



Licensing Act 2003

**REPRESENTATION FORM FROM RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES**  
**Stevenage Borough Council LICENSING AUTHORITY**

Responsible Authority: Hertfordshire Constabulary

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Your Name</b>                | [REDACTED]  |
| <b>Job Title</b>                | Senior Licensing Officer  |
| <b>Postal address</b>           | Stevenage Police Station<br>Lytton Way<br>Stevenage<br>Herts, SG1 1HF |
| <b>Email Address</b>            | [REDACTED]  |
| <b>Contact telephone number</b> | [REDACTED]  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Name of the premises you are making a representation about</b>    | Borough Wines, application to vary DPS                           |  |
| <b>Address of the premises you are making a representation about</b> | 9 THE OVAL, VARDON ROAD<br>STEVENAGE<br>HERTFORDSHIRE<br>SG1 5RA |  |

|   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| <b>Is this the first objection in respect of these premises</b> | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Police applied for review of Oval Wines Premises licence on 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2024.</li> <li>- The licence was revoked at a Licensing Hearing at SBC on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2024.</li> <li>- Appeal was lodged and hearing at Stevenage Magistrates Court was due to be held in December 2025, however it was not heard and a new date for 2026 has been set.</li> <li>- Application for Minor Variation was objected to by Herts Constabulary and Trading Standard in August 2025, this was upheld an application was refused on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2025.</li> <li>- Multiple Representations have been made by Stevenage Police Senior Licensing Officer, on behalf of Hertfordshire Constabulary has made representation against the application made by [REDACTED] to become DPS of Borough Wines (formerly Oval Wines), each time, the application has been withdrawn prior to the hearing date, and re-submitted as a new application on the same day.</li> </ul> |
|---|----|--|



Hertfordshire Constabulary, being a nominated Responsible Authority under the Licensing Act 2003, wish to make representation to this application.

Our representation(s) are made in consideration to the below licensing objectives, as we believe the operating schedule does not adequately demonstrate how you, the applicant will best support this.

**Licensing Objections**

| <b>YES</b>                           | <b>Yes<br/>Or<br/>No</b> | <b>Evidence supporting representation or reason for representation.<br/>Please use continuation sheet as required</b>  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <b>To prevent crime and disorder</b> | <b>YES</b>               | <p>The proposed DPS is Premises Licence Holder for Borough Wines (formerly Oval Wines).</p> <p>Evidence of multiple incidents of breaches of licence including sales of illegal/illicit products, evidence of drugs paraphernalia and residue of cocaine in various areas of premises. The proposed has been made aware of these breaches, has been warned in writing by [REDACTED] and <b>has been viewed on video footage at the scene of crime and disorder</b>. See video footage produced –</p> <p><b>This is part of the revocation case, which is being appealed against and was re-scheduled until later in 2026 to be heard at SMC.</b></p> <p><b>A complaint was recently received by Police, which has now been investigated in relation to the conduct of Management of Oval Wines, and alleged breaches of the Licensing Act 2003. Statements and downloads of house CCTV are available to be viewed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Following enquiries into this complaint, [REDACTED] did not offer CCTV download, requested on several occasions, and was sent a warning letter in respect of a breach of his Licencing Conditions. See attached letter.</b></li> <li>• <b>[REDACTED] was also sent a letter in relation to sale of alcohol to a drunk, which is also attached.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>An incident was reported to Police on 9th September 2025, and reports and evidence are attached to this application. This incident has evidenced that the customer involved was highly intoxicated and was able to purchase alcohol at Oval Wines.</b></p> <p><b>On 29<sup>th</sup> January 2026, there was an incident at Oval Shopping Centre, Stevenage, when a robbery was committed, and this currently being investigated. Though the incident does not involve Borough Wines it has highlighted a concern about customers with balaclava's being served by staff at Borough Wines, which is being looked in to at this time. The customer being served at Borough Wines, on that still, is the suspect in the robbery case. The still will be available when investigations are completed.</b></p> |
| <b>Public safety</b>                 | <b>YES</b>               | <p>It is reported, and also admitted, by [REDACTED] (the proposed DPS) that he has been on scene when:</p> <p>'Disruption and violent disorder by customers around the vicinity of Oval Wines, regarding activities, caused distress and alarm to other businesses and their customers. CCTV footage is available.'</p>  |

