

**Minutes of a meeting of Mid Sussex District Council Liquor Licensing Panel
held on Friday, 22nd September, 2023
from 10.00 am**

Present: Councillors: A Eves
J Mockford
C Wood

Officers in attendance: Nathan Mountney, Solicitor to the Licensing Panel
Jon Bryant, Senior Licensing Officer
Lucy Corrie, Assistant Director Communities
Lucinda Joyce, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Also in attendance: Alex Green – Solicitor
James Coomber – Regional Technical Manager
Stuart Frost – Area Manager
George Zormelo – National Licensing Manager
Peter Aston, WSCC Trading Standards, Interested Party
Ryder White, Democratic Services Officer
Terry Stanley, Head of Service, Democratic Services

LS.1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies were received from WSCC Public Health and Sussex Police.

LS.2 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.

None.

LS.3 APPLICATION TO REVIEW PREMISES LICENCE - LICENSING ACT 2003.

Introduction and outline of the report

Jon Bryant, Senior Licensing Officer introduced the report to determine an application submitted by West Sussex Trading Standards to review a Premises Licence at Morrisons Daily, Church Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3RA. The grounds for the review relate to the licensing objectives of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder and the Protection of Children from Harm.

The review cites the sale of alcohol to a child during a test purchase operation conducted by Trading Standards on the 8th of February 2023 and the subsequent enquiries that were made into the incident. Two further Responsible Authorities, Sussex Police and WSCC Public Health, have submitted representations in support of the review application.

He noted that the Panel must determine this matter on the evidence presented to it during the hearing having due regard to the Licensing Act 2003, MSDC Licensing Policy and the Home Office Guidance issued under Section 182 Licensing Act 2003.

He confirmed that the premises concerned is at Church Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3RA and is currently known as Morrisons Daily. It has been licensed for the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises since November 2005 under Licence Number PWA0095. Prior to this date the premises benefitted from a Justices Licence issued under the Licensing Act 1964.

The Premises Licence was transferred to the current premises licence holder, Alliance Property Holdings Limited, Hilmore House, Gain Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD3 7DL on the 10th May 2022 when the premises was formerly known as McColls.

At the time of the incidents referred to within the review application submitted by Trading Standards, the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was Sarah Mahoney. She was employed at a different branch within the company and was not permanently located at this store. The DPS was changed on the 4th of August 2023 to an Andrew Vickers.

He noted that the current Premises Licence is attached at Appendix 2. The premises is currently licensed for the following licensable activities:

Licensable Activity	Timings
Sale by retail of alcohol	Sunday 10:00 - 22:30 Monday to Saturday 08:00 - 23:00

The current opening hours of the premises are:

Sunday 10:00 - 22:30
Monday to Saturday 08:00 - 23:00

The premises operates as a convenience store and is located within Copthorne village. Photos of the store are attached at Appendix 3.

He confirmed that there are currently no extra conditions attached to the licence in addition to the mandatory licence conditions.

The Officer noted that West Sussex Trading Standards have applied for a review of the premises licence based on the sale of alcohol to a child that took place during a test purchasing operation that they conducted on the 8th of February 2023.

They cite that they received information regarding underage sales of alcohol and vapes. An advice visit was made to the store in August 2022 where they spoke to the manager at that time, Ms Kirstie East, regarding the sale of age restricted products, provided advice to ensure staff were correctly trained and a copy of this advice was provided to Ms East. On the 8th of February 2023 staff at the store sold alcohol to a child during a test purchase operation.

When Trading Standards officers spoke to the staff member who failed the test purchase, he stated that he had received training the previous week but did not know what the 'Think 25' policy was or what the refusals log was.

On the 22nd of May 2023 further questions were put by Trading Standards to a representative of the Company but there was no response. Further attempts were made and on the 9th of June they were informed by the current store manager that Ms East no longer worked for Morrisons Daily, but he confirmed that they had received the additional questions and would reply in the next 7 working days from that date.

