

Audit Report for

Today's Extra 50 Kesteven Road, Stamford Lincolnshire PE9 1SU

Completed on 6th Day of November 2025 at 1030 hours.

This is an audit report for the premises namely **Todays Extra, 50 Kesteven Road, Stamford Lincolnshire PE9 1SU. Premises licence Number 23619**

Introduction

1.1 The audit was requested as a result of the premises being given papers to attend a Licensing Hearing with regards to failing to promote the Licensing Objectives:

i) The prevention of crime and disorder

1.2 RJJ Consultancy were instructed to carry out the audit from the premises licence holder Arumugam Kalamohan

1.3 RJJ Consultancy are industry experts in recognising failings and implementing solutions in licensed premises in accordance with Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2023 and the Licensing Act 2003.

1.4 RJJ Consultancy have gained their expertise from working as alcohol licensing officers with Lincolnshire Police and from their longevity of service within the Metropolitan and Lincolnshire Police services.

1.5 The audit is based on their findings from their initial visit to the premises carried out on Thursday 6th Day of November 2025.

1.6 RJJ Consultancy confirm they were instructed to carry out a purely independent audit for the purpose of supplying information to all the relevant parties concerned in the forthcoming licensing hearing.

1.7 RJJ Confirm that the audit report is based on their true findings and have not been fabricated in any means to show bias to any of the interested parties.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



2.0 Purpose of Audit.

"To assess the store's adherence to licensing conditions and operational standards in light of the deficiencies outlined in the review documentation submitted by Lincolnshire Police to South Kesteven District Council 22nd Day of August 2025."

Finding by Lincolnshire Police in respect of breaches to the **Premises Licence 23619 are recorded below and have been directly abstracted from their review paperwork.**

Lincolnshire Police has referenced legislation from:

Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003.

South Kesteven District Council statement of licensing policy (2021 – 2026).

Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Section 17

2.1 Within the review application Lincolnshire Police concluded that there is evidence to show the licensing objective for the prevention of crime and disorder is being undermined.

Within the body of the review paperwork, I note and acknowledge historical evidence identifying, previous reviews against the premises, based on persons located at the premises working with no entitlement to do so, civil penalty issues being issued against the named premises of this current review, and connections to other premises that are owned by the mentioned male known as Mr Arumugam Kalamohan. It is also noted that additional conditions were placed on the licence for this premises to include more stringent relating to staff training and refresher training, checks and recording of employees right to work

Though it has to be acknowledged that the above has occurred, this audit is purely based on findings of non-compliance to the conditions of the licence identified by Lincolnshire Police. My audit is not to identify or prove in one way or another if persons with no entitlement to work at the premises were located.

I now address the breaches to the licensing conditions alone police have identified on their visits.

2.2 Lincolnshire Police identified that on the **3rd Day of October 2023** there was non-compliance to the conditions on the licence, relating to DPS authority, right to work

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



documentation and staff training. To expand on these from a direct abstract from the statement of PC Braithwaite dated 22/08/25

CCTV –Staff member confirmed neither they nor any other staff member could operate the system

DPS AUTHORITY – only an old authority was viewed in the old DPS name, so confirmation over who worked at the shop could not be established.

RTW – no documentation for workers was available to view.

STAFF TRAINING – since it could not be confirmed who worked in the shop, I could not verify staff training documentation was in order.

During this inspection it was noted a significant amount of wine for sale on the shelves) which were not price marked, along with boxed alcohol on the floors.

2.4 On the **7th day of November 2024**, Lincolnshire Police with Immigration Officers attended the premises. Lincolnshire police encountered the following non-compliance issues.

CCTV - It was noted that there were various cameras displayed on a screen opposite from the counter giving the correct date and time, however the worker could not operate the system in anyway. This was a clear breach of annex 2 conditions as referred to in my statement found in appendix J.

INCIDENT BOOK - No incident book at all could be presented. This was a clear breach of the annex 2 condition which states ‘an incident book shall be kept at the premises in which details of crime and disorder shall be recorded’.

REFUSALS REGISTER - I was shown the refusals register (see appendix H exhibit KB02). The last entry was dated July 2024, and I would have expected more entries for a shop of this type. I was concerned that not all refusals had been recorded as per the licence condition which states ‘refusals of alcohol and age restricted goods relating to the premises shall be recorded’.

DPS AUTHORITY LIST - No DPS authority list was present at the premises.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



It is a mandatory condition that every supply of alcohol under the premises licence shall be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence. It is deemed best practice for the DPS to make a written authorisation of those persons selling alcohol on their behalf which can be presented to police or an authorised person on request. Supplying alcohol without authorisation is an offence under s.136 of the Licensing Act 2003

SIGNAGE - Annex 2 of the licence stipulates that 'adequate signage will be displayed requesting customers leave the area quietly'. I can confirm there was no sign of this type at the premises.