|   |            |  |
|---|------------|--|
| <p><b>To prevent public nuisance</b></p>    | <p>YES</p> | <p>Members of the 'Oval' gang used this as their hub and constantly frequented the shop and gathered in close proximity outside. These males were causing distress and anti-social behaviour in and around the Oval shopping precinct. Meeting in large numbers as many as 20 to 30 people, smoking and believed to be dealing drugs. Using foul and abusive language, intimidating people visiting the precinct and causing a nuisance to customers and other local businesses. Statement from Policed Sergeant [REDACTED] NPT, produced. The proposed DPS/owner was aware and there is video footage of him on scene when the gang have entered and exited the premises, during an incident.</p> <p><b>*Though the gang was dispersed by Police during additional emergency patrols at that time, these are not permanent, and it is believed they will resume their activities in the future.</b></p> <p><b>See last comment added on the Prevent Crime and Disorder section above, in relation to a customer wearing a full-face balaclava.</b></p>  |
| <p><b>To protect children from harm</b></p> | <p>YES</p> | <p>As there was evidence of drug use in the shop, due to residue being found within that shop, (also there are concerns and gang related ASB), there was no chance of the applicant/ owner, who attends the shop on a daily basis, not to being aware of this. It has also been proven that illegal tobacco and other substances/medication have been stored and found in the rear of the shop, which is of concern.</p> <p>There are various <b>Intelligence reports</b> which refer to drugs and young males attending the premises, some as young as 11 years of age and there is cause for concern. Knife carrying has also been mentioned. Local authority CCTV has shown that previously suspects at the Oval in possession of large machetes chasing this group, (many of whom are children), and some have sought refuge in Oval Wines. When requested the licensee and owner/applicant, have been unable to provide footage that shows this incident.</p> <p><b>– Please also see recent failure by [REDACTED] to furnish Police with download of CCTV, requested on several occasions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As previously alluded to, though the gang was dispersed by Police during additional emergency patrols at that time, <b>these are not permanent, and it is believed they will resume their activities in the future.</b></li> </ul> |

The below additions to the Schedule as provided at Part 4 of the application, identifies those matters that we believe are necessary, to promote the licensing objectives.

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>Hertfordshire Constabulary is of the view that the proposed DPS <b>will not conform with the licence and have proven, by way of constant breaches to which he will not adhere to it. (See attached notes).</b> Added to this, the use of these premises for the purpose of selling illegal vapes. tobacco/cigarettes, in the past, and the evidence of drugs within the shop, <b>Police do not believe that the proposed DPS/Management of the premises can be trusted to adhere to the four Licensing Objectives.</b> The proposed DPS/PLH challenged police, in support of the</p> |
|--|---|

youths, during enquiries being conducted following incidents around the premises, indicating that the youths were not doing anything wrong.

As already stated, there is currently an outstanding complaint from a MOP, being investigated in relation to an alleged breach of the Licensing Act 2003, which, if founded will deem [REDACTED] as not fit and proper to be DPS at Oval Wines.

**OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

Previous attitude of proposed DPS towards Police Officers, Police staff on occasions, have been unacceptable.

Recent complaint from MOP is being investigated, including attitude of management towards the complainant.

Information to be submitted with this application, however, extract below from the complainant's statement regarding a drunk purchasing alcohol from the shop.

***'This person in particular, was irate when I mentioned the licencing act and he said, "IF HE PICKS UP A 6 PACK OF BEER, IM SELLING IT TO HIM, WE ARE A SHOP".'***

Police do not expect this sort of behaviour from a DPS – see comments made by the witness on statements with regard to the sale of alcohol to a paying customer.

