

## LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE

10 June 2020

Present: Councillor G Saffery (Chair)  
Councillors A Dychton, A Grimston and G Saffery

Also present: Miss Soral Chavda

Officers: Democratic Services Officer (JK)  
Senior Licensing Officer (AY)  
Senior Solicitor  
Democratic Services Manager

### 1 **Committee membership/ election of a Chair**

The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that the Sub-Committee would comprise Councillors Dychton, Grimston and Saffery.

The Sub-Committee was asked to elect a chair for the hearing.

RESOLVED –

that Councillor Saffery be elected chair for this hearing.

### 2 **Disclosure of interests (if any)**

There were no disclosures of interest.

### 3 **Application for a new premises licence - Soralina (Candy & Cocktails), 132 Ridge Lane, Watford WD17 4SY**

The Chair welcomed all parties to the hearing and explained the procedure to be followed.

The Senior Licensing Officer advised that there were preliminary matters for members to be aware of. Additional information had been received from two of the objectors as well as further details about the operation of the business from the applicant. Members of the Sub-Committee and the applicant confirmed that they had all received all these documents.

The Senior Licensing Officer confirmed that one of the representations included with the agenda papers, 4D, had been withdrawn and no consideration should be given to its contents by the Sub-Committee.

Of the five remaining interested parties, four had confirmed that they were not intending to attend the hearing but wanted their representations to stand. No response had been received from the fifth interested party. Although the presence of all parties was not required, it did limit the opportunities for members to question them. Members of the Sub-Committee confirmed that they were happy to proceed in their absence.

### **Introduction to the application**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Head of Community Protection outlining an application for a new premises licence for an outbuilding at 132 Ridge Lane. The application was for the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises. Five valid representations had been received from interested parties. Further to comments made in the representations, it was noted that planning and licensing were separate regimes underpinned by different legislation. Conditions had been agreed with the police and there were no representations from responsible authorities. One interested party had questioned the wording of these conditions but had not responded to requests for suggested amendments. Mediation had been offered but not all parties had wished to participate, preferring that the matter be decided by members. There were no questions from members, the Senior Solicitor or the applicant.

### **Address by the applicant**

The applicant, Miss Soral Chavda, presented the application to the Sub-Committee. Miss Chavda advised that the nature of her application had developed since she submitted the application form. She set out how she would address the four licensing objectives and the measures agreed with the police, these included:

- Orders could only be made from a bona fide address.
- Collections could only take place at a pre-arranged single time slot.
- Any customers collecting orders would park on the driveway of the property.
- No promotional discounts would be available.
- Sales would be made by the applicant as the designated premises supervisor.

Prevention of crime and disorder:

- There would be no events or consumption of alcohol on the premises.
- A Challenge 25 age verification policy would be in place.
- CCTV was being installed at the property.
- No large quantities of alcohol would be sold; the kits bought would be deconstructed cocktails for home mixing.

### Public safety

- Sales would only take place remotely.
- Every kit sold would be pre-ordered and bespoke.
- Customers who collected orders would be asked to arrive and leave quietly and would only be at the premises for a few minutes.
- The target market was those in their mid-twenties and young professionals; they were luxury products.

### Protection of children from harm

- A Challenge 25 age verification policy would be in place.
- Couriers would be trained in the age verification policy and Royal Mail tracked service would also be used.
- No sale would be made to customers who were unable to produce valid ID.

The operating schedule reflected the agreement with the police and it was unlikely that there would be collections during the full range of hours set out on the application. The vast majority of orders would be delivered by the applicant or a courier. The products were high-end and although masterclasses had been envisioned, they would not now proceed.

In response to questions from the sub-committee, the applicant confirmed the following:

- Deliveries to the property by suppliers would be in small delivery vans.
- Following contact with the fire service, she had undertaken the recommended fire safety check of the premises which had a fire alarm and fire extinguishers.
- The business had begun as an interactive, immersive experience at small dining events but due to the coronavirus crisis it had been reimagined as home cocktail kits to maintain a source of income.
- Although future bookings were not taking place, the cocktail experience at dining events had proved popular with people looking for a luxury experience.
- The cocktail kit business might continue beyond lockdown should they prove popular. In the event that the business grew substantially she would look to rent a storage unit elsewhere.
- The kits contained two 50ml bottles of spirits, one 50ml bottle of syrup, two garnishes and instructions to provide two large cocktails.
- Collections were envisioned to be a minimal part of the process and she would prefer that orders were sent out for delivery. As a resident of the address with her family, she understood residents' desire to keep disruption in the street to a minimum. This matter had been discussed with the planning enforcement team and the police licensing officer.

- Projecting sales was difficult but the idea was popular with friends and family. She did not anticipate significant numbers of orders from the start.
- The police had not given any timescales for reviewing the licence but she would be happy to provide regular updates as required.
- She would provide training to the couriers used by the business in relation to checking ID and she would be notified immediately should the customer be unable to produce the requisite ID.
- She would log all sales and refusals.

In response to a question from the sub-committee, the Senior Licensing Officer added that it would be expected that responsible businesses would keep adequate records, and that the regular submission or access to such records by the police and licensing authority may be required for higher risk premises, such as those in the town centre.

Describing the ordering process, Miss Chavda explained that clients would make contact online directly with her, either through Instagram or the website. She would check that they were over 18 and ask for a copy of their ID which would need to be UV or holographic such as a driving licence. She would process the order keeping a log of names, addresses, ages and delivery details. She would deliver items herself locally at first and then a courier would be used. She, or the courier, would check the identification at delivery and ensure the name matched the order. Records would be kept of customers who did not provide adequate ID and sales would not be made in those circumstances.

In response to questions from the Senior Solicitor, Miss Chavda confirmed that any orders that would be posted would require prior sending of a copy of the customer ID. Deliveries would only be made to the address on the ID. Couriers would be trained only to give orders to the person whose ID had been checked.

In response to questions from the Senior Licensing Officer regarding the payment for orders; Miss Chavda explained that this would be through BACS or she could accept cash if undertaking the delivery herself. It was noted that PayPal was an option and account holders had to be over 18; Miss Chavda said she would be happy to use PayPal and would accept it as a condition if required.

The Sub-Committee and the officers had no further questions for Miss Chavda.

### **Summary**

The applicant summarised her points noting that the business was different to her original idea and that she had had to reconsider her options during the lockdown. The business would provide gifts and treat boxes to her target audience. All the comments from interested parties and councillors had been

taken on board. She reiterated that she did not want to negatively impact her neighbourhood and was happy to speak to anyone with concerns.

### **Decision**

The Chair advised that the Sub-Committee would retire to consider its decision and that it would be made available to all parties within five working days.

RESOLVED –

Having heard evidence from the applicant and considered the representations from interested parties, the Sub-Committee is of the view that there are sufficient conditions that could be attached to the license which would mitigate and address the concerns raised in the objections.

The Sub-Committee is of the opinion that granting this application subject to conditions would ensure the four Licensing objectives are not undermined.

The Sub-Committee therefore grants this application in full and attaches the conditions agreed with the Police as well as conditions consistent with the operating schedule.

In reaching this decision, the Sub-Committee had regard to the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003, the Secretary of State's guidance and the council's statement of licensing policy.

Chair

The Meeting started at 10.35 am  
and finished at 11.35 am