



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LICENSING (HEARINGS) SUB-COMMITTEE

Held: MONDAY, 2 MARCH 2026 at 10:00 am

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Dr Barton (Chair)

Councillor Cank

Councillor Joshi

* * * * *

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

Councillor Barton was appointed as Chair.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

**4. APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF AN EXISTING PREMISES LICENCE -
JAS NEWS & BOOZE, 72 BURNHAM DRIVE, LEICESTER**

Councillor Barton, as Chair led on introductions and outlined the procedure the hearing would follow.

The Director of Neighbourhood and Environmental Services submitted a report for an application for a variation of an existing premises licence for Jas News & Booze, 72 Burnham Drive, Leicester.

The applicant Mr Jaswinderpal Saini and his interpreter Ms Ena Toor were present. Also in attendance were Sergeant Nicholas Golden, Leicestershire Police, Lynsay Coupe, Senior Regulatory Officer, and Victoria Marshall, Senior Regulatory Officer. Also present were the Service Manager (Regulatory Services) and the Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee.

Ms Coupe from the Licensing Team presented the report and outlined details of

the application.

A representation was received on 9 February 2026 from the Police. The representation related to the prevention of crime and disorder.

Prior to making the representation Leicestershire Police were in consultation with the applicant and also visited the premises several times. The support of the local neighbourhood policing area had also been sought. There were multiple areas of non-compliance within the premises licence identified upon the visits – no signage being placed, no Challenge 25 scheme, no incident book nor refusal register at the premises, the rear camera was broken and waiting to be fixed. An agreed follow up visit was completed by Local Police on 30 January 2026 and the premises had implemented updates on some of the areas on non-compliance – clear signage was in place and a refusal logbook was implemented, however, Challenge 25 posters were printed, but not displayed. The rear CCTV camera had yet to be repaired or installed.

On a further visit on 5 February 2026, Police established that the Challenge 25 posters were displayed, however, an incident book was not in place. In addition, the status of CCTV system at the premises caused the most concern. It was disclosed to the Officer that the footage only lasted for 15 days before being deleted which is currently half the required 30 day timescale. It was also identified that the rear CCTV camera was still not operational.

The applicant had been afforded time and benefit of the doubt to rectify the issues raised and has for some, but not all the conditions – therefore, the Police concluded that despite intervention, the premises was not complying with some of its licence conditions – failure to comply with existing CCTV conditions directly undermines the Prevention of Crime and Disorder. The Police felt that the extended hours if agreed with the applicant should not take effect until the applicant demonstrated full compliance with the premises licence conditions, including the existing CCTV condition or an amendment to a minimum retention period of 28 days.

Sergeant Nicholas Golden from Leicestershire Police, was given the opportunity to outline the details of their representation and answered questions from Members and officers.

Via the interpretation of Ms Toor, Mr Saini was given the opportunity to address the Sub-Committee and answered questions from the Members and officers.

All parties were given the opportunity to sum up their positions and make any final comments.

The Sub-Committee received legal advice from the Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee in the presence of all those present and were advised of the options available to them in making their decision.

The Sub-Committee were also advised of the relevant policy and statutory guidance that needed to be taken into account when making their decision,

In reaching their decision, the Sub-Committee felt they should deliberate in private on the basis that this was in the public interest and as such outweighed the public interest of their deliberation taking place with the parties represented present, in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005.

The Chair announced that the decision and reasons would be confirmed in writing within five working days. The Chair informed the meeting that the Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee would be called back to give advice on the wording of the decision.

The Chair then asked all but Members of the Sub-Committee and Governance Services Officers to withdraw from the meeting. Members then deliberated in private to consider their decision.

The Sub-Committee recalled the Legal Adviser to the Sub-Committee to give advice on the wording of the decision. The observer from Legal Services also returned at that time.

RESOLVED:

The Sub-Committee's decision is that it is appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives to **VARY** the Premises Licence to authorise the supply of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises Monday to Sunday from 7am to 11pm.

REASONS

In considering the application by Jaswinder Pal Saini for variation of the Premises Licence he holds for Jas News & Booze, 72 Burnham Drive, Leicester, the Sub-Committee has considered the Licensing Officer's Report and all the relevant representations, both written and oral. The Sub-Committee has taken account of all relevant legislation, the Statutory Guidance, the Regulators' Code, and the Council's Licensing Policy. The Sub-Committee has had regard in its deliberations to the steps appropriate to promote the licensing objectives in the overall interest of the local community and has decided the matter on its merits on the evidence presented to it. The Sub-Committee has had regard to the public sector equality duty detailed in section 149 the Equality Act 2010 and has taken a risk-based approach to its decision which has been made on the balance of probability. The Sub-Committee has, as it is required to do, limited its deliberation to the promotion of the licensing objectives (with each licensing objective being of equal importance) and nothing outside of those parameters.