RIGHT TO WORK (RTW) AND TRAINING DOCUMENTATION - Annex 3 conditions included onto the premises licence by the committee following a licencing hearing, clearly states a number of conditions in respect of RTW and training

I can confirm during this visit, no staff RTW documentation could be viewed.

2.5 On Tuesday 17th June 2025 PC Braithwaite attended the premises again in the company of PC Wilson, a local Neighbourhood Beat Manager. This was to carry out an inspection of the premises with respect to carry out a compliance check on the licence.

2.6 Whilst conducting the inspection multiple areas of non-compliance were observed which included the following.

CCTV – Staff member could not operate the premises CCTV. This contravenes the condition '**a member of staff shall be on the premises at all times they are open to the public who is capable of operating the CCTV system and proving recordings on request**'. Staff member stated he was not allowed to access the CCTV system at all because it was all done through head office.

INCIDENT BOOK - No incident book could be presented but a loose sheet of paper with details of an incident dating back to 15/01/24 regarding a shoplifter was presented. Staff member confirmed this was the most recent report available. Pc Braithwaite found it difficult to believe that in what is a relatively busy premises, there had been no other incidents in the last 5 months that would require logging. she was concerned that staff were not correctly logging incidents as per the condition within annex 2, which states '**an incident book shall be kept at the premises in which details of crime and**

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



disorder shall be recorded”. The condition stipulates that the entry should be **‘signed by the member of staff dealing with it’ and should note ‘any action taken to prevent further such incidents where appropriate’**. Both details were missing from the report.

REFUSALS REGISTER – Pc Braithwaite was shown the refusals register that the premises uses but again she stated that she would have expected more entries for a shop of this type. Since the 9th of July 2024 there had only been two entries, both for refusals of nicotine products. I was concerned again that staff were not logging all incidents, whereas per the annex 2 licence condition states **‘refusals of alcohol and age restricted goods relating to the premises shall be recorded’**. **The sheet the premises have adopted does fulfil the requirements of the licence, with the exception of having no column to note ‘action taken to prevent further such incidents where appropriate’.**

SPIRITS - Annex 2 of the licence clearly stipulates that **‘spirits will be kept behind the counter and not available for self-service’ by customers. Whilst the majority of spirits sold by the shop were indeed behind the counter where only staff members could access them”** There was discovered a number of spirits including Baileys, Malibu and Archers located on the main shelves in the alcohol area within the shop

SIGNAGE - Annex 2 of the licence stipulates that **‘adequate signage will be displayed requesting customers leave the area quietly’**. I noted that there was a more than adequate sign printed, however it was positioned behind the counter in a location totally obscured from view which simply could not be seen by customers.

DPS AUTHORITY LIST -. During this inspection an authority was presented with Mr Kalamohan’s name and signature on it, however it was not dated. It also had not been signed by the staff member, it was also out of date as the staff member no longer worked at the premises.

When Pc Braithwaite questioned on how many staff members currently work at the premises, staff member was unsure. In my opinion it would not be feasible for only two other members of staff in addition to the one working who only works on the odd occasion, to operate a shop which advertises on Google the opening hours of 0600-

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



2300hrs every day of the week. This suggests that there may be other workers not documented on this authority.

RIGHT TO WORK AND TRAINING DOCUMENTATION - During my inspection, the only documentation in terms of Right to Work that I was able to view was a single sheet of paper with a government share code valid until 2nd July 2025

The only training documentation available to view were files relating to staff member's but this was dated 10/09/2024 – so out of date as per the licence condition and for a member of staff who was not listed on the DPS list, and in any case out of date with dates given as the 11/04/24 for the Challenge 25 training and 21/11/24 for the other elements of the training required as per the condition.

2.7 In addition to the many areas of non-compliance discovered during the inspection, other additional concerns were raised. It was noted that there was equipment used to prepare and smoke illegal drugs on sale within the shop, including cannabis grinders and 'crack pipes. There were also bottles of 'Poppers' for sale which contain a drug called Alkyl Nitrite. These products are commonly inhaled as a recreational drug to provide intoxicating effects and can be dangerous. Whilst having these products on sale may not break the law, the fact they were on sale would attract a certain type of customer and potentially draw in children.

