

**Unconfirmed**



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Licensing Sub-Committee** held in the Claud Castleton Room, Riverside, on **Monday, 2 March 2020** at **10.00 am**

**Members of the Sub-Committee present:**

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Janet Craig, Councillor Mark Newton

**Other Members present:**

Councillor Mary Rudd

**Officers present:**

Leonie Hoults (Licensing Officer), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Kerryn Woollett (Litigation Lawyer)

**Others present:**

Dr Padmanabhan Badrinath (Public Health Suffolk), Robert Barley (Solicitor for Mr C), John Corkett (Licensing Officer, Suffolk Constabulary), Mr C (License Holder), Dr Sara Dunling-Hall (Public Health Suffolk), Mr H (Designated Premises Supervisor), Inspector Claire Simons (Suffolk Constabulary)

---

**1 Election of a Chairman**

On the proposition of Councillor Newton, seconded by Councillor Craig it was by unanimous vote

**RESOLVED**

That Councillor Paul Ashdown be elected as Chairman for this meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee.

**2 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

**3 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying**

There were no declarations of lobbying.

**5 Review of an existing Premises Licence: Harbour Inn, Royal Thoroughfare, Lowestoft, NR33 0AG (Faith Nightclub)**

The Committee received report **ES/0320** of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Health.

The report was presented by the Licensing Officer. It stated that an application for a Summary Review under Section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003 had been made by the Suffolk Constabulary on Wednesday 5 February 2020 in respect of the Harbour Inn, Royal Thoroughfare, Lowestoft, but primarily relating to the part of the premises known as Faith Nightclub. The application had been accompanied by a Certificate issued under section 53 (1)(b) of the Act and signed by Superintendent Paul Sharp, outlining the reasons why the Constabulary was requesting the interim steps of;

1. The removal of the 'in-house' security team from performing any security duties at Faith.
2. The replacement of the 'in-house' team with an outside contracted security company.
3. An interim condition that requires the searching of ALL customers each time they enter Faith even if they have just left the venue for a moment and are being readmitted. For the avoidance of doubt this will apply to females as well as males.

Further interim steps were requested in response to additional information provided by the Premises Licence holder and these were to;

1. Exclude any door staff who have performed security duty at the venue since 1 January 2020.
2. The head door supervisor be removed from security duties, as he had been the cause of several confrontations with Police Officers in the past.

With this type of application, the Licensing Authority had been required to consider whether or not it was necessary to take interim steps within 48 hours of receipt of the application.

The Licensing Officer confirmed that the Sub-Committee had met at 10am on Friday 7 February 2020 to make a determination and the decision of the Sub-Committee was to impose interim steps in line with what was suggested by Suffolk Constabulary;

1. Door Supervisors at Faith must be obtained from an external SIA accredited security company.
2. Door Supervisors that have performed security duties at Faith at any time since 1 January 2020 are not permitted to provide security duties at Faith. For the avoidance of doubt, this includes Head Door Supervisor not to provide any security duties at Faith.
3. All customers to be searched each time they enter Faith even if they have just left the venue for a moment and are being readmitted.
4. Employment of at least one male and one female Door Supervisor to ensure all customers entering Faith are searched as per 3 above.
5. Mr C be removed as the Designated Premises Supervisor from the premises licence.

Mr C, the premises licence holder, was informed of this decision and made no representation.

Two representations were received within the consultation period from responsible authorities in support of the application for review. These were from Public Health Suffolk and the Fire Service, the Fire Service also requested additional conditions be placed on the licence. These representations were available at appendices E & F of the report.

Both the Police and Mr C had provided further information to be considered at the meeting and these documents were provided to the Sub-Committee prior to the meeting.

The Sub-Committee was asked to determine the application by either modifying the conditions of the licence, excluding a licensable activity from the scope of the licence, removing the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS), suspending the licence for a period not exceeding three months, or revoking the licence.

There being no questions to the Licensing Officer the Chairman invited Mr Corkett, Licensing Officer for Suffolk Constabulary, to address the Committee.

Mr Corkett explained that the type of summary review request, as detailed by the Licensing Officer in her presentation of the report, was for an expedited review. Mr Corkett said that this demonstrated how serious the situation had been as the Police had considered that the application needed to be heard by the Sub-Committee immediately. Mr Corkett had spoken with Mr C's solicitor, Mr Barley, prior to the meeting and stated that some common ground had been reached, pending the Sub-Committee's determination of the application.

The Sub-Committee was advised that on 1 February 2020 door staff saw an individual on the premises in possession of a 'flick' knife and that a stun gun was later found on the premises. Mr Corkett said that door staff appeared to have been aware of these incidents and the Police considered that they had not been treated seriously enough. Later that evening, an individual was arrested outside a neighbouring licensed premises after threatening to stab a Police Officer and a knife similar to the one seen at the Harbour Inn/Faith was recovered.

Mr Corkett said that the Police were reliant on door staff to maintain law and order as well as safety for customers and were expected to support Police in excluding individuals that may pose a danger to others. In this particular instance, Mr Corkett explained, door staff at the Harbour Inn/Faith had refused to co-operate with Police officers and would not provide statements. Mr Corkett noted that there was a pocketbook entry from a Police Officer which stated that the door supervisor who had seen the knife had declined to provide a statement.

It was the view of the Police that this lack of co-operation had contributed to evidential difficulties as the knife had not been able to be connected to the suspect. Mr Corkett said that it was likely that no charges would be brought in relation to this incident and that the stun gun could not be connected to any individual.

Mr Corkett said that the application for an expedited summary review had also been influenced by more longstanding concerns about the premises, including past

allegations of door staff not dealing with customers appropriately and an incident in July 2018 where Mr C was not fully co-operative with a Police investigator. Mr Corkett stated that due to the persistence of the investigator it was eventually established that an incident had taken place, but by this time there was no CCTV footage available from the date in question. The investigator had been of the view that she had been obstructed in her investigation. The emails exchanged between the investigator and Mr C had been included in the additional paperwork submitted by the Police to the Sub-Committee.

Following this incident Police met with Mr C and an agreement between parties was established, which was included in the additional paperwork circulated to the Sub-Committee. Mr Corkett considered that this agreement had not been adhered to by Mr C and cited an incident of assault at the venue in 2019 where the door staff, in particular the head door supervisor, had been un-cooperative with the Police.

Mr C had intimated to the Police that he would be happy for all bar one of the interim steps to be added to the premises licence as conditions. Mr C had requested that the interim step to search people on re-entry to the premises, even if leaving briefly (i.e. for a cigarette), not be included as a condition. Mr Corkett said that the Police were content for this interim step to be dispensed with.

The Police were also asking for the CCTV at the premises to be enhanced to cover the fire escape steps; this area was not currently covered by CCTV and was often the venue for allegations of assault when customers had been ejected from the premises.

Mr Corkett said that the use of an in-house security team presented a danger that door staff could be influenced by their employer. He considered that external companies were more inclined to act responsibly and report poor practice at licensed premises. Mr Corkett was clear that the Police wanted to see this condition retained, including the presence of a female door supervisor.

Mr Corkett concluded by acknowledging that Mr C was often polite and helpful but not always as forthcoming as he could be. The Police were not seeking the closure of the premises and wanted to re-establish a positive relationship with Mr C going forward.

The Chairman invited questions from the Sub-Committee to Mr Corkett.

It was confirmed that the stun gun had been found in toilets in the Harbour Inn, rather than the part of the premises known as Faith Nightclub. Mr Corkett noted that the Harbour Inn was used as a 'feeder' bar for Faith.

A member of the Sub-Committee noted that the stun gun had been submerged in a toilet cistern and asked if it would still have been a viable weapon. Mr Corkett advised that once dried out, the stun gun would have been a viable weapon, adding that its immersion had removed fingerprints. He said that there was a suspect but because of this, the weapon could not be connected to them. In response to a supplementary question from the member of the Sub-Committee, Mr Corkett said that the entrance to the toilets was not covered by CCTV.

The Chairman invited Mr Barley, Mr C's representative, to ask questions of Mr Corkett.

Mr Corkett confirmed to Mr Barley that he was aware that a PC J. Brown had been present at the premises at the time of the incident but had not originally been aware she was on duty at the time. Mr Corkett said that he was also now aware that PC Brown had requested that colleagues attend the premises at the time of the incident.

The Legal Advisor referred to the interim step, regarding excluding any door staff who have performed security duty at the venue since 1 January 2020 from providing security duty at the premises, and asked Mr Corkett how he envisaged this being applied as a condition of the premises licence.

Mr Corkett said that the Police would be content for former in-house door staff to work at the premises, if working for an agency, providing they had not performed security duty there since 1 January 2020.

