

**Minutes of a meeting of the
Licensing & Gambling Acts Casework Sub-
Committee
on Monday 8 June 2026**

www.oxford.gov.uk



Committee members present:

Councillor Robinson

Councillor Taylor (Chair)

Councillor Turkson Wood

Officers present for all or part of the meeting:

Uswah Khan, Committee and Member Services Officer

Tanaka Merralls, Legal Advisor

KC Prawesh, Licensing Compliance Officer

Emma Thompson, Senior Licensing Compliance Officer

1. Election of Chair for the hearings

Councillor Robinson proposed, and Councillor Wood seconded, Councillor Taylor as Chair.

Councillor Taylor was elected as Chair for the duration of the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence

None.

3. Declarations of Interest

None.

4. Procedure for the hearing

The Sub-Committee noted the relevant procedure.

5. Application for a new Premises Licence – Botley Superstore, 133 Botley Road, Oxford, OX2 0HD

The Chair invited all attendees to introduce themselves.

The Licensing Compliance Officer presented a summary of the report in relation to an application submitted by Manpreet Kaur Lalpurwal for a variation to a premises license in respect of 133 Botley Road, Oxford, OX2 0HD.

The key matters for consideration included the activity of supply of alcohol (off sales only):

- Sunday to Saturday 08:00 hours to 23:00 hours

The Licensing Compliance Officer noted that the authority had previously received an application from Botley Booze Limited for a new premises license at the same place which was withdrawn. The original application raised concerns from Thames Valley Police and Trading Standards following a joint meeting with the Licensing Authority and the applicant in which revised conditions were agreed and accepted. As a result, the initial application was withdrawn and replaced with a new application incorporating the agreed operating schedule. A copy of the current application and the steps that the applicant intended to take to promote the licensing objectives can be found at appendix 1 of the report.

The Licensing Compliance Officer noted that during the consultation period, the application received no adverse comments from any Responsible Authorities under the Licensing Act 2003. The application did however receive representations from seventeen Interested Parties highlighting concerns in relation to Public Safety, Public Nuisance, Crime and Disorder, and the Protection of Children from harm. A copy of all the representations can be found at appendix 3 of the report.

Members were reminded of their responsibilities under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the Human Rights Act 1998 when considering the fair balance between the interests of the applicant and the rights of local residents. Any decision taken by the Sub Committee must be necessary and proportionate to the objectives being pursued.

The Sub-Committee were reminded that when considering any representations, only issues relating to the four licensing objectives could be considered and appropriate weight given to the importance and relevance of each representation.

In making its decision, Members were also reminded that they had to regard the Home Office statutory guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's own Statement of Licensing Policy.

The Licensing Compliance Officer noted to the Sub-Committee that there were concerns regarding planning permissions for the premises included within the application. He noted that they had contacted Planning for comments on the matter and the information received was part of the premises plan circulated at the meeting. The planning permission for the rear extension was refused by Planning and they stated that it was a retrospective application. He noted that if the licence be granted, licensing permissions would not supersede planning permissions. Planning was aware of the application and any action they might take was at their discretion. The only comment to consider was that the extension did not have planning permissions. Regarding the Licensing Act, any alcohol stored in such an area, if used for immediate sale, must fall under the premises licence.

The Chair thanked the Licensing Compliance Officer and invited questions from the Sub-Committee; there were none.

The Chair invited questions.

Councillor Robinson asked how seriously the officers considered objections from the Interested Parties. The Licensing Compliance Officer noted that any concerns related to the four principles of the Act were considered equally significant as a representation from a Responsible Authority.

Councillor Wood inquired about the Police's safety concerns. The Licensing Compliance Officer explained that Trading Standards and TVP had concerns about the proposed name and the operating schedule, which led to a meeting where all parties agreed on the terms now included in the current operating schedule.

