

## **DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL**

At a Meeting of **Statutory Licensing Sub-Committee** held in Committee Room 2 - County Hall, Durham on **Tuesday 4 June 2019 at 10.00 am**

### **Present:**

**Councillor L Marshall (Chair)**

### **Members of the Committee:**

Councillors P Atkinson, D Brown and C Hampson

### **Also Present:**

#### **Premier Shield Row Food and Wine**

Mr S Buston (Council's Solicitor)

Ms H Johnson (Licensing Team Leader)

Ms L Brooks (Trading Standards Team Leader)

PCSO Michelle Williamson (Durham Constabulary)

Ms L Mustard (Dere Street Chambers, on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder)

Mr M Ullah (Premises Licence Holder)

#### **Odeon Cinema**

Mrs C Hazell (Council's Solicitor)

Ms Y Raine (Senior Licensing Officer)

Ms S Davies (Clifton Davies Consultancy Ltd – Applicant's Consultant)

Ms M Harding (General Manager for Odeon Cinema)

Mr D Kerr (Project Manager for Odeon Cinema)

Mr N Ripon (on behalf of Roberta Blackman-Woods MP)

Cllr R Cromwell (Durham City Parish Council)

Cllr L Brown (Durham City Parish Council)

### **1 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor J Blakey.

### **2 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute members.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor L Marshall declared an interest in the Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence for Odeon Luxe Cinema, Durham and withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof.

### **4 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 and 30 April 2019 were agreed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

### **5 Application for the Review of a Premises Licence - Premier Shield Row Food and Wine, 1 Rodham Terrace, Shield Row, Stanley**

#### **Members:**

Councillor L Marshall (Chair), Councillors P Atkinson and C Hampson

The Committee considered a report of the Licensing Team Leader regarding an application for the review of a Premises Licence in respect of Premier Shield Row Food and Wine, 1 Rodham Terrace, Shield Row, Stanley (for copy see file of Minutes).

A copy of the application and supporting information had been circulated to Members, together with further information from the Applicant.

Laura Brooks, Team Leader, Trading Standards addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the Applicants. Members were informed that Trading Standards received intelligence from the Police in December 2018 that the premises was alleging to be selling alcohol to young people under the age of 18. The area was experiencing problems of anti-social behaviour and Premier Food and Wine was targeted with other premises in a Police Operation. As part of that operation 2 test purchases were carried out, details of which were set out in the report.

Following the failed test purchases a visit was made to the premises by Trading Standards and the Police and the sales assistant who had failed made both sales had said that she had not been working in the store for very long and had received no training on challenging people and was unaware of any procedure for recording refusals.

On 25 February 2019 Trading Standards met with the Licence Holder and found that the female was no longer working on the premises and found a number of negatives in terms of how the shop was managed:

- Staff training was carried out verbally only and no records were kept
- Challenge 25 posters were on display but there was no formal written policy
- The till had an electronic prompt system for refusals but tickets were not retained.

Ms Brooks advised that she had met with the Licence Holder on 26 March 2019 to discuss conditions to be added to the Premises Licence. She was only confident that the licensing objective would be upheld with these 'tweaks' to the existing Premises Licence. Mr Ullah had expressed his willingness to take steps to ensure the licensing objective protection of children from harm was promoted. The complex points discussed were included in a letter to Mr Ullah, a copy of which had been circulated.

Following queries from Councillor Crathorne and Councillor Brown, Ms Brooks confirmed that there were two typing errors in the report - it was 15 January 2019 when Officers visited the premises and the sale made on the first visit was 4 cans of lager as stated in the witness statement, not a bottle of wine.

Following a further question from Councillor Brown about test purchases Ms Brooks advised that volunteers were carefully selected to ensure that they did not appear older than their actual ages. A large number of premises were targeted as part of an Operation.

Answering questions from Members, Ms Brooks confirmed that the alcohol was bagged and tagged as evidence so that it could be used in criminal proceedings.

The Licence Holders Barrister, Lorraine Mustard, confirmed that the same member of staff had failed both test purchases, but no longer worked there and had only worked there for a short period of time. This was not a case of not wanting to comply with the licensing objectives.

Ms Brooks confirmed that there were some issues, particularly with staff training which needed addressing. She had to advise Mr Ullah that he had to ensure all staff received full training.

The Barrister queried why the review was dated 6 March which was one week after the meeting with Mr Ullah on 25 February. Ms Brooks confirmed that they were not confident that the recommended conditions would be adhered to if they were not determined by the Licensing Committee.