2.8 It was also noted various alcohol products for sale on the shelves which were not price marked

2.9 Thus ends the police evidence of non-compliance identified and abstracted from their statements and review paperwork.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



3.0 Audit Findings.

3.1 Whilst it is clear to see from section 2, that there were failings at the premises, and they have been acknowledged it is important also to reflect evidence of good practices and procedures that are in operation that were identified on my visit. Below are my findings. My visit occurred at **1030 hours on the 06th Day of November 2025.**

3.2 On attendance at the premises I spoke to 2 male members of staff. The members of staff were able to answer every question put to them in relation to challenge 25, underage sales of restricted products, their immigration status and eligibility to work in the UK.

3.3 A check on their DPS authorisation sheet for members of staff to sell alcohol was current, showing the DPS and members of staff working at the premises. This was dated and signed.

3.4 The DPS had put in place authorisation sheets to give permission to persons to sell alcohol. in their absence. These were dated and signed to an acceptable level.

3.5 All staff were competent in operating the CCTV system and were able to demonstrate to me playback, time, date, camera locations.

3.6 RTW checks are stored on a computer behind the counter and are accessible on request.

3.7 Staff present were knowledgeable in their understanding of the necessity of filling in the refusals register and incident books.

3.8 Records of refusals documented in the logbooks were cross referenced against CCTV footage and showed the exact incident as it occurred to what was documented.

3.9 Staff were able to locate all the training, refusal and incident logs upon request.

3.10 There was a gap in recording refusals between the dates of 09/07/24 and 17/05/25. From here on the refusals log has been completed with consistency.

3.11 Between the dates of 24/06/22 and 09/11/23 there was good consistency in the refusals register showing a good approach to recording.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



3.12 Alcohol pricing was 97% complete. Gaps noticed on the shelves were due to price changes and new pricing tabs had arrived and were put out during my visit.

3.13 The bottles identified as spirits located on the floor were by their own companies' descriptions and classifications were liqueurs and not spirits.

3.14 The member of staff explained this to the attending officers, but in their reply they stated they themselves were unsure and would have to go back and check, even though it is documented by the officers as there been spirits on display. I quote again from their visit.

SPIRITS - Annex 2 of the licence clearly stipulates that 'spirits will be kept behind the counter and not available for self-service' by customers. Whilst the majority of spirits sold by the shop were indeed behind the counter where only staff members could access them" There was discovered a number of spirits including Baileys, Malibu and Archers located on the main shelves in the alcohol area within the shop

3.15 All signs were displayed to members of the public at all the exit points to the premises requesting they respect the neighbours.

3.16 All staff were confident in explaining the Challenge 25 policy with regards to selling age restricted products. They knew their responsibilities to challenge appropriately without showing confrontation. And to record their actions.

3.17 The CCTV system records for 31 days which is in excess of the required 28 days as prescribed as a condition on the licence.

3.18 The Poppers identified by police, were in fact room odorisers and are sold as that. If persons wish to use them for any other reason, then this their choice and the premises cannot be held responsible for the individual's abuse. The selling of is not an illegal practice and therefore should not be mentioned in the review.

3.19 The selling of drugs paraphernalia as already been observed is not an illegal practice and therefore should not form of a breach of condition nor be mentioned in the review. The comment made by Pc Braithwaite is an opinion and not based on evidence otherwise there would be evidence to connect the premises to drug activity within this review.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



3.20 The lack of a column was identified as per PC Braithwaite's comments on the refusals register. This is minor and in fact was an official document supplied by Staffordshire District council. To critique an established form is minor to more serious breaches that could occur. The fact it was filled shows due diligence when other premises fail to either have a book and if they do, never complete it.

3.21 The presence of a DPS authority sheet is only classed as best practice as quoted in the Licensing Act 2003 under SEC 19. It is not deemed as an offence under this same act not to have a written one, as already stated in the act it states **It is a mandatory condition that every supply of alcohol under the premises licence shall be made or authorised by a person who holds a personal licence.** It does not stipulate how this has to be recorded. It could be a verbal authority and therefore does not have to be written down and therefore should not be identified as a reason to breach a licence.

3.22 Thus ends the audit report.

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 Despite the shortcomings identified in the police review, the premises have demonstrated a commendable commitment to addressing and rectifying these issues. Management has acknowledged that greater accuracy was required and that minor clerical errors had occurred.

4.2 It is a premises situated in the middle of Stamford and footfall is consistent throughout the day. The customers are from all demographic groups but each showing respect and courtesy to the staff member and vice versa.

4.3 The premises showed that it was a community shop where people valued and respected it, not a premises which would attract criminality.

