

Brent Civic Centre Engineers Way Wembley Middlesex HA9 0FJ

TEL 020 8937 5303

EMAIL esther.chan@brent.gov.uk

WEB www.brent.gov.uk

Mr Phidias Charalambous CHARLIE'S WINE BAR 238-240 Neasden Lane London NW10 0AA

6th January 2016

Case Reference: 223520697

Licensing Representation to the Application to Review the Premises Licence for CHARLIE'S WINE BAR, 238-240 Neasden Lane, London, NW10 0AA

I certify that I have considered the application shown above and I wish to make representations that the likely effect of the review of the application is detrimental to the Licensing Objectives for the reasons indicated below.

Licensing Enforcement Officer: Esther Chan

An officer of the Licensing Authority, in whose area the premises are situated, who is authroised for the purposes of exercising its statutory function as a 'Responsible Authority' under the Licensing Act 2003.

The application has been made to review the premises licence under section 51 of the Act.

Chronology of Visits

On Saturday 12th December 2015 at approximately 00:17hrs, my colleague Licensing Officer Ms Lavine Miller Johnson and I conducted a visit to Charlie's Wine Bar 238-240 Neasden Lane, NW10 0AA to advertise the review application by displaying a notice in close proximity of the premises where it can be conveniently read by members of the public. Whilst Ms Miller Johnson was affixing the notice on the lamp post facing the premises, I noticed a white male sitting outside the premise having a cigarette. There was at least two door supervisors who were in high visibility vests and did not make any attempt to move the patron from the external seating area (Appendix 1).

This is a breach of the condition embedded on the premise licence under **Entertainment**:

The pavement seating outside the premises shall not be used by Patrons past 11 pm or other such earlier time required by Planning or Liquor licence consents.





Once Ms Miller Johnson had affixed the notice on the lamp post, I took a picture of the notice with my camera phone and we left the site.

At 00:18hrs, we drove past Charlie's in an unmarked vehicle, where I observed a white Eastern European male walking up to the lamp post to view the notice followed by a black male SIA (1) wearing a high visibility vest and a flat cap. Eventually, I observed the black male handle the notice, whilst the white male ripped it down from the lamp post and then handed it to the male SIA (1). The male SIA (1) did not make any gestures of annoyance to the white male and both headed back to the premise.

At 00:19hrs, Ms Lavine Johnson and I left our vehicle and returned to the premise. As we approached the premises I observed a black male dressed in casual clothing holding the notice standing outside the premise with the premise licence holder Mr Phidias Charalambous known as 'Charlie'. We introduced ourselves to Charlie and the male SIA (1) who was seen assisting with the removal of the notice. We explained what we had witnessed and informed Charlie that it is an offence to remove the notice, the male SIA (1) denied he had any involvement. The male SIA (1) became irate and aggressive towards us by waving a security wand in his hand at us as he spoke.

I then asked the male SIA (1) to provide his badge number and personal details, which he refused to provide. The male SIA (1) became so irate, another male SIA (2) pulled him away from us. The male SIA (1) walked away accompanied by male SIA (2) and another male into the premise and stated he did not have to provide his details to us as we are 'only Council workers'. Charlie did not make any attempt to control the situation at any point.

Ms Miller Johnson then spoke to Charlie to highlight her concerns. Whilst Ms Miller Johnson was having a conversation with Charlie, a white female patron of Charlie's Wine Bar approached me and asked if my husband was inside the premise, I did not respond. The white female then asked Ms Miller Johnson the same question to which Ms Miller Johnson did not respond either. The while female then headed back to Charlie's Wine Bar and shouted out 'FUCKING BITCHES'.

Ms Miller Johnson then took Charlie aside to continue her conversation with him. Male SIA (1) then approached me to give me his personal details who is known to be CHUKWUMA ONYIA, SIA badge number 0130 0196 8202 0675.

During the course of our conversation with the male SIA (1) and Charlie, we were surrounded by approximately 6 male patrons from Charlie's Wine Bar who kept intercepting our conversation. As the crowd became hostile towards us, we carried out a risk assessment and decided to leave the area. (Appendix 2).

Please refer to witness statement (Appendix 3) from Ms Lavine Miller Johnson.

On Monday 14th December 2015 I visited Brent CCTV Control Room to view the footage captured on our camera, which shows the whole incident taking place outside Charlie's Wine Bar on Saturday 12th December 2015 between 00:16hrs to 00:35hrs.

Please refer to CCTV footage (Appendix 4).





On Monday 21st December 2015 at approximately 13:50hrs, I conducted a further visit to Charlie's Wine Bar accompanied by PC Michael Sullivan. At the time of our visit, the premises was open to the public and there was one Eastern European male sitting inside the premise having a drink.

A female member of staff known to be Ms Mirela Selami was lone working behind the bar. Ms Selami stated she did not hold a personal licence and had been working at the premise for 4 years as a part time member of staff.

During my observation, it was noted that the premise licence was not displayed at the premise. When I asked Ms Selami to show me where the premise licence was displayed, she was not sure and was unable to provide a copy of the premise licence for me to view.

This is a breach of section 57 of Licensing Act 2003 - Duty to keep and produce licence.

Ms Selami was not able to show me staff training records to demonstrate that an age verification policy is adopted on the premises. She was unaware of the conditions embedded on the premise licence.

To summarize, the Licensing Authority makes representation against this application as we are not confident that Mr Charalambous has a full understanding of the requirements and responsibilities placed upon a premise licence holder. The licence holder is unable to promote the licensing objectives as required by the Act.

The Licensing Authority agree with all the conditions imposed by the Licensing Police in this Review Application.

Yours faithfully,

Ehen

Esther Chan Licensing Officer Regulatory Services



