

Aylesbury Vale District Council

**DECISION OF THE LICENSING AND GAMBLING ACTS SUB-COMMITTEE
FOLLOWING A HEARING ON 29 JANUARY 2013 AT THE COUNCIL'S GATEWAY
OFFICES, GATEHOUSE ROAD, AYLESBURY**

**Application by Kyle Michael to vary the premises licence for Mango, 1 Silver Street,
Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire**

Members of the Sub-Committee

Cllr Janet Blake (Chairman)
Cllr Steven Lambert
Cllr Sue Renshell

Declarations of interest

None.

The application

1. The Sub-Committee has given careful consideration to the application before it, namely, to vary the premises licence for Mango, 1 Silver Street, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire.
2. In general terms, the application seeks permission to:
 - a. **extend alcohol and regulated entertainment hours** (plays, films, indoor sporting events, live music, recorded music, performance of dance, entertainment similar to music & dancing) from the current terminal hour of 03.00 and 03.30 respectively to 06.59 on a Friday and Saturday (i.e. for a 24 hour period);
 - b. **add the activity of boxing and wrestling** for the same hours as all other regulated entertainment activities.
 - c. **extend late night refreshment** everyday from the current terminal hour of 03.30 (on a Monday until Saturday) and 03. 00 (on a Sunday) to 05.00 (i.e. for the full duration of the licensable period);
 - d. **extend opening hours** from the current terminal hour of 03.30 to 06.59 (i.e. 24/7); and
 - e. **further extend the hours for alcohol and regulated entertainment** on a seasonal basis (i.e. between 1 July and 30 September) and on other specified days.
3. Mr Kyle Michael, who is also the designated premises supervisor, attended the hearing and was assisted by Mr Zayyan Haroon-Doyle and Mr Fred Wilkes.

The representations

4. The application received representations from the Police; Licensing Authority; Environmental Health and Buckinghamshire Fire Authority, acting in their capacity as responsible authorities, and a representation from Mr and Mrs Amos.
5. The Police submitted a detailed representation strongly objecting to the application. The representation draws on the facts and findings recorded in the decision made by this Sub-Committee in October 2010 in response to a similar application to extend the licensing hours of the premises. Namely:
 6. There are approximately 21 pubs/clubs operating after 2300 hours in the town centre.
 7. The increase in the number of town centre premises selling alcohol and the increase in licensing hours has led to an increase in crime, disorder and nuisance over the years.
 8. The town centre is a hot spot for incidents and policing.
 9. Most town centre premises are open to the public until 0230 hours.
 10. It is the operational experience of the police that longer hours have not seen customers slowly dispersing but in effect has seen them drink right up to the last possible moment and then leave en masse at a later hour.
 11. Later licensing hours have resulted in later incidents of crime, disorder and nuisance.
 12. Most crime and disorder incidents happen in the town centre between 2200 and 0300 hours and generally peak between midnight and 0200 hours.
 13. Most premises do not open late during the week and that is why the majority of incidents take place over the weekend when the majority of premises open for longer.
 14. The police have already changed their shift patterns in response to the demands of policing the town centre for longer and later at night.
 15. Even later hours at the weekends and during the week would cost the police even more money to police the town centre and would mean an even greater disproportionate amount of police resources being deployed in the town centre.
 16. Late night town centre incidents can be very labour intensive with a single arrest monopolising the time of at least two officers for hours.
 17. Although the number of incidents have declined since the high water mark in 2007 it is still unacceptably high.
 18. The reduction has come at a price: bigger police wage bill and less policing elsewhere.
 19. The reduction is proof that the saturation policy and the police strategy is working and should be supported to avoid a decline.

