



## **RECORD OF DECISION: APPLICATION UNDER LICENSING ACT 2003**

Premises Licensing Sub-Committee  
Date: 5<sup>th</sup> January 2026

Members:

1. Cllr Clough
2. Cllr McPherson (Chair)
3. Cllr Swift

To consider the application of **SS Foods Centre Limited** in regards to the premises **King Street Supermarket , 84 King Street, Cambridge, CB1 1LN** licence to **provide the following licensable activities:**

- Supply of alcohol (off the premises)  
Monday – Sunday 11:00 to 20:00

We heard representations from the following persons:

Mr Necmuttin Altun  
Mr Hassan Kumas  
Mr Oisin Daly Agent  
Police Sergeant Sutcliffe  
PC Clare Metcalfe

The reason you appeared before the Sub-Committee:

Cambridge City Council received an application under section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003 to apply for a Premises Licence for the sale by retail of alcohol with respect to King Street Supermarket, 84 King Street, CB1 1LN has been received. The application was served on Cambridge City Council on 6 November 2025. The proposed licence holder previously submitted a premises application in April 2025, for the sale of alcohol 07:00 to 00:00. Following the receipt of representations, on 20 May 2025, the application was considered by Members during Licensing Sub-Committee and subsequently

refused. Record of Decision is contained within the officer's report as Appendix 6. Geographical and locational factors remain the same, and the proposed premises is within a Cumulative Impact Area (CIA) and is therefore subject to the Cumulative Impact Assessment. Appendix 5 details a map and supply of alcohol information of premises licences in surrounding area, within the Market ward, excluding restaurants. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate why the granting of the licence would not add to the cumulative impact already being experienced within the area.

As part of the consultation the Responsible Authorities as determined by the Licensing Act 2003 were consulted on the application. Cambridgeshire Constabulary opposed the application and stated that it was necessary to refuse the application in order to promote the licensing objectives. During correspondence between the applicant and Cambridgeshire Constabulary, the applicant proposed a set of conditions, upon which Cambridgeshire Constabulary commented but re-iterated their opposition and a hearing was required.

In making our decision we considered the following:

*List:*

*Statutory provisions (Licensing Act 2003)*

*Statutory Guidance*

*Cambridge City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy*

*Reports*

*Advice from Legal Officer*

*Representations from*

Mr Oisin Daly Agent

PC Clare Metcalfe

*Evidence from*

Mr Necmuttin Altun

Mr Hassan Kumas

Police Sergeant Sutcliffe

While the geographical / locational factors remain the same or similar to those described in the Decision arising from hearing on 20 May 2025, Members considered and reviewed all new and relevant information and views presented before them on 5 January 2025 and found the following facts:

1. The premises opened 16 April 2025 and is in a Cumulative Impact Zone (CIZ). The police continue their previous opposition to the Application.
2. There are seven licensed premises concentrated in a tight area in the King Street area (appendix 5) and 18 distributed across a slightly wider area. These have the potential to impact on the promotion of the licensing objectives including the prevention of crime and disorder and prevention of public nuisance. The applicant gave evidence that, as it

was offering more robust conditions than had been imposed on other premises, that safeguarded against any negative impact upon the licensing objectives within the CIZ. Members noted this but differed in their conclusion, finding that any additional licensed premises within walking distance of the proposed premises would increase the concentration of off-licence options and have a negative impact.

3. It is relevant to Members that the premises backs onto Christ's Pieces, one of the City's premier green flag spaces. It includes a small playpark, used by mothers and their children, and tennis courts. The space has been subject to ASB and needs to be protected or maintained. Any change in conditions which may increase the likelihood of crime and disorder must be seriously scrutinized.
4. The police accepted in submissions that there had been some changes in King Street since the last hearing for example a set of preventative barriers highlighted at Section 5 of the report, which "designed out" access to certain alleyways where previously there had been a congregation of street drinkers. However, under questioning from Cllr Clough it was ascertained that the closed off alley was some distance away from the Premises' i.e. roughly at no. 4 on the map within the appendix. The premises were closer to the Christ Pieces location than the designed-out alleyway and so it remained accessible to street drinkers. Police Sergeant ('PS') Sutcliffe supported this in his oral evidence on the point, confirming that ASB and disorder had not been *designed away* by new barriers at Malcolm Street, and indeed the physical change had only led to a dispersal of those street drinkers closer towards the city centre and to the shop. Members accepted evidence that the premises is extremely proximate to access points into Christ's Pieces, an area known to experience street drinking, drug use and disorder.
5. Mr Daly, for the applicant, submitted that police national statistics showed that since the last application, only a further 5 stop and search incidents had occurred on Kings Street. PS Sutcliffe confirmed this but noted that in September 2025 one of those incidents was recorded in the higher, violent category. Mr Daly submitted that by comparison to the London Boroughs he had worked as an officer for the Metropolitan Police, Kings Street was not a bad area (although he recognised the CIZ was justified) and highlighted that other areas such as Market and Sydney Sussex street had statistically many more crimes incidents. However, PS Sutcliffe was clear that the history of disorder and crime in the location should not be minimised. He confirmed that in addition to robberies and crimes, there is an ongoing issue with youths, with phone thefts, disorder and aggression. Groups congregate at night and the location is not well lit. Street drinkers are present throughout the day.

6. Members accepted police submission that directly linked the concentrated availability of alcohol as a contributing factor. The following crime statistics and information were provided:
  - a. Previously an individual was stabbed close to the tennis court in Christ's Pieces and alcohol was a causative factor. This is very close to the premises.
  - b. Sydney Sussex College – which has residential student accommodation in the area had complained that street drinkers slept outside rear gate in Malcolm place and defecated there. Jesus college made similar complaints. The Business against crime partnership also reported to PS Sutcliffe that disorder continued in the location, in similar terms to those described at the last hearing. He also confirmed that support services and the police Street Outreach Team say that street drinkers pose a significant challenge and undermine the objective to prevent crime and disorder.
  - c. PC Metcalfe confirmed that the lack of relevant retail experience with street drinkers made it likely that they would struggle to control the problems described.
7. Members gave careful consideration to the Applicant's revised operating schedule and the extensive package of conditions proposed in support of the application. Members expressly acknowledged that many of these conditions represented positive, thoughtful and constructive steps, including the reduced hours, the restriction of alcohol strength to 5.5% ABV, the prohibition on single can sales, the control of alcohol displays, CCTV, Challenge 25, and incident/refusals logs, together with proposed membership of CAMBAC. Members accepted that, taken in isolation, these measures could reduce risk within the premises; however, they were not satisfied that the conditions were sufficient to rebut the presumption against grant within the Cumulative Impact Zone, because the principal concern in this location was the external, location-specific cumulative impact arising from the concentration of licensed premises and persistent street drinking and related ASB in the immediate vicinity.
8. Members carefully scrutinised the Police objections, as advised, and were satisfied that they were supported not only by crime statistics but also by oral and written testimony, corroborated by contemporaneous reports from colleges, local businesses and outreach services. Members accepted that not all relevant incidents manifest as recorded crimes, and that behaviours such as aggressive begging, obstruction of passageways, people sleeping in doorways and defecating in public spaces are highly relevant to the promotion of the licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of crime and disorder and public nuisance.
9. Members also took into account concerns regarding experience, staffing and training. While Members acknowledged that the Applicants

had operated the premises since April 2025 and had demonstrated some experience with age-restricted sales, they were not satisfied that the evidence demonstrated sufficient experience or training to manage the particular challenges posed by this location. Members noted that the proposed Designated Premises Supervisor had limited experience in the UK and in Cambridge specifically, that the DPS was not present at the hearing, and that the evidence as to who would deliver and oversee specialist training in dealing with street drinkers and aggressive behaviour was unclear. Members were concerned that this application sought to introduce alcohol sales into a highly challenging environment at a time when the Applicants were still developing the necessary experience and operational resilience.

10. Members further noted practical concerns raised during the hearing, including issues relating to visibility from outside the premises due to obscured windows, uncertainty as to the precise positioning of alcohol displays, and the enforceability of certain suggested mitigation measures, such as minimum spend proposals, which were not ultimately offered as conditions.
11. Members also considered whether the business required alcohol sales in order to remain viable and noted the evidence that the premises had continued to trade for several months without a premises licence. While Members accepted that economic considerations and business growth are relevant, they concluded that these factors did not outweigh the risks identified in this specific location within the Cumulative Impact Zone.
12. In reaching these conclusions, Members did not treat the refusal of the application in May 2025 as determinative. Rather, they treated it as relevant background only and assessed the current application afresh on its own merits, taking into account all new evidence, submissions and proposed conditions presented at the hearing on 5 January 2026.
13. Having listened to all the evidence and considered the statutory framework, policy guidance, representations and advice, the Sub-Committee determined to **REFUSE** the application for a premises licence. Members concluded that, although the Applicant had proposed a number of helpful and constructive conditions and had taken steps in the right direction since the previous refusal, those measures were insufficient to rebut the presumption against grant within the Cumulative Impact Zone, given the location-specific evidence of ongoing alcohol-related disorder and cumulative impact.

Yours Sincerely

*Signed*

Cllr McPherson (Chair)

Cllr Clough  
Cllr Swift

*Dated 9<sup>th</sup> January 2026*

The applicant or those who made a relevant representation has the right of appeal to a Magistrates Court within 21 days from the date of this decision notice by contacting:  
Cambridgeshire Magistrates Court, The Court House, Bridge Street, Peterborough, PE1 1ED.