

**Minutes of a meeting of Mid Sussex District Council Liquor Licensing Panel  
held on Wednesday, 8th November, 2023  
from 10.00 am**

**Present:** Councillors: A Eves (Chairman)  
P Chapman  
P Kenny

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

**Also in attendance:** Ibrahim Kahraman, Licence Holder  
Mehmet Kahraman, Designated Premises Supervisor  
Peter Aston, WSCC Trading Standards, Interested Party  
Ellen Fisher, Democratic Services Officer  
Alison Hammond, Democratic Services Officer

The panel and officers were introduced to the applicants and Responsible Authority.

**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 TO BE AGREED BY GENERAL AFFIRMATION THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2023.**

The Solicitor verified the minutes as accurate representation of the meeting. The minutes were accepted by the Panel and were signed by the Chairman.

**LS.4 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, namely at London Road Food and Wine, 65 London Road, East Grinstead, RH19 1EQ. The grounds for the review relate to the licensing objectives of the Prevention of Crime and Disorder and the Protection of Children from Harm.

He noted that the review cites the sale of alcohol to a child during a test purchase operation conducted by Trading Standards on the 27th of June 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.

To provide background, he confirmed that the premises concerned is at 65 London Road, East Grinstead, RH19 1EQ and is known as London Road Food and Wine. It has been licensed for the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises since August 2014 under Licence Number PWA0487. The Premises Licence Holder is Mr Ibrahim Kahraman and the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) is his brother, Mr Mehmet Kahraman. The current Premises Licence and conditions is attached at Appendix 2 and the premises is currently licensed for the following licensable activities:

<b>Licensable Activity</b>	<b>Timings</b>
Sale by retail of alcohol	Everyday 08:00 - 23:00

The premises operates as a local convenience store in East Grinstead situated in the town centre and there are a number of additional conditions attached to the licence in addition to the mandatory licence conditions. These are comprehensive and include that the premises will operate an age verification policy set at a minimum of 25 years, whereby any person attempting to buy alcohol who appears to be under 25 (or the age set by the policy) will be asked for photographic ID to prove their age. It also includes a list of acceptable ID, that signage advertising the 'Challenge' policy will be displayed in prominent locations in the premises and shall include the point of sale as a minimum and that a written record of those authorised to make sales of alcohol shall be kept. This shall be endorsed by the DPS with the date such authorisation commences and shall be made available immediately upon request to the Local Authority Licensing Officers and Sussex Police Licensing Officers.

In addition, all staff members engaged, or to be engaged, in selling alcohol on the premises shall receive full training pertinent to the Licensing Act 2003, specifically in regard age-restricted sales, and the refusal of sales to persons believed to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Induction training must be completed and refresher training thereafter at intervals of no more than six (6) months. All restricted sales training undertaken by staff members shall be fully documented and signed by the employee and the DPS.

He 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 they conducted on the 27th of June 2023.

They cite that they had previously received several complaints, alleging the location was selling e-cigarettes to individuals aged under 18.

On the 2nd of June 2023, a Trading Standards Officer conducted an advice visit in relation to selling age restricted products. The Trading Standards Officer spoke to the Premises Licence Holder, Mr Ibrahim Kahraman, on the phone about the underage sales advice visit. Several points around age restricted products and training were discussed during the advice visit. On the 5th of June 2023, a follow up advice letter,

which reiterated what was discussed from the advice visit, was sent to Mr Kahraman's email address.

On the 27th of June 2023 as part of an underage sales operation a 16-year-old volunteer selected a WKD Blue bottle of alcohol and took it to the till. A female working behind the till area sold the WKD Blue bottle of alcohol to the child volunteer, without asking them for any identification.

Trading Standards Officers immediately returned the shop to explain to the seller about the test purchase. Mr Kahraman was present when Trading Standards Officers entered the shop and listened while Trading Standards officers were talking to the seller, Ms Jankeer. She stated that she did not know the drink she sold to the volunteer was alcohol, she did not remember the volunteer and was unable to say what age they thought the volunteer was. She was aware of the 'Think 25' Policy. There was no till prompt for the alcohol product and the refusal logs could not initially be located. When the seller was asked about any training, she confirmed she has had training and signed something, however there were no records of this when checked.

