutory guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act and in particular the paragraphs in relation to the review of premises licences.

- The Sub-Committee noted that a premises licence holder must ensure that the promotion of the four statutory licensing objectives was always a paramount consideration. In the Sub-Committee's view, the DPS had failed in this responsibility and it was noted that despite Mrs Sherratt challenging the Licensing Officer's opinion of the CCTV footage exhibited by him, the only footage supplied in support of the premises did not appear to be time-stamped, and looked to be several video clips edited together to appear as one segment of footage. In the Sub-Committee's view, rather than support the case for the premises, the negative references to the Council that could be heard on the recording supported the applicant's assertion that the premises did not properly promote the licensing objectives, nor do they appear to take their responsibilities seriously.

- The Sub-Committee noted that the DPS had not admitted any wrongdoing on his part, nor on the part of his staff, except for one sale to the intoxicated person who could be seen dancing. It appeared to the Sub-Committee that the DPS had a lack of awareness of his own failings in respect of his responsibilities as the Designated Premises Supervisor. The Sub-Committee further noted that the DPS smirked and appeared amused throughout the Sub-Committee hearing, which added weight to the Sub-Committee's view that the DPS did not take his responsibilities as the Designated Premises Supervisor seriously.

- It was clear to the Sub-Committee, having viewed the CCTV footage, that alcohol was sold to drunk customers on more than one occasion, and that licensing conditions had been breached as alleged. The Sub-Committee found that the DPS repeatedly appeared to minimise and deflect issues, and this only added to the Sub-Committee's concern in relation to the DPS's ability to appropriately manage the premises.

- The Sub-Committee considered the DPS's view that the issues outlined above were caused by a neighbouring store premises and a charity food bank. The Sub-Committee appreciated that the physical location of the premises may be contributing to the issues in question, however, this did not relieve the DPS of his responsibilities;

on the contrary, it was imperative that he worked with the authorities to tackle issues as they arose. In addition, the Sub-Committee noted that at the time that some of the alcohol related issues were reported to occur, at approximately 0600 hours, neither the neighbouring store nor the charity were open or trading.

- The Sub-Committee noted that the DPS's nonchalant attitude, lack of engagement and non-co-operative manner intensified the Sub-Committee's concerns and made it difficult to trust that the DPS would work with the authorities in the future. This was particularly highlighted by the DPS's failure to provide CCTV footage as requested, despite support of licensing officers to do this. The Sub-Committee noted that as of the hearing date, this had still not been received.
- The Sub-Committee noted that there was no evidence provided by the premises to support their assertions in relation to the premises' takings pertaining to alcohol sales. It appeared to the Sub-Committee that the premises made conflicting statements in this regard. The DPS said that he would go out of business if the premises licence was revoked and said that he would be out of business if he relied solely upon the profit made from alcohol sales. It appeared to the Sub-Committee, on balance, that the DPS was likely to rely upon the sale of high strength, low cost alcoholic drinks to maximise the premises' income.
- In relation to the alleged failure to implement the "Challenge 25" policy, and the DPS's assertion that the female in question was 22 years old, the Sub-Committee noted that no evidence was provided by the DPS in this regard. The Sub-Committee further noted that no records of staff training nor details of any refusals book was provided at the hearing in support of the premises.
- The Sub-Committee had regard to the powers available to them when considering what action, if any, to take under the premise licence review process.
- The Sub-Committee took the matter before them seriously, particularly the concerns raised in relation to the sale of alcohol to people who were drunk and the breaches of licence conditions, along with the DPS's lack of engagement. The Sub-Committee were mindful of the evidence from Public Health; that the premises was situated in a challenging area of the Town Centre ward, one of the most deprived areas of Stockton-on-Tees, with the highest crime rates in the borough, with drug and alcohol misuse being cited as the reason for this. The Sub-Committee could not allow the issues at the premises to continue and felt that revocation was the only appropriate option in the circumstances before them.

The Sub-Committee were therefore satisfied that this was a case where revocation of the premises licence was a necessary, proportionate and appropriate sanction. After considering and weighing up all the evidence and submissions made by the parties to the hearing, the Sub-Committee resolved to revoke the premises licence.

RESOLVED that the premises licence for Dhillon Food & Wine, 68 Dovecot Street, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 1LL, be revoked for the reasons as detailed above.

SLS/14/25 Licensing Act 2003 Application for a Variation of a Premises Licence Yarm Lane Convenience Store, 53 Yarm Lane, Stockton-On-Tees, TS18 2FP

Members of the Statutory Licensing Sub Committee of the Council's Statutory Licensing Committee were asked to consider an application for a variation to a

premises licence for Yarm Lane Convenience Store, 53 Yarm Lane, Stockton-on-Tees, TS18 2FP under the Licensing Act 2003 to which there had been representations from Responsible Authorities.

The application was to increase the hours of supply of alcohol, Monday to Sunday from 09:00 - 22:00 to 09:00 - 23:00. Opening hours were to remain the same.

A copy of the full application and existing licence was contained within the main report.

Representations had been received objecting to the variation from, Public Health, Cleveland Police and the Licensing Authority, full details of which were contained within the officers' report.

The Applicant Mr Muhammed Adnan Rabani and his representative Mrs Gill Sherratt were in attendance and were given the opportunity to make representation.

The Chair introduced all persons who were present and explained the procedure to be followed during the hearing.

A copy of the report and supporting documents had been provided to all persons present and to members of the Committee.

The Licensing Team Leader presented the report to the Statutory Licensing Sub-Committee.

Members of the Sub-Committee of the Council's Statutory Licensing Committee heard the above application, full details of which appeared before the Members in their agenda and background papers.

The Licensing Officer, Public Health and Cleveland Police submitted their representations to the Statutory Licensing Sub Committee objecting to the application to vary, full details of which were contained within the main committee report.

All parties were given the opportunity to ask questions. The main topics discussed were as follows:

- Mrs Sherratt who was representing the applicant highlighted that her client was only asking for one additional hour and that there had not been any issues at the premises in question and that Cleveland Police had originally supported the application, however had now submitted an objection which was felt was due to the issues at the applicants other premises Dhillon Food & Wine on Dovecot Street which was under review, however this should was not deemed as acceptable as each application should be considered on its own merits.

- Licensing objectives had been upheld for the premises current hours therefore why could this not be upheld for one additional hour?

- There was evidence to support that the application to vary could and should be granted.

- Officers highlighted that other premises in the area had a licence condition for sale of alcohol until 2200 hours and to keep the current licensed conditions would keep this consistent with those other premises.

- PC Andy Thorpe of Cleveland Police explained to the Committee that his mind had not solely changed due to the current review of the applicant's other premises, Dhillon Food & Wine but was a factor alongside the fact that the area of Parkfield and Oxbridge already had issues and to keep the later time of alcohol sales to 2200 hours would be upholding current licensing policy.

- The Chair highlighted that the problems in the Parkfield and Oxbridge area were well known, and those problems were exacerbated by additional sales in alcohol.

- Mrs Sherratt explained to the Sub-Committee that the premises was a convenience store and that if customers could not get everything on sale in one go then the premises would lose sales, particularly alcohol. If this wasn't a known problematic area the applicant would have applied to vary until 0200 hours mirroring the premises opening times. If the application to vary was granted and there was an issue then it could come back to Committee, therefore the application should be granted.

The Sub-Committee considered all the papers before them as well as the oral submissions made by all parties and determined that the application to vary should be granted.

RESOLVED that the application for a Variation of a Premises Licence Yarm Lane Convenience Store, 53 Yarm Lane, Stockton-On-Tees, TS18 2FP be granted for the reasons as stated above.

Chair: