



## Licensing Sub-Committee

30th November 2017

### Notice of decision

<b>Application reference:</b>	17/00381/CPCREV – Club940
<b>Application type:</b>	Club Premises Cert (review application)
<b>Applicant(s) name:</b>	Brixton Domino Community Centre
<b>Premises:</b>	Brixton Domino Community Centre, 299 Coldharbour Lane, London, SW9 8RP
<b>Summary of decision:</b>	Conditions Imposed
<b>Decision details:</b>	<p><b>REASONS AND DECISION-BRIXTON DOMINO COMMUNITY CENTRE</b></p> <p>1. The LSC heard an application by the Metropolitan Police Service for a review of the club premises certificate (CPC) held in respect of the Brixton Domino Community Centre, 279-299 Coldharbour Lane, London, SW9 (“the Club”). The CPC presently allows for qualifying club activities to be carried on at various times on Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays to Sundays. The review raised concerns relating to the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety. The review was supported by three responsible authorities: Community Safety, Lambeth Licensing, and Public Health.</p> <p>2. The Licensing Officer, in her report, informed the LSC that clubs were not referred to in the Council’s Statement of Licensing Policy in the context of appropriate hours but that they would take it to be 23:00 hours in a residential area. It is worth noting at the outset that Appendix 1 does in fact clearly refer to qualifying clubs and suggests a terminal hour of 23:00 hours daily in a residential area. No party to the proceedings sought to suggest that the Club was not located in a residential area and the LSC therefore accepts that the area is residential.</p> <p>3. The LSC heard from Sarah Le Fevre on behalf of the Police. She stressed that the Police did not wish to see the venue shut down. However, it needed to operate in a way that ensured the safety of patrons and the public. The review summarised the action taken since July 2016. Ms. Le Fevre noted that the frequency and severity of the incidents referred to were such that the Police would have sought a review regardless of the type of premises involved.</p> <p>4. Ms. Le Fevre properly drew the LSC’s attention to the fact that staff had, on occasions, called the police when items were found at the Club e.g. when a knife and replica firearm had been found in the Club (9th December 2016 and 28th April 2017 respectively). However, it raised the question of how these items found their way inside and what could be done in the future to prevent similar occurrences.</p> <p>5. Violence had been used or threatened inside the Club or immediately outside it on several occasions, examples being on 12th to 13th May 2017 and 29th July 2017. The evidence obtained also showed that the Club had operated outside of its permitted hours e.g. the stills from the CCTV system on 29th July 2017 (at Annex J to the report pack) showing people still going to and from the bar when the Club ought to have been closed.</p> <p>6. There were instances of nuisance arising from the operation of the Club, such as on 18th September when a caller complained of noise disturbance and referred to that as being a regular occurrence.</p>

7. Some of the incidents indicated difficulties that the Police had encountered in investigating the alleged offences, such as on 27th August 2016 (a stabbing) or 29th July 2017 (an armed robbery inside the Club). The CCTV system's retention period certainly appeared to be a matter that affected the Police's ability to investigate offences.

8. Ms. Le Fevre drew the LSC's attention to the fact that the most serious incidents seemed to occur in the later hours, which was why Annex B to the report pack set out proposed conditions to help mitigate such concerns. Ms. Le Fevre urged the LSC to consider what hours might be appropriate for this venue and what conditions might be appropriate in order to ensure that those attending the Club were members and their bona fide guests.

9. The Police officer was asked to clarify what was meant by the 'nightclub' style of operation and whether there was a distinction between that and a private party. Sgt. Smith and Ms. Le Fevre explained that what the CCTV stills at Pages 208 to 216 and the footage itself showed was a steady flow of people to and from the bar, with the vast majority of people dancing. It suggested that people could simply enter off the street and purchase alcohol. There was some evidence of dominies being played but that was very much the minority activity. Nobody from the Club's management had suggested that there was a private party on this or any other occasion.

10. Members queried whether there was any indication of how entry and egress was being managed, such as by requiring people to sign in. Ms. Le Fevre explained that there was no evidence.