The Chairman invited Inspector Simons from Suffolk Police to address the Sub-Committee.

Inspector Simons said that the venue, overall, had provided good licensing activity. She noted that there was not a comparable venue, in terms of Faith Nightclub, in the local area to compare it to but that over the last five to ten years it had been transparent and well run.

Inspector Simons, however, considered that the overriding issue resulting from this incident was public safety. The Sub-Committee was advised that the incident had required a high amount of resource from the Police to resolve and that attention to the premises in the weeks preceding the incident had been rising, causing concern. Inspector Simons said that if actions that evening lead to the incidents could have been prevented by the premises working co-operatively with the Police, this could and should have happened.

Inspector Simons advised that the Police were not seeking to shut down the premises but to promote to Mr C the Police's expectations of him to assist in preventing crime and disorder and to promote public safety, which did not happen during this incident.

There being no questions to Inspector Simons the Chairman invited Mr Barley, representing Mr C, to address the Sub-Committee.

Mr Barley informed the Sub-Committee that Mr C was saddened that this meeting had been required and apologised for that fact. Mr Barley considered that it was important to acknowledge the discussions that had taken place between Mr C and the Police immediately prior to the meeting to resolve the latter's concerns and ensure there was not a repeat of the incident that had led to this point.

Regarding the incident in question, Mr Barley said that two males were declined entry to Faith that evening as they were unable to provide identification. Mr Barley conceded that there was not the facility to scan customers for illicit items when attempting to enter Faith and that Mr C has since addressed this.

The Sub-Committee was advised that following the refusal of entry, one of the two males entered the Harbour Inn and went to the toilets. Mr Barley noted that PC Brown was present at this point and said it was his understanding that she was a licensing officer.

As this individual entered the Harbour Inn a member of the door staff stated that he believed he had seen something like a bladed article and reported this to the head door supervisor, who in turn spoke to Mr C and PC Brown. Mr Barley said that Mr C was therefore confused at the suggestion that the Police were unaware of the incident from the outset. The individual then left the premises and remained in the area, as there were other licensed premises nearby.

Additional police officers were requested to attend the scene and searches of the two males who had been refused entry did not reveal anything at that time, and Mr C considered that there was no suggestion of a bladed article being on the premises. Mr Barley stated that Mr C and PC Brown returned inside and were then advised that one of the individuals had entered the Harbour Inn toilets; a search of the toilets was suggested, and this was how the stun gun was found.

Mr Barley advised that the initial search took place at 10.35pm and that there was an incident at a neighbouring licensed premises at 11.33pm that evening. Mr Barley advised the Sub-Committee that one of the males was arrested at 1.53am and that Police records stated that this was when a bladed article was recovered, having been felt to have fallen out of the suspect's clothing. Mr Barley considered that this would be sufficient grounds to charge the suspect.

Mr Barley considered that as the suspect had been searched at Faith earlier in the evening, and had not been in a possession of a bladed article at that time, it was likely that the suspect had sourced the weapon after this search and before his eventual arrest. Mr Barley said that Mr C had wanted to bring this to the Sub-Committee's attention as the Police's records indicated a total failure to co-operate.

Mr C accepted that the conduct of the premises' security staff later that evening was wholly insufficient and unacceptable and had fully agreed and implemented the interim steps imposed by the Sub-Committee. Mr Barley advised the Sub-Committee that the Harbour Inn had entered into a contract with Maximum Security, a company based in Great Yarmouth, for the provision of all security at the premises. Mr Barley added that all customers were being scanned and searched by appropriate security staff and this included both male and female staff.

Mr Barley reiterated what Mr Corkett had said about the agreement reached to not search patrons who have briefly left the premises to smoke, subject to the Sub-Committee's determination.

Mr Barley stated that Mr C did not accept that he or the premises had failed to promote the licensing objectives, having sought to co-operate. Mr C accepted and understood that society was understandably concerned about the prevalence of knife crime and had implemented the interim steps imposed and would continue to co-operate with authorities.

Mr Barley said that Mr C had been a premises licence holder for over 20 years and that, overall, the premises had a good reputation and a good relationship with the Police. Mr C wished to be reinstated as the Designated Premises Supervisor (the DPS), so that he could resume running the business on a day-to-day basis.

Mr Barley reiterated Mr C's apology to the Sub-Committee and said that he had acknowledged how a loss of objectivity could occur when operating an in-house security team, and that Mr C had addressed this by engaging an external security company.

