

**BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL**  
**LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 June 2026 at 10.00 am

Present: Cllr D Farr, Cllr A Keddie and Cllr L Williams

12. Election of Chair

**RESOLVED that Councillor L Williams be elected Chairman of the Sub-Committee for the duration of the meeting.**

Voting: Unanimous

13. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C Matthews and P Sidaway. Councillors L Williams and D Farr attended as first and second reserve members.

14. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

15. Protocol for Public Speaking at Licensing Hearings

The protocol for public speaking was noted.

16. Hengistbury Post Office, 106 Broadway, Southbourne, Bournemouth, BH6 4EH

Present:

From BCP Council:

Sarah Rogers – Senior Licensing Officer

Johanne McNamara – Legal Advisor to the Sub-Committee

Michelle Cutler – Clerk to the Sub-Committee

Christiane Tan – Observing, Democratic Services

The Chair made introductions and explained the procedure for the hearing which was agreed by all parties.

The Senior Licensing Officer presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Arka Licensing Consultants had made an application on behalf of Sudharron Ltd for a premises licence at Hengistbury Post Office, an established Post Office and general store, located at 106 Broadway, Southbourne.

The application sought to permit off sales of alcohol between 06:00 and 23:00 each day of the week.

The application attracted 45 representations and a petition with 132 signatures on the grounds that to grant the application would undermine all four licensing objectives – the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.

The following persons attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee to expand on the points made in written submissions:

Suresh Kanapathi – Licensing Consultant, Arka Licensing, representing the  
Applicant  
Ramanathan Arulmoleaman – Applicant

The Sub-Committee asked various questions of all parties present and were grateful for the responses received. All parties had the opportunity to ask questions. All parties were invited to sum up before the Sub-Committee retired to make its decision. Before concluding the hearing, the Legal Advisor advised all parties of the right of appeal.

**RESOLVED that the application for a Premises Licence for the premises known as Hengistbury Post Office, 106 Broadway, Southbourne, Bournemouth, BH6 4EH, to permit off sales of alcohol between 06:00 and 23:00 each day of the week. be GRANTED.**

Reasons for Decision:

The Sub-Committee gave very detailed consideration to all of the information which had been submitted before the hearing and contained in the report for Agenda Item 5, including written representations relating to all four licensing objectives, and the verbal submissions made at the hearing by Sarah Rogers, Licensing Officer, Suresh Kanapathi, Arka Licensing Consultants, representing the Applicant, Ramanathan Arulmoleaman, the Applicant and Cllr Nanovo and Faith Gokogly, objecting to the application.

The Sub-Committee noted there had been 45 representations objecting to the application and a petition with 132 signatures submitted on the grounds that to grant the application would undermine all four licensing objectives – the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.

In making its decision, the Sub Committee could only refer to the licensing objectives and were not able to place any relevance on need or characteristics of the neighbourhood in this instance.

The Sub Committee noted the fears expressed by residents that the premises was in a residential area and that an additional licensed premises could lead to an increase in crime and disorder and public nuisance, have an adverse impact on public health and alcohol related harm and increase exposure and availability of alcohol to children, however, BCP Council's Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) & Community Safety Accreditation Scheme (CSAS) Manager had confirmed that there were no ASB issues with these premises, or in the immediate area of the premises. The Sub-Committee also noted that no Responsible Authorities had made an objection to the application.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Licensing Consultant that the Post Office would provide great opportunities for the local community and that the premises would not be operating as a bar so noise from customers would be minimal, however, the applicant would display a notice inside his premises asking customers to leave quietly.

In response to the representations made about an increase in litter, the applicant advised that he would manage any litter outside his premises and keep the area clean.

The Sub-Committee also noted that residents were concerned that if an alcohol licence was granted that anti-social behaviour could increase at Hengistbury Head as there was already noise disturbance, illegal overnight camping and litter in this area. The Legal Adviser confirmed that Hengistbury Head was subject to a Coastal Area Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) and that these issues would be covered by BCP Councils ASB Team and were not in the Sub-Committees remit.

The Sub Committee heard that the applicant had been working in licensed premises for approximately 25 years and he would be operating 'Challenge 25' at his premises and comprehensive staff training would take place every 6 months. In addition, CCTV was installed at the premises, and the windows were kept clear to monitor proxy sales, which would protect children from harm.

In conclusion the Sub-Committee was satisfied that if the premises operated in accordance with the conditions offered in the operating schedule of the application the premises should not undermine the licensing objectives and as such the application should be granted.

It was noted however that a review of the premises licence may be sought at any time by a Responsible Authority, or any other person, should future issues arise that may undermine the licensing objectives.

In making this decision the Sub-Committee have had regard to the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council Licensing Policy, the revised

guidance, as set out by the Secretary of State and the licensing objectives, as set out in the Licensing Act 2003.

Revised Guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 (February 2026) under the new National Licensing Policy Framework for hospitality and leisure sectors, explicitly requires licensing authorities to consider economic benefits and business growth alongside traditional public safety and community well-being objectives. In making this decision the Sub-Committee had regard to this.

All parties to the application have the right to appeal to the Magistrate's Court within the period of twenty-one days beginning with the day on which the applicant is notified by the Licensing Authority of this decision in writing.

17. Wok4go, 13 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth, BH8 8EH

Present:

From BCP Council:

Sarah Rogers – Senior Licensing Officer

Johanne McNamara – Legal Advisor to the Sub-Committee

Michelle Cutler – Clerk to the Sub-Committee

Christiane Tan – Observing, Democratic Services

The Chair made introductions and explained the procedure for the hearing which was agreed by all parties.

The Licensing Officer presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these minutes in the Minute Book.

The Licensing Sub-Committee was asked to consider an application by Home Office Immigration Enforcement (HOIE) for the review of the premises licence for the premises known as 'Wok4go'.

HOIE had identified illegal working at the premises and no longer had confidence in the licence holder to uphold the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective.

Section 36 and Schedule 4 of the Immigration Act 2016 (the 2016 Act) amended the Licensing Act 2003 (the 2003 Act) to introduce immigration safeguards in respect of licensing applications made in England and Wales on or after 6 April 2017. The intention was to prevent illegal working in premises licensed for the sale of alcohol or late-night refreshment.

The following persons attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee to expand on the points made in written submissions:

Fi Smythe – Immigration Officer

Stephen Morgan – Immigration Officer, observing for training purposes

James Andrews, Set Square Studio, representing the Premises Licence

Holder, Mr Rasi Khalil

Mr Rasi Khalil did not attend.

The Sub-Committee asked various questions of all parties present and were grateful for the responses received. All parties had the opportunity to ask questions. All parties were invited to sum up before the Sub-Committee retired to make its decision. Before concluding the hearing, the Legal Advisor advised all parties of the right of appeal.

**RESOLVED that having considered the application dated 28 April 2026, made by Home Office Immigration Enforcement, to review the premises licence for the premises known as ‘Wok4go’, 13 Holdenhurst Road, Bournemouth, BH8 8EH, the Sub-Committee has decided that it is appropriate to revoke the licence on the grounds that the premises are not upholding the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective and is satisfied that there is no alternative outcome that will mitigate the concerns raised by Home Office Immigration Enforcement and Dorset Police.**

The Sub-Committee gave detailed consideration to all of the information which had been submitted before the hearing and contained in the report for Agenda Item 6, presented by Sarah Rogers, Senior Licensing Officer, including the Witness Statement dated 12 June 2026 provided by Vanessa Rosales, Licensing Officer, Dorset Police, in support of the Application for Review of the Premises Licence on the grounds of Prevention of Crime and Disorder, as well as the verbal submissions made at the hearing by Fi Smythe, Immigration Officer and James Andrews, Set Square Studio, representing Mr Rasti Khalil, the Licence Holder.

In determining the review, the Sub-Committee considered the options available to them as set out in the recommendations of the report and provided for in the Licensing Act 2003. They took account of the Guidance by the Secretary of State made under section 182 of that Act as well as the BCP Statement of Licensing Policy. The Sub-Committee’s decision is based upon consideration of the promotion of the Licensing Objectives. The Sub-Committee acknowledged that it was only able to consider matters directly relevant to the licensing objectives raised in the application namely prevention of crime and disorder.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the premises had failed to uphold the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective, and that revocation of the Licence was the only appropriate response to the issues raised in the review when considering the evidence currently available to it.

### **Reasons for decision**

Members of the Sub-Committee in determining the application for review must consider the following options: -

- a) Leave the licence in its current state.
- b) Modify the conditions of the licence; and/or

- c) Exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence; and / or
- d) Remove the Designated Premises Supervisor; and/or
- e) Suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months; and/or
- f) Revoke the licence.

**Leave the licence in its current state:**

In considering the information contained in the agenda report, the representations made by Home Office Immigration Enforcement, Dorset Police and the verbal submissions made during the hearing, the Licensing Sub-Committee agreed that taking no action would not be a sufficient response to the concerns identified by Home Office Immigration Enforcement in bringing this review.

The Guidance issued by the Home Office under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 updated in February 2025, alongside the BCP Statement of Licensing Policy both guide that intervention is expected to tackle Immigration offences associated with licensed premises.

**Modify the conditions of the licence; and/or add conditions**

The Sub-Committee do not consider that modifying the existing conditions would resolve the concerns raised by Home Office Immigration Enforcement and Dorset Police as *conditions should not duplicate other statutory requirements or other duties or responsibilities placed on the employer by other legislation and should not replicate offences set out in the 2003 act or other legislation.*

The Sub-Committee had heard that Dorset Police had visited the premises on 28 May 2026 to find the premises had been left unattended while customer remained inside, which posed a significant risk to public safety. In addition, when Home Office Immigration Enforcement Officers had visited the premises on 13 June 2025, they noted that several existing licensing conditions were being breached, including no operational CCTV, no refusals register and no Designated Premises Supervisor or personal licence holder present. Given that existing conditions were not being adhered to the Sub-Committee had no faith that any new conditions would be complied with.

It would not be appropriate to add conditions such as offering a documented right to work check on every staff member in the operation of the business to the licence as there is an expectation that all responsible for running a business would act responsibly and within all relevant legislation.

**Exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence:**

James Andrews, Set Square Studios, representing Mr Rasti Khalil, licence holder, advised that Mr Khalil was prepared to surrender the element in the licence related to the sale of alcohol, however, serious concerns had been raised by both Home Office Immigration Enforcement and Dorset Police regarding the business as a whole and not the sale of alcohol alone.

The Sub-Committee do not consider that excluding a licensable activity from the scope of the licence to be an appropriate response to the concerns raised in this review. The issue was not the sale of alcohol but the

evidence that the premises are associated with employing or operating with illegal workers being recompensed below the minimum wage, contrary to immigration and other legislation and concerns raised by Dorset Police about the premises being unsupervised during opening hours.

The Sub-Committee note that if licensable activities were not taking place the premises could remain operational as a take-away and that the concerns highlighted may remain.

**The removal of the Designated Premises Supervisor from the licence:**

The Sub-Committee was advised by the Senior Licensing Officer that an application had been made on 22 June 2026 to change the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) from Mr Rasti Khalil to Mr Karzan Omar Ali.

Mr James Andrews advised the Sub-Committee that Mr Khalil was also going to transfer the operation of the premises to Mr Ali. Mr Ali already holds a personal licence and would become the new operator with the responsibility for complying with the licensing objectives and ensuring the appropriate compliance checks were carried out for all staff. When questioned, Mr James Andrews confirmed that Mr Khalil and Mr Ali were known to each other as friends but stated they were financially independent of one another.

It was noted that Mr Khalil and Mr Ali's brother were co-directors of another company and the Sub-Committee was concerned about business links between the families.