On the 12th of June 2023, the current manager called the Trading Standards officer investigating the case and explained that the member of staff who failed the test purchase had been fired and it has been sorted. The Trading Standards officer asked him to respond to the questions that were put forward and confirm this information. There was no further response from Morrisons Daily since the 12th of June 2023 leading to the submission of the application to review the premises licence.

Trading Standards state that in view of the sale and the subsequent lack of engagement from the business in response to their contact with them, they do not believe the licensing objectives are being continually upheld, there is a failure of the management to promote the licensing objectives, and they consider that a review of the premises licence is necessary to limit further criminal activity by the licence holder and to act as a deterrent against such illegal conduct.

They further contend that the continued sale/supply of alcohol by the premises licence holder in the circumstances outlined above would potentially be a breach of the licensing objectives and the premises has demonstrated a particular failure in its ongoing responsibilities to protect children from harm. As underage advice had been provided before the sale of alcohol was made to a Trading Standards volunteer, the Responsible Authority suggests an appropriate outcome would be a three-month suspension of the Premises Licence.

He noted that full details of the Trading Standards investigation are attached to the report at Appendix 4.

Sussex Police have submitted representations in support of the application to review the premises licence on the grounds of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder and the Protection of Children from Harm. These are attached at Appendix 5.

In their representation they state that they are particularly concerned that in this case alcohol was sold to a child during a test purchase exercise. They note that prior to the test purchase advice was given to the Management of the premises by Trading Standards and that this advice revolved around underage sales of alcohol. They also recommend to the Committee that they consider a suspension period of 3 months is appropriate in this case.

In addition to a suspension of the premises licence, Sussex Police invite the Committee to update the current premises licence by adding modern conditions. A schedule of these conditions is attached at Appendix 6. The Officer noted that since the report was written there have been a large number of enquiries between the Police, the Solicitor and Trading Standards and a revised Appendix 6 has been provided which detailed conditions agreed by the parties involved.

WSCC Public Health have submitted representations in support of the application on the grounds of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder and the Protection of Children from Harm. These are attached in full at Appendix 7.

In their representation they state that sale of alcohol to children is of extreme concern, considering the strong evidence demonstrating the harms caused by alcohol to children and young people. They highlight that the premises had received an advice visit from two Trading Standards officers. They note that despite the member of staff confirming that they had received training, he was unable to explain the 'Challenge 25' policy. The fact that he was also completely unaware of a refusals log, demonstrates that staff training at the premises was completely insufficient to uphold the licencing objectives. They further state that it is disappointing that representatives of the company (up to the time that the review was submitted) have not responded in a timely manner to further questions put forward by Trading Standards. Given the serious nature of this offence and the harm caused to children by alcohol, this suggests that the premises is not taking seriously their responsibility to uphold the Licencing Objectives.

Having considered the information provided in the review, West Sussex Public Health state they are supportive of the recommendation of Trading Standards to suspend the premises alcohol licence for 3 months, as this will provide sufficient time for staff retraining, and would also invite the Committee to consider additional conditions being attached to the current licence. These are also outlined in Appendix 6. He also confirmed that the legal context is set out in the report.

In terms of the Licensing Objectives he confirmed that the Licensing Act 2003 requires representations to address the four licensing objectives which are:

1. Prevention of Crime and Disorder
2. Promotion of Public Safety
3. Prevention of Public Nuisance
4. Prevention of Harm to children and young persons

He noted the guidance set out in the report and highlighted that Licensing authorities should give considerable weight to representations about child protection matters. In addition to the responsible authority whose functions relate directly to child protection, the Director of Public Health may also have access to relevant evidence to inform such representations. These representations may include, amongst other things, the use of health data about the harms that alcohol can cause to underage drinkers. Where a responsible authority, or other person, presents evidence to the licensing authority linking specific premises with harms to children this evidence should be considered, and the licensing authority should also consider what action is appropriate to ensure this licensing objective is effectively enforced.

Responsible authorities and other persons may make representations in respect of an application to review a premises licence or club premises certificate. They must be relevant (i.e., relate to one or more of the licensing objectives) and, in the case of other persons, must not be frivolous or vexatious. Representations must be made in writing and may be amplified at the subsequent hearing or may stand in their own right. Additional representations which do not amount to an amplification of the original representation may not be made at the hearing.