20. The police once again drew attention to the fact that the premises has the latest licensing hours in the town centre and attracts people to the premises who have already been drinking. The police, in particular, renewed their concern about customers migrating to the premises in the early hours of the morning from other premises if this is the sole premises supplying these activities. This, by past experience, will cause problems when people who have already been drinking all night or who have drunk too much attempt to gain entry to the premises or once they are inside the premises. The significance of these incidents, the police argued, is that even if they are properly handled by the premises and even if the management could not have done anything to prevent them, they arise from the use of the premises for licensable activities at that (even later) time and add to the cumulative impact of alcohol related incidents of crime and disorder and public nuisance in Aylesbury town centre.
21. This is compounded by the fact that the premises are the hardest to police in the town centre because of the location: the premises are surrounded on three sides with alleyways which lead onto Market Square and Bourbon Street and CCTV coverage is limited.
22. The police acknowledged, however, that the premises are reasonably well run by Mr Michael; that he is a supporter of the local Pub Watch scheme; that he has run a number of TENs throughout the summer which have been incident free and that the number of incidents concerning the premises has declined since the last hearing. The police pointed out, however, that their representation is not an objection of Mr Michael's abilities as a bar owner but is directed at the wider impact of late night drinking on the licensing objectives.
23. The police stated that it is only because the council extended the licensing hours of two premises in the town centre in the past, one of which now trades as Mango, that the council subsequently allowed the town centre take-aways to extend their hours resulting in more people remaining in the town centre later at night and causing greater disturbance to residents, resulting in even later incidents of crime and disorder and increasing the cost of policing.
24. Drawing on local licensing experience the police argued that a significant extension of hours granted to one premises in the town centre is likely to result in other similar applications and ultimately customers drinking for even longer followed by a mass exit of customers at a common but even later hour. In fact, according to the police, other premises have already stated that if the licensing hours in the town centre were extended even further, then in order to compete they would have to make the same applications.
25. In support of their objection, the police also relied upon the following.
26. The council's special saturation policy which the police believe is working as crime and disorder in the town centre has declined in recent years but that the granting of this application would have the opposite effect i.e. would add to the overall number of incidents.
27. Their experience that parts of the Licensing Act have not worked, especially longer hours which has not resulted in customers slowly dispersing but in effect has resulted in customers drinking up to the last possible moment and then leaving en masse.

28. Recent legislative and statutory guidance changes forming part of the Government's 'rebalancing agenda' including, not surprisingly, what the guidance says about how we should treat representations made by the police (which we will return to).
29. A report analysing alcohol disorder incidents in Aylesbury town centre for the period 2009-2012 between the hours of 22.00 and 04.00.
30. A police constable's memo of his experience of policing Aylesbury town centre which served to demonstrate how time-consuming it is for the police to deal with even a relatively straightforward assault.
31. A list of incidents recorded by the police relating to the premises.
32. A compilation of CCTV evidence of four serious incidents of alcohol related violence, crime and disorder in various places in Aylesbury town centre at night time during December last and January of this year.
33. The impact the granting of the application will have on other agencies such as the Ambulance Service and Accident and Emergency at Stoke Mandeville Hospital and other persons as a result of domestic abuse because, according to the police, the statistics show that the majority of incidents take place from Fridays through to Sundays and between 10.00pm and 4.00am.
34. The Police were represented by their Licensing Officer, Mr Trevor Hooper, and Inspector Simon Steel.
35. The Licensing Authority's representation was made by Mr Peter Seal, the council's Licensing Services Manager. Like the police, Mr Seal reminded us of the recent changes made to the licensing regime as part of the Government's 'rebalancing agenda' aimed at strengthening the licensing regime by giving local authorities, the police and communities stronger powers. Mr Seal also pointed out that the application breached the council's special saturation policy which has so far proved to be an effective tool in promoting the licensing objectives and strongly recommended that the application be refused. Mr Seal attended the hearing in support of his representation.
36. Environmental Health's representation expressed concern about an increased likelihood of disturbance caused by persons leaving the premises at times when the area would otherwise be quiet but confirmed the absence of any recent history of complaints. District Environmental Health Officer, Mr Neil Green, attended the hearing in support of his representation.
37. The Fire Authority's representation simply stated that "A comprehensive fire risk assessment must be provided and reviewed regularly, and form part of the conditions of the licence." The Fire Authority notified the council in advance that they would not be attending the hearing and that their representation "was to serve as a reminder of the legal obligations of the licence holder".
38. Mr and Mrs Amos who live and own a public house in Aylesbury town centre also made a representation objecting to the application. Their representation expressed concern about noise disturbance even later at night and property damage. They also

argued that if the application was granted it would only cause more problems for the police, local authorities and local residents.

