## HAVANA BAR – LICENCE REVIEW

## **Response on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder (agreed with the Police)**

## WARNING – IT MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE TO PUT THIS ENTIRE DOCUMENT INTO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN – PARTS REFER TO A POTENTIAL PROSECUTION AND MAY BE REGARDED AS DEFAMATORY – THE RELEVANT SECTIONS ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN RED

## Introduction

This is a slightly unusual case in that we do not propose to respond to the detail of incidents reported by the Police in their application for review. If the sub-committee chooses to explore these in more detail, Mr Halabi will be available to answer questions at the hearing.

For the purposes of this document, suffice it to say that it is accepted that there have been shortcomings but to an extent, it is not accepted that the incidents referred to have been entirely the fault of the premises.

Rather, the situation here is that early in the process, the police indicated that they did not seek a revocation or suspension of the licence but would be content with modifications to the licence conditions – they provided the premises licence holder with what can be described as a "wish list" of changes that they sought to the licence.

There followed a long exchange of emails and meetings as a consequence of which I, on behalf of the licence holder submitted a minor variation to add conditions and restrictions to the licence. A copy of that application is included within the agenda papers and by the time the hearing takes place, the licence will have been amended accordingly. The amended licence will take effect immediately rather than after the end of the usual "appeal period" i.e. not until either a period of 21 days has elapsed or, in the event of an appeal, until the appeal was determined – a process that would likely take a number of months.

The (minor) variation did not go as far as the police had originally suggested in their "wish list" but following further discussions and meditation, the police have indicated that they are content and would not now seek any further changes to the licence – this on the basis that it is clearly understood that should there be any further issues with the premises, a further application might be forthcoming.

Given the steps that the Premises Licence Holder has already taken, it is respectfully submitted that the Licensing Authority should not take any further steps with regard to this application.

Philip Day Partner – Laceys Solicitors LLP 9 Poole Road Bournemouth BH2 5QR