Where authorised persons and responsible authorities have concerns about problems identified at premises, it is good practice for them to give licence holders early warning of their concerns and the need for improvement, and where possible they should advise the licence or certificate holder of the steps they need to take to address those concerns. A failure by the holder to respond to such warnings is expected to lead to a decision to apply for a review. Co-operation at a local level in

promoting the licensing objectives should be encouraged and reviews should not be used to undermine this cooperation.

The noted that the 2003 Act provides a range of powers for the licensing authority which it may exercise on determining a review where it considers them appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The licensing authority may decide that the review does not require it to take any further steps appropriate to promoting the licensing objectives. In addition, there is nothing to prevent a licensing authority issuing an informal warning to the licence holder and/or to recommend improvement within a particular period of time. It is expected that licensing authorities will regard such informal warnings as an important mechanism for ensuring that the licensing objectives are effectively promoted and that warnings should be issued in writing to the licence holder.

However, where responsible authorities such as the police or environmental health officers have already issued warnings requiring improvement – either orally or in writing – that have failed as part of their own stepped approach to address concerns, licensing authorities should not merely repeat that approach and should take this into account when considering what further action is appropriate.

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),
- exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence,
- remove the designated premises supervisor, for example, because they consider that the problems are the result of poor management;

At this point the Officer noted that the Designated Premises Supervisor at the premises has subsequently changed since the incident.)

- suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months;
- revoke the licence.

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.

There is certain criminal activity that may arise in connection with licensed premises which should be treated particularly seriously. These are the use of the licensed premises: for the illegal purchase and consumption of alcohol by minors which impacts on the health, educational attainment, employment prospects and propensity for crime of young people;

It is envisaged that licensing authorities, the police, the Home Office (Immigration Enforcement) and other law enforcement agencies, which are responsible authorities, will use the review procedures effectively to deter such activities and crime. Where reviews arise and the licensing authority determines that the crime prevention objective is being undermined through the premises being used to further

crimes, it is expected that revocation of the licence – even in the first instance – should be seriously considered.

He noted that the rest of the report outlines other options considered and background papers and he went through the appendices noting the revised version of Appendix 6 which has been tabled. He also highlighted one other item which has been provided to the Panel by the Solicitor which is a timeline as to the actions carried out by the Premises Licence holder since incident came to their notice.

Questions to the Senior Licensing Officer

There were no questions for the Senior Licensing Officer.

Mr Peter Aston, WSCC Trading Standards, Team Manager - Responsible Authority

Mr Aston advised Trading Standards had requested a standard review of the premises licence of Alliance Property Holdings trading as Morrisons Daily, Church Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3RA under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003 with a view to a revocation, suspension, inclusion of additional conditions or removal of the DPS.

He highlighted that the current operation of the premises was undermining the Licensing Objectives and the purpose of the review was to bring to the Local Authorities attention the breaches of the licencing laws. He outlined their press release of October 2021 warning businesses there would be a county wide crack down on to underage sales of alcohol and noted previous cases where shops had been found to be selling alcohol and tobacco products to children. There has also been significant press coverage of licences across the District that have been revoked. There have also been occasions of other underage sales across the County, but they have involved other criminal activity and are not reported on. As the sale of vapes has continued, Trading Standards took the decision in January 2022 to instigate a zero-tolerance policy to the sale of alcohol to children and where there is sufficient evidence they will seek a review of the business alcohol licence with the aim of having it suspended or revoked unless there are exceptional circumstances. This approach would be following businesses having been fully advised in a personal visit and followed up in writing.

As part of their policy they agreed that the following steps would be taken: Trading Standards engage with the alcohol licence review process in view of tackling the supply of the restricted items. They conduct intelligence led test purchasing operations with evidence that usually comes from parents, teachers or businesses. All reported instances are followed up. They give robust advice to businesses who are reported as selling age restricted products to children and take appropriate and proportional action. They also utilise zero tolerance messaging and this is reflected in the published enforcement policy.

Unfortunately, incidents in Mid Sussex and the County have escalated which has a significant impact on the resources of both Trading Standards and Mid Sussex District Council.

