

Minutes

Alcohol, Entertainment & Late Night Refreshment Licensing Committee

Tuesday, 8 July 2025



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Committee members present

Councillor Robert Leadenham (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Pam Bosworth
Councillor Helen Crawford
Councillor Patsy Ellis
Councillor Jane Kingman
Councillor Philip Knowles
Councillor Rhea Rayside
Councillor Susan Sandall

Officers

Licensing Officers, Elizabeth Reeve, Chris Clarke
Head of Public Protection, Ayeisha Kirkham
Legal Advisor (LSL), Kim Robertson
Democratic Officer, Lucy Bonshor

9. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing, Councillor Paul Fellows and Councillor Elvis Stooke.

10. Disclosures of interests

None.

11. Minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June were proposed, seconded and agreed.

12. Licensing Act 2003: Application for a New Premise Licence - Ramin Off Licence, 10 Wharf Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire, NG31 6BA.

Decision

That the application for a new Premise Licence for Ramin Off Licence, 10 Wharf Road, Grantham be rejected.

The Chairman introduced those present and asked for confirmation of who would be speaking in respect of the application before the Committee. Sergeant Amy Adams was speaking on behalf of Lincolnshire Police and Nawaz Anwar was the legal representative who would be speaking on behalf of the Applicant Ramyar Sabah Salih who was not present.

The Licensing Officer presented the report which concerned an application for a new premise licence at a premise known at Ramin Off Licence, 10 Wharf Road, Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 6BA.

The premise had previously benefited from an alcohol off sale licence under the name of "Max Off Licence" from 10 April 2019 to 30 May 2024. The Licence was revoked by the Alcohol, Entertainment and Late Night Refreshment Licensing Committee on 16 June 2023 following a review application by Lincolnshire Police. The review included evidence of underage sales and non-compliance of Premise licence conditions. The Committee concluded that the Licence holder was unable to prove they were an appropriate person to hold such a licence. Copies of the report, appendices, decision notice and minutes were included as links in background papers.

The applicant appealed the decision. The appeal was subsequently withdrawn via a consent order and the revocation of the premises took effect from 30 May 2024.

On 6 December 2024 an application for a new premise licence to be held by a Ramyar Sabah Salih at the location called "Ramin Off Licence" was refused by the Committee following a representation by Lincolnshire Police. The reasons for the refusal included concerns about the management experience of running a licensed premises and the applicant being unable to dispute any claims that the previous licence holder was not involved in running the business. A copy of the initial application, police representation, published minutes and decision notice of the meeting were appended to the report at Appendix 2.

On 19 May 2025 an application was accepted by the Licensing Team for a new premise licence again under the Ramin Off Licence name as appended to the report at Appendix 1. The application was to licence the premises for the following:

- Sale of Alcohol off the premises Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00
- Opening hours Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00

The license to be held by Ramin Off Licence Ltd, of which Ramyar Sabah Salih was the sole director and therefore the same applicant as previously. The application was sent out to the statutory consultees for consultation together with the required advertising.

During the consultation period one representation was received from Lincolnshire Police with the following reasons:

- Noted increase in the off sale of alcohol hours than what was previously requested or licensed, with no increased mitigation for such hours
- Insufficient conditions offered under the operating schedule given the history of the premises
- Concerns regarding the previous premises licence holder still having a connection with the running of the premises and not the new applicant
- Ongoing concerns in the applicants understanding of the licensing objectives and what is expected in them as a responsible premise licence holder

Licensing Officers have the delegated authority to decide whether a representation is relevant, vexatious, or frivolous however, Section 9 of the Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states:

9.9 It is recommended that, in borderline cases, the benefit of the doubt about any aspect of a representation should be given to the person making that representation. The Subsequent hearing would then provide an opportunity for the person or body making the representation to amplify and clarify it.

It was not felt that the representation by the Police fell within the delegation and therefore a hearing was convened.