The Barrister asked why they couldn't have given Mr Ullah the opportunity before applying for a review and Ms Brooks confirmed that there were two visits to the premises, one on 25 and one on 28 February, and there had

been no changes made. The same issues were discussed on 28 February and she was unaware whether any consideration was given to allow Mr Ullah a period of time to make the changes.

PCSO Williamson confirmed that she had visited on 15 January and the shop assistant said she only worked a couple of nights, she was not aware of a refusals register and had not been trained. In response to the Councils Solicitor, PCSO Williamson confirmed that the FPN issued was for £90 and if it they are not paid, the recipient is summonsed to court.

Mr Ullah confirmed that he had five members of staff and one of them held a Personal Licence. All staff had been sent for training and two were now in receipt of a Premises Licence and two staff were qualified DPS. There had been an issue with one member of staff receiving a DPS. He confirmed that he had purchased a programme for £100 per month which warned shop assistants to ask for ID and a receipt was produced for a refusal. The Barrister suggested that there had been a lack of organisation in the past but a refusals register would be kept up to date.

With regards to the licensing objectives, the Barrister confirmed that there did not appear to be any reference in the report with regards to public nuisance, only the protection of children from harm. As well as alcohol the store sold cigarettes and Lotto tickets, which were regularly checked by Camelot. A letter was produced to the Chair which confirmed a successful test purchase had taken place by Camelot. Mr Ullah was doing everything a Licence Holder could do and she did not feel it was necessary to take further action.

The Chair asked how often staff would undergo training and the Barrister confirmed that in addition to DPS training, staff had undertaken health and safety training by a certified company. Mr Ullah had went beyond what was required by a Premises Licence Holder.

The Councils Solicitor asked if Mr Hussain had been on the DPS course and it was confirmed that was given internal training, of which records could be provided for inspection. All new staff would be given new training.

Ms Brooks confirmed that when she met with Mr Ullah, they discussed reminders at regular intervals to remind staff about selling alcohol to children, Challenge 25 and with regards to health and safety. In addition, he was advised to ensure that he was using the booklets given to complete when reminders were given.

In summing up Ms Brooks confirmed that the proposed course of action for the Sub-Committee was to consider more robust conditions to the premises licence which would help the business to promote the licensing objectives more effectively.

The Barrister summed up on behalf of the Licence Holder – it was clear that when given the opportunity of a tidying up exercise (which had been completely overlooked for a review), Mr Ullah had taken the right action. Therefore, no further action was needed and this was not a case of not taking responsibility seriously – the Camelot test purchase proved he was – but Mr Ullah was already doing what was required and to burden him with additional conditions was unnecessary - he had addressed all of the issues raised. She acknowledged that the Sub-Committee would take a proportionate view of what happened with a member of staff only being there a short period of time.

The Committee retired to deliberate the application in private at 10.55 am and upon returning at 11.10 am, the Chair delivered the Sub-Committees decision.

**Resolved** that the following conditions be imposed upon the Premises Licence:

#### **The Prevention of Crime and Disorder**

- CCTV footage must be available and downloaded upon request by a Responsible Authority.
- CCTV footage must be kept for a minimum of 28 days
- All incidents occurring at the premises will be recorded in an Incident Book maintained by the Premises Licence holder or a nominated member of staff. The details which will be recorded in the Incident Book are: the time and date of the incident; the name or full description of any person(s) involved (including staff members), whether the incident was recorded on CCTV, and the signature of the person making the entry. This book will be available at all times for inspection by the Police and other Responsible Authorities upon request.
- Persons known to be, or suspected to be, buying alcohol or tobacco on behalf of children will be refused and reported to the Police.

#### **The Protection of Children from Harm**

- Adherence to the law surrounding the ban on the sale of alcohol and tobacco to those under 18.

- The operation of a documented Age Certification Policy (Challenge 25) where all patrons believed to be under the age of 25 who seek to purchase age restricted goods will be asked to provide proof of age in the form of a UK Driving Licence, Passport, Military ID card or photo identification which is endorsed with the government PASS holographic logo.
- A refusals register must be in place at the premises and used to keep a record of all attempted test purchases of alcohol and tobacco where a person believed to be under 25 is challenged and no identification is provided, and the sale is therefore refused.
- The refusals register should record: the date and time of the refusal, a description of the young person refused, the goods asked for, any significant comments made, or behaviours exhibited by the person and the signature of the person making the entry.
- The register should be checked for completion and signed off on a regular basis by the DPS or Premise Licence Holder. The refusal register must be kept available at all times for inspection by the Police and other Responsible Authorities upon request.
- Persons known to be or suspected of buying on behalf of children will be refused and reported to the Police.
- Notices to be displayed concerning the law surrounding the ban on the sale of alcohol to children and explaining the Challenge 25 scheme.
- All staff to receive full training on the law surrounding the sale of age restricted products and the operation of the Challenge 25 scheme. Regular reminders to staff as to their obligations with respect to the above.
- All staff training records and reminders to be put in writing and kept as a record of training which must be kept on the premises and be available at all times for inspection by the Police and other Responsible Authorities on request.