With regards to this specific case in April 2022 the Responsible Authority received an intelligence report that the Alliance Property Holdings Limited trading as Morrison's Daily had sold alcohol and vapes to children. It originated from a Copthorne Police Community Support Officer as one of two properties selling alcohol and elf bars and was rife at the Copthorne carnival. He confirmed that they intervened and another

PCSO witnessed e-cigarettes being sold. Under the Children and Families Act 2014 it is a criminal offence to sell nicotine inhaling product to under 18's. Following receipt of this information Trading Standards made an appointment with Ms East on 5 August 2022. A visit was carried out by two Trading Standards Officers who viewed the training records online and checked the till prompts and refusal logs. Ms East read and signed a report and a copy was given to her. She was specifically warned that a test purchase will happen and if failed, the licence could be revoked. On 8 August 2022 a letter was sent reiterating the advice discussed and the zero-tolerance policy. On 8 February 2023 a test purchase took place with a 17-year-old volunteer under supervision. They selected a WKD Blue alcopop and took it to the till. The till person did not look up until asking for payment and he sold it without asking for any identification. After securing the bottle as evidence, the Officers returned after the purchase to explain what had taken place. Under caution the seller, Mr Felgate stated that the volunteer looked 19 or 20 years old. He explained that he started working at the store 2 weeks ago and had received written and video training one week prior. He had been required to sign paperwork confirming the training. When asked about the Think 25 policy he couldn't remember and so it was explained to him. When asked about the refusal log he didn't know what it was and had never written anything down but said it might be kept electronically. He sold the drink as he didn't think to ask for identification. Further questions were put to the Premises Manager Ms East who did not respond. Several attempts of contact were made with Morrisons Daily and on 9 June 2023 a Trading Standards Officer called and spoke to Mr Mo who explained that Ms East did not work there anymore. Mr Mo confirmed that he had received the questions and would respond in the next 7 working days. On 12 June 2023 Mr Mo called to explain that Mr Felgate had been fired and that it had been sorted. He was asked to complete the questions in writing but there was no further response until the application for the review was made on 8 August 2023.

The sale of alcohol to an underage person is a breach of the licence in a failure to protect children from harm. The Panel is reminded that the second objective, the prevention of crime and disorder, has also been failed. In view of the sale and subsequent lack of engagement the Officer felt that the Licensing objectives are not continually being upheld so and so it is proportional and necessary to ask the Panel to review the licence with a review to revoking it to act as a deterrent to other operators considering such illegal activities.

He referenced the Local Government handbook on the Licencing Act where the primary purpose is to act as deterrent and prevent further breaches and any licensable activities which are causing concern from happening. A review is often more of a deterrent than criminal prosecution. A further reason for bringing this review is the Home Officer revised guidance of the Licensing Act which was updated in August 2023 which notes the need to protect children from moral, physiological harm and the wider harms of sexual exploitation. Section 2.28 of the handbook notes that the Government believes it is completely unacceptable to sale to children and specific weight should be given to representations on child protection matters. Section 11.10 notes that where authorised person have concerns, it is good practice to give the Licence Holder early warning of the concerns and advise them of steps to change it. He noted that this took place with a visit by appointment and follow-up in writing, with a failure to respond to this. Section 11.27 notes that certain criminal activity is to be treaded particular seriously, for example the purchase of alcohol by minors. Section 11.28 notes that it is envisaged that Licencing Authority's, Police, the Home Office and other Responsible Authorities will use review procedures to deter such activities and crime. Where the crime prevention activities are being undermined it is expected that a revocation of licence even in a first instance should be considered.

In conclusion he noted that the sale of alcohol is a breach of the licencing objectives and is a failure to protect children from harm. The second licensing objective has also been failed. He felt that the company would blame the individual employees involved but senior officers and managers need to take responsibility as they had no oversight of what was happening in the store, noting that Morrison's is a large national Business. Underage prevention advice has been provided and a 3-month suspension is consistent and proportional with other small businesses that have come before the Panel recently. He felt that it would provide a strong message to others if consistent and robust sanctions are administered.