39. Mr and Amos notified the council in advance that they would not be able to attend the hearing.
40. Prior to the hearing, the applicant had submitted a comprehensive response to the representations submitted strongly arguing in favour of his application. Amongst other things, Mr Michael dismissed the council's special saturation policy as "flawed" and criticised the authorities for applying it inflexibly and failing to consider individual premises and applications on their merits; questioned whether Mr Seal's representation should even be considered because of a "role conflict"; argued that as opening hours are not a licensing activity in themselves the law does not allow licensing authorities to restrict licensing hours; stated that the approach taken by the authorities was not evidence based contrary to case law and in the main not premises specific; and argued that the cost of policing was not a relevant consideration and that even if the special saturation policy was valid, his application was a genuine exception.
41. Mr Michael also relied on an on-line petition signed by over 200 people. Mr Michael believed that over a hundred of the signatories had also made a representation to the licensing authority but Ms Kerryann Ashton, Senior Licensing Officer, confirmed that there was no evidence of any representations being received by the council. Mr Michael speculated whether the council's spam filter had blocked the emails but Ms Ashton confirmed that having asked the council's IT Services to check no such emails had been received but blocked.

The decision

42. We have listened to all the representations and have read all the material.
43. We have had regard to the statutory guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003, and the Council's own licensing policy statement.
44. We have also taken into account our duty to have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of our discretion on, and the need to do all we reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in our area.
45. We confirm that in making our decision we have sought to promote the licensing objectives.
46. We have taken into account that local residents have a right to respect for their private and family life and their home. They are entitled therefore not to be disturbed by unreasonable noise and nuisance. However, this is a qualified right and has to be balanced against the rights of others including the rights of businesses in the area to operate.
47. This application once again raises significant issues concerning the implications of longer licensing hours in Aylesbury town centre. It spotlights the content and significance of the council's licensing policy statement and, in particular, the special saturation policy which deals with the cumulative impact on the licensing objectives of a concentration of licensed premises in Aylesbury town centre. It addresses the need to

consider the bigger picture and the wider impact individual licensing decisions are likely to have on crime, disorder, nuisance, disturbance and public safety in sensitive locations.

48. It is important to appreciate that having a licensing policy statement is a statutory requirement and that the council is also required to keep its policy under review and to determine its policy on a periodic basis (previously it was every three years and now its 5 years). Each time the council determines its policy it has to follow a statutory process and consult responsible authorities, the trade and representatives of residents and businesses in the council's area. In other words, all the key stakeholders. The Licensing Act requires the policy to be approved at a meeting of the full council such is the policy's significance.
49. Once in force, the policy forms an essential part of the background against which licensing decisions are made by the council because the Licensing Act requires the council to have regard to its licensing policy, amongst other things, in carrying out its licensing functions.
50. It is worth mentioning that statutory guidance confirms that the cumulative impact of licensed premises on the promotion of the licensing objectives is a proper matter for a licensing authority to consider in developing its licensing policy statement (13.19).
51. The current version of the council's licensing policy has been in force since 7 January 2011 and is the council's third policy. Material changes and improvements were made to the previous version of the council's policy which the preface to the council's policy explains in the following terms:

“When the Council first published its Licensing Policy (the Policy) in January 2005 in compliance with Section 5 of the Licensing Act 2003 (the Act), we could only best guess how in practice we would exercise our powers. The Act was then a new and untested piece of legislation and its practical impact was uncertain. In particular, the licensing of the sale and supply of alcohol and take-aways was not something that the Council had any previous experience of.

In the ensuing years the precise nature of the Council's role, acting in its capacity as Licensing Authority, has evolved and matured.

When the Council reviewed its policy in 2007 we were able to address the gap between the anticipated role of the Licensing Authority as defined in our first policy and the role actually assumed in reality. The Council's revised policy, which we published in January 2008, was much more experience based and therefore more responsive to the effects of the new licensing regime.

Drawing on the lessons learnt over a further 3 years of operational experience, changes have been made to the policy which build on past successes and which challenge in new or more effective ways remaining areas of concern. This experience has allowed the Council to develop its policy making role with greater confidence, clarity and precision as to what works in the district of Aylesbury Vale in terms of promoting the licensing objectives.”