Trading Standards Officers questioned Mr Kahraman, as to why there was no records for the sellers training. Mr Kahraman explained that the seller usually stacks shelves and that is the reason there were no training record for her.

West Sussex Trading Standards contend they do not believe the licensing objectives are being continually upheld at London Road Food and Wine and deem it both proportionate and necessary to invite the committee to consider a review of the premises licence, to limit further criminal activity by this licence holder and to act as a deterrent to other operators considering such illegal conduct.

As underage age advice had been provided before the sale of alcohol was made to a Trading Standards volunteer, the Responsible Authority suggests an appropriate outcome of the review would be a three-month suspension and further conditions added to the licence. He noted that full details of the Trading Standards investigation are attached to the report at Appendix 4.

Subsequently 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 5. 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 advice regarding under-age sales a short time prior to the incident and despite this recent advice, alcohol was sold to a child.

They highlight that in Mid Sussex alcohol-specific hospital admissions among under 18s have shown an increase since 2016/17 and the comparable rate for the district is 35.2 admissions per 100,000 under 18s which is also above rates for England overall.

They state that they are concerned by the inadequate staff training procedures at the premises. The apparent lack of training amongst some staff members is putting children at risk of harm from alcohol. The failure to keep adequate training records suggests further still that the premises is not taking seriously their responsibility to uphold the Licencing Objectives.

They further state that from a Public Health perspective, it is disappointing that despite previous advice provided by Trading Standards, alcohol was sold to a child. Given the serious nature of this offence and the harm caused to children by alcohol, West Sussex Public Health are supportive of the recommendations made by Trading Standards which seek to limit further criminal activity and to promote the licencing objectives.

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 6.

They detail that Sussex Police are particularly concerned in this case that on the 27th of June 2023, alcohol was sold to a child during a test purchase exercise. Prior to the test purchase exercise carried out by Trading Standards, advice was given to the Management of the premises.

They comment that as a result of receiving details of this review application they attended the premises on the 28th of September 2023 to conduct a licensing visit.

The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was not on site, so a member of staff was spoken to. The following observations were made during the visit:

- The member of staff had very little knowledge of the licensing legislation which was of concern as the member of staff was in a position of the sale of alcohol.
- The member of staff could not locate part A of the Premises Licence and stated that she had never seen the document.
- The member of staff stated that she had no formal training. The member of staff stated the only training that she has had was verbal instructions not to sell age related products to children. The member of staff was aware of challenge 25.
- There were training records for a number of members of staff, but the records were not documented and there were no dates of training or refresher training as per the conditions of the premises licence. It would appear from one document that the last training was conducted on the 24th of October 2021.
- Part B of the premises licence was displayed correctly.
- The member of staff produced a folder with the following documents - DPS authorisation form, Written age verification policy and training records as above.
- Challenge 25 posters were on display, one at the point of sale and one where the alcohol was displayed.
- All spirits were on display behind the counter. All other alcohol products were displayed in a small chiller in view of the till.
- CCTV was working and appeared in good order, the correct time and date displayed.
- A refusals log was produced by the member of staff. There were numerous entries on the log, the last being the 21st of September 2023.
- During the visit a further member of staff returned to the premises after a break. This member of staff had an improved knowledge of the running of the premises and the Licensing legislation.
- It was clearly evident that there was a distinct lack of knowledge at the premises and training by the DPS would improve the situation and prevent any future sales of age restricted products. No other issues identified at the premises.

Sussex Police support the review application and recommend to the Committee that they consider a suspension period of three months is appropriate. In addition to a suspension of the premises licence, Sussex Police invite the Committee to consider updating the premises licence conditions by replacing all the existing conditions in

the operating schedule of the licence with proposed conditions detailed at Appendix 7.