Sergeant Adams from Lincolnshire Police then made their representation outlining their concerns in respect of the Applicant, Ramyar Sabah Salih. The Police referenced the previous revocation and refusal of the premise licence and the reasons that the review and representation had been made previously, the underage sales and the numerous breaches of the licensing conditions as well as the failure to price mark alcohol within the premise. The Police were not satisfied that the Applicant had no contact with the previous premises licence holder and no evidence had been produced that the businesses were separate and distinct from each other. The Applicant had lied at the previous meeting in respect of his DPS experience. Concern was also raised in respect of the merchandise that had been on sale at the premise previously, although not illegal, the glass pipes and bombs and other material on sale could be classed as drug equipment and having them on sale did not promote the licensing objective of “the Protection of Children from Harm”. The Police couldn’t understand why more caution had not been taken with the application due to the history of the premise and the Applicant had not attended in December or submitted any evidence at that time.

The Police expressed concern with the lack of experience of the Applicant and what appeared to be a lack of understanding of holding a premise licence. The Police were not satisfied that the Applicant had demonstrated that the licensing objectives would not be undermined. The Police were surprised that a further application had been made six months later and that the hours to sell alcohol and open the premise had increased with no comprehensive or robust reasoning for this increase. There appeared to be no robust conditions such as Challenge 25 included especially as the premise had a history of selling to minors. The Applicant had not been in contact with the Police since November 2024 to get any advice in respect of the new premise application. The Police also expressed concern about when the business was transferred and when the business rates and utility bills were put in the Applicants name and again the true ownership of the business was questioned. The conditions suggested were poor and due to the history of the premise the Police felt that the granting of the premise licence would undermine the licensing objectives and they ask the Committee to reject the application.

The Applicant's representative, Nawaz Anwar then made their representation stating that the new business was distinct from the previous licence holder who had nothing to do with the current application before the Committee and that the businesses were two different entities. She stated that the business rates and the utility bills, copies of utility bills had been circulated, had been changed to the current Applicants name and the new business was completely separate to the previous premise licence holder.

The Applicant's representative then made reference to what the Applicant had previously stated about their DPS experience in Manchester and stated that it had been a misunderstanding and that he should have said that he had extensive experience working in a licensing premise not that he was a DPS. Ms Anwar then made reference to the photographs that had been circulated which showed the premise as vacant and again stated that the previous merchandise had been the previous owners when the Applicant had taken over the premise and measures would be taken to ensure the licensing objectives were met once the new premise was opened.

Reference was then made to the conditions which included CCTV and staff training and incident logs which wouldn't be in place until the premise opened and also the transfer of utility bills which were now in the Applicants name. It was stated that Track and Trace would be used as the wholesalers would be the same as that used by the previous premise licence holder and were a well-known wholesaler within the licensing trade.

Ms Anwar then offered that a new DPS had been put forward in place of the Applicant. The new DPS held a personal licence and was based in Grantham and would manage the store for the Applicant.

Members questioned Ms Anwar about what the Applicant had previously stated about their experience in Manchester and the equipment that had previously

been sold in the shop. Reference was also made to the photographs circulated which did not have any date on them so could have been taken at any time and why the Applicant had not contacted the Police since December. It was also asked for confirmation that the former owner and the Applicant did not have a connection with the business and there was no collaboration in respect of the business. Members felt that the Applicant should have been in attendance and Ms Anwar stated that due to personal reasons he was unable to attend.

It was stated that the applicant should have demonstrated that they could run a business of this nature listing knowledge, skills, understanding but nothing had been included within the application and the applicant should have been in attendance to answer Members questions. Ms Anwar reiterated that due to personal reasons the applicant could not attend.

Members asked if there was any documentation to state when the applicant had bought the business/leased the business and it was stated that it was a long process that was still being undertaken but this could be checked.

Reference was then made to the new DPS that had been offered and the fact that none of the information pertaining to the person had been shared and that the new DPS should have been brought to Committee to answer questions. It was suggested by the Ms Anwar that the DPS could attend and information sought later. The Legal Advisor reiterated that the application would be considered on that day with the information currently before the Committee.

The Applicant's representative suggested that a short adjournment took place, however the Vice-Chairman allowed the Police to question the Applicant's representative first.

