

From: [Philip Rush](#)
To: [Licensing.Com](#)
Subject: Subject: Licence Review Application – Bulbuls Premier, 69 Bennett Road (Case Ref: PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC/PLAN-NUISANCE)
Date: 28 May 2026 11:00:07

Applicant:

Philip Rush ■ Bennett Road Bournemouth BH8 8RH

Premises Subject to Review: Bulbuls Premier 69 Bennett Road Bournemouth BH8 8RH

Premises Licence Type: Off-Licence (Retail sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises)

1. Mandatory Case Reference Instruction

Please ensure that all correspondence, internal notes, and case actions relating to this matter are recorded under the case reference:

PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC/PLAN-NUISANCE. This reference will appear on all future submissions for consistency and traceability.

2. Summary of Application

I am applying for a **review of the premises licence** for Bulbuls Premier due to ongoing and severe **public nuisance** caused by the industrial mechanical plant installed and operated at the rear of the premises. The nuisance has persisted for **nine years**, significantly affecting residential amenity and breaching the mandatory licensing objective.

3. Nature of the Nuisance

The premises operate multiple industrial extractor systems and refrigeration condensers from:

77:30 am until 11:00 pm daily

These units generate:

- Excessive and intrusive noise
- Heat discharge
- Odours
- Vibration
- Loss of amenity

- Interference with sleep
- Inability to use my garden

This is a **clear breach** of the licensing objective: **Prevention of Public Nuisance.**

4. Premises Licence Does Not Justify Industrial Extractors

The premises are licensed solely for:

- Retail sale of alcohol
- For consumption off the premises

It is **not** licensed as:

- A takeaway
- A restaurant
- A hot-food premises
- A food-production site

Therefore, the industrial extractor systems:

- Are **not required** for the licensed activity
- Are **not incidental** to lawful retail use
- Are **not justified** by the premises licence
- Are **not compatible** with the licensing objectives

5. Companies House Evidence – Dissolved Company & Irrelevant SIC Code

Companies House records confirm:

- **BULBUL EXPRESS LIMITED** (Company No. 05954255)
- **Registered at 69 Bennett Road**
- **Dissolved on 27 April 2010**
- **SIC Code: 9240 – News agency activities**

This demonstrates that:

The dissolved company is NOT the current operator.

The dissolved company was NOT a retail shop.

The dissolved company was NOT an off-licence

The dissolved company cannot hold the current premises licence.

The current operator must be a different legal entity.y

Therefore:

The Licensing Authority must confirm the identity of the current Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises Supervisor.

This information materially strengthens the licensing review case.

6. Extractors Should Be Located on the Public Highway Side (Front), Not the Rear

The extractors are currently placed at the **rear**, directly adjacent to residential gardens, causing maximum nuisance.

The **front of the premises**, facing the **public highway**, is:

- Non-residential
- Open and ventilated
- Suitable for a mechanical plant
- The correct location for any lawful equipment

The decision to place an industrial plant at the rear has **no operational justification** and causes **avoidable harm**.

7. Requested Licensing Actions

I request that the Licensing Authority:

1. **Review the premises licence**
2. **Impose conditions**, including:
 - Restricting the operating hours of the mechanical plant
 - Requiring relocation of machinery to the **front of the public highway side**
 - Requiring noise-reduction measures
3. **Require identification of the current licence holder and DPS**

4. **Consider suspension or revocation** if compliance cannot be achieved
5. **Require immediate mitigation** pending the outcome of the review

8. Evidence Available

I can provide:

- Photographs
- Noise recordings
- A nine-year disturbance log
- Correspondence with the shop owner
- Planning Enforcement complaint
- Environmental Health complaint
- Companies House documentation

9. Conclusion

The premises are operating a mechanical plant that is:

- **Not required** for an off-licence
- **Not justified** by any registered business activity
- **Not incidental** to lawful use
- **Causing a significant nuisance**
- **In breach of the Licensing Act 2003**

This information materially strengthens the licensing review case.

I request Licensing Authority intervention to protect residential amenity and uphold the licensing objectives.

Signed: Philip Rush  Bennett Road Bournemouth BH8 8RH

From: [Philip Rush](#)
To: [Licensing Com](#)
Date: 30 May 2026 21:31:02
Attachments: [Bulbuls Premier, 69 Bennett Road Case Ref PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC PLAN-NUISANCE.pdf](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Philip Rush**
Date: Sat, May 30, 2026 at 9:24 PM
Subject: Subject: Response to Licensing Clarification – Bulbuls Premier, 69 Bennett Road
Case Ref: PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC/PLAN-NUISANCE
To: Licensing Com <licensing@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>, <icensing@bcpcouncil.gov.uk>

Dear Ms Pitts and Ms Jardim,

Thank you for your recent correspondence and for confirming that the current Premises Licence Holders for 69 Bennett Road are **Mehmet Ali Bulbul, Hatice Bulbul, and Bahar Bulbul**, with **Mehmet Ali Bulbul** acting as the Designated Premises Supervisor.

This clarification is important, as Companies House records show that **Bulbul Express Limited**, previously associated with the address, was dissolved in 2010 and could not lawfully operate the premises or hold a licence. Your confirmation, therefore, resolves the discrepancy and establishes the identity of the individuals currently responsible for the licensed activity.