The Chair asked if there had been good engagement during the meeting. The Licensing Compliance Officer responded that the applicant communicated well and agreed to the schedule and proposed conditions.

The Chair invited the applicants to present their case. Mrs Lalpurwal and Mr Bahal were in attendance to present the application to the Sub-Committee.

Mr Bahal addressed the Sub-Committee and explained that the applicant had held a licence for 13 years and had experience running an Off-License store. He noted that there had been many discussions and extensive views had been exchanged, which resulted in the application being altered. Mr Bahal pointed out that the local press had reported miscommunication which had caused objectors to raise concerns. He emphasised that Mrs Lalpurwal was not responsible for the actions of another license holder in the past and highlighted that she had no criminal record and had never sold alcohol to anyone underage. Mr Bahal clarified that Mr Lalpurwal did not have any involvement with the premises beyond supplying the goods to the store and would not be working there. He mentioned that Mrs Lalpurwal's son was turning 18 in January next year and expressed interest in joining the family business. Another family member

also wished to join, reinforcing that it was a family-oriented business. Mr Bahal addressed the objections referencing Mr Lalpurwal, stating that his actions should not influence how Mrs Lalpurwal would operate the business. He also noted that two major stores, Aldi and Waitrose were in the area but catered to customers making larger or weekly purchases, while this application was for a convenience store serving students and the general public in the area.

The Chair thanked Mr Bahal and Mrs Lalpurwal and invited questions from the Sub Committee.

Councillor Robinson asked the applicant how she envisioned the shop and how it might be managed differently. The applicant explained that she had 13 years of experience and that her family intended to run the business together. Mr Bahal expressed dissatisfaction with the proposed name and advised the client to change it, emphasising that the store was more of a convenience store than just a booze or an Off-Licence. He acknowledged the concerns of the residents but clarified that Mr Lalpurwal would have no involvement in the store's operation.

The Chair asked the Licensing Compliance Officer to clarify the situation around the court case. The Licensing Compliance Officer explained that the licence had been reviewed and revoked due to issues raised by the Trading Standards. An investigation into the sale of illegal tobacco, vapes or nicotine related items had led to the licence revocation, but the applicant was not involved.

Councillor Robinson asked the applicant how confident she was in enforcing the conditions. The applicant stated she would do her best and mentioned her 13 years of experience. Mr Bahal added that he intended to include Mrs Lalpurwal and her son in any relevant ongoing training and had been inquiring with local authorities about available training sessions.

The Chair asked how the applicant would ensure alcohol was not sold to vulnerable people suffering from substance abuse. Mr Bahal responded that they already had a policy against selling alcohol to anyone who was visibly intoxicated and that this policy would be recorded in their refusal book.

The Chair invited summaries.

To summarise, the Licensing Compliance Officer reminded Members of the four licensing objectives and to make decisions as detailed in the report. The Officer also noted that the committee should finally note that the applicant or persons making representations have the right of appeal against the decision taken today.

Mr Bahal had nothing further to say but noted that Mrs Lalpurwal would be happy to comply with any added conditions.

Mr Bahal, Mrs Lalpurwal, the Licensing Compliance Officer and the Senior Licensing Compliance Officer left the room to allow the Sub-Committee to deliberate.

The Sub-Committee deliberated in private.

Mr Bahal, Mrs Lalpurwal, the Licensing Compliance Officer and the Senior Licensing Compliance Officer rejoined the meeting.

The Chair welcomed all attendees back to the meeting and delivered the decision of the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee resolved to:

- **Grant** the license as applied for in the report.

The Chair asked the applicant to note that the storeroom at the back of the premises should not be used until it is granted planning permission and while no conditions could be added regarding the sale of tobacco and vapes, they would appreciate if the applicant would extend the challenge 25 policy to include vapes and tobacco.

Mr Bahal and Mrs Lalpurwal thanked the Sub-Committee and left the meeting.

The meeting started at 6.25pm and ended at 7.20pm.