The Police sought clarification in respect of when the Applicant had taken over the business as he was trading in November 2024 when the first application had been made. The Police also referenced the offer of the new DPS which the Police knew nothing about and therefore could not undertake any necessary checks. Ms Anwar stated that she could prove the Personal Licence number and details. Reference was then made in respect of the £20,000 loan payment for the business, had this loan been paid as this still tied the applicant to the previous business. It was suggested that as the business was not generating any income the loan had not been paid and the Police asked if the amount of money was still outstanding. Ms Anwar stated that she would check.

A further comment was made in respect of the DPS and it was stated that the Applicant had originally intended to be the DPS and now holds a Personal Licence, however due to personal circumstances this had changed.

(A short adjournment took place between 10:55 – 11:10)

Following the adjournment the Applicant's representative confirmed that the lease had been signed in February 2025 and she was trying to get a copy of the lease and they had not been aware that the newly offered DPS could attend the meeting.

The Licensing Officer asked if the new DPS was licensed with South Kesteven District Council to which it was responded that they were. It was stated that the new DPS would take up a managerial position at the Grantham premise.

The Licensing Officer gave their closing statement. The Committee should give appropriate weight to the steps that are appropriate to promote the four licensing objectives:

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

The representations made by all parties and the guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 together with the Council's Licensing Policy.

Where a relevant representation is made the authority must:

- i. Hold a hearing to consider them, unless the authority, the applicant and each person who has made such representation agree that a hearing is unnecessary, and
- ii. Having regard to the representations, take such steps mentioned below (if any) as it considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The steps are:

- iii. Grant the application subject to conditions that are consistent with the operating schedule modified to the extent that the committee considered appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives and any mandatory conditions that must be included under the Licensing Act 2003.
- iv. Exclude from the scope of the licence a licensable activity to which the application relates.
- v. Refuse to specify a person in the licence as a Premises Supervisor. (DPS)
- vi. Reject the whole or part of the application.

The Police gave their closing statement referring to Section 182 guidance specifically 9.43:

9.43 The authority's determination should be evidence-based, justified as being appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives and proportionate to what it is intended to achieve.

The Police stated that they felt that the Applicant was not a responsible and trustworthy business owner. That no evidence had been supplied that stated there were no links between the Applicant and the previous premises licence holder. That no liaison had taken place with the Police since the previous

licence had been revoked. That the offer of a new DPS should have been supplied earlier to enable the Police to carry out necessary checks. The Police had little confidence that the licensing objectives would be promoted and they asked that the Committee reject the premise licence application.

The Applicants representative gave their closing statement stating that there was a clear separation between the Applicant and the previous premise licence holder. That the utility bills and business rates were now in the Applicants name that the lease had been taken over in February 2025. That the new DPS was based in Grantham and would be managing the premise on a daily basis and that the licensing objectives would be met with relevant conditions being carried out such as the Challenge 25 and having the necessary logbooks and she asked for the premise licence to be granted.

(11:18 the Licensing Officers, Head of Public Protection, Police and the Applicants representative together with the press left the meeting)

Members discussed the application before them having regard to all representations made, relevant guidance, the Licensing Act 2003, Section 182 Guidance and the Council's Licensing Policy.

Members expressed concern over what the Applicant had previously stated in respect of their experience which had been incorrect. Also that evidence that had been submitted only showed the recent transfer of utility bills and business rates being transferred to the Applicants name. The offer of a new DPS who was based in Grantham should have been raised earlier to allow the Police to do the relevant checks and the DPS should have been present at the meeting to answer Members questions. Regardless of what the Applicant had indicated on their application form, it was clear that no liaison had been undertaken with the Police in respect of the new Premise Licence. Members felt that no clear evidence had been provided that there were no links with the previous licence holder and the requested increase in hours was not supported by any business justification. Members felt that the licensing objectives would not be promoted if the licence was granted. It was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed to reject the application for a new premise licence.

(11:30 the Licensing Officers, the Head of Public Protection, Police and the Applicants representative together with the press returned to the meeting)

The Legal Advisor read out the Committee's decision.

The Committee had read all the paperwork before them. They had heard from the Licensing Officer, Lincolnshire Police and the Applicants representative, Nawaz Anwar.