11. The Police were asked to express their views on the conditions proposed at Pages 68-71 and the commitments given by the Club in relation to those. Ms. Le Fevre told the LSC that there was a clear willingness by the management to engage but that there was little actual action e.g. the Club had expressed willingness to upgrade the CCTV but subject to the Police paying for it. Similarly, in relation to Club Scan the Club's position was that it could not afford to pay for it. The Police took the view that the CCTV system was currently inadequate in that the retention period was too short or it did not cover all the areas it needed to and this hindered their ability to investigate offences. Sgt. Smith also pointed out that this hindered the Club as well, since it would not be able to rely upon it to disprove any assertions being made.

12. The Police explained that there had been a number of meetings with the Club's management although the Police had only met with the Club twice in the last year. Various things had been discussed at those meetings, including incidents that had occurred in the preceding twelve months, as set out in the report pack at Pages 53 to 71 and 244 to 256. Following one such meeting in early September 2017 a series of conditions had been proposed to the Club. The Police expectation was that the Club would consider the matters raised and look into what they could do to mitigate the risks to public safety. This included the possibility of applying for a premises licence if the Club wished to operate as a licensed premises. The Club had responded to the suggested conditions, which had been supplied to assist the Club with an indication of the sort of conditions that might be expected to be added to the Certificate or any premises licence that might be issued in the future.

13. It was accepted by the Police on further questions from Members that the Club had or did implement a considerable number of the suggested conditions and that the main concerns centred on the use of Club Scan, an upgrade to the CCTV system, and consideration of whether the hours remained appropriate. As far as the Police were concerned, the appropriate terminal hour would be 23:00 every day with the Club closing at midnight. The Police were not able to suggest how long a period of suspension might be required to implement the suggested changes that they sought and submitted that this was whatever period the LSC considered to be appropriate.

14. The LSC then heard from Jamie Akinola on behalf of Community Safety and Ola Owojori on behalf of the Licensing Authority. Like the Police, Mr. Akinola's focus was on finding a solution that allowed the Club to continue to operate and that ensured that its patrons and passers-by would be safe.

15. Mr. Akinola explained that a key concern for him was the hours. When he had met with the Club's board and others on 26th May 2017 he had been told that visiting teams tended to arrive by 20:00 hours or 21:00 hours. If that was so, he saw no reason why the Club could not restrict entry from midnight, which would ensure that non-members could not gain entry.

16. The other main concern for him was ensuring that there were clear processes in place that would allow the authorities to differentiate between the members and guests and the general public. The conditions proposed by the Police would, in his opinion, change the activity taking place at the Club, perhaps make it less akin to a nightclub, and would reduce the risks to the public.

17. Mr. Owojori echoed these views and informed the LSC that the incidents complained of should not be taking place anywhere and that the review should be seen as a last resort to achieve compliance and not because the authorities wanted the certificate to be withdrawn.

18. There was some discussion between Members and Mr. Akinola regarding the arrangements for controlling the entry of members and guests. Mr. Akinola said that there might have been too much focus on the use of Club Scan and CCTV but that by 26th May 2017 it was made very clear that only members and guests should be entering the Club. He understood that the Club had trialed a policy of no entry or re-entry after midnight for two or three weeks but had decided it was not financially viable to continue this.

19. Mr. Akinola accepted that the incidents relating to crime and disorder referred to in the Police reports had not been caused by members of the Club and that in several instances staff at the Club had reported the incidents. Notwithstanding that, however, measures needed to be put into place to prevent such incidents from occurring.

20. The LSC then heard from Dr. Mohammed Hashi, Chair of the Club. He expressed concern that the LSC had been misled by the various reports exhibited by the Police in support of the review. He drew the LSC's attention to the fact that Sgt. Smith's application referred to the Club operating well as a dominoes club but struggling later in the evenings (Page 41) but that this appeared to contradict what he had said in an email on 1st June 2017 (Page 254), in which a list of incidents was provided without any judgment on whether they are the fault of the Club.

21. The incident of 29th July 2016 was disputed. Dr. Hashi said the Club was closed at this time and that the application and the CRIS report were at odds with each other. In relation to the stabbing on 27th August 2016 it was not possible to ascertain where that had occurred. Dr. Hashi told Members that all the incidents in the report pack, except for one, were disputed. In some cases he asserted that an incident had not occurred. In others, he disputed the factual elements or sought to challenge the quality of the information." The accepted incident was the stabbing and Dr. Hashi stressed his opinion that it was taken out of context.

22. Dr. Hashi expressed concerns about what he considered to be a lack of communication with the Police. He had met Sgt. Smith only once and the review application had been put in just three weeks after the Club had met with Cllr. Seedat. He submitted that the application was extremely premature and that they had been making headway in dealing with these issues.