**CCTV was requested by an Officer and was not readily available on the day – 21<sup>st</sup> August 2025.**

**Since this date various attempts to retrieve downloads of CCTV footage for specific dates, have been made, and though some have now been received, there have been unacceptable delays, and Police hours wasted attempting to collect them.**

**There have been other requests by Police, visits made and advice given by Officers. when Good Sam was offered as a tool to assist [REDACTED] (after reminders), to transfer the CCTV download, for access by officers.**

**Additional information attached as evidence, due to content offered, and missing footage.**

**It is a condition of the premises licence, (Condition 1 of Annex 2) that The Oval Wines have CCTV in place which will record and retain unedited images for up to 30 days and which will be made available to any Responsible Authority on request.**

**Additional Note.**

**More recently revised/replacement conditions were offered by [REDACTED] on the recently refused Minor application for Oval Wines, as below:**

**Conditions to be added:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p><i>1. Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) systems that capture head and shoulders images of persons entering the premises and all points of sale shall be installed, operate and record video images at all times that the premises are open to the public.</i></p> <p><i>2. All CCTV recordings made shall be retained for not less than 31 days and be made available to Police or an authorised officer of any responsible authority within one hour upon request. In accordance with current data protection legislation.</i></p> <p><i>3. A member of staff capable of operating the CCTV system and downloading images shall be at the premises at all times that the premises are open to the public.</i></p> <p><i>4. The CCTV system shall display on any recording, the correct date and time of the recording.</i></p> |
|--|---|

Should you require clarification on any matter being made, please contact the named officer to discuss further.

Signed ..  .....

Date: ..  .....

**Note for Officers:**

Please submit this form along with any additional sheets to: Licensing at Stevenage Borough Council or email to [licensing@stevenage.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@stevenage.gov.uk)

**This form must be returned within the Statutory Period.**

## **NOTES – INCIDENT AT OVAL WINES 9<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2025**

On Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025, at approximately 17:00 hours, Police received a 999-call stating there was a fight at the Oval Wines Store, 9, The Oval, Stevenage.

I have collated below the evidence I now offer, with regard to the incident.

The information I have, I offer in relation to this shop serving to drunks, as Police have already received complaints from a member of the public regarding an alcoholic being able to purchase alcohol from Oval Wines – see previous information recently submitted.

### **Report and observations from Pc [REDACTED]**

The informant stated there was a fight outside the shop, involving five people, including two Asian men who worked in the shop. Police arrived.

Pc [REDACTED] was among three officers attending the incident at the Oval.

His version of events explained that when police arrived, they were made aware of two separate allegations with regard to the incident.

The person who is employed at the shop was working the tills and the other party entered the shop three to four times throughout the day.

He was eventually refused alcohol by him, and the shop assistant and another, believed to be employed by the shop, attempted to escort him out of the store. He stated that the customer had then pushed him, so he pushed him back.

The customer then briefly left the store before returning as he believed that he had left his phone in the shop.

The shop assistant said that the customer then punched him to the left-hand side of his face, causing no injury, over not being able to find his phone.

### **Allegations made by Customer:**

He stated that he entered the store to purchase alcohol.

He was refused the alcohol.

A verbal altercation ensued which resulted in the customer being pushed. As a result of that push, the customer fell backwards into a puddle.

The Officer stated that the staff failed to provide CCTV when it was requested, telling Pc [REDACTED] that 'The boss wasn't in,' and he did not know how to work it?

On Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> September, Pc [REDACTED] attended Oval Wines, and requested the CCTV download from Mr [REDACTED] who was in attendance at the shop. Mr [REDACTED], once again, told Police that he was unable to download CCTV at any length but in 10-minute snippets.