The Chairman invited the Committee to ask questions of Mr Barley and Mr C.

Mr C confirmed that the stairwell that led to the Harbour Inn's toilets was not covered by the CCTV system, but that the entrance to the stairwell from the bar was covered.

A member of the Committee asked if a toilet cistern was a common hiding place in the venue. Mr C said that he was not aware that it was, and that Mr H had searched there after speaking to PC Brown. Mr C confirmed that the toilet cisterns were not searched on a regular basis.

The Chairman asked if it was known how long the stun gun had been in the toilet cistern. Mr C was unable to advise how long it had been there. Mr Corkett advised that the condition of the weapon suggested it had not been immersed in the cistern for a long period of time.

Mr C confirmed that Maximum Security were using hand-held metal detectors to scan customers and were also searching bags. He also advised that the smoking area was covered by CCTV. Mr Barley said that it was his understanding that the fire escape stairs area was now covered by CCTV.

The Sub-Committee was informed that CCTV records were kept for one month. Mr Corkett confirmed that this was in line with the conditions of the premises licence.

Mr C stated that the transition between the Harbour Inn and Faith was controlled by security staff.

Following a question from the Legal Advisor, it was confirmed that the Police were seeking to restrict individuals who had provided in-house security at the Harbour Inn/Faith between 1 January 2020 and 7 February 2020.

The Chairman invited Dr Badrinath, from Public Health Suffolk, to address the Sub-Committee.

Dr Badrinath said that as the responsible authority, Public Health Suffolk looked at all licensing applications regarding any harm to the public through alcohol use. He invited his colleague, Dr Dunling-Hall, to address the Sub-Committee.

Dr Dunling-Hall explained that Public Health Suffolk assessed evidence of harm caused by alcohol use in the immediate area of an application and explained how the country was divided up into different areas for this purpose. Evidence included Accident &

Emergency attendance rates caused either directly or indirectly by alcohol use. Dr Dunling-Hall said that the area in which the Harbour Inn was located had a significantly higher attendance rate when compared to the district and county averages - 8-10 per 1,000. This was based on pooled data between April 2016 and March 2019.

Dr Dunling-Hall added that Public Health Suffolk had also looked at hospital admissions for the area caused either directly or indirectly by alcohol use and that, again, this was significantly higher than the district and county averages.

It had, therefore, been concluded by Public Health Suffolk that alcohol use was a significant issue in the immediate area of the Harbour Inn. The Harbour Inn was also located within the lowest 20% in the United Kingdom for health deprivation. Dr Dunling-Hall said that Public Health Suffolk was concerned with anything that would suggest further harm through alcohol use could be caused and supported any measures to protect the general public from further harm.

The Chairman invited questions from the Sub-Committee to Public Health Suffolk.

Dr Dunling-Hall confirmed that the same concerns would be raised on an application in the area, regardless of the type of premises being applied for. She added that it was not possible to link concerns in an area to a specific licensed premises. Dr Badrinath suggested that any further applications in the area could be controlled through the restriction on the hours during which alcohol could be sold.

A member of the Sub-Committee suggested that restricting these hours could dilute the problem and move it elsewhere. Dr Dunling-Hall said that there was evidence to link the level of availability of alcohol to the level of harm caused and that where the density of premises was reduced, the level of harm was reduced.

The Chairman invited any further questions from the Sub-Committee.

Mr C confirmed that Faith was only operated once a week, on Saturdays. He advised that he was aware that a change in licence would be required to increase this.

In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr C said that he was happy to comply with the conditions suggested by the Fire Service and that staff would be adequately trained.

Mr Corkett advised that the removal of Mr C as the DPS had not been sought by the Police and was an interim step that had been imposed by the Sub-Committee, and that the Police were content with Mr C resuming the role of DPS.

The Chairman invited Mr Barley to sum up on behalf of Mr C.

Mr Barley invited the Sub-Committee to reinstate Mr C as the DPS. He considered that it was fair to say that the premises had co-operated with authorities fully since the incident in question and had taken seriously the concerns and the interim steps imposed by the Sub-Committee. Mr Barley added that conversations with the Police immediately prior to the meeting had provided greater clarity for Mr C regarding both his co-operation and that of anyone he employs or sub-contracts to.



