

**Meeting** Licensing Committee

**Portfolio Area** Communities, Community Safety and Equalities

**Date** 25<sup>th</sup> November 2025

**APPLICATION TO VARY THE SPECIFIED DESIGNATED PREMISES  
SUPERVISOR OF THE OVAL WINES, 9 THE OVAL, STEVENAGE, SG1 1HF**

**Authors** Mary O'Sullivan | Ext. 2724

**Lead Officers** Julie Dwan | Ext. 2493

**Contact Officer** Mary O'Sullivan | Ext. 2724

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To determine an application for the Variation of Specified Designated Premises Supervisor at The Oval Wines, 9 The Oval, Stevenage, SG1 1HF. Senior Licensing Officer Gillian Akroyd, on behalf of Hertfordshire Constabulary, has made representations.

**2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That the Committee reviews the evidence presented by the responsible authority and the applicant. The licensing authority must restrict its consideration to the issue of crime and disorder and if it considers it necessary, reject the application for this variation, or grant the variation.

**3 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION**

- 3.1 The current premises licence holder of The Oval Wines, 9 The Oval, Stevenage SG1 1HF, Mr Emrah Oruc, submitted through a licensing agent, an

application to vary the Designated Premises Supervisor from Polat Hasan to Emrah Oruc on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2025. **A copy of the application is attached at Appendix A.**

- 3.2 On 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2025 Senior Licensing Officer (SLO) Gillian Akroyd, submitted a representation to this application stating that Mr E Oruc being the new proposed DPS would undermine the crime prevention objective Section 37 (5) Licensing Act 2003. **A copy of the Police Objection notice is attached at Appendix B and continuation notes at Appendix B1**
- 3.3 This application to vary the DPS was accepted as valid and duly made by the Council on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2025.

#### **4 BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 4.1 The Oval Wines is located in the shopping precinct at The Oval, Stevenage. It has a premises licence in place which authorises the sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises, Monday to Sunday between the hours of 07:00hrs and 23:00hrs. **A copy of the Premises Licence is attached at Appendix D**
- 4.2 The Police applied to the Council for the review of the Premises Licence for The Oval Wines on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2024 for failing to promote all four of the licence objectives. The application for review was heard by the licensing committee on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2024.
- 4.3 The committee during the review of the Premises licence accepted that there was evidence of multiple incidents of breaches of licence including supply/sales of illegal/illicit products, evidence of drugs paraphernalia and residue of cocaine in various public and private areas of the premises.
- 4.4 The premises have failed to observe their licensing conditions attached to the Premises Licence for The Oval Wines, predominantly Annex 2 Condition 1 which refers to the requirement for a digital CCTV system recording images which will be retained in an unedited form for up to 30 days and which shall be made available to any responsible authority upon request, however on multiple occasions when Police have requested CCTV footage it has been unavailable. The Designated Premises Supervisor at the time, Polat Hasan has also failed to make himself available to Police.
- 4.5 Trading Standards officers have recently seized illegal items from these premises. On two occasions Trading Standards Officer recovered illegal products from The Oval Wines including tobacco pouches, a number of cartons of cigarettes and a number of Viagra jellies, which can only be obtained following a consultation with a pharmacist.
- 4.6 The proposed DPS and Premises Licence holder Mr Oruc identified himself on CCTV footage as being present and gesturing known gang members who had been seen armed with machetes and knives however, he had not previously identified himself as being a witness when Police had approached him at the premises requesting CCTV footage as per the conditions of the premises licence, nor did he call the Police at the time of the incident.

- 4.7 The decision of the committee at the review hearing on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2024 was to revoke the premises licence in its entirety. **Notes and matters of fact relating to the hearing can be found in the decision notice which is attached at Appendix C.** This decision is being appealed and due to be heard at Stevenage Magistrates Court on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2025.
- 4.8 The proposed Designated Premises Supervisor, Mr Oruc who is also the licence holder had applied to vary the DPS to himself with immediate effect on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2024. An objection was received by police on 23<sup>rd</sup> December as they believe the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard by the licensing committee on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2025 however the application was withdrawn by the applicant on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2025.
- 4.9 A second identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was received on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2025. Again, an objection was received by police on 21<sup>st</sup> January as they believe the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard by the licensing committee on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2025 however the application was withdrawn by the applicant on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2025.
- 4.10 This third identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was also received on 14<sup>th</sup> February 2025. Again, an objection was received by police on 14<sup>th</sup> February as they still believe that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard by the licensing committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2025 however the application was withdrawn by the applicant on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2025.
- 4.11 The fourth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was also received on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2025. Again, an objection was received by Police on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2025 as they still believe that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2025 however the application was withdrawn on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2025.
- 4.12 The fifth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was also received on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2025. Again, an objection was received by Police on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2025 as they still believe that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2025 however the application was withdrawn on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2025.
- 4.13 The sixth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was also received on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2025. Again, an objection was received by Police on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2025 as they still believe that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The

matter was due to be heard on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2025 however the application was withdrawn on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2025.