I write to respond to the points raised in your email and to clarify the legal basis upon which a review of the premises licence is sought. To avoid repetition of my original request, I have prepared a single consolidated document titled “**Integrated Four-Pillar Statement – Licensing, Planning, Mechanical Plant & Home Office Guidance**”, which is attached to this email.

This document:

- Addresses the legal test under the Licensing Act 2003
- Summarises the breaches of licence conditions (Conditions 2.14 and 2.17)
- Identifies the planning breaches relating to unapproved mechanical plant
- Explains why the extractors are not authorised by the premises licence
- Clarifies that a 24-hour opening does not authorise the mechanical plant
- Sets out the relevant Home Office statutory guidance confirming that a review must be accepted unless irrelevant, frivolous, vexatious, or repetitious
- Confirms the identity of the current Premises Licence Holders and DPS

I respectfully request:

1. Confirmation that a review application based on breach of licence conditions and public nuisance will be accepted as valid.

2. Confirmation of the correct service addresses for all Responsible Authorities.
3. Confirmation that the Licensing Authority has recorded this matter under the case reference PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC/PLAN-NUISANCE.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your confirmation.

Yours sincerely, **Philip Rush** ■ Bennett Road Bournemouth BH8 8RH

INTEGRATED FOUR-PILLAR STATEMENT

Bulbuls Premier, 69 Bennett Road – Licensing Review Grounds & Regulatory Breaches
Applicant: Philip Rush, ■ Bennett Road, Bournemouth BH8 8RH **Case Ref:**
PR-BULB-69BR-2026-LIC/PLAN-NUISANCE

1. Introduction

This document sets out the full legal and evidential basis for a review of the premises licence for Bulbuls Premier, 69 Bennett Road. It integrates four regulatory pillars:

- Licensing breaches
- Planning breaches
- Unlawful mechanical plant
- Home Office statutory guidance

It also clarifies the identity of the current Premises Licence Holders and Designated Premises Supervisor.

2. Identity of the Current Licence Holders

The premises licence (081253) confirms that the current Premises Licence Holders are:

- **Mehmet Ali Bulbul**
- **Hatice Bulbul**
- **Bahar Bulbul**

The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) is:

- **Mehmet Ali Bulbul**

This clarification is essential because:

- **Bulbul Express Limited**, previously associated with the address, was dissolved in 2010.
- A dissolved company cannot legally operate a business or hold a premises licence.
- The dissolved company's SIC code (9240 – News Agency Activities) confirms it was not a retail or off-licence operator.

Therefore, the individuals named above are the persons legally responsible for compliance with the premises licence and its conditions.

3. Pillar One – Licensing Breaches

A. Breach of Conditions 2.14 and 2.17

The premises licence expressly states:

2.14 Noise and vibration will not be allowed to emanate from the premises so as to cause a nuisance to nearby properties. **2.17** Noxious smells will not be allowed to emanate from the premises as to cause a nuisance to nearby properties.

The industrial extractors and condensers installed at the rear of the premises generate:

- Excessive noise
- Vibration
- Heat discharge
- Odour
- Loss of amenity
- Interference with sleep

These impacts constitute a **direct breach** of the licence.

B. Extractors are not authorised by the premises licence

The licence authorises:

- **Off-sales of alcohol only**

It does **not** authorise:

- Cooking
- Hot food
- Food preparation
- Industrial extraction
- Mechanical plant

The extractors are therefore **not incidental** to the licensed activity and are **not authorised**.

4. Pillar Two – Planning Breaches

Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, extractor systems constitute:

- Operational development
- External alteration
- Material change of use

No planning permission exists for:

- Installation of extractors
- External mechanical plant
- Change of use of the rear area

The extractors are therefore **unlawful**.

5. Pillar Three – Unlawful Mechanical Plant

A. Not required for an off-licence

An off-licence does not require:

- Cooking
- Ventilation
- Hot food extraction
- Industrial plant

The extractors are:

- Not necessary
- Not incidental
- Not authorised
- Not lawful

B. Location is unjustifiable

The extractors are placed:

- At the rear
- Adjacent to residential gardens
- In the most harmful location possible

The front elevation faces a public highway and is suitable for plant. The rear placement maximises nuisance.

6. Pillar Four – Home Office Statutory Guidance

The Home Office factsheet states:

“Local residents can request a review where activities at licensed premises are undermining one or more of the licensing objectives.”

And:

“A licensing authority must act on requests for review unless they consider the request to be irrelevant, repetitious, frivolous or vexatious.”

The extractors are:

- Installed by the business
- Operated by the business
- Used for the business
- Causing nuisance
- Breaching licence conditions

They are therefore **activities at the licensed premises**.

Environmental Health involvement is **optional**, not a prerequisite.

7. 24-Hour Opening Does Not Authorise Extractors

The premises licence permits:

- 24-hour alcohol sales

It does **not** authorise:

- Mechanical plant
- Extractors
- Condensers
- Ventilation systems

These require separate planning approval and must comply with licence conditions.

The extractors remain unlawful regardless of opening hours.

8. Conclusion

The premises is:

- In breach of its licence
- In breach of planning control
- Operating unlawful mechanical plant
- Causing public nuisance
- Undermining the licensing objectives

A review is justified and necessary.