## **6 Application for the Review of a Premises Licence - Costcutter, Units 2-3 Old Co-op Buildings, Front Street, Burnopfield**

The Licensing Team Leader confirmed that an adjournment be granted as it had become apparent that in addition to the License Holder, Mr James Millican, his son was also named Mr James Millican. There had been some

confusion as to which one held the Licence and the Licensing Team had been liaising with Mr Millican senior's son, when in fact Mr Millian held the Premises Licence.

**Councillor L Marshall (left the Meeting)**

**Councillor Hampson (in the Chair)**

**7 Application for the Grant of a Premises Licence - Odeon Luxe Cinema, Unit 15, The Riverwalk, Durham**

The Committee considered the report of the Senior Licensing Officer regarding an application for the grant of a Premises Licence in respect of the Odeon Luxe Cinema, Unit 15, The Riverwalk, Durham (for copy of report, see file of minutes).

A copy of the location plan and application form had been circulated.

The Senior Licensing Officer stated that the application was for a premises licence for a new cinema for the sale of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises from 11:00 hrs until 00:00 hrs Sunday to Thursday and 11:00 hrs until 01:00 hrs on Fridays and Saturdays; the provision of Regulated Entertainment from 09:00 hrs until 01:00 hrs Sunday to Thursday and from 09:00 hrs until 02:00 hrs on Fridays and Saturdays and the provision of Late Night refreshment from 23:00 hrs until 01:00 hrs Sunday to Thursday and from 23:00 hrs until 02:00 hrs Friday and Saturday.

Up to ten occasions per year, the application requested an extension of hours for the Sale of Alcohol up until 01:00 hrs and an extension for Regulated Entertainment and Late Night Refreshment up until 03:00 hrs.

Following Mediation with Durham Constabulary the applicant agreed to add an additional condition in relation to staff training, details of which were provided at Appendix 4 to the report.

Two objections had been received during the consultation period from Ms Roberta Blackman-Woods MP and Durham City Parish Council. Additional information had also been received from Ms Blackman-Woods.

In response to the objections, Ms Davies the Applicant's Consultant wrote to Ms Blackman-Woods and Durham City Parish Council to provide further details on the way the applicants proposed to operate the premises. A copy of the correspondence had been circulated with the papers.

Durham County Council's Environmental Health Authority, the County Durham Public Health department and the County Durham and Darlington Fire Safety Authority all responded to the consultation with no comments.

There were no questions of the Licensing Officer.

Mr N Rippon who was representing Ms Blackman-Woods thanked the Chair for the opportunity to address the Sub-Committee.

He read out the statement of Ms Blackman-Woods MP that stated that the application was for a regulated entertainment, late night refreshment and alcohol licence for the Odeon Luxe cinema in the River Walk complex, which was the new development on the site of the Gates shopping centre near North Road in Durham. North Road was situated near the centre of the city and sat adjacent to the World Heritage site. The area was home to a number of licensed premises and was the main route for transport services into and out of the city.

Ms Blackman-Woods welcomed the Odeon opening in Durham, and this was a much-needed addition to the city centre. There were several issues with the application in relation to the four licensing objectives, which she outlined in her submission to the licensing committee. The key points of concern were:

The applicant suggested that the majority of customers would travel by car, but only one car park in the complex was currently operational, and this closed at 10.30 pm. She asked why the applicant thought that this would mean that customers would be arriving and leaving by car, rather than on foot?

Even if customers parked elsewhere in the city, in reality, this would create more pedestrians on the streets of Durham, and the lack of public transport options may also lead to more people queueing for taxis, which was a recognised flash point for crime and disorder. The simple matter was, whether people choose to walk through the city to other locations where they had parked, whether they walked home, or whether they queued for taxis, this was simply creating more noise and disruption for residents in the city centre.