Questions to the Trading Standards, Responsible Authority

The Solicitor for the Licence Holder asked if the Manager had escalated the request for information back in May 2023 and if Trading Standards had been provided with a timely response and were given all the information to their satisfaction is it possible that the Panel wouldn't be convened today.

The Trading Standards Officer confirmed that they have a zero-tolerance policy on the sale of alcohol and so they would still have undertaken a review of the alcohol licence.

The Panel asked if Mr Felgate was alone in the shop when the test purchase took place. The Trading Standards officer did not know.

Representatives of the Premises Licence Holder : Alex Green – Solicitor, James Coomber – Regional Technical Manager, Stuart Frost – Area Manager, George Zormelo – National Licensing Manager

Before commencing, the Solicitor established that there would be an opportunity to sum up at the end of the representations.

The Solicitor confirmed that on behalf of Alliance Property Holdings Ltd and Morrisons, the attendees at the meeting apologise to the Police, Public Health and the Panel and hold their hands up to what happened.

He noted that Alliance Property Holdings Ltd is a neutral name confirming that Morrisons took over the McColls chain in 2022. One reason that they are here, is that following a failed test purchase, the manager failed to respond to Trading Standards. The manager was given ample opportunity to escalate it internally. Whether he claimed to be busy or misplaced the paperwork the Solicitor did not know. He noted that there is no criticism of Trading Standards as they asked for questions to be answered and despite chasing and ringing the manager, he didn't escalate it. The Solicitor has provided a timeline of the incident and subsequent action for the Panel to review. He summarised points in the timeline from the failed test purchase on 8 February 2023, the Senior Licencing Officer's visit to site to review processes, an investigation into the staff Member who was suspended and then dismissed and a number of reactive Serve Legal test purchases which took place and were all passed.

He acknowledged that initially there was a big response, and the Premises Licence Holder was in contact with the Licensing Authority and believed that everything was resolved since the horrible error. However, 3 months later Trading Standards provided correspondence to the previous manager requiring answers to a series of questions. They followed up with a call to the manager, Mr Mo who agreed to

respond within 7 days. He did not escalate this and Trading Standards issued their application to review in August 2023 as they had received no response. As soon as the Licence Holder was made aware of the review the Solicitor was in contact with Trading Standards to confirm that Head Officer were aware and on it. The store was visited by the regional compliance team straight away to investigate. To receive the review papers was a surprise and the response was detailed. The manager was investigated for non-escalation, the compliance teams visited, and more test purchases took place and were passed. The Trading Standards questions were answered by the National Compliance Manager and a full audit of the store took place. The manager was investigated, a disciplinary lined up and he subsequently resigned. The new staff have had training and everything has been done as far as they can see to ensure that it doesn't happen again. With regards to the representations, the conditions have been agreed and there has been a lot of emails with Sussex Police with regards to CCTV requirements. The Police are clear that they wish for the conditions to be included this has been agreed as per the revised appendix 6 including CCTV, and incident log, a door staff policy for late evenings if needs and detailed training. He noted that they are trying to demonstrate that once it hit home on a national and regional level, they are demonstrating how seriously it is being taken.

Questions to the Licence Holder

Mr Aston noted that Callum Wells was aware of the situation on 15 February 2023 and asked what position Mr Wells is within the company.

James Coomber, Regional Technical Manager, confirmed that Mr Wells is a Regional Compliance Specialist. Mr Aston replied that if he was aware in February, why was it not escalated? The Solicitor replied that they were aware of the failed test purchase in February as everything kicked into place with a comprehensive response. He was not aware of any criticism of the Regional and National response and thought that everyone locally had met and dealt with the necessary issues. Mr Aston commented that they appear to be blaming the staff in the shop at the time for the lack of escalation. The Solicitor replied that that one manager was responsible for the subsequent escalation, and he solely didn't. The staff member who failed the test purchase had received comprehensive training and signed to acknowledge that. If they subsequently didn't understand the training or failed to remember it, that is not the failure of the training.