See below from Pc [REDACTED]

***'I was shown the CCTV from Oval wines, I have sent him a goodsam link for him to upload the footage, he said it will come in 10 min chunks.***

***I've requested 16:30-17:00 under 09092025-0532 and 16:00-16:45 under 41/85817/25.'***

Mr [REDACTED] has since supplied CCTV download, via GOODSAM, though in several 10-minute snippets, which have been downloaded onto a CD by Police, due to it being continuing, out of sequence, and duplicates of some of the snippets. See notes to accompany the viewing of the CD.



OVAL WINES camera  
footage notes.docx

Attached is the statement from Pc [REDACTED] who was one of the Officers dealing with this incident, and who has made subsequent enquires to clarify points raised.



MG11 1585  
PICKERING, Jack 2009

There is footage of Pc [REDACTED] attending the Oval, which, if required, would be offered at any hearing, by himself.

[REDACTED]  
**Community Safety Unit**  
**Senior Licensing Officer Stevenage**

Office: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]@police.uk



[In a non-emergency, report information online, speak to us via web chat or call via 101](#)  
(in an emergency, always dial 999).

## **Additional/amended Notes in relation to the breach of Licence conditions for Oval Wines in relation to production of CCTV to Responsible Authority**

Following receipt of this information, and the CCTV being reviewed, Pc [REDACTED] of the Neighbourhood Policing Team attended Oval Wines on the morning of

21<sup>st</sup> August. He requested footage for the times between the drunk individual leaving his residence and when he returned to that residence, to verify that he had purchased his alcohol from Oval Wines.

### **Timeline:**

- The Sales assistant told [REDACTED] that he was unable to download as he had no 'mouse,' therefore Pc [REDACTED] attended the Police Station and returned later that morning with a mouse. By that time **Mr [REDACTED] owner and applicant for DPS**, had been contacted by the sales assistant, and spoke on the phone to Pc [REDACTED] telling him that he was unable to produce the CCTV footage requested, at that time, but offered to furnish him with the footage later, but asap
  - PC [REDACTED] re-contacted Mr Oruc on 22<sup>nd</sup> August, as there had been no contact from him, and was told by Mr. [REDACTED] that he was unable to offer it until the beginning of the following week.
  - On Saturday 23<sup>rd</sup> August Mr [REDACTED] made contact via e mail, with Pc [REDACTED] stating he was unable to download the CCTV. But if somebody from the Police were to attend the shop, they could download.
  - Following Bank Holiday Monday, on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> August two PCSO's from Stevenage Neighbourhood Policing Team, attended Oval Wines, as requested by M [REDACTED] to attempt to download the CCTV footage which had been requested by Pc [REDACTED] previously.
  - When the PCSO's attended on that afternoon and requested the CCTV. Mr [REDACTED] was not on site and had left a message that he unable to provide the CCTV as he had said, and it was not accessible. This was captured on Body Worn Camera, which will have the exact times.
  - M [REDACTED] then spoke with the PCSO's over the phone and asked that an officer attend the shop on Thursday between 16:00 and 17:00 as he will be on site and would have it accessible for download by Police.
  - On 28<sup>th</sup> August at 16.50 hrs, PCSO [REDACTED] attended Oval Wines for a pre-arranged collection of Downloaded CCTV. Mr Oruc informed PCSO [REDACTED] he was unable to produce this. PCSO [REDACTED] provided Mr [REDACTED] with a GoodSam link which he agreed to upload the CCTV footage onto as soon as practicable.
  - On 2<sup>nd</sup> an 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025, PCSO [REDACTED] checked the Gooosam link hadn't sent the CCTV footage as agreed. Statement by PCSO [REDACTED] and BWC footage of the visit on 28th September is available.
  - On 8<sup>th</sup> October, 2025 PCS [REDACTED] was tasked to check the CCTV footage produced by Mr [REDACTED] for 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 as a sample, due to the extent of number

of files sent through by Mr. [REDACTED] Statement by PCSO [REDACTED] with results of that check, attached, and identifying a gap of 44minutes, is available.

**New additional information from 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**

A further disruption was recorded at Oval Wines, on 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2025, which relates to two inebriated males, who were involved in an incident within and outside the shop.

