

## **CITY OF NOTTINGHAM**

### **LICENSING COMMITTEE**

#### **MINUTES**

of meeting held on **16 FEBRUARY 2004** at the

Council House from 10.01am to 11.55am

Councillor Cresswell	(Chair)
Councillor Grocock	(Vice-Chair)
Councillor Clarke-Smith	
Councillor Ibrahim	
Councillor Packer	
Councillor Smith	
Councillor Wilson	

indicates present at meeting

#### **72 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clarke-Smith and Wilson.

#### **73 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the last meeting held on 5 February 2004, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **74 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** that, pursuant to Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following two items as they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of schedule 12(A) to the Act.

#### **75 APPEAL AGAINST DOOR SUPERVISOR REGISTRATION REFUSAL - Ms S**

Consideration was given to a report of the Corporate Director of City Development, copies of which had been circulated.

The appellant, Ms S, accepted the Committee's invitation to attend the meeting and was not accompanied. Ms J Swain, Licensing Officer, City Development Department, presented the report. The Chief Constable of Nottinghamshire Police was represented by Mr I Seeley, Force Solicitor.

Ms Swain verbally corrected an error in the report of the Corporate Director of City Development.

Ms Swain, Ms S, and Mr Seeley, having made their submissions and been available for questioning, withdrew from the meeting during the Committee's deliberations.

In reaching its decision, the Committee had regard to the following:-

- (a) the City Council's policies, practices and guidelines in relation to the registration of door supervisors;
- (b) details of the caution as outlined in the report and the appellant's failure to meet the 5 year conviction free guideline;
- (c) submissions by the Corporate Director of City Development, the appellant and Mr Seeley, on behalf of the Police, regarding the incident and Ms S's failure to meet the 5 year conviction free guideline.

**RESOLVED that the appeal by Ms S against the decision of the Corporate Director of City Development to refuse door supervisor registration be allowed.**

#### **76 APPEAL AGAINST DOOR SUPERVISOR REGISTRATION REFUSAL - Mr S**

Consideration was given to a report of the Corporate Director of City Development, copies of which had been circulated.

The appellant, Mr S, accepted the Committee's invitation to attend the meeting and was not accompanied. Ms J Swain, Licensing Officer, City Development Department, presented the report. The Chief Constable of Nottinghamshire Police was represented by Mr I Seeley, Force Solicitor.

Ms Swain advised the Committee that after the report had been prepared an additional letter had been received supporting the appellant's appeal. The content of the letter was read out to the Committee.

Ms Swain, Mr S, and Mr Seeley, having made their submissions and been available for questioning, withdrew from the meeting during the committee's deliberations.

In reaching its decision, the Committee had regard to the following:-

- (a) the City Council's policies, practices and guidelines in relation to the registration of door supervisors;
- (b) details of the conviction as outlined in the report and the appellant's failure to meet the 3 year conviction free guideline;
- (c) submissions by the Corporate Director of City Development, the appellant and Mr Seeley, on behalf of the Police, regarding the incident and Mr S's failure to meet the 3 year conviction free guideline.

**RESOLVED that the appeal by Mr S against the decision of the Corporate Director of City Development to refuse door supervisor registration be dismissed.**

**The public were readmitted to the meeting at this point.**

**77 GAMBLING BILL 2003**

Consideration was given to a report of the Corporate Director of City Development, copies of which had been circulated, advising the Committee of the Government's intention to reform current gambling legislation and setting out the joint response of officers from Licensing Section and Legal Section to LACORS' (Local Authorities Coordinators of Regulatory Services) consultation exercise in November 2003 on the proposed reforms.

It was explained that the transfer of responsibility for gambling matters previously regulated by licensing justices to a new Gambling Commission and local authorities had considerable resource implications for the Authority. However, the financial cost to the Authority could not be quantified until more detail, including the proposed fee structure, was made available from the Government. Similarly, both the staffing implications and the quantity of paper and other records needing transferring from the Magistrates Courts to the City Council had not yet been established.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that the report be noted;**
- (2) that it be recorded that this Committee was in agreement with the response provided by the Authority to the consultation exercise on the draft Gambling Bill 2003, and that the Authority's response also be sent to the Local Government Association.**