

LICENSING HEARING PANEL (LICENSING 2003 ACT) SUB COMMITTEE

5 January 2026

10.10 - 11.46 am

Present: Councillors Clough and McPherson

Officers

Environmental Health & Licensing Support Team Leader, presenting as the
Licensing Officer: Wangari Njiiri

Legal Advisor: Alan Parr

Democratic Services Officer: Matthew Hussey

Present for the Applicant

Mr Necmuttin Altun: Applicant

Mr Hassan Kumas: Applicant

Mr Oisin Daly: Agent

Other Persons Present

PC Clare Metcalfe Via TEAMs

Police Sergeant Kevin Sutcliffe

FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE COUNCIL

26/1/Lic Sub Appointment of a Chair

Councillor McPherson was appointed as Chair for the meeting.

26/2/Lic Sub Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

26/3/Lic Sub Meeting Procedure

All parties noted the procedure.

**26/4/Lic Sub Consideration of an application for a Premises Licence
to be Granted - King Street Supermarket, 84 King Street, Cambridge, CB1
1LN**

Representation from the Applicants Representative

The Applicants Representative then gave their report highlighting the following areas:

- The application was to vary the supply of alcohol only (for consumption off the premises only) from Monday to Sunday between the hours of 11:00 and 20:00.
- The Applicant had considered the geographical / locational factors as the premises was in a Cumulative Impact Areas (CIA) since the previous hearing on 20 May 2025.application.
- Crime statistics was limited to anti-social behaviour with only five recorded incidents in King Street.
- The hours applied for were not excessive.
- Only beer was kept in the fridge with spirits and wines stored behind the counter to prevent shoplifting.
- CCTV was installed and included cameras on the counter top and within the shop along with two external cameras being installed since the previous application due to concerns of limited views of the shop.
- There would be no sales of single cans of beer.
- There would be a minimum spend of £5 as advised by the Police if the application were granted.
- The premises sold vapes and operated a 'Challenge 25' Rule.
- The applicant wanted to run a responsible business.

In response to questions the Applicant said the following:

- The Premises wanted to be able to sell alcohol as it was a convenience store and needed a full range of products to be available to customers.
- The applicant had no desire to sell to street drinkers and were aware of who the street drinkers were.
- The applicants wanted to run a viable business and understood why strict conditions were needed.

Representations from Police Sergeant Kevin Sutcliffe and PC Clare Metcalfe

- The Polce still had concerns even though the applicant had tried to address previous issues and offered additional conditions.
- Not all of the issues in the area were due to crime.
- The CIA was designed to reduce/displace issues.
- There were historical issues in the location
- Although there were issues across the city, King Street did cause numerous problems to residents, businesses and customers.

- The area including Christs Piece had suffered from robberies, street drinking and was a focal point for drug users, dealers and youths and was an unattractive area to walk through.

Summing up.

The Officer reminded Members they were to determine the application on its individual merits having reference to the statutory licensing objectives and Cambridge City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the Cumulative Impact Assessment.

Members should take such steps that they consider were necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives. The subcommittee may resolve:

- a. To grant the variation as applied for.
- b. To modify the conditions of the licence.
- c. To reject the whole or part of the application.

Members must give reasons for their decision.

In making the decision the committee considered the following:

- Statutory provisions (Licensing Act 2003)
- Statutory Guidance
- Cambridge City Council's Statement of Licensing Policy
- Reports
- Advice from Legal Officer
- Representations from those listed above.

The Decision

The Committee made the following findings of fact:

- The premises opened 16 April 2025 and is in a Cumulative Impact Zone (CIZ). The police continue their previous opposition to the Application.
- There were seven licensed premises concentrated in a tight area in the King Street area and 18 distributed across a slightly wider area. These had 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.

- It was relevant to Members that the premises backs onto Christ's Pieces, one of the City's premier green flag spaces. It included a small playpark, used by mothers and their children, and tennis courts. The space had been subject to ASB and needed to be protected or maintained. Any change in conditions which may increase the likelihood of crime and disorder must be seriously scrutinized.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- Applicant had met all the safety and licensing requirements.
- The applicant had licensing experience within Cambridge, which has been managed well.
- The premises offered a cultural and community venue for local and other residents.
- The Applicant had a good knowledge and context of the CIA, including the effects of licensed premises within the CIA.

Resolved: (i) That taking all of the above matters together, the Sub-committee concluded that granting the premises licence would be likely to undermine the licensing objectives, in particular:

- The prevention of crime and disorder; and
- The protection of children from harm.

(ii) The Sub-committee found that Having listened to all the evidence and considered the statutory framework, policy guidance, representations and advice, the application for the grant of a premises licence be **REFUSED**.

Our reasons for reaching the decision are as follows:

1. 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.

The meeting ended at 11.46 am

CHAIR