The Senior Licensing Officer noted that the review has been applied for under Section 51(1) of the Licensing Act 2003 and confirmed that Section 52 deals with the determination of the review and the considerations of the committee. 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 that the panel will be aware of the extensive guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and reiterated a number of key points:

2.34

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 (such as ambulance data or emergency department attendances by persons under 18 years old with alcohol-related illnesses or injuries) this evidence should be considered, and the licensing authority should also consider what action is appropriate to ensure this licensing objective is effectively enforced.

11.16

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.

11.19

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), for example, by reducing the hours of opening or by requiring door supervisors at particular times;
- exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence, for example, to exclude the performance of live music or playing of recorded music;
- remove the designated premises supervisor, for example, because they consider that the problems are the result of poor management;
- suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months;
- revoke the licence.

11.20

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.

#### 11.23

Licensing authorities should also note that modifications of conditions and exclusions of licensable activities may be imposed either permanently or for a temporary period of up to three months. Temporary changes or suspension of the licence for up to three months could impact on the business holding the licence financially and would only be expected to be pursued as an appropriate means of promoting the licensing objectives or preventing illegal working., it will always be important that any detrimental financial impact that may result from a licensing authority's decision is appropriate and proportionate to the promotion of the licensing objectives But where premises are found to be trading irresponsibly, the licensing authority should not hesitate, where appropriate to do so, to take tough action to tackle the problems at the premises and, where other measures are deemed insufficient, to revoke the licence.

#### 11.27

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;

#### 11.28

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.

The Senior Licencing Officer noted that the final decision made by the Panel in this matter is subject to appeal in the Magistrates' Court by any party to the proceedings. He took the Panel through the background papers noting that there is an addendum to Appendix 7 which includes 2 further conditions that Trading Standards invite the Panel to add to the licence.

#### 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 that Trading Standards had requested a standard review of the premises licence of London Road Food and Wine, 65 London Road, East Grinstead, RH19 1EQ 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. This policy reflected in the published enforcement policy on the website.

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. The sale of Vapes are of particular concern and he drew the Panel's attention to a recent Panorama report focussing on the effects on vaping on children. He also cited a press release from Manchester Police noting the link between the sale of prohibited items, grooming gangs and exploitation.

With regards to this particular case, he cited a number of reports from concerned parents regarding the sale of vapes to children. Reports were received on 18 April 2023, 20 April, 2 June, 5 June, 9 June and 26 June illustrating a community concern and a wish for Trading Standards to act and reduce such instances going forward.

On the 27 June 2023, during a controlled Trading Standards Test purchasing exercise, a shop employee at Yowu Limited t/a London Road Food and Wine, 65 London Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1EQ, sold alcohol to a Trading Standards volunteer who was under the age of 18. He outlined that a child selected a bottle of WKD Blue and a female member of staff sold it without asking any questions. After securing it as evidence, Trading Standards Officers returned to explain and instigate an investigation. The Licence Holder was present and listened while they spoke to the seller, therefore she was under supervision. The seller explained that she didn't know it was alcohol and could not remember the volunteer or what age they were. When asked about 'Think 25' she was aware of this. When she scanned a bottle there were no till prompts and she could not locate the refusals log, however another person did find it. She confirmed that she had received training and had signed for it but there were no records of this. Trading Standards questioned the Licence Holder who explained that the seller usually stocked the shelves which is why there were no training records.

Mr Aston noted that 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 view to revoking it, to act as a deterrent to other operators considering such illegal activities.

He drew the Panel's attention to 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. Referencing the Home Office revised guidance of the Licensing Act which was updated in August 2023 it 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 by email. 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 seriously considered.