Lincolnshire Police presented their application as set out in their evidence pack. They expressed concerns regarding the Applicants link to previous premise licence holder who had the licence revoked, the responsibility of the Applicant

and the conditions offered which in their view were not sufficient. The Committee noted that changes made to business rates as submitted by the Applicant, had only happened the previous week.

The Applicants representative advised regarding the link to the previous licence holder and noted that the previous owner was a separate individual and there was no connection. Business rates and utility bills were in the current Applicants name and they had a separate accountant. Regarding the Applicants previous experience this was a miscommunication, the Applicant had previously worked in a licensing premises and had experience working but was not a DPS. Regarding the equipment at the premises, pictures were provided showing that the premises was currently empty. The premises wasn't operating and should the licence be granted, will be opened to ensure it meets the licensing objectives. The conditions were difficult to assess at the moment given that the premises was empty and if operating, the Applicant would then have a better idea of what was required. The current Applicant purchased stock from the same wholesaler but was a separate individual to the previous licence holder. The representative confirmed another person would be specified as the DPS and that person lived in Grantham and had a personal licence with SKDC. The representative advised the lease of the premises had been in the Applicants name since February 2025 but was unable to provide written confirmation. When asked about the equipment being in the premises in November 2024 when the Applicant was operating the premises as a shop, the representative advised that her understanding was this was not the Applicants' equipment and the equipment was not there at the moment and would not be sold.

The Committee considered all options available to them. They considered whether there were any conditions that could be included which would address concerns and were of the view that there were not. The Committee considered removing a licensable activity from the licence but noted that as the application was only for the sale of alcohol, to remove a licensable activity would be the same as rejecting the application.

The Committee considered refusing to specify the Applicant as DPS but noted that the DPS and the licence holder were the same person and therefore did not consider this would address their concerns. It was noted that a new DPS had been offered, but the police had not had an opportunity to check the details of that person and that person was not in attendance at the meeting, with that in mind, the Committee did not consider this was appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The Committee having considered all other option available to them decided that it was appropriate for the promotion of all the licensing objectives to reject the application for a new premise licence.

There was a right of appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of the licence decision being received.

13. Ask Angela

The Vice-Chairman referred to the documentation that he had circulated to Members in respect of the “Ask for Angela” scheme. The scheme was a safety initiative designed to protect individuals who felt vulnerable whilst in bars and clubs and was mainly aimed at females and the LGBTQ community. It provided a discreet way for patrons to signal to staff that they needed assistance to leave a venue safely and avoid any confrontation. By asking for “Angela” staff were alerted to the individual’s need for help and were trained to intervene and ensure their safety. The Vice-Chairman stated that there were various schemes in place around the country. The BBC had contacted 340 councils around the UK and it had found that 34 had made “Ask for Angela” a condition of granting new alcohol license with a further 67 possibly set to follow. It was stated that the Vice-Chairman was not asking for it to be part of the licencing conditions but felt that the scheme should be promoted within the nighttime economy on a voluntary basis.

Members of the Committee were supportive of the proposal with examples being given of instances where the scheme had been promoted and examples of bad behaviour being encountered by young people when too much alcohol or drugs had been involved.

Questions were asked about how the scheme worked to which the Vice-Chairman replied.

Members felt that it was a good idea which should be promoted across the district not just within the Grantham area. Although the scheme would be voluntary it was stressed that training in respect of the “Ask for Angela” scheme would be critical to any success.

The Cabinet Member for Corporate Governance and Licensing stated that he would raise the issue at Cabinet with a view to allocate funds for the promotion of the scheme to be undertaken.

Further discussion on the promotion of the scheme followed and how this could be undertaken with references being made to the Pubwatch scheme and that it should be as wide as possible across the district. It was proposed, seconded and agreed that officers undertake work in relation to the “Ask for Angela” scheme. It was acknowledged by Members that any work would take time to be carried out.

Decision

That the Committee request that Officers look in more detail at how the “Ask for Angela” scheme could be promoted on a voluntary basis across the district.

- 14. Any other business which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, decides is urgent.**

None.

- 15. Close of meeting**

The meeting closed at 12 noon.