- 4.14 The seventh identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was also received on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2025. Again, an objection was received by Police on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2025 as they still believe that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2025 however the application was withdrawn on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2025.
- 4.15 The eighth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was received on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2025. An objection was received by Police on 16<sup>th</sup> July 2025 as they still believed that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. The matter was due to be heard on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2025 however the application was withdrawn on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2025.
- 4.16 An application for a Minor Variation to the Premises Licence for The Oval Wines was accepted which proposed to remove 4 conditions and add 16 additional conditions. On 15<sup>th</sup> August 2025 an Objection to this application was received from Hertfordshire Police on the basis that it would fail to prevent crime and disorder. Also on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2025, Hertfordshire County Councils Trading Standards submitted an objection to this application on the basis that it would fail to prevent crime and disorder and to fail to protect children from harm. The Licensing Authority was satisfied that granting this minor variation would, on balance, adversely affect the premises' ability to promote all four of the licensing objectives, therefore the application for a minor variation to the premises licence for these premises was refused on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2025.
- 4.17 The ninth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was received on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2025. An objection was received by Police on 27<sup>th</sup> August 2025 as they still believed that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective. This matter was due to be heard on 22<sup>nd</sup> September however the application was withdrawn on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2025.
- 4.18 The tenth identical application to vary the DPS to Mr Oruc was received on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2025. An objection was received by Police on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2025 as they still believed that the appointment of Mr Oruc as designated premises supervisor, would undermine the crime prevention objective, which is now brought before this committee for consideration.

## **5 RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES**

- 5.1 Representations to vary the Designated Premises Supervisor can only be made by the Police, who may object to the designation of the new DPS where in exceptional circumstances, they believe that the appointment would undermine the crime prevention objective.
- 5.2 An additional statement was provided by Police on 8<sup>th</sup> August 2025, following a complaint by a local resident in respect of the premises selling alcohol to a

drunk person contrary to Section 141 Licensing Act 2003. This and a second exhibiting statement is **attached at Appendix F**.

- 5.3 An additional E Mail was submitted on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025 from the SLO Akroyd regarding requests from Police requiring CCTV from Mr Oruc which had not be provided and is **attached at Appendix G1**.
- 5.4 PCSO Brickett provided a statement outlining a visit to obtain CCTV from Oval Wines on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025 which is **attached at Appendix G2**.
- 5.5 SLO Akroyd sent a warning letter dated 16.09.25 to Mr Oruc following the failure to provide CCTV to Police and is **attached at Appendix G3**.
- 5.6 PC Brown provided a statement outlining a visit to obtain CCTV from Oval Wines on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2025 which is **attached at Appendix G4**
- 5.7 PCSO Davison provided a statement summarising the viewing of CCTV provided to Police in October 2025 relating to the date and time of 11<sup>th</sup> July 2025 between 18:00-19:00hrs. Of the 36 files provided for that hour there were 44 minutes of footage missing. **Attached at Appendix G5**
- 5.7 PC Pickering provided a statement regarding an altercation at the premises between two drunk males on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025 which is **attached at Appendix H**

## **6 IMPLICATIONS**

### **6.1 Financial Implications**

There are no financial or resource implications arising from the content of this report.

### **6.2 Legal Implications**

- 6.2.1 The Committee is advised that paragraphs 4.69 - 4.71 of Section 182 Guidance for the Licensing Act 2003 describe the powers of a Licensing Authority on the determination of an application the decision of the committee is subject to appeal at Magistrates Court.
- 6.2.2 The committee under Section 39 (89) Licensing Act 2003, must if it considers necessary, reject the application.
- 6.2.3 The committee must under Section 39 (90) notify the applicant, police and new DPS and must give reasons for its decision.

### **6.3 Policy Implications**

There are no policy implications.

## **6.4 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

- 6.4.1 Any decision by the Committee is based on evidence before it at the meeting; there are no equalities and diversity implications.

## **7 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

**BD1** Licensing Act 2003 (Section 39 Determination of Section 37 Application)

**BD2** Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003

## **8 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

- 8.1 On 12<sup>th</sup> February 2025, the Police forwarded an email from PC Steven Hill, who had taken a statement from an ex-employee of Oval Wines in relation to Mr Emrah Oruc, owner and premises licence holder of Oval Wines and attached at **Appendix E**.

## **9 APPENDICES**

- A Application to vary Designated Premises Supervisor
- B Police Objection to Variation of Designated Premises Supervisor
- C Decision Notice – Revocation of Premises Licences for Oval Wines
- D Current Premises Licence and Plan
- E Supplementary Information – Witness statement from ex-employee.
- F Witness Statement from a Local resident referred to in the Police Objection to the application to Vary the DPS.
- G1 Supplementary Information – E mail from Police relating to requests for CCV
- G2 Statement re No CCTV – PCSO Brickett 09.09.25
- G3 Police Warning Letter re No CCTV 16.09.25
- G4 Statement re No CCTV – PC Brown 21.08.25
- G5 Statement re CCTV Viewing PCSO Davison - 44minutes missing 11.07.25
- H Statement re an Altercation at the Premises Between Two Drunk Males – PC Pickering 09.09.25