In view of the above, the Responsible Authority does not believe the licensing objectives are being continually upheld at Yowu Limited t/a London Road Food and Wine, 65 London Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1EQ, and deem it both proportionate and necessary to invite the committee to consider a review of the premises licence, to limit further criminal activity by this licence holder and to act as a deterrent to other operators considering such illegal conduct. As underage age advice had been provided before the sale of alcohol was made to a Trading Standards volunteer the Responsible Authority suggests an appropriate outcome of the review would be a three-month suspension and further conditions added to the licence. These conditions are an addendum to Appendix 7 including that no more than 2 children are allowed in the shop at any one time unless accompanied by an adult and that a till prompt is in place to remind staff to check that the customer is over 18 years old when selling any restricted product. This would send a strong message across the County and District that robust sanctions will be administered.

#### Questions to the Trading Standards, Responsible Authority

With regards to the reports from parents alleging that the shop is selling vapes, the Licence Holder noted that CCTV camera records are held for 90 days and Trading Standards Officers are welcome to verify the reports by checking the footage. He asked why they had not done so.

Mr Ashton noted that this has been considered, and he has been in contact with the Licensing Officer. Only the Police and the Licensing Authority have the power to seize and view the CCTV footage.

The DPS noted that, whilst not an excuse, the business has been active since 2014 and this is the first instance of alcohol being sold to a minor. He noted that all the earlier reports were related to the sale of vapes, and there are 15 shops in the area



that sell them. He is aware minors often get an adult to buy them and they have CCTV outside to watch out for this. They refuse to sell to the adult if this is suspected and have banned one person for this in the past. They also have a refusal log.

The Panel asked for clarification on the size of the bottle. The DPS confirmed it was a small bottle and provided an example which he had brought with him, alongside a similar small blue bottle of soft drink as the seller had mistakenly thought she was selling a soft drink on that occasion.

Premises Licence Holder: Ibrahim Kahraman, Designated Premises Supervisor Mehmet Kahraman:

The DPS noted that the staff member had been working at the shop for almost a year part time, stacking shelves. She wishes to learn to use the till and has done so under supervision but on this occasion the DPS was not at the store and the License Holder was giving advice to someone so she made a sale when she shouldn't have. The DPS had trained the staff member and apologised that the paperwork is missing. He reiterated the example of the two similar blue bottles to demonstrate how they could be mistaken for a soft drink.

He noted that the shop is the biggest in East Grinstead with a memorable name and if someone wants to make a complaint it is easy to remember that shop whether they made the sale or not. He confirmed that he would not serve vapes to children as he wouldn't want the same to happen to his child.

He offered to demonstrate how people are happy with the service they offer and what they have done for the community. He also confirmed that they have done everything to rectify the situation since the test purchase, reiterating the training, and showing the seller how to identify the percentage alcohol on a bottle if they are unsure. He also confirmed that he has given the seller a second chance as he believed it to be an honest mistake and asked that the panel do the same with this review.

The Licence Holder confirmed that till prompts now identify age restricted items to remind the seller.

Questions to the Licence Holder

The Licensing Officer asked if there was a till prompt for alcohol at the time of the test purchase. The DPS confirmed that the till system had recently changed and as the previous one didn't have the option to offer a warning, it had taken time to add in the hundreds of products and by mistake some had been missed out. He has since checked and is 99.9% sure all items are on the system, and this is checked each time a new item is added.

The Panel noted that the sale took place in June and the Police visited in September at which time the till prompt still was not installed so sought clarification on when the till prompts were active and whether it covers all age restricted items such as vapes, and tobacco. The DPS confirmed that the capacity to have a till prompt had been in place for over a year and new products are added on a daily basis but that it was possible that some items had been missed as they have over 10,000 items of stock. He confirmed that it did cover all age restricted items.

The Panel sought clarification of what other improvements had been made regarding training and records in the interval between the incident and the Police visit. The DPS confirmed that everyone had been retrained, especially the seller and the main focus

had gone into the till prompts to ensure items were added. He confirmed there are 11 staff and in response to a question on whether they have door staff to manage numbers of children he confirmed this was felt to be unnecessary as his experience is that they are not there to steal, and they will not cause issues when in school uniform and surrounded by people they know.

