

LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE A

A meeting of the Licensing Sub Committee A was held on Tuesday 14 October 2025.

PRESENT: Councillors L Lewis (Chair), J Kabuye and J Platt

**ALSO IN
ATTENDANCE:** V Meehu – Applicant
N Suresh – Applicant's Representative, Arka Licensing

B Bashir – Making Representations
Councillor J McTigue – Longlands & Beechwood Ward Councillor – Making Representations.

OFFICERS: C Cunningham, J Dixon, T Durance, F Helyer and R Johansson.

**PRESENT AS AN
OBSERVER:** Councillor M Nugent – Longlands & Beechwood Ward Councillor

25/1 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest made by Members at this point in the meeting.

25/2 **LICENSING ACT 2003 - APPLICATION FOR PREMISES LICENCE: PREMIER STORES, 31-33 SALTERSGILL AVENUE, MIDDLESBROUGH, TS4 3LD, REF: PR0149**

The Director of Environment and Community Services had circulated a report outlining an application for a Premises Licence in relation to 31-33 Saltersgill Avenue, Middlesbrough, TS4 3LD, Ref No: PR0149, as follows:-

Summary of Licensable Activities and Hours requested

Sale of Alcohol (Off Sales) – 9.00am to 10.00pm daily.

Full details of the Premises Licence application and accompanying operating schedule were attached at Appendix 1.

Two representations had been made in response to the application – a local business owner and a local Ward Councillor.

At the commencement of the meeting, it was noted that the Ward Councillor was not in attendance despite her indication that she would attend. The Chair adjourned the meeting for a period of 20 minutes in order for the Democratic Services Officer to make enquiries as to whether the Councillor still intended to attend. The Democratic Services Officer made enquiries and returned to advise the Committee that the Councillor had stated that she had not received an agenda pack but that she wished to attend. The Committee subsequently agreed that a further adjournment for a period of one hour be made to allow the Ward Councillor time to attend and the Ward Councillor was advised accordingly.

At 11.20am, the meeting reconvened. The Chair opened the meeting and highlighted the Council's fire evacuation procedure, should the fire alarm sound. The Chair explained, under Regulation 20 of the Licensing Act (Hearings) Regulations 2005, the reasons for the adjournment.

The Ward Councillor, who was now in attendance at the meeting, subsequently requested a further adjournment of 24 hours in order for the objectors to read through the agenda pack. The applicant's representative advised that neither he nor the applicant would be available to attend a reconvened hearing in 24 hours.

The Committee retired to consider the request and all parties other than officers of Legal and Democratic Services left the meeting.

All parties subsequently returned and the Chair announced the Committee's decision to

adjourn the meeting until 1.00pm which should provide sufficient time for the objectors to read the report and the information in relation to the conditions agreed between the applicant, Police, Public Health and Trading Standards – contained at pages 34 to 36 of the pack – including a reduction in the requested hours of sale from 7.00am – 11pm daily to 9.00am – 10.00pm daily.

At this point in the meeting, the applicant's representative requested that the meeting be adjourned to a new date, after 22 October 2025, and explained that he had other commitments which would require the meeting to finish before 1.00pm.

In view of the information provided, the Chair and Members of the Sub Committee considered that it was not feasible to proceed with the meeting and that it should be adjourned to a new date and time to be advised.

ORDERED that the meeting be adjourned to a date and time to be agreed, as follows:-

The Committee decided to adjourn the Hearing and extend time until a date to be agreed, after the 22 October 2025, under Regulations 20 and 11 of the Licensing Act (Hearings) Regulations 2005.

At the commencement of the hearing at 10.00am, the Ward Councillor who made representations was not in attendance. The Committee decided to adjourn the Hearing for 20 minutes, in the public interest, in order to make enquiries in view that a Ward Councillor represents the interests of the residents in the ward.

The Committee reconvened at 10.20am, after hearing that the Ward Councillor had not received the full pack which included details of the further restriction in hours and conditions on the licence agreed by the Police, Public Health and Trading Standards and wanted to consider that information and attend the Hearing. It was, therefore, decided to adjourn the Hearing for one hour, until 11.20am. At that point, the other objector was given a copy of the pack and directed to the further restriction on hours and agreed conditions on pages 34 and 35. It was considered to be in the public interest as a matter of fairness to allow time for the Ward Councillor to attend and to have an opportunity to address the Committee.

The Committee reconvened at 11.20am. A request was made by the Ward Councillor to adjourn the hearing for a further 24 hours, to consider the Report Pack given to her prior to the Hearing reconvening. The Premises Licence Holder and his Representative made representations that they did not consider 24 hours was required to consider two pages of the conditions.

At that point, the Committee decided to adjourn the Hearing until 1.00pm, and considered that 1 hour 20 minutes would be sufficient time to enable the Ward Councillor and the Objector to further consider the report.

The Committee noted that the Ward Councillor and the objector had not been sent the report pack, however, it noted the report pack included a short report with a short background, the representations and that the Police, Public Health and Trading Standards agreed to a restriction of hours and further conditions on the licence.

It noted that the Ward Councillor was sent the application when it was made and that although the pack was not sent to the objectors, it was publicly available on the Council's website. Additionally, the objectors had opportunity to approach Responsible Authorities or the Licensing Team to ask questions. It noted that the Notice of the Hearing was given to all parties in accordance with the Licensing Act (Hearings) Regulations 2005. It considered, as the main element was contained in two pages which included actual further restrictions on the premises licence holder, a period of 1 hour 20 minutes for the objectors to further consider that information, to be able to address the Panel and respond to any points raised would be sufficient and would not result in any prejudice.

The Premises Licence Holder's Representative then made a further request to adjourn the hearing until a later date after the 22 October, the Premises Licence Holder's representative was not available to attend the hearing after 1.00pm.

In light of this further request, and after hearing the previous representations of the objectors,

the Committee did not consider the hearing could proceed.

The Committee considered that in order to reach a decision it required to hear the oral representations of the premises licence holder, his representative and the objectors, and would also require parties' responses to questions the Panel may have to clarify any points raised. Although the Hearing was listed for the whole day, the Premises Licence Holder's Representative had requested the adjournment and was not available from 1.00pm and, in effect, would not be in attendance if the hearing was to proceed. Therefore, in the public interest and interests of fairness in order to hear all the parties and to reach an informed decision, the Committee decided to adjourn the hearing to a date to be arranged after the 22 October. Once the date was arranged the parties would be notified. It was noted that all parties now had the report pack for the new Hearing to proceed.

There was no right of appeal against the Sub Committee's decision to adjourn the Hearing, other than if a party considered it to be unlawful whereupon an application would have to be made to judicially review the decision in the High Court.

25/3

ANY OTHER URGENT ITEMS WHICH IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIR, MAY BE CONSIDERED.

There were no other urgent items.