It was the view of Mr Barley that the Harbour Inn was a well-run premises. He said that on the night in question, several issues had arisen at multiple licensed premises in the area. Mr Barley noted that when the suspects were first stopped at Faith the Police were present and notified of the situation. Mr Barley acknowledged that the co-operation of the door staff with the Police was not as good as it should have been, and that Mr C had taken this onboard and had entered into security arrangements with an external company.

Mr Barley stated that Mr C was saddened and disappointed with himself that he was before the Licensing Sub-Committee. Mr Barley urged the Sub-Committee to reflect carefully on what it had heard, allow Mr C to resume the role of DPS and allow the premises to continue operating with the additional appropriate conditions as agreed between Mr C and the Police.

The Chairman invited Mr Corkett and Inspector Simons to sum up.

Mr Corkett stated that there had been concern regarding the lack of representation from the premises at the local Pub Watch. Mr Corkett said that this was not an enforceable condition but encouraged Mr C to attend the group as he could provide valuable input for other licensed premises in the area. Mr Corkett added that the Police wished to see CCTV coverage of the fire escape stairs added as a condition of the licence.

Inspector Simons confirmed the PC Brown was a frontline police officer with a portfolio for licensing and conducted licensing inspections such as the one being conducted on the night in question. Inspector Simons said that the events confirmed that a licensing check had been required and was concerned that the weapons would not have been recovered had PC Brown not already been present. Mr C's co-operation with PC Brown's presence that evening was acknowledged.

The Sub-Committee retired to make its Decision, together with the Legal Advisor and the Democratic Services Officer. Mr Barley advised that he would need to leave during the Sub-Committee's deliberation, but that Mr C would be present to hear its decision.

On its return the following Decision Notice was read by the Chairman:

*"An application for a Summary Review under section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003 ("the Act") was made by the Suffolk Constabulary on 5 February 2020. The application related to the premises at Harbour Inn, Royal Thoroughfare, Lowestoft NR33 0AG, though specifically to the upstairs part of the premises known as 'Faith Nightclub'.*

*A meeting of the Sub-Committee was held on 7 February 2020 at which the Sub-Committee imposed interim steps, pending determination of the Summary Review.*

*The premises licence holder did not make representations against the interim steps.*

*The Summary Review hearing has been held today under section 53C of the Act.*

*The Sub-Committee was provided with documentation from the police which included the Police's original application for the Summary Review. In addition to the incident logs provided by the premises licence holder in response to the original application, the premises licence holder also provided a further document addressing the issues raised by the police at the Summary Review.*

*The Sub-Committee was also provided with documentation from Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service seeking additional conditions and from Public Health Suffolk (Suffolk County Council) supporting the interim steps imposed on 7 February 2020 based on the crime and disorder and public safety licensing objectives.*

*During the hearing it became apparent that there had been confusion as to the incident which led to the Summary Review. The police accepted that there was a police officer present at the premises on the night of 1 February 2020. On 1 February 2020 two gentlemen had attended the premises and were refused entry to Faith as they were not able to provide identification. These gentlemen then went to the toilets downstairs at Harbour Inn at which point a member of security staff reported to the police officer that he had seen what looked like a bladed object. The police officer called two colleagues to attend and the two gentlemen were searched though no such object was found. Security staff then searched the toilets in the Harbour Inn and found the stun gun in the cistern. Later in the evening the same two gentlemen were involved in an incident at another premises in close proximity and it was a result of this incident that the knife was found on one of the gentlemen.*

*The Police drew the Sub-Committee's attention to a pocket notebook entry of an officer present on the evening. This recorded a statement from a member of security staff indicating that they did not wish to make a statement.*

*Mr Barley on behalf of the premises licence holder, submitted that Mr C had been cooperative with police on the evening of 1 February, however accepted that the behaviour of door staff refusing to give a statement was not helpful as door staff were essential in ensuring the safety of those attending the premises.*

*The Police submitted that the premises has historically been a good premises and has cooperated with the police, though, recently this standard has deteriorated, referring to an email exchange in the bundle of documents in which Mr C was not as cooperative as was expected.*

*The Police remained of the view that it was a serious incident and it was correct to bring the Summary Review. However, discussions with the premises licence holder since the interim steps were imposed, have enabled the Police and the premises licence holder to reach a common ground. The premises licence holder was willing to accept that all the interim steps imposed become conditions on the licence, save that the requirement to search individuals even when they have only left the premises for a cigarette be removed. The smoking area was a separate area and was covered by CCTV. As such the police were in agreement that this was not required.*

*The Police did, however, want a condition that CCTV be installed which would cover the fire escape stairs and the dancefloor.*