While not objecting to the sale of alcohol completely, this would only be acceptable if the applicant had in place stringent measures to ensure that the supply of alcohol did not lead to drunken, rowdy behaviour, both inside and outside of the premises, and that minors were not able to access alcohol, whether through direct sales or proxy sales.



She was aware that the applicant had put forward a number of conditions on this issue, such the inclusion of CCTV, a Challenge 25 policy and regular training for staff. The committee needed to be clear however that these conditions were enough, as it was questionable whether, in a dark and busy cinema, proxy sales could be properly controlled, and the licensing objectives could be properly promoted.

The case remained however that the application proposed introducing regulated entertainment and alcohol sales into a small area of the city that already had issues with saturation of licensed premises and was a small residential city. In her discussions with residents, in the meetings she had held on licensing issues, and in the submissions made to the local authority as part of the recent licensing review, it was clear that there were huge concern that the Framework Licensing Hours were simply not being adhered to, and licensing hours in Durham were being allowed to slip further and further into the early hours.

This application should adhere to the framework hours published in the current Statement of Licensing, as should all applications. While the sale of alcohol does largely fall within these framework hours (except the ten occasions a year this would be extended to 1.00 am on any day of the week), other regulated entertainment and late-night refreshment did not do so, as it was proposed that the cinema operated these services until 1.00 am Sunday to Thursday, and until 2.00 am on Fridays and Saturdays. For reference, the framework hours indicated that late night refreshment should only be provided until midnight during the week, and until 1.00 am on Fridays and Saturdays.

Equally, there was no reason why an extension to 1.00 am for alcohol and 3.00 am for other entertainment ten times a year should be granted as part of the licence. There was plenty of scope for applications to be made under the current TENs system should the applicant wish to do this. This would also allow the police and Environmental Health to make a full assessment of the suitability of the proposed dates for an extension of opening hours. It was questionable whether, in such a residential city, opening to 3.00 am was acceptable in any circumstance.

Durham have already seen a growing number of venues across the city being granted licenses that run outside the framework hours, and there was no reason why this should be allowed. There was real anger amongst residents within the city that the continued granting of late licenses was simply making the framework hours redundant, and so many residents were just at the end of their tether with this problem. This simply had to stop. The Framework of licensing hours was already at the extremes of what was acceptable for a residential city, and the normalisation of licenses until 2.00 am or later was not accepted by the vast majority of residents in the city.

She hoped that the licensing committee fully considered the impact that this application would have on the city centre, when determining this licence, and would take the necessary steps to uphold the licensing objectives.

There were no questions of Mr Rippon.

Mr Cornwell speaking on behalf of the City of Durham Parish Council was asked to address the Sub-Committee.

Mr Cornwell on behalf of the Parish Council welcomed the new cinema to the City and indicated that there were no issues with the proposal for the opening hours from 9.00 am as opposed to 10.00 am in their original planning application. They were however concerned with the proposed closing hours during the week which were a concern for the parish.

The original planning application for the cinema stated that the closing hours were Midnight Sunday to Thursday and 2.00 am on a Friday and Saturday and the Parish felt that the Cinema should stick to these opening hours which were already beyond the framework hours.

There are residential houses in close proximity to the cinema in particular Lambton Walk which was a row of maisonettes with a river view on the exit route from the cinema and when built the area was a shopping centre so was reasonably quiet on an evening. They now have a cinema which would cause disturbance in the evening and the small hours of the morning. There were potentially 253 students surrounding the cinema who were wanting to study and had already objected to the building noise as they moved in a year before the building was complete which had caused them a disturbance.

He then referred to the 10 occasions per year where the hours could be extended until 3.00 am for blockbuster movies but were seeking an extension of other activities like live and recorded music. In a subsequent letter to the parish council they offered conditions and advised that live and recorded music was ancillary to the provision of the exhibitions of film i.e. The Rocky Horror Show. He asked that if permission was granted to the cinema then he would like to see these conditions included.

He then indicated that not every point the parish had raised had been addressed and asked how drinks only to patrons would be enforced as someone could come in off the street, they also asked if they were going to have arrangements in place so that tickets had to be shown to obtain a drink.

There was an expectation that people would travel by car but there are a lot of students in Durham and some residents living within a mile of the cinema. There was likely to be a lot of people walking home from the cinema on a

Friday and Saturday coming out of the Cinema onto North Road being rowdy and so on. Visitors to the City would be returning to their hotels most likely on foot.

