
CENTRAL LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE 21/09/26

Present:

Councillors: Gwynfor Owen (Chair), Elfed Williams and Gwilym Evans

Officers: Nia Grisdale (Legal Manager), Gwenan Mai Roberts (Licensing Manager), Andrew Parry (Trading Standards and Licensing Manager), and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer)

Others invited:

Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar Director of Registered Company

Donna Marie Evans Trading Standards Team Leader (Consumer Protection)
Chris O'Neal Member of the Public

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deiniol Gwyn Jones (Public Protection Officer – Environmental Health) and the Public Health Representative for Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board (BCUHB)

2. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

3. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

None to note

4. APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE

The Dragon Shop Ltd, 280 High Street, Bangor

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

a) The Licensing Department's Report

The report of the Head of the Environment Department was presented providing details of a premises licence application for The Dragon Shop Ltd, 280 High Street, Bangor. The application was made by the Licensing Agent 'The Licensing Guys', on behalf of the applicant which was a limited company with Mr Bayzidiazar named as the sole director of that company.

It was highlighted that the premises was already operating as a Convenience Store: the application was for selling alcohol to be consumed off the premises, from 07:00 until 23:00, 7 days a week.

It was noted that the Licensing Authority's Officers had sufficient evidence that the application had been submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Licensing Act 2003 and the relevant regulations. Reference was made to the measures that had been recommended by the applicant to promote the licensing objectives, and it was highlighted that these measures would be included on the licence should it be granted.

The officer drew attention to the responses received during the consultation. BCUHB had submitted comments which expressed concern about the potential impact of the application on the licensing objectives of preventing crime and disorder, public safety, and protecting children from harm. They referred to local evidence of alcohol-related harm in Gwynedd, the above-average levels of alcohol consumption among young people, concerns about community safety within the Deiniol ward area, and the relationship between alcohol availability and alcohol-related crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour. It was suggested that the Sub-Committee consider previous enforcement matters relating to the site.

The Public Protection Service (Trading Standards Service) had also expressed an objection based on evidence of crime and disorder. It was noted that, in accordance with the provisions of part 4 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, a Closure Notice had been served on the business premises at 280 High Street, Bangor, on 26 February 2026, and later, following a Court case in which evidence was presented following several test purchases of illegal cigarettes/tobacco, seizure of counterfeit items such as counterfeit toys, vapes, cigarettes and tobacco. A Closure Notice was issued on the premises (not the Company/business) which was effective for 3 months until 2 June 2026.

Reference was made to information that had been shared on an intelligence and data system operated by Trading Standards services across the UK. It was discovered that Mr Bayzidiazar was associated with a shop at 85 Drake Street, Rochdale. The shop was the subject of a closure order, and Mr Bayzidiaza was the director of another company, Cloud 9 Vape Shop Ltd of the same address, and his son was associated with the shop who was also linked to alleged illegal tobacco sales through other similar shops. It appeared that Mostafa Bayzidiazar was a tenant at the premises.

An objection had been received from the Public Protection Service - Environmental Health in relation to the licensing objective of preventing crime and disorder, specifically because the store had been closed earlier in the year by trading standards officers due to sales of counterfeit tobacco products. Reference was made to additional representations that had been received from the Officer which stated,

- 'Although the application has come from a new business, the same staff continue to work there, which follows the pattern of difficulties with previous businesses on the site with a food standards notice and a seizure notice on foods that did not meet British Regulations requirements, with many goods from abroad being sold there.
- The new business is not registered as a food business. Despite having contacted them by e-mail and a letter through the post, registration has not been implemented – this leads to doubts as it is a legal requirement to register a food business. Also, a lack of confidence in the business to cooperate with the Council'.

Objections were received from a Local Member and a member of the public in relation to the four licensing objectives which highlighted that the premises'

history of non-compliance did not inspire confidence in the applicant's ability to comply with the wider responsibilities associated with selling alcohol. It was noted that a food hygiene score of 1 did not bode well in terms of the business's ability to keep the public safe. It was reiterated that the shop attracted a large number of young people which could lead to the risk of young people congregating around the shop at times where there are incidents of anti-social behaviour, with the right to sell alcohol exacerbating the problem. It was also noted that there were discrepancies with the shop's opening hours – although 23:00 was noted in the Licensing Manager's report, there were allegations that the shop sometimes remained opened until 2:00.

North Wales Police and North Wales Fire and Rescue Service had no objection to the application.

The officers, in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003, recommended that the Sub-Committee refuse the application due to a history of crime and disorder and concerns associated with the premises; and associated with the director of the company who was submitting the application for a licence.