*The premises licence holder also requested that interim step removing Mr C as DPS also be removed. The Police said that it had not requested this interim step as part of its Summary Review, therefore would have no objection to Mr C being allowed to be the DPS once again.*

*The premises licence holder confirmed that he would be happy for the conditions suggested by Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service to be added to the premises licence.*

*The Sub-Committee also heard from representatives from Public Health Suffolk (Suffolk County Council). The representatives referred to the report for the Sub-Committee stating that the location of the premises has a very high rate of accident and emergency department attendances related to alcohol and significantly more than the average for East Suffolk, Suffolk and England; and the premises is in an area affected by significantly higher alcohol related hospital admissions than East Suffolk, Suffolk and England. Public Health Suffolk (Suffolk County Council) therefore supported the interim steps which had been imposed by the Sub-Committee.*

*In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee considered the documents provided as well as the representations made by all parties at the hearing. The Sub-Committee also considered the need to promote the four licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, the Central Government guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003, the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the Human Rights Act 1998.*

*The Sub-Committee was mindful that the statutory guidance advises Licensing Authorities to look to the police as the main source of advice on crime and disorder.*

*As the Police were content for Mr C to be reinstated as the DPS, the Sub-Committee were minded to withdraw interim step number 5. As the Police were also of the view that it was not necessary for persons to be searched that had only briefly left the premises for a cigarette, the Sub-Committee was also minded to withdraw this part of interim step 3 such that it reads "All customers to be searched."*

*The Sub-Committee has decided that the remaining interim steps will remain in force until the decision made under section 53C comes into effect.*

*Having reviewed the current conditions on the premises licence, the Sub-Committee therefore determined under section 53C to amend the following conditions currently on the premises licence.*

- 1. Condition 4 be amended to read as follows "The Licence Holder/DPS shall ensure CCTV cameras encompass all ingress and egress to the premises, fire exits, outside areas, the dance floor in Faith and all areas where the sale/supply of alcohol occurs."*
- 2. Condition 15 be amended to read as follows "Faith only. The Licence Holder/DPS shall ensure that on Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays preceding a bank holiday Monday, door supervisors will be employed at the premises. These door supervisors are to be sourced from an external SIA accredited security company. No persons acting as door supervisors between 1 January 2020 and 7 February 2020 are permitted to act as door supervisors. Door supervisors will be employed prior to customers attending the premises and will be so employed until 30 minutes after the termination of licensable activities."*

3. Condition 16 be amended to read as follows "Faith only. The Licence Holder/DPS shall ensure on all nights when door supervisors are required, at least one of them will be a male and one of them will be a female."

4. Condition 17A will be inserted which reads as follows "Faith only. The Licence Holder/DPS will ensure a log is kept of actual hours worked by all door supervisors."

5. Condition 20 be amended to read as follows "Faith only. The Licence Holder/DPS shall ensure that a search policy be implemented. All customers are searched upon entry to the licensed premises, including use of handheld metal detectors. Clear signage will be prominently displayed advising customers that they will be searched as a condition of entry. All bags and larger items will be searched, and an area will be made available in the foyer for searches of bags and larger items to be conducted. A box will be made available where any prohibited articles are securely deposited prior to being taken to the safe in the office. Police will be notified within 24 hours of any prohibited articles for collection."

6. Condition 25 be amended so that it applies to both Harbour Inn and Faith and reads as follows "The License Holder/DPS shall ensure that the toilet areas, including cisterns, are checked whilst the Premises are open for licensable activities. Whilst Faith is open, toilets, including cisterns, in both the Harbour Inn and Faith are to be checked at least every hour the premises are open for licensable activities. A record of these toilet checks will be retained and made available to authorised Police and Local Authority Officers on Demand."

The Sub-Committee also decided that the conditions suggested by Suffolk Fire & Rescue Service be added as new conditions to the licence.

The Police requested that the premises licence holder participates in the pub watch initiative as per the licence conditions. The Sub-Committee is mindful of the premises licence holder's commitment in the hearing to participate in pub watch and would expect that the licence holder continues with this commitment.

The Sub-Committee also suggests that the Licence Holder revisits the conditions on the licence and ensures compliance with all these conditions.

Any party aggrieved by this Decision have the right to appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of the date they are notified of this Decision.

Date of this Decision: 2 March 2020"

The meeting concluded at 1:13 pm

.....  
Chairman