52. As far as this application is concerned, it is particularly noteworthy that drawing on the council's increased operational experience and knowledge of what works in the district of Aylesbury Vale in terms of promoting the licensing objectives and, the flipside, what harms those objectives, the council revamped its saturation policy. The saturation policy was strengthened and its scope extended and it was stated in more clear, precise and stricter terms.
53. The policy states that it does not prevent any party from making any application and having it determined on its merits but that the policy will always play a key role in decision-making (1.10) and that some of the policies are intended to be strictly applied because of the importance of the policy in question to the promotion of the licensing objectives locally and that the council will only depart from the policy in truly exceptional cases where the applicant can show that the licensing objectives can be met by other means (1.11).
54. The council's saturation policy receives focussed attention in section 5 of the policy. The key points to note are that the saturation policy applies to this variation application because (1) the premises is within the saturation zone and is in fact a "higher risk premises" as the sale of alcohol is a primary activity and it can serve hot food or drink for consumption off the premises and (2) the application is a "material variation" as, amongst other things, it seeks permission to increase the trading hours of the premises and extend the sale of alcohol and late night refreshment.
55. According to the policy, applications relating to "higher risk premises" seeking to sell alcohol beyond midnight or close beyond 12.30am will be refused and that even applications for "lower risk premises" seeking to sell alcohol beyond 2.a.m. or close beyond 2.30a.m. will be refused.
56. It is expressly stated that the policy is intended to be strictly applied; exceptions will only be made in genuinely exceptional cases and that a case will not normally be considered exceptional on the ground of the good character of the applicant or the size of the variation.
57. The factual and evidential bases of the council's special saturation policy is set out in the licensing policy and is, in essence, directed at the crime and disorder and nuisance arising from the large number of customers in the town centre, particularly late at night.
58. The effect of the policy is to create a rebuttable presumption that applications for new licences or variations that are likely to add to the existing cumulative impact will normally be refused, unless the applicant can demonstrate that there will be no negative cumulative impact on the licensing objectives.
59. However, each case still has to be determined on its own individual merits as we confirm we have in this case.
60. Against that background and having assessed very carefully the likely impact of the extension of hours, we are satisfied that this application is a material variation which is likely to add to the existing cumulative impact. Given the nature and significance of the special saturation policy and its actual wording, Mr Michael's submissions to the contrary were simply not credible.

61. We have arrived at this conclusion having particular regard to the representations made by the police and the Licensing Authority which weighed heavily with us. We reject the complaint that the policy is flawed or unfair. As already mentioned, the special saturation policy has been approved by the full council, following a statutory process, and we have to have regard to it in carrying out our licensing functions. Indeed, it will always be a key consideration in the decision making process whenever it applies. This does not mean that it is being applied inflexibly as Mr Michael argued – that is just the proper application of a key policy.
62. It pursues a legitimate aim, namely, preventing harm to the licensing objectives caused by a concentration of licensed premises in a specific location. It has a basis in statutory guidance, which we also have to have regard to in carrying out our licensing functions. Mr Hooper and Mr Seal were right in our view to argue that it is legitimate and necessary in this case to focus on the wider or overall impact of the grant of this application and not on this premises in isolation or its track record.
63. The special saturation policy says in terms that it is to be strictly applied and that exceptions will only be made in genuinely exceptional cases but that a case will not normally be considered exceptional on the ground of the good character of the applicant. We are therefore not persuaded that Mango was a genuinely exceptional case because, as Mr Hooper and Mr Seal told us, there are many other premises in the special saturation zone which are run at least as well as Mango.
64. The upshot is that the policy created a rebuttable presumption that this application would normally be refused, unless Mr Michael could demonstrate that there would be no negative cumulative impact on the licensing objectives. For the reasons given by the police and the Licensing Authority, which we have already outlined, this is not something Mr Michael was able to do.
65. We agree that the wider impact on policing is relevant. Longer licensing hours in town centres with a concentration of licensed premises attracting a large number of people, especially on Friday and Saturday nights, would demand extra and an even greater allocation of finite police resources in order to prevent crime, disorder and public nuisance and to ensure public safety.
66. Inspector Steel informed us that there is only 1 Sergeant and 9 police constables (which was recently increased from 8) who patrol the whole of Aylesbury Vale on Friday and Saturday nights. In order to police the night time economy in Aylesbury and deal with the kind of incidents which were graphically illustrated by the CCTV evidence the police showed us, the Sergeant and 6 constables are allocated to Aylesbury leaving just 3 constables to patrol the rest of the district.
67. As was the case with the fourth clip we were shown which involved a group of people fighting in the street and on the road, as many as 6 officers can sometimes be pre-occupied with just one incident. This is why the aim of the police on a Friday and Saturday night is to clear the town centre as quickly as possible to eliminate the risk of alcohol related crime, disorder and violence.
68. Inspector Steel explained that extending licensing hours would mean police officers having to extend their shift hours which would encroach upon their rest time and would have cost implications. According to Inspector Steel, the reality is that he does not think

that he is going to get any more resources. An over-stretched police force unable to effectively deal with the risk of alcohol related crime, disorder and violence would clearly harm the licensing objectives and is therefore clearly a relevant consideration for us to weigh in the balance.