4.4 It has to be identified there is a requirement to have some training input in the premises. With discussions already had with the owner of the premises Mr Kalamohan, training has been provisionally booked in for the 19th of November 2025. This training will be completed by RJJ Consultancy who are accredited by Highfield Qualifications to deliver the highest level of training. Their Training Reference number 40988

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



4.5 The training will consist of each allocated person completing them.

Personal Licence Training to APLH2 level

Right to work checks and procedures

Section 136 offences and knowing their licence

Completion of refusal and incident logs to a competent level.

Price Marking Order Act 2004

4.6 This shows commitment and responsibility to show the determination to make the premises operate in accordance with the requirements of the Licensing Act 2003 and beyond. During my time of dealing with the premises, I found them nothing but accommodating in listening to our concerns and offering voluntary conditions to help

4.7 It is essential from my experience that any punishment or action taken by any Licensing Committee should be tied in with and how are the licensing objectives being compromised to the harm of others. This shop is in the centre of a housing complex, with a community feel, that serves a local community and offers everything they require. It has a high and continuous foot fall, with a single member of staff working within it at any one time. If the premises is a source of continuous current issues in the area with behaviour that compromises the licensing objectives to the town then yes I can respect the police's decision to review. But they are not, everyone in every day work can let the clerical aspect of the daily duties slip, and this is what the breaches are identified as, a slip in clerical duties. Nothing that cannot be put right by training and education.

4.8 As an independent auditor and using my experience, Revocation in my opinion is not a suitable course of action and should only be used in the most serious of cases. Each matter must of course be dealt with on their own merit and positives. To revoke the licence would not serve any purpose other than denying a community of a valuable service. Continuous training and support are the way forward. I have already identified the training package that will be delivered to the staff at the premises and would be happy to provide details of attendees and their certificates upon completion of training.

4.9 The training is a full day's event led by real people with scenario and question-based knowledge checks to insure complete and utter respect is shown to the personal licence they will gain and the daily duties they carry out. Normal procedures for training

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



would be to sit in front of a computer and do online training which is neither human led nor gives the opportunity to ask questions on the legislation.

4.10 Mr Kalamohan has chosen the human led training as he sees the value and importance of this over pre-loaded material.

4.11 I welcome PC Braithwaite as the licensing officer for SKDC to attend the training to ensure that the level of depth of the training is not shallow but attends to the issues she has raised in this review.

4.12 The breaches to the licensing conditions on their individual merit would not warrant a revocation of licence in my view but would prompt the licensing committee to add Annexe 3 conditions to the licence. These considerations could have been applied by means of consultation and mediation between the appropriate agencies and the premises. Thus, not resulting in a hearing today.

4.13 I still have questions as to why we are here today in relation to the review for revocation. Previous matters regarding right to work have been dealt with accordingly. The premises are operating under their current licence, and there are no current reported incidents within the review paperwork that have put the licensing objective, the **prevention of crime and disorder** at risk. There are purely clerical errors and nothing more.

4.14 It would be remis also of me to ignore the comments made by the officer PC Braithwaite, about the lack of staff working at the premises does not collaborate with the openings of the premises, and the selling of paraphernalia would contribute to attracting a certain type of person. Thus, expecting more documented evidence in the refusal incident and refusals register.

4.15 In my snapshot of being present at the premises, the customer based are local people who respect they have a premises within close vicinity of their homes, alcohol is not the biggest seller at the premises so there fore to remove the licence would serve no purpose, as it fails to contribute any undermining evidence not to promote the licensing objective **the prevention of crime and disorder**.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk



4.16 At no time throughout the review has reference been made to alcohol related crime and disorder. If there were alcohol/drug related issues attached to the premises then yes I would agree totally with the police and apply for a review/revocation of the licence.

4.17 There are no reported incidents of underage sales, persons loitering outside the premises causing alarm and distress to passers by drinking alcohol purchased from the premises. There are no reported incidents of drug use attached to the premises after purchasing 'drugs paraphernalia', no incidents that person have damaged their health from misusing the room odorises.

4.18 As mentioned my audit is based on the compliance issues raised by the Police and not the immigration issues as referenced in the Review, but acknowledgement has to be given to the fact these are historical and have already been dealt with by the appropriate authorities.

4.19 In short the premises operates to a good standard without no obvious recent signs of causing or being a negative impact on the local community. Breaches to the licence have been identified, but no more than other premises may do, they are not damaging for which the purpose they were implemented for under the Licensing Act 2003.

Thus ends my report.

Jon Jones

Co-Owner of RJJ Consultancy

07/11/2025.

RJJ Consultancy

Tel 07734 109347

Jon@rjjconsult.co.uk
Rick@rjjconsult.co.uk

www.rjjconsult.co.uk