NOTES attached separately.

## **NOTES – INCIDENT AT OVAL WINES 9<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2025**

On Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025, at approximately 17:00 hours, Police received a 999-call stating there was a fight at the Oval Wines Store, 9, The Oval, Stevenage. I have collated below the evidence I now offer, with regard to the incident. The information I have, I offer in relation to this shop serving to drunks, as Police have already received complaints from a member of the public regarding an alcoholic being able to purchase alcohol from Oval Wines – see previous information recently submitted.

### **Report and observations from Pc [REDACTED]**

The informant stated there was a fight outside the shop, involving five people, including two Asian men who worked in the shop. Police arrived. PC [REDACTED] was among three officers attending the incident at the Oval. His version of events explained that when police arrived, they were made aware of two separate allegations with regard to the incident. The person who is employed at the shop was working the tills and the other party entered the shop three to four times throughout the day. He was eventually refused alcohol by him, and the shop assistant and another, believed to be employed by the shop, attempted to escort him out of the store. He stated that the customer had then pushed him, so he pushed him back. The customer then briefly left the store before returning as he believed that he had left his phone in the shop. The shop assistant said that the customer then punched him to the left-hand side of his face, causing no injury, over not being able to find his phone.

### **Allegations made by Customer:**

He stated that he entered the store to purchase alcohol. He was refused the alcohol. A verbal altercation ensued which resulted in the customer being pushed. As a result of that push, the customer fell backwards into a puddle. The Officer stated that the staff failed to provide CCTV when it was requested, telling Pc [REDACTED] that 'The boss wasn't in,' and he did not know how to work it?

On Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> September, Pc [REDACTED] attended Oval Wines, and requested the CCTV download from Mr [REDACTED], who was in attendance at the shop. Mr [REDACTED] once again, told Police that he was unable to download CCTV at any length but in 10-minute snippets. See below from Pc [REDACTED]

***'I was shown the CCTV from Oval wines, I have sent him a goodsam link for him to upload the footage, he said it will come in 10 min chunks. I've requested 16:30-17:00 under 09092025-0532 and 16:00-16:45 under 41/85817/25.'***

Mr [REDACTED] has since supplied CCTV download, via GOODSAM, though in several 10-minute snippets, which have been downloaded onto a CD by Police, due to it being confusing, out of sequence, and duplicates of some of the snippets. See notes to accompany the viewing of the CD.

available from Pc [REDACTED]

## **Additional/amended Notes in relation to the breach of Licence conditions for Oval Wines in relation to production of CCTV to Responsible Authority**

Following receipt of this information, and the CCTV being reviewed, Pc [REDACTED] of the Neighbourhood Policing Team attended Oval Wines on the morning of

21<sup>st</sup> August. He requested footage for the times between the drunk individual leaving his residence and when he returned to that residence, to verify that he had purchased his alcohol from Oval Wines.

### **Timeline:**

- The Sales assistant told Pc [REDACTED] that he was unable to download as he had no 'mouse,' therefore Pc [REDACTED] attended the Police Station and returned later that morning with a mouse. By that time **Mr. [REDACTED] owner and applicant for DPS**, had been contacted by the sales assistant, and spoke on the phone to Pc [REDACTED], telling him that he was unable to produce the CCTV footage requested, at that time, but offered to furnish him with the footage later, but asap
  - PC [REDACTED] re-contacted Mr [REDACTED] on 22<sup>nd</sup> August, as there had been no contact from him, and was told by Mr. [REDACTED] that he was unable to offer it until the beginning of the following week.
  - On Saturday 23<sup>rd</sup> August Mr [REDACTED] made contact via e mail, with Pc [REDACTED], stating he was unable to download the CCTV. But if somebody from the Police were to attend the shop, they could download.
  - Following Bank Holiday Monday, on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> August two PCSO's from Stevenage Neighbourhood Policing Team, attended Oval Wines, as requested by M [REDACTED] to attempt to download the CCTV footage which had been requested by Pc Brown previously.
  - When the PCSO's attended on that afternoon and requested the CCTV. Mr [REDACTED] was not on site and had left a message that he unable to provide the CCTV as he had said, and it was not accessible. This was captured on Body Worn Camera, which will have the exact times.
  - Mr [REDACTED] then spoke with the PCSO's over the phone and asked that an officer attend the shop on Thursday between 16:00 and 17:00 as he will be on site and would have it accessible for download by Police.
  - On 28<sup>th</sup> August at 16.50 hrs, PCSO [REDACTED] attended Oval Wines for a pre-arranged collection of Downloaded CCTV. Mr [REDACTED] informed PCSO [REDACTED] he was unable to produce this. PCSO [REDACTED] provided Mr [REDACTED] with a GoodSam link which he agreed to upload the CCTV footage onto as soon as practicable.
  - On 2<sup>nd</sup> an 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025, PCSO [REDACTED] checked the Gooosam link hadn't sent the CCTV footage as agreed. Statement by PCSO [REDACTED] and BWC footage of the visit on 28th September is available.
  - On 8<sup>th</sup> October, 2025 PCSO [REDACTED] was tasked to check the CCTV footage produced by Mr [REDACTED] for 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 as a sample, due to the extent of number

of files sent through by Mr. [REDACTED] Statement by PCSO [REDACTED] with results of that check, attached, and identifying a gap of 44minutes, is available.

**New additional information from 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**

A further disruption was recorded at Oval Wines, on 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2025, which relates to two inebriated males, who were involved in an incident within and outside the shop.

NOTES attached separately.

## **NOTES – INCIDENT AT OVAL WINES 9<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2025**

On Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025, at approximately 17:00 hours, Police received a 999-call stating there was a fight at the Oval Wines Store, 9, The Oval, Stevenage. I have collated below the evidence I now offer, with regard to the incident. The information I have, I offer in relation to this shop serving to drunks, as Police have already received complaints from a member of the public regarding an alcoholic being able to purchase alcohol from Oval Wines – see previous information recently submitted.

### **Report and observations from P [REDACTED]**

The informant stated there was a fight outside the shop, involving five people, including two Asian men who worked in the shop. Police arrived. PC [REDACTED] was among three officers attending the incident at the Oval. His version of events explained that when police arrived, they were made aware of two separate allegations with regard to the incident. The person who is employed at the shop was working the tills and the other party entered the shop three to four times throughout the day. He was eventually refused alcohol by him, and the shop assistant and another, believed to be employed by the shop, attempted to escort him out of the store. He stated that the customer had then pushed him, so he pushed him back. The customer then briefly left the store before returning as he believed that he had left his phone in the shop. The shop assistant said that the customer then punched him to the left-hand side of his face, causing no injury, over not being able to find his phone.

### **Allegations made by Customer:**

He stated that he entered the store to purchase alcohol. He was refused the alcohol. A verbal altercation ensued which resulted in the customer being pushed. As a result of that push, the customer fell backwards into a puddle. The Officer stated that the staff failed to provide CCTV when it was requested, telling Pc [REDACTED] that 'The boss wasn't in,' and he did not know how to work it?

On Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> September, Pc [REDACTED] attended Oval Wines, and requested the CCTV download from [REDACTED], who was in attendance at the shop. Mr [REDACTED], once again, told Police that he was unable to download CCTV at any length but in 10-minute snippets. See below from Pc [REDACTED]

***'I was shown the CCTV from Oval wines, I have sent him a goodsam link for him to upload the footage, he said it will come in 10 min chunks. I've requested 16:30-17:00 under 09092025-0532 and 16:00-16:45 under 41/85817/25.'***

M [REDACTED] has since supplied CCTV download, via GOODSAM, though in several 10-minute snippets, which have been downloaded onto a CD by Police, due to it being confusing, out of sequence, and duplicates of some of the snippets. See notes to accompany the viewing of the CD.

available from Pc [REDACTED]