69. Licensing experience since the Licensing Act came into force strongly suggests that longer licensing hours in the town centre will result in more and later incidents of crime and disorder and nuisance.
70. Local licensing experience also demonstrates that a significant extension of hours granted to one premises in the town centre is likely to result in other similar applications and ultimately customers drinking for even longer followed by a mass exit of customers at a common but even later hour.
71. These are the clear conclusions we can draw from real life operational experience of licensing premises in Aylesbury town centre.
72. The need to consider each application on its own merits, as we have in this case, does not preclude us from considering the cumulative and wider impact on the licensing objectives of granting this application. This is clearly a material and weighty consideration given our duty to promote the licensing objectives and there was nothing exceptional about this application justifying a departure from this important policy.
73. Nor were we persuaded that the use of TENs proves that extended hours would not add to the cumulative impact. The temporary, ad hoc nature of these extensions, over a relatively short period of time, which may or may not have been common knowledge, do not represent in our view a reliable account of the likely impact of extending the hours on a permanent basis.
74. We accept what the police told us that in their experience once a granting of a 24 hour licence to a premises becomes common knowledge to customers of other premises they will gravitate to it. At the moment other premises are far busier than Mango and they also use TENs too. Apparently, this is causing issues for policing in the town centre as are bank holiday extensions which the police say they will have to deal with.
75. In deciding to attach the weight that we have to the representations made by the police we noted that the statutory guidance advises us as follows:

“9.12 In their role as a responsible authority, the police are an essential source of advice and information on the impact and potential impact of licensable activities, particularly on the crime and disorder objective. The police have a key role in managing the night-time economy and should have good working relationships with those operating in their local area. The police should be the licensing authority’s main source of advice on matters relating to the promotion of the crime and disorder licensing objective, but may also be able to make relevant representations with regards to the other licensing objectives if they have evidence to support such representations. The licensing authority should accept all reasonable and proportionate representations made by the police unless the authority has evidence that to do so would not be appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives. However, it remains incumbent on the police to ensure that their representations can withstand the scrutiny to which they would be subject at a hearing.”

76. We reject therefore Mr Michael's criticism that the representations objecting to his application were not evidence based as, in a licensing context, local knowledge, experience and the professional judgement of the responsible authorities are relevant and can, and in the circumstances of this case, should be weighty considerations.
77. Mr Michael referred us to the **Daniel Thwaites Plc** case and we can do no better than repeat what the 2010 decision notice said. In that case the High Court decided that a decision of a Magistrates' Court to impose restrictions on the hours of operation of a licensed premises was unlawful as it had not been established that it was necessary to do so to promote the licensing objectives.
78. In that case, the Court noted that "what led the magistrates to impose restricted hours of operation was their forecast as to what would occur in the future in association with the premises, notwithstanding the absence of reliable evidence of past problems."
79. The High Court criticised the Magistrates' Court for failing to take proper account of the changed approach to licensing introduced by the Licensing Act and for imposing regulation without looking for real evidence that it was required in the circumstances of the case.
80. However, in that particular case the applicant had agreed to restrict the hours to those that were acceptable to the police. The police accordingly withdrew their representations and did not take part in the hearing conducted by the licensing authority.
81. Significantly, the Court specifically held that the fact that the police did not oppose the hours sought should have weighed very heavily with the Magistrates.
82. The other key point to note is that no representations were made by Environmental Health.
83. It is plain therefore that the facts of this particular application are very different from that case. As far as this application is concerned, we do attach considerable weight to the representations made by the police, the Licensing Authority and Environmental Health, all of whom objected to the application and asked us to refuse it. Our decision is also based on local licensing experience and concern for the future based on reliable evidence of past problems.
84. For these reasons, we were satisfied that it was appropriate, and indeed necessary and proportionate, to refuse the application, save for permitting boxing and wrestling, in order to promote the licensing objectives. Before doing so, however, we confirm that we considered but ultimately discounted for the reasons given, extending the hours for a shorter time and/or on some but not all days and/or on a seasonal or non-standard basis (as per the application).
85. The only part of the application which the police did not object to was permitting the activities of boxing and wrestling until the existing terminal hour for all other forms of regulated entertainment. Nor did the Licensing Authority object in principle subject to the imposition of unspecified special conditions. In all the circumstances, we felt there was no point in refusing this part of the application because of the permissions the