The members thanked the officer for the report

In considering the application, the following procedure was followed:-

- Members of the Sub-committee were given an opportunity to ask questions of the Council's representative.
- At the Chair's discretion, the applicant or his representative to ask questions of the Council's representative.
- The applicant and/or his representative to be invited to expand on the application and to call witnesses.
- Members of the Sub-committee to be given the opportunity to ask questions of the applicant and/or his representative.
- At the Chair's discretion, the Council's representative may ask questions of the applicant or his representative.
- Each Consultee to be invited to support any written representations.
- The Council's representative and the applicant or his representative to be given the opportunity to summarise their case.
- The Legal Officer to summarise the requirements of the application.

b) In elaborating on the application, the applicant made the following comments (through his interpreter):

- He was open to discussing the opening hours of the business with the Licensing Service
- The food hygiene issues did not apply to him as he was not the owner of the shop
- If he was granted a licence, he would buy the store
- There were only suspicions regarding the premises in Rochdale because of false information – he had not behaved unlawfully
- He was a businessman and would not do anything illegal
- He bought cheap cigarettes, but not illegal ones
- He had no convictions against him, and he had not worked illegally
- His son now ran the store in Rochdale and he supported his son to ensure that the store operated legally
- He would not behave unlawfully or allow his staff to sell counterfeit or illegal products
- He needed one chance.

- He wanted to invest in the business

- c) Members of the Sub-committee were given an opportunity to ask questions of the Council's representative and the applicant.

In response to a question as to who was running the shop, the Council's representative stated that on 11 August 2026, Trading Standards had become aware of an application for a new premises licence for the premises at 280 High Street, Bangor and it was highlighted that the applicant was Dragon Shop Ltd, a company that had been registered with Companies House since 21 July 2026 with Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar as the Director of the Registered Company. It was reiterated that since the licence application was submitted, complaints had been received from the public alleging that the shop was selling illegal goods.

In response to a question about the store's opening hours and whether the premises had opened for trading, the applicant stated that he was prepared to open as per the sub-committee's wishes, but that he would not buy the store if he was not granted an alcohol licence. In response to a supplementary question about how he would manage the store if he were granted a licence and ensure that only legal alcohol would be sold given the history of counterfeit goods, the applicant stated that he would comply with the requirements of the licence and promised not to sell anything illegal.

In response to a question about what had happened in Rochdale, the applicant stated that it was the previous owner of the store who had sold illegal goods – the store was not in his name, therefore he questioned why this was relevant. He added that he had bought the shop cheaply and that the shop was now running as a legal premises.

- ch) The consultee in attendance took the opportunity to expand on the observations they had submitted in writing.

Donna Marie Evans: Trading Standards Team Leader (Consumer Protection)

- Trading Standards had conducted a 'New Business Visit' to the shop on 8 September 2026 and according to their records, Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar was the new owner of the shop.

Mr Chris O'Neal – Member of the Public

- The community of Bangor was trying to regenerate the High Street and welcomed any new shops to increase the footfall
- He opposed the application because of issues associated with the premises
- A recent Closure Notice had been served on the shop
- He was concerned about the safety of children – the shop had been selling illegal goods to underage children
- A hygiene rating of 1 gave some idea of the premises' standards, therefore the issue needed addressing
- The existing premises was open until 02:00, although the trading hours were 23:00 – no safeguards in place
- The sale of harmful goods was completely unacceptable – if illegal cigarettes and vapes were already being sold in the shop, what would stop the sale of illegal alcohol?
- He had no issue against the individuals, but his objection pertained to the notice on the premises
- He hoped that the owner would behave responsibly

- There was a need to ensure there were safeguards in place
- d) Taking advantage of the right to summarise their case, the Licensing Manager noted
- That the application submitted was one for a premises licence for The Dragon Shop Ltd, 280 High Street, Bangor;
 - The application had been submitted by 'The Licensing Guys' who had withdrawn the application after seeing the comments, therefore Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar was submitting the application.
 - Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar was unsure of the store's opening hours
 - He had no information or evidence regarding managing the store's illegal operations in future
 - There must be the name of a designated person on the premises - it would have been possible for Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar himself to apply for a licence

The applicant had no further comment

- dd) The Legal Officer took the opportunity to summarise and confirm the requirements of the application.

The applicant and his interpreter, the Licensing Manager, the Trading Standards Team Leader (Consumer Protection), the press and public left the meeting while the members of the Sub-committee discussed the application.

In reaching its decision, the Sub-committee considered the applicant's application form, the written representations submitted by interested parties, the Licensing Officer's report, together with the verbal representations from each party present at the hearing. The Council's Licensing Policy and Home Office guidelines were considered. The Sub-committee gave due consideration to all the observations and weighed these up against the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, namely:

- i. Prevention of crime and disorder
- ii. Prevention of public nuisance
- iii. Ensuring public safety
- iv. Protection of children from harm

Representations submitted which were irrelevant to the above objectives were disregarded.

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application:

A premises licence application had been submitted for 280 High Street, Bangor. A new company called Dragon Shop Ltd was incorporated at Companies House on 21 July 2026 with the registered address of the location as 280 High Street, Bangor. The sole director of the company was Mr Mostafa Bayzidiazar, and he appeared on behalf of the company that had submitted the application. Mr Bayzidiazar told the Sub-committee that he had not purchased the property, and that the application had been made in order to decide whether he would buy the property or not.

The Public Protection Service, as the relevant authority, submitted representations stating that the premises had been subject to a Closure Notice in June 2026 due to evidence of multiple test purchases of illegal cigarettes/tobacco, seizure of counterfeit goods including toys, vape devices, cigarettes and tobacco. The applicant stated that this happened before he considered buying the premises. However, the Sub-committee was informed that further allegations of illegal cigarettes and tobacco were reported on 30 June 2026 and 27 August 2026. In addition, it was reported that on 8 September 2026, the shop's employees had clarified that Mr Bayzidiazar was the current owner of the shop.

The Sub-committee was made aware through the Public Protection Service, which had received information and data through the UK-wide Trading Standards services forum, that Mr Bayzidiazar was also involved with a premises in Rochdale which had been the subject of a Closure Notice. Mr Bayzidiazar denied that he was associated with any Closure Notice, stating that he had purchased the premises after the Closure Notice had been issued at a much lower price due to the illegal activities that had been taking place there, and that he was now trading as a legitimate entity.

Information was also provided to the Sub-committee that the existing premises had a hygiene rating of 1 and that the premises had failed to register as a food outlet in accordance with Public Protection Legislation, which raised concerns about a lack of co-operation and compliance with regulations. Mr Bayzidiazar did not explain the proposed opening hours for the shop, or provide the current opening hours for the premises, as he was not yet involved in the business.

Taking consideration of comments from a member of the public who had submitted objections verbally at the meeting and through a written objection, the Sub-committee considered the comments which described anti-social behaviour problems as a result of the shop being open late into the night (sometimes until 2am or 3am), and that this attracted further anti-social behaviour to the area. The Sub-committee was concerned that granting a licence would potentially attract more young people to convene there, which could exacerbate behavioural problems.

The Sub-committee considered the information provided by Mr Bayzidiazar on behalf of the company that had made the application. However, there was a lack of clarity regarding several key issues, which included the premises' ownership, the proposed opening hours, and the measures that would be implemented to protect the public. As a result, the Sub-committee had not been persuaded that everything would be carried out "legally" as no robust management plan or detailed strategy had been presented.

The Sub-committee was not satisfied that the operating schedule submitted with the application adequately addressed the concerns that had been raised during

the hearing. No evidence was received that effective measures would be put in place to address the issues surrounding counterfeit goods, which had been found at the premises in recent months. Moreover, the Sub-committee was not provided with adequate evidence or assurance that any alcohol, vapes, or tobacco goods sold on the premises would be genuine and sourced legally, beyond Mr Bayzidiazar's assertion that all future operations would be carried out legally.

The Sub-committee was also concerned about the information that had been received from Rochdale Trading Standards in relation to sites associated with Mr B, and therefore considered them relevant to the application.

The Sub-committee had also read the comments of BCUHB Public Health Service which had objected to the application based on the licensing objectives of public safety and protection of children from harm. Their concerns related to alcohol-related harm in Gwynedd, particularly as the Deiniol ward was recognised as one of the most deprived areas in Gwynedd, and that there was a clear link between alcohol availability and alcohol-related crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour. They had asked the Sub-committee to consider the wider well-being implications of the application, particularly in relation to vulnerable individuals, children and young people.

The Sub-committee noted that neither North Wales Police nor the Fire Service objected to the application.

In considering the licensing objectives, the Sub-committee concluded that the application, as submitted, did not provide adequate assurance that the licensing objectives would be upheld. Specifically, the Sub-committee was not satisfied that the objectives of preventing crime and disorder, ensuring public safety, and protecting children from harm would be adequately promoted by Mr Bayzidiazar and Dragon Shops Ltd, given the evidence presented regarding recent issues associated with the premises, and the individual associated with the application.

The Solicitor reported that the decision would be formally confirmed by letter to everyone who had submitted written observations. She added that all parties to the application had the right to submit an appeal to Caernarfon Magistrates' Court against the Sub-committee's decision. Any such appeal should be lodged by giving notice of appeal to the Chief Executive, Llandudno Magistrates' Court, Llandudno within 21 days of the date the appellant receives the letter (or a copy of the letter) confirming the decision.

The meeting commenced at 10.45 am and concluded at 12.25 pm

CHAIRMAN