The Panel noted that the person who sold the alcohol was immediately dismissed and asked who the manager at this point was. The Solicitor believed that there wasn't a permanent manager at the time. Mr Stuart confirmed that Sarah Mahoney was managing two sites. He confirmed that it was unlikely that Mr Felgate was alone as he was a colleague not a supervisor.

The Panel asked about the specifics of the training, whether it happens at home, are they supervised, does the company check that the staff member has completed it and have they changed the training since this event took place.

Mr Coomber confirmed that it is e-learning designed to contain videos and information to constantly test you as you go through the module. At the end there is a full test and you have to pass it to complete the module. If you fail, you restart and the questions at the end change.

The Panel noted that the staff training at the premises was insufficient and asked what systems are now in place that are different.

George Zormelo, National Licensing Manager confirmed that McColls has been integrated into Morrison's ways of working and training has been moved into Morrison's systems, aligned to Morrison's colleague training. This involves initial training and a bi-yearly refresher carried out on a comprehensive and interactive system which verifies colleagues have taken it. He also noted that they have passed the test purchases which have taken place since the failed instance.

Summing up by WSCC Trading Standards

Mr Aston confirmed that Trading Standards still do not have the confidence that the licensing objectives will be upheld as it is clear there is a shortfall at all levels including procedures and training to staff. He noted that there should be a sanction for a large national business to deter them and others from selling age restricted products. We believe a 3 months suspension of the licence is an appropriate deterrent.

Summing up by the Licence Holder

He referenced Section 11.20 of the Home Office Guidance, that in deciding which power to use, the Licencing Authority should seek to address the cause of issues and any remedial action should be directed at these causes. It should also be proportional to these causes. A suspension of a licence for 3 months could impact the business and should only be expected to be pursued as an appropriate means of promoting the licensing objectives.

He noted that the Licence Holder does not need time to get its house in order. A review was completed recently, the staff member who sold the alcohol has gone, the store is monitored on a regular basis, and training has taken place at a level expected of Morrisons employees. He also referenced point 9.43 where guidance should be evidence based and reiterated that the cause of the failure was 2 staff members and the action taken from the license holder was comprehensive. All staff have been trained, all subsequent test purchases have passed, and the Regional Manager has visited the site on multiple occasions. In serious cases the Panel could revoke a licence, or do nothing, or add conditions. In this case the licence holder has agreed conditions with all the responsible authorities involved which is a reasonable and proportionate response. He asked how a revocation would help, citing that it should not be used as a form of punishment.

The Solicitor outlined the next steps. The Panel will retire to consider the application. If the Panel is unable to come to a decision today, it will be communicated to various parties within 5 working days. They may come back with a decision but not reasons, however these will be made clear. Any appeal of the decision is to be within 21 days.

The Panel retired at 11.04 and returned at 12.12.

The Panel carefully considered the application for review and verbal submissions from West Sussex Trading Standards; the representations made by Sussex Police and West Sussex County Council Public Health; and verbal submissions submitted at the hearing by the Premises License Holder. It has taken into account the Mid Sussex District Council's Statement of Licensing Policy, the revised Home Office guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003, the duties under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the rights set out in the Human Rights Act 1998. All options for determination have been considered as per section 52 of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Chairman confirmed that allegations by Trading Standards have been established but the Premises Licence holder does not argue the facts. The Premises Licence Holder says the failure is in the escalation to management.

Based on the evidence by the Trading Standards Officer, the seller clearly didn't understand the training he had received only 2 weeks prior so it is the Public Licence Holders responsibility to ensure that the training given is sufficient to promote the licensing objectives. We do not believe the training was adequate especially as prior warning was given in August 22 that a test visit would occur.

Given that you have agreed to amend the conditions as requested and your training systems are much improved, based upon your new conditions and chronology you have supplied, we cannot justify suspension or revocation on this occasion. Should there be further instances you are more likely to receive a suspension or revocation of your licence.

RESOLVED

The Panel decided that the Premises Licence held by Alliance Property Holdings Ltd trading as Morrisons Daily, Church Road, Copthorne, West Sussex, RH10 3RA be amended to include the additional conditions from Sussex Police.

The meeting finished at 12.15 pm

Chairman