premises already has. If, however, we were starting afresh, it would have been appropriate, in order to promote the licensing objectives, for us to refuse this part of the application too.

86. We felt that Mr Michael's submission that the law did not allow us to restrict the opening hours of the premises was misconceived and the article he sought to rely on lent him no support. Applications have to be made in the prescribed form and be accompanied by an operating schedule in a prescribed form which requires applicants to specify the opening and closing times of the premises. It is obvious to us at least that this information forms part and parcel of the application process; is, on the facts of this particular case, very closely related to the provision of the licensable activities and was intended by the Licensing Act to be regulated because the opening hours of a licensed premises is capable of directly and significantly impacting upon the licensing objectives.
87. Mr Michael's application included an offer to volunteer a condition which would mean that the licence would effectively revert back to the current hours should he no longer remain as the designated premises supervisor. The Licensing Act does not allow for this. Section 35(4) stipulates that the steps that we can take are to modify the conditions of the licence or to reject the whole or part of the application. What Mr Michael suggests is something different altogether and is not permissible. Granting an application for a temporary period or for as long as the DPS does not change is not an option open to us.
88. Besides, that is not an answer to the fundamental and weighty reasons why we feel that it would not be appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives to grant the application (or at least most of it). Nor could the use of other conditions overcome the objections we have already discussed.
89. Mr Michael also invited us to grant the application and then rely on others to take advantage of enforcement powers such as applying for a closure order or a review of the licence in the event of problems. Our duty is to carry out our licensing functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives and in this case that means it is appropriate, and necessary and proportionate, to prevent the problems from arising in the first place for all the reasons given.
90. Mr Michael's objection to Mr Seal's representation was misplaced. As far as the regulation of alcohol, entertainment and late night refreshment is concerned, the legal landscape has changed and this is one manifestation of that. As the council's most senior licensing officer Mr Seal has detailed knowledge of licensed premises and licensing policy. If he perceives an application to harm the licensing objectives or undermine the special saturation policy it is perfectly legitimate for him to make a representation and draw it to the attention of the Sub-Committee.
91. Ultimately, however, it is the Sub-Committee that decides whether the application should be granted or not. That said, given the potential for conflict, it is important that, as Mr Seal confirmed he had in this case, the advice in the statutory guidance is followed. In this case, Ms Kerryann Ashton dealt with the administration of the application and presented the application and issues to us so as to achieve a separation of responsibilities.

92. We did not feel it was necessary to take any action in response to the Fire Authority's representation because the matter was adequately dealt with by other existing legislation which the Fire Authority had the power to enforce.
93. As for the representation made by Mr and Mrs Amos, Mr Michael dismissed their representation as "commercially driven" and "vexatious". As their representation was contested by Mr Michael and according to him "there is known animosity between myself and Mr Amos", although we took it into account, in the interests of fairness little weight was attached to it because their concerns could not be tested either by Mr Michael or us.

Conditions

94. The mandatory conditions and the conditions volunteered by the applicant (i.e. the details of the operating schedule) have not been reproduced in this decision notice but will be set out in the licence document itself.

The effective date of this decision

95. This decision will take effect when the licence (or a certified copy) is kept at the premises and a summary of that licence (or a certified copy) is displayed at the premises. These documents will be issued by Licensing Services as soon as possible.

Right of Appeal

96. Mr Michael has a right of appeal to Aylesbury Magistrates' Court against this decision. The applicant can appeal against the refusal of part of the application.
97. The other parties also have a right of appeal. They can appeal against the grant of part of the application.
98. If you wish to appeal you must notify Aylesbury Magistrates' Court within a period of 21 days starting with the day on which the Council notified you of this decision.

6 March 2013