The Sub-Committee was advised that Mr Ali first entered into discussions about the business in May 2026 and noted that the incident referred to in the Dorset Police statement took place after these discussions.

The Sub-Committee was disappointed to not have been provided with further information from Mr Ali about his taking over the business and his suitability to operate a licenced premises.

The Sub-Committee had no confidence that a new DPS would ensure that right to work checks would be carried out and that Mr Khalil would not be involved in the business operation.

The Sub-Committee were of the view that removing Mr Khalil as DPS would not be enough to alleviate the issues raised in the Review Application. The Sub-Committee are unable to remove the Premises License Holder.

**Suspension of the Licence:**

Mr James Andrews requested a suspension of the licence to allow Mr Ali time to get the business in order and provide evidence that he was operating a new business separate from Mr Khalil. It was noted that the Sub-Committee had been advised by Mr Andrews that Mr Ali had been in discussions regarding operating the business since May 2026 but had failed to provide any information in relation to this by the Sub-Committee hearing on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2026.



The Sub-Committee feel that a temporary suspension of the Premises Licence of up to three months will not resolve the concerns raised in the Application for Review.

**Revocation of the Licence:**

The Sub-Committee, after considering all the options available to them, determined that revocation of the premises licence is the appropriate option in response to this Application for Review.

The evidence presented to them clearly demonstrates that Mr Khalil as DPS and Premises Licence holder, and others associated with the business, do not manage the premises responsibly and that they should have had regard to the necessary requirements, when employing employees into the business.

The Sub-Committee found that Mr James Andrews had not demonstrated that that Mr Khalil, or Mr Ali, have the attributes necessary to uphold and promote the four licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of crime and disorder.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Senior Licensing Officer that an application had been submitted to change the DPS to Mr Karzan Omar Ali, and that he would be taking over the running of the business, however, no application had been received to transfer the Premise Licence Holder.

The Sub-Committee were not satisfied with Mr Andrews explanation as to the relationship between Mr Khalil and Mr Ali and were concerned that those in management and control would not effectively change.

The Sub-Committee do not believe that those involved with operating the premises have done so responsibly and in a way that upholds the Licensing Objectives. The absence of both Mr Khalil and Mr Ali at the hearing left the Sub-Committee with little confidence that in future, 'Wok4go' would be run in such a way as to be able to promote the Licensing Objectives.

The Sub-Committee agreed with the views of Home Office Immigration Enforcement, that the employment of illegal workers at this licensed premises disregards the law, places those illegal workers at increased vulnerability and acts to the detriment of other businesses and the wider community.

The Sub-Committee considered the application for review including the representation produced by Home Office Immigration Enforcement, Dorset Police, the BCP Council Statement of Licensing Policy and the revised section 182 Guidance issued by the Home Office. They noted sections 11.27 and 11.28 of the guidance which states that, *"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 employing a person who is disqualified from that work by reason of their immigration status in the UK;"*.



Section 11.28 continues, *“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 Sub-Committee further noted that the Home Office (Immigration Enforcement) incident took place in June 2025 and the Dorset Police incident relating to the lack of supervision of the premises took place in May 2026, some considerable time later. Both incidents are of grave concern and show a continued disregard to the provisions of the Licence and Licensing Objectives. The Incident in May 2026 having taken place after the premises received notification of the Review and service of the relevant documentation regarding the same.

The Sub-Committee agreed that the premises had been involved in serious crime and had disregarded public safety and had failed to uphold the licensing objective of the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety.

The Sub-Committee concluded that none of the other available options were appropriate at this time, and it was both appropriate and necessary to revoke the licence.

### **Right of appeal**

An appeal against the review decision may be made to a Magistrates’ Court within 21 days of the appellant being notified of the Licensing Authority’s determination on the review.

#### **18. Exclusion of Press and Public**

**RESOLVED that under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs such interest in disclosing the information.**

#### **19. Consideration of suitability to remain a licenced driver**

This item was restricted by virtue of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Exempt information – Categories 1 (information relating to any individual) and 2 (information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual).