In response to a question on the processes for a new member of staff the DPS confirmed that they are informed of the rules regarding selling items to people under 25 years old and to ask for ID even if they are not sure of the age. They are informed of the types of acceptable ID and to look out for fake ID. He also shares his personal experience of how to spot someone who appears guilty or suspicious. He then goes through the products with the staff including noting that items such as cigarette paper, filter tips and lighters also should not be sold to anyone under 18 years old.

The DPS confirmed that he is at the shop approximately 5 hours per day as he splits his time between two stores that he supervises, and the Licence Holder is usually there from 6.30am until 5pm or 6pm. An experienced senior member of staff is there in the evenings to cover when neither the DPS or Licence Holder are on site. The Panel asked what their training documentation looks like and the DPS was confident that they had done everything right regarding documentation. The Licensing Officer offered to provide them with a copy to consider during the recess and gave an example of what good training documentation should look like. The Panel asked if the DPS was familiar with this example of good practice and he confirmed that he was.

The Panel sought clarification on how many refusals are made in a month noting that the last entry on the log is 17 September. The DPS confirmed that more refusals occur in the summer months and holidays as it relates to an increase of visitors, noting that local people won't try to buy anything underage. Sometimes there can be a number of refusals and sometimes only one or none. Refusals also often relate to drunk people.

The Panel noted that this is the first time that the business has come before them for the failure of a test purchase.

#### Summing up by WSCC Trading Standards

Mr Aston reiterated that on 2 June a Trading Standards Officer visited and noted that the refusals log hadn't been used since 3 February 23. The Licence Holder countered that he had the logs available to view and is not sure why this was noted.

Mr Ashton asked if the Licence Holder reviewed CCTV footage as part of a compliance check after the Officer had visited. The DPS confirmed that he did look at it, noting that you can't look through it all the time. He gave an example of using CCTV to prove to a complainant that their son hadn't purchase alcohol at the store.

Mr Aston reiterated that he still does not have the confidence that the licensing objectives will be upheld. He felt it was clear there are ongoing shortfalls in training and these need to be fully addressed. Sanctions for selling alcohol to minors was also needed and robust action should be taken as a clear deterrent to other business who continue to sell products to children.

The Solicitor outlined the next steps noting that the Panel would retire to consider the application. If the Panel was unable to come to a decision, 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. This appeal can be made a Brighton Magistrates Court and details of where to write to will be provided when reasons are given.

The Panel retired at 11.23am and returned at 12.07pm

The Panel noted that the immediate cause of the sale of alcohol to a minor was an untrained person on the till and no till prompts on the bottle of WKD, which indicated ineffective managerial oversight. There also was no supervisor available to correct the person. They also felt that there was an inadequate focus on the licencing objectives as the refusals log showed only 18 refusals in 9 months. They considered removing the DPS however this would not be helpful as the DPS needs to convey his considerable knowledge to the staff. The management needs to give higher priority to the licensing objectives particularly the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention from harm to children and young persons.

The Panel therefore felt it was reasonable to impose a suspension for 6 weeks and to amend the conditions of the licence as per the Sussex Police recommendations, excluding the additional conditions supplied by West Sussex Trading Standards . The 6-week suspension will allow time to carry out a full review of the till prompts and make sure all staff are adequately trained.

The Solicitor confirmed that the 6 weeks will take effect after the 21 days appeal time. If the Licence Holder does appeal the suspension the decision is held off until the appeal is decided on. He confirmed that in light of all the information provided, the Panel's decision was considered appropriate and asked that the Licence Holder clearly corresponds with the Licencing Officer if they plan to appeal.

## **RESOLVED**

The Panel decided that the Premises Licence held by London Road Food and Wine, 65 London Road, East Grinstead, RH19 1EQ be suspended for 6 weeks and that the conditions of the licence be amended as per the Sussex Police recommendations, excluding the additional conditions supplied by West Sussex Trading Standards (WSTS).

The meeting finished at 12.10 pm

Chairman