

London Borough of Haringey – Decisions taken by the Licensing Sub Committee B on Thursday, 16 February 2017

Title	Decision
<p>SOTILS GREEN LTD, 271 PARK LANE LONDON N17 0HU</p>	<p>The committee carefully considered the application for a new premises licence, the representations of the Police, Public Health, and Licensing Authority as responsible authorities, the representations made by the Applicant and his representative, the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the Licensing Act 2003 s182 guidance.</p> <p>Having heard the parties' evidence, the Committee resolved to refuse to grant the application for a new premises licence.</p> <p>The committee heard evidence that the premises had previously sold alcohol without a licence and was of the opinion that public safety and the risks to public health, in an area of acute alcohol problems, would be exacerbated if a licence was granted for a premises that showed little sign of willingness to work with the licensing authority in limiting the risks associated with the unlicensed and unregulated sale of alcohol.</p> <p>In addition the licensing sub committee heard that the premises had previously been engaged in the unlawful sale of a bladed article to a minor. This was a serious matter which in the opinion of the committee showed that the licence holder and those associated with the premises would have insufficient regard to the need to protect children from harm.</p> <p>The applicant's evidence to the committee was that he had no prior involvement with the premises and was only going to become involved with the premises once a premises licence had been granted. The committee did not consider this evidence as credible, particularly since the applicant had by his own admission no current involvement financial or otherwise with the premises. The committee's view was that once licensed, the premises would not require any further involvement from the applicant.</p> <p>The committee's view was that there was a significant risk that those currently operating the premises, and who had already demonstrated disregard for the licensing objectives, would be in a position to employ a Designated Premises Supervisor and continue trading without the</