Attendance:

From BCP Council:

Nananka Randle – Licensing and Trading Standards Manager

Johanne McNamara - Legal Advisor

Michelle Cutler - Clerk to the Sub-Committee

Christiane Tan – Observing, Democratic Services

The Driver attended via phone, having already indicated that he would not be attending the hearing due to work commitments.

The Chair made introductions and explained the procedure to be followed in considering this item, which was agreed by all parties present.

The Licensing Officer and Trading Standards Manager presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Licensing Team had received information in relation to a licensed driver that raised concerns on their suitability to remain a licensed driver. The Sub- Committee was asked to consider whether the driver remained a 'fit and proper' person to hold a hackney carriage and private hire driver licence.

The Sub-Committee asked various questions of all parties present and were grateful for the responses received. All parties had the opportunity to ask questions. All parties were invited to sum up before the Sub-Committee retired to make its decision. Before concluding the hearing, the Legal Advisor advised all parties of the right of appeal.

**RESOLVED that the driver is no longer deemed to be a 'fit and proper person' to hold a hackney carriage and private hire driver licence and that the licence be revoked with immediate effect under Section 61(2B) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 in the interests of public safety).**

Reasons for Decision:

The Sub-Committee carefully considered all the written information which had been submitted before the hearing and contained in the Licensing Officer's report for Agenda Item 8.

The Sub-Committee also considered the verbal submissions made at the hearing by the Licensing and Trading Standards Manager and the driver, and the responses given to questions.

In considering whether the driver remained a 'fit and proper person', the Sub- Committee had regard to the BCP Council Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Policy 2026 – 2031, the provisions of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, the Institute of Licensing (IOL) Guidance on determining the suitability of drivers and licensees in the

hackney and private hire trades (2018), and the Department for Transport Statutory Taxi and Private Hire Vehicle Standards (updated November 2022).

The Sub Committee considered the following points:

Dorset Police contacted the Taxi Licensing Authority asking for information on the driver regarding an ongoing Police investigation.

A copy of the drivers new enhanced DBS check was circulated to all parties present at the hearing. The DBS check was clear; however, the Police had disclosed relevant information relating to concerns over the driver's role as a taxi driver.

The Sub-Committee asked the driver if he was aware of his responsibilities as a licensed driver and asked if he had read the BCP Council Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Policy 2026. The driver advised that he had not read the policy. He was therefore unaware that he had to notify the Council of any arrest within 3 working days, whether charged or not.

In his defence, the driver cited that he had received no complaints from other licensed drivers or customers regarding his driving. He admitted that he had made some mistakes, but he was a hard-working family man that needed to provide for his family.

The Sub-Committee found that the driver has failed to disclose any arrest to the licensing authority. This is in breach of his driver conditions which are set out in Appendix A of the BCP Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver Policy 2026 -2031 which states at section 7. The licence holder must notify the Council in writing within 5 working days (or 3 working days in the case of arrest) providing full details of any conviction, binding over, caution, warning, reprimand, or arrest for any matter (whether or not charged) imposed on him / her during the period of the licence.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the driver had failed to comply with the Council's licensing policy by not notifying the Licensing Authority of his arrests. The Sub-Committee was particularly concerned by the nature of the arrests. These matters raised significant safeguarding concerns and were considered serious indicators of risk within the context of taxi licensing, given the potential vulnerability of passengers and the known risks associated with exploitation and criminal activity in the sector.

The Sub-Committee determined that the drivers conduct represented a serious risk to public safety, fell significantly below the expected standards of behaviour for licensed drivers, and was wholly incompatible with holding a hackney carriage and private hire driver's licence.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee determined that the driver was not a 'fit and proper' person and that there was a risk to public safety and as such in accordance with S 61 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions)

Act 1976, it was necessary and proportionate to revoke his private hire driver's licence with immediate effect.

The driver has the right of appeal to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days beginning with the date on which he is notified in writing of this decision.

The meeting ended at 1.52 pm

CHAIRMAN