He referred to patrons driving to the Cinema and drinking moderately but not everyone was responsible. He then referred to the protection of young people and the cinema would be dark so would the CCTV operate with infra-red lighting. There were 6 screens so how were they going to be monitored and indicated that staff going into the cinema every 30 minutes was not enough to deter children from taken a drink.

They asked for the prevention of public nuisance and to protect children from harm the hours be limited to 12 midnight during the week and 2.00 am on a Friday and Saturday with sufficient conditions for the sale of alcohol to prevent under age children from being able to be passed an alcoholic drink.

Councillor Brown indicated that the parish had raised concerns about the tipping of glass bottles after 11.00 pm and asked if this condition had been included so that no glass bottles were tipped between the hours of 8.00 pm and 9.00 am.

Mr Cornwall indicated that a number of conditions had been offered and he asked that these be included. He commented that the tipping of glass bottles throughout the City was a concern and asked if this condition could be imposed.

Ms Davies, the Applicant's Consultant indicated that they had responded to the objections but were unable to engage until they met outside before the meeting today. She was pleased that both objectors welcomed the cinema and just had some issues.

Ms Davies then outlined the nature of the application and introduced Mr Kerr who was the project manager for the brand and Ms Harding who was the general manager and previously operated an Odeon cinema at Stoke then Leeds/Bradford which were bigger premises.

The Cinema would be their luxurious brand with greater emphasis on guest experience with a high level of service which was customer focused with staff on hand to show you to your seats etc. Seats were much bigger like first class on an aeroplane which were electric and had their own table. There were fewer seats in the auditorium so fewer people, the screen were small with a capacity of 43 with an overall capacity of 400.

Ms Davies then referred to the plan showing the layout of the venue and explained that the external terraced area would only be used during nice weather that had a maximum capacity of 20. The terrace would be monitored

by staff with no glass and alcohol could only be purchased on the production of a cinema ticket. The terraced area did not belong to Odeon but they had permission to use it and was the reason why they had applied for off sales.

Odeon operated throughout England and had 101 premises in the country. The company were very experienced in alcohol sales and some of the premises operated for 24 hours which was not the case for Durham. They were experienced in residential areas so were well experienced and not one of their premises had been subject to a review. It was a standard company condition that alcohol could only be purchased with a cinema ticket which was policed and was not a general bar and staff were trained to ensure that this was the case.

The alcohol was at a premium pricing and you could only purchase one drink per ticket at a time.

Ms Harding indicated that staff were trained on alcohol sales and that cinema tickets needed to be shown to purchase alcohol.

Ms Davies continued that alcohol was an ancillary service and patrons only tendered to have a drink before the screening. If the reputation of the Odeon was tarnished then they would lose business so they did not want disorder or children being able to obtain alcohol, if this came out it would be damaging to the brand.

The operating hours were in line with planning permission which was a separate function, but residential amenities had been consulted as part of the planning process.

All films had different times and the hours sought were to allow for extra screenings of blockbuster films to accommodate as many people as possible. The operating hours were also in line with alcohol sales and CCTV equipment was in place and someone on duty would always be able to use the equipment to facilitate inspections of the footage. The CCTV equipment operated in low light and not all screens would be in use at the same time, there would be patrols every 30 minutes and staff were trained to identify inappropriate behaviour and used infrared goggles to carry out these checks. They also check that people were not illegally filming so staff were used to monitoring.

Further conditions had been agreed with Durham Constabulary on the training of staff, films were an age restricted product, the company operated a challenge 25 and they had offered this as a condition. Challenge 25 was operated within the company nationally and not challenge 21. There was only one exit to leave the premises so staff on duty would remind customers to leave quietly which would be backed up with signage. They were working on

a dispersal policy which would be shared with staff. They had also offered a no glass condition so drinks would be served in non-glass ware and alcohol could only be purchased on the production of a cinema ticket.

There would be two car parks near the cinema and when they were both operational would have a capacity of 470 and 200, one of which was accessed from the cinema without having to go outside at all. The hours of the car park would be in line with the cinema opening hours and would offer concessions for people attending the cinema so there would be minimal disturbance. Other car parks were a 3 minute walk away when operational. There would be more disturbance from the pubs and bars than from people having one or two drinks at the cinema, who would be in a different frame of mind.

Bottles in bins was potentially noisy so the cinema had a dedicated internal area for bottles, but they were happy to comply with the condition suggested by Mr Cromwell that there be no tipping of glass bottles between 8.00 pm and 9.00 am.

She then referred to the regulated entertainment which was ancillary and was for singing and dancing along while watching a film, there was no live music, it was just to ensure they were in line with legislation.

They were happy to include other conditions to promote the licensing objectives.

The circulated crime statistics were prepared for a different application and was for a consultation, so was not linked to this application. The 'Thwaites' case made it clear that decisions must be made on real evidence and not speculation.

She referred to the Licensing Act and how conditions could be attached to the licence before a refusal and there was the power to review the application if there were any issues. The company had 101 revenues up and down the country with no issues.

She then referred to the guidance issued by the Secretary of State which stipulated that any decision should be evidence based. She asked that little weight be attached to the statistics and indicated that the police were not making representations today.

The representation from Roberta Blackman-Woods referred to the proposed opening hours and indicated that cinemas were different to bars and they were seeking an extra hour each evening which was in line with the council's policy. It was a small cinema and not all screens would finish at the same time, so people leaving the cinema would be staggered.

She concluded her representations by stating that no local residents were objecting and in her 30 years' experience, residents would come forward if they had any concerns.

Councillor Atkinson stated that it was not unusual for cinemas to sell alcohol and asked if customers would continually come out of the cinema to purchase alcohol.

Ms Davies responded that customers came to watch a film and usually had a drink before the film and didn't tend to leave the film for a drink.

Councillor Atkinson then asked if this was monitored. In response Ms Davies stated that they could not prohibit people from leaving the film to purchase a drink but from experience this would not happen.

The Council's Solicitor asked when the second car park would be opened.

Members were advised that when the second car park closed the larger car would be open that had a larger capacity than the cinema.

Mr Cornwell referred to the layout of the screens with a chair and a table and how a child could pick up an alcoholic drink without being detected which was a concern.

Ms Davies responded that based on experience they had not had these issues previously.

All parties were invited to sum up.

Mr Ripon indicated that he had covered everything in his submission.

Mr Cornwell indicated that he had covered all issues he wished to raise and was happy to leave the decision in the hands of Members.

Ms Davies asked Members not to curtail the application as there was no evidence before them and asked Members to grant the application in its entirety subject to the conditions they had offered.

At 3.00 pm the Sub-Committee **Resolved** to retire to deliberate the application in private.

After re-convening at 3.30 pm the Chair delivered the Sub-Committee's decision. In reaching their decision the Sub-Committee considered the report of the Senior Licensing Officer, the verbal and written representations of other persons and the Applicant. Members had also taken into account the

Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and S182 Guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

**Resolved:** That the application for a Premises Licence be granted subject to a number of conditions as follows:

<b>Licensable Activities</b>	<b>Days and Hours</b>
Supply of Alcohol (consumption on and off the premises)	Sunday to Thursday: 11:00 to 00:00 hrs. Friday and Saturday: 11:00 to 01:00 hrs On no more than 10 occasions in any calendar year: 11:00 to 01:00 hrs (on any day of the week if not already authorised)
Plays, Films, Live Music, Recorded Music, Performance of Dance, Similar Entertainment (All Indoors)	Sunday to Thursday: 09:00 to 01:00 hrs Friday and Saturday: 09:00 to 02:00 hrs On no more than 10 occasions in any calendar year: 09:00 to 03:00 hrs (on any day of the week)
Late Night Refreshment (Indoors and Outdoors)	Sunday to Thursday: 23:00 to 01:00 hrs Friday and Saturday: 23:00 to 02:00 hrs On no more than 10 occasions in any calendar year: 23:00 to 03:00 hrs (on any day of the week)
Opening hours	Sunday to Thursday: 09:00 to 01:00 hrs Friday and Saturday: 09:00 to 02:00 hrs On no more than 10 occasions in any calendar year: 09:00 to 03:00 hrs (on any day of the week)

### **Condition mediated with Durham Constabulary**

- a) All staff involved in the sale of alcohol shall be properly trained in accordance with the premises licence holder's own training programme and retrained every six months. Training records shall be made available to the police or authorised officer of the licensing authority on request.

Additional conditions:

### **Prevention of Crime and Disorder**

- b) Off-sales of alcohol will be limited to sales made for consumption of alcohol on the terrace area, which may be used until 10pm;

### **Prevention of Public Nuisance**

- c) Signage is to be displayed at the premises to remind guests that they are in a residential area and to leave quietly;
- d) Glass bottles should not be removed by the premises from 8pm until the closing time of the premises;
- e) Regulated entertainment, other than the exhibition of film, shall only be provided as ancillary activities to the exhibition of film.