The existing Premises Licence authorised the supply of alcohol for consumption OFF the premises Monday to Sunday from 9am to 10pm. The Licence is subject to conditions which require a Challenge 25 scheme, signage asking patrons to show courtesy to neighbouring residents, a public safety risk assessment, the installation of CCTV with recorded images being retained for a minimum of 30 days, and the keeping of an incident book and a refusal

register.

Mr Saini sought variation to extend the daily hours for the supply of alcohol to run from 6am to 11pm. He proposed conditions in the Operating Schedule which do not add to the existing conditions on the Licence.

Mr Saini, with the assistance of an interpreter, explained to the Sub-Committee that he wanted his business to grow. Some of his customers, including some shift workers from local factories, had asked for an increase in the hours. In the event the hours were increased he might be able to employ additional staff. He had co-operated with the Police. The CCTV system currently in operation is the system left in place by the previous owner which is why it only provides for retention of recordings for 15 days. An electrician would be attending the premises that day to install a new system with the ability to retain recordings for 28 days. To comply with the Licence conditions, he would ask the settings to retain recordings for 30 days and if this was not possible he would arrange for another compliant system to be installed.

The Sub-Committee heard from the Police that they visited the premises on 15 January 2026, the day after the application was made. They spoke with Mr Saini and discovered he had not been complying with the existing conditions on the Licence. Required signage asking customers to show courtesy for the neighbouring residents was not in place. No Challenge 25 scheme was in operation and there was no incident book or refusal register. The CCTV at the premises has six cameras. Four are internal and two are external covering the front and rear of the property. The rear camera was not working at the time of the visit. Mr Saini indicated this would be repaired within a few days. He also confirmed that CCTV footage was retained for 28 days (the Licence condition requires images to be retained for a period of 30 days). The Police gave advice and agreed a follow-up visit.

The Police returned to the premises on 30 January 2026. They found improvement but there was continued breach of some conditions. Challenge 25 posters had been printed but were not displayed, The CCTV camera at the rear of the premises remained inoperative.

The Police returned to the premises on 05 February 2026. There was no incident book. However, the status of the CCTV system caused them the most concern. The CCTV at the rear of the premises remained inoperative. In addition, Mr Saini indicated that CCTV footage was only retained for 15 days as opposed to the 30-day period required by the Licence conditions. The Police returned to the premises on 16 February 2026. The CCTV at the rear of the premises was now working. Mr Saini confirmed again that CCTV footage was only retained for 15 days as opposed to the required minimum 30-day period.

The Police informed the Sub-Committee that Mr Saini had been given time to rectify the issues found at the premises. However, his failure to comply with the existing conditions on the Licence was a concern and he now needed to demonstrate full compliance with the Licence conditions. There was an existing

ongoing breach of the Licence condition requiring CCTV footage to be retained for a minimum of 30 days. On 30 January, prior to being informed that that CCTV footage was only retained for 15 days in breach of the Licence conditions, the Police had spoken to Mr Saini. At that time, they suggested to Mr Saini that licensed hours from 8am to 11pm, in line with other premises in the area might be appropriate. In response Mr Saini had told the Police he would agree licensed hours from 7am to 11pm. The Police informed the Sub-Committee they were now agreeable to those hours if the Sub-Committee was to grant the variation.

The Sub-Committee heard that Mr Saini had taken over the premises in November 2025. The Sub-Committee was concerned that he had breached the Licence conditions at various times as regards the respective absence of signage, a Challenge 25 scheme, an incident book and a refusal register. He had rectified these breaches but he must understand that further breach of the Licence conditions may lead to a review and potential loss of the Licence.

The Sub-Committee noted no incidents of crime and disorder or anti-social behaviour were linked to the premises. No representations had been received from any Responsible Authorities other than the Police and there were no representations from residents or other local businesses.

The Police indicated that in the event the variation was granted, they anticipated making a prompt visit to the premises to ensure compliance with the Licence conditions and in particular the requirement for CCTV footage to be retained for a minimum of 30 days.

The Sub-Committee has made no change to the Licence conditions. The Sub-Committee expects Mr Saini to be fully compliant with the Licence conditions going forward. If Mr Saini does not comply with the conditions, the Sub-Committee expects consideration to be given to a review of the Licence. Mr Saini must understand that this could lead to the revocation of the Licence.

5. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

With there being no further business, the meeting closed at 11:18am.