23. In relation to some of the items found, such as the knife and the replica firearm, Dr. Hashi explained that the Club operated a youth club on Wednesdays. He considered it more likely that items were placed there by members of the youth club than that they were placed there by members of the dominoes club.

24. Dr. Hashi accepted that two patrons had been found in possession of cannabis on 2nd September but asserted that blame could not be attached to the Club given that one person had had it secreted in his underwear.

25. Dr. Hashi told the LSC that since the end of May 2017 they had implemented all but five of the conditions that had been proposed by Mr. Akinola (the LSC notes that these were in fact proposed by PC Lance Edmondson) and that they continued to make progress.

26. Members discussed the issue of restricting entry after certain times. Dr. Hashi asserted that due to the layout of the Club a condition prohibiting entry or re-entry after certain times created a health and safety risk. He told Members that the majority of the Club's income was generated between midnight and 02:00 hours and if that changed the financial viability of the Club would be threatened.

27. Members also discussed security and the signing-in arrangements. The LSC was told that there were two SIA staff inside the front door. If three were on duty there would be one roaming; if five on duty then two would be roaming, one would be outside and the other two would be inside the front door. He confirmed that there was a signing-in book. He told the LSC that it was not "completely practicable" and that they were in the process of perfecting it. The LSC understood Dr. Hashi to mean that it was not being used regularly and that the Club was looking to address this. Members were allowed to sign in two guests and Dr. Hashi explained that they were looking at new ideas to address this. When asked what was in place to prevent a member of the public simply walking in off the street Dr. Hashi said that there was the signing-in book and long-standing members at the front door. It was one of those issues that they were trying to tackle but they did not really know how. Dr. Hashi did accept that if required to have all persons signed in by midnight and no new entries after that time it could be achieved.

28. Dr. Hashi's attention was drawn to the CCTV stills at Pages 208-216, which appeared to show that the Club was still operating after its permitted hours. He told the LSC that he had viewed the CCTV, that no alcohol had been sold and there had been no music being played. He maintained that the Club had been closed. He also criticised the Police for not bringing that to the Club's attention, a point he had also made in relation to some of the other incidents.

29. There was some discussion as to how long it would take to put measures in place such as upgrading the CCTV and operating some kind of membership scanning system. Dr. Hashi's answer suggested that this had not been considered in particular detail and he suggested that it would take eight to twelve weeks to come back with an answer to this.

30. One final point arose, which related to the CCTV and the time stamps. Dr. Hashi drew the LSC's attention to the fact that in March 2017 (Page 144) the CCTV was thirty minutes or so fast. In June 2017 it was about thirty minutes slow (Page 175). Dr. Hashi maintained that the time stamp was fast and not slow.

31. This application engages the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder and public safety. Although public nuisance was alleged in one of the calls to the Police there was no other evidence to suggest that public nuisance was a matter of real concern.

32. As far as the overall credibility of the evidence was concerned the LSC was satisfied that the Police evidence on the whole stood up to scrutiny. While there might well be inconsistencies within some of the reports but such inconsistencies as there might have been were not sufficient to justify the LSC discounting them in their entirety. The LSC understood that the reports detailed the progress of an investigation and so accepts that things within the reports may change as the investigation progresses. It is outside the scope of the LSC's remit to judge the guilt or innocence of any individual but rather it has to consider the credibility and appropriate weight to give to the evidence before it within the context of the promotion of the licensing regime, here crime and disorder and public safety. Doing so does not mean that the LSC blames or holds responsible the Club for any incidents themselves but rather that sufficient measures are not in place to ensure that either they do not occur at all or the impact of such incidents is minimised in the event that they do occur.

33. The LSC understood the concerns of the responsible authorities in terms of the manner of operation of the Club and specifically in relation to the monitoring and management of entry by members and guests. [It accepted that the Club gave the impression of operating, at least part of the time, as a nightclub.] The Club's failure to keep track of who was in the Club at any given time did not give the LSC confidence that only members and their guests, as permitted by the CPC, were entering and using the club to drink and socialise. It might be the case that the general public were not permitted entry; it [might be the case that they were. What is clear is that the Club did not put before the LSC any evidence to refute the responsible authorities' evidence.

34. The LSC heard and accepts that the Club carries on a number of charitable activities and accepts that the board are willing to engage with the responsible authorities. Nonetheless, the LSC was concerned by the apparent lack of control in certain respects as set out above. Incidents such as finding a knife and replica firearm on the premises, irrespective of how they got there, suggest that there is an increased likelihood of scenarios taking place that could put the safety of individuals who attend the Club at risk. The LSC notes that in response to these incidents the Club took action and closed off the upstairs area on Wednesday evenings as there was a possibility that the instruments were left there by individuals who attended a youth group held on that day. The point is the Club did not know if it was individuals from the youth group or not and, without casting blame on the Club itself, the LSC is faced with a serious issue of instruments that could be used as weapons being discovered at a premises where licensable activity takes place at various times during any given day. In addition, there was evidence that a patron had attended the Club with several packages of cannabis in his underwear. It is entirely logical to infer that he was in possession with intent to supply and to do so within the Club.

35. The LSC accepted the evidence that the Club was sometimes open beyond the hours permitted in the CPC. The LSC took note of the fact that during a meeting between the responsible authorities and representatives of the Club's management agreement had been reached that about restricting entry and re-entry after midnight. This measure was put into place for three weeks and then abandoned with no alternative put into place. Dr. Hashi suggested that the layout of the Club meant that this posed a health and safety risk but also commented that it would affect the financial viability of the Club. It was not clear to the LSC how such a restriction posed a health and safety risk and the LSC is aware of a number of other premises subject to such a condition that have no problem complying with it. It was also not clear how it could impact on the financial viability of the Club; it was not suggested that its members and guests tended to arrive between midnight and 02:00 hours. It was suggested by Dr. Hashi that it would affect the Club's ability to host visiting teams because visiting teams had experienced difficulty adjusting to it, which affected the Club's reputation. However, the LSC did not consider that this was a sufficient reason to not impose the condition and that visiting teams would need to accept that this was a condition of the Certificate.

36. The LSC was concerned about the responsible authorities' evidence in relation to the CCTV system. There was no disagreement from any of the parties that the system was unable to retain data for a reasonable period of time, which the Police explained could impact upon their investigations. The LSC is aware that the standard position is a system that permits data to be preserved for up to 31 days. As such, the current system is clearly not fit for purpose. On that issue the LSC considered the issue of whether or not the CCTV's clock was [fast or slow. It noted that 17th March 2017 was prior to the clocks going forward. The CRIS report noted that it was some thirty minutes fast. If the CCTV was thirty minutes fast prior to the clocks going forward it would be thirty minutes slow after that point. This assumes that the system does not update automatically for daylight saving and was not updated manually. Dr. Hashi asserted that it always ran fast. However, the CRIS report for 29th June indicates otherwise and, if the CCTV had been updated, one would have expected this report to also refer to the clock running fast rather than slow. The fact is that the situation is not satisfactory and can clearly give rise to the inability to assess whether certain incidents of crime and disorder have occurred or not. Promotion of the licensing objectives requires a CCTV system that is fit for purpose to be in place.

37. The LSC also notes that based on the assessment at paragraph 36 it is likely that the stills at pages 208 through to 216 were in fact likely to be showing a timestamp that was thirty minutes slow. This would mean that the Club in actual fact was open half an hour later than the time stamps reflected which was some hour and fifteen minutes beyond the time permitted in the CPC.

38. Based on the evidence before the LSC, it is clear that there had been a long period of engagement with the Club and the responsible authorities over a period of at least one year. During this time some progress had been made but not enough to assuage the concerns the responsible authorities had raised with the Club during this time. The LSC considered it appropriate for the authorities to take some action as, based on the incidents that had occurred during the last twelve months. There was a real risk that something more serious could occur putting individuals who attend the Club and those who work there at risk. In the event that no action, was taken it is likely the authorities would be criticised for not acting swiftly enough. It had also been suggested that some of the incidents had not been drawn to the attention of the Club. However, the LSC considers that the management of a well-run premises should be aware of what is taking place within it and need not wait for incidents to be drawn to their attention.

39. The LSC has carefully considered the available options. Taking no action is not an option. The issues arising on this review are serious, involving a real risk to members and guests and to other individuals in the vicinity. The safety of those persons is of paramount importance.

40. It was not suggested by any party that this was a case where the LSC should consider withdrawing the Certificate. Whilst it would be open to the LSC to do so the LSC does not consider that this would be appropriate or proportionate in the circumstances.

41. The Statutory Guidance, at paragraph 11.20, reminds the LSC that:  
"In deciding which of these powers to invoke, it is expected that licensing authorities should so far as possible seek to establish the cause or causes of the concerns that the representations identify. The remedial action taken should generally be directed at these causes and should always be no more than an appropriate and proportionate response to address the causes of concern that instigated the review."

42. Suspension of the licence would clearly be open to the LSC and this can be particularly effective when combined with other measures, such as the imposition of conditions, particularly when those conditions might require substantial training or changes in management. However, having carefully considered all the options open to it the LSC is satisfied that the licensing objectives can be adequately promoted by the imposition of conditions and by some modifications to the opening hours. In making this decision the LSC has considered the financial impact of this decision on the Club, as it is required to do by paragraph 11.23 of the Statutory Guidance and the dicta of Toulson J in the Court of Appeal in the Hope and Glory case. However, whilst financial hardship is a factor to be weighed in the balance, the LSC must ultimately make a decision that will be appropriate and proportionate and ensure the promotion of the licensing objectives.

43. The LSC considers that amending the opening hours at the weekends will strike the appropriate balance between the Club's financial viability and the promotion of the licensing objectives. The Club is to be closed at 02:30 hours on Friday and Saturday and 02:00 hours on Sunday. For the avoidance of doubt, the permitted hours for qualifying club activity remain unchanged.

44. The LSC is also satisfied that imposing conditions on the Certificate will suffice to promote the licensing objectives. Some of the conditions suggested by the police related to issues that were not engaged by the review e.g. under-age sales. Where that was the case, the LSC did not consider that its discretion was engaged. The LSC is satisfied that all the conditions below can be achieved with a minimum of difficulty or financial outlay on the part of the Club.

45. In relation to the CCTV and membership scanning requirements the LSC has taken an exceptional step and required those systems to be in place by 31st March 2018 rather than immediately. The Club has been on notice for some time that these would be needed to help address the concerns raised. This requirement recognises that there is a CCTV system in place, albeit one in need of modernisation and that the Club may need some time to finance that. Similarly, with the membership scanning system, it allows the Club time to finance it. Some of the concerns, particularly those relating to not knowing who is on the premises at any given time, can be addressed in the short-term by the imposition of a condition requiring proper signing-in records to be kept and for membership cards to be shown on entry. The LSC considered that these were basic record-keeping functions that would be expected of any club, whether or not it was authorised under the Licensing Act 2003. In reaching this part of the decision the LSC also reminded itself that the Club would be free to seek to vary this condition in the future if, for example, more time was needed to arrange the financing or if circumstances changed so that the condition was no longer appropriate. When the Club has installed an electronic membership and scanning system then it may be that conditions 23 and 24 below can be removed or amended by way of an application to vary the Certificate.

46. The following conditions are to be imposed on the Certificate:

#### CONDITIONS

1. Patrons shall be requested not to loiter outside the premises and to leave the premises quietly. Notices to this effect must be prominently displayed at the entrances and exits of the premises.
2. There shall be no entry or re-entry to the premises after midnight save for smokers who shall be permitted to smoke in a clearly defined smoking area with no more than 10 persons allowed at any time.
3. By not later than 31st March 2018 digital CCTV and appropriate recording equipment is to be installed in accordance with Home Office Guidelines relating to UK Police Requirements for Digital CCTV System, operated and maintained throughout the premises internally and externally to cover all public areas, including the entrance to the premises and shall as a minimum cover the counter and the entrances and exits. The system shall be on and recording at all times that qualifying club activity is taking place.
4. The CCTV cameras and recording equipment must be of sufficient quality to work in all lighting levels inside the premises at all times.
5. CCTV footage shall be retained for a minimum of 31 days.  
N.B. Conditions 4 and 5 are to take effect when the system is upgraded in accordance with condition 3 above.
6. The management will give full and immediate cooperation and technical assistance to the police in the event that CCTV footage is required for the prevention and detection of suspected or alleged crime.
7. The CCTV images will record and display dates and times and these times will be checked at least every six months to ensure their accuracy. These checks are to be kept in a log which is to be retained on the premises for not less than twelve months and produced to the police or authorised officers of the local authority upon request.
8. Subject to data protection guidance and legislation the management of the premises will ensure that key staff are fully trained in the operation of the CCTV system and will be able to download footage onto a disc, USB stick or other removable media for the police or responsible authorities without delay and without charge.

9. Any breakdown or system failure is to be reported within 24 hours and remedied as soon as practicable. The failures are to be recorded in a log. Receipts, invoices or any other documentation with regard to repair or replacement of the CCTV system, including the breakdown log, shall be kept on the premises for not less than twelve months and produced to the police or authorised officers of the local authority upon request.
10. All patrons will be searched prior to entry when door supervisors are on duty.
11. All SIA door supervisor sign-in sheets are to be kept on site for not less than twelve months and to be produced to the police or authorised officers of the local authority upon request.
12. Anti-drugs notices will be displayed at the entrances, smoking area and in the toilets. These shall be of A4 size and situated at eye level.
13. A lockable safe shall remain in a secure lockable room and drug seizures are to be deposited in the safe. A drug seizure log will be completed each time by the SIA door supervisor. Each time that a collection is made by the police the log shall be signed by a member of the Club's board or a door supervisor and by the police.
14. The premises shall contact the police when a drugs seizure has been made.
15. All door supervisors shall have a metal detecting hand wand to assist with searches.
16. Any events that are not in-house (outside promoters, etc.) or where the venue is hired out require the completion of a risk assessment (Form 696 or any other form produced for that purpose) shall be completed and sent to Central Police Licensing (SCD9) electronically and to Lambeth Police Licensing not less than 28 days before the date of the event.
17. On Thursday to Sundays whenever qualifying club activities are being carried on a minimum of two SISA door supervisors shall be employed from 23:00 hours until thirty minutes after closing. At least one SIA door supervisor must be stationed on the front door at all times.
18. A personal licence holder shall be on the premises at all times that qualifying club activities are being carried on.
19. The premises will attend any police licensing forums or meetings upon having been given sufficient notice.
20. The premises will join the Business Crime Reduction Partnership (BCRP) for the duration of the club premises certificate.
21. The opening hours stated in this certificate shall apply as a condition. The premises are to be closed to the public by the stated closing time and all patrons are to have left the premises by that time.
22. At all times that qualifying club activities are being carried on all members and guests are to be required to sign in and out upon entry and egress. The log must contain, at a minimum: the person's name; whether they are a member or guest; if a member their membership number or other internal club identifier; if a guest the member permitting them entry or, where appropriate, details of their associate member status including the recognised club to which they belong; the time of entry; the time of exit. These logs are to be kept on the premises for not less than twelve months and made available upon request to the police or authorised officers of the local authority. The signing-in book is to be kept at the entrance to the premises.

<p>23. The premises is to operate a membership card system and all members are to be issued with a membership card showing, as a minimum, their full name and membership number or internal club identifier. At all times that qualifying club activities are being carried on members are to produce their membership cards to a staff member or an SIA door supervisor, at the point of signing in.</p> <p>24. No member shall be permitted to sign in more than two guests at any one time.</p> <p>25. By 31st March 2018 the premises shall install and operate an electronic membership identification or scanning system. At all times that qualifying club activities are being carried on this system shall be in use. The system must be able to capture the minimum information specified in condition 23 above.</p>	
<b>Date of issue:</b>	7th December 2017

### Appeal information

If you wish to appeal a decision made by the Licensing Sub-Committee you must give written notice of appeal, within the period of 21 days beginning with the day on which you were notified by the licensing authority of the decision you wish to appeal, to:

The Appeals Officer  
 Camberwell Green Magistrates' Court  
 15 D'Eynsford Road  
 London  
 SE5 7UP

Please note that there is no power to extend the time limit for an appeal.

On appeal a magistrates' court may:

- Dismiss the appeal;
- Substitute for the decision appealed against any other decision which could have been made by the licensing authority;
- Remit the case to the licensing authority to dispose of in accordance with the direction of the court.

The court has wide discretion and may make such order to costs as it thinks fit.

The table below sets out each party's entitlement to appeal a decision:

<b>Appeal entitlement: Review of a club premises certificate</b>		
<b>Nature of decision</b>	<b>Applicant's appeal rights</b>	<b>Other parties appeal rights</b>
Any	The applicant may appeal against the decision.	The club that holds the certificate may appeal against the decision.  Any other person who made relevant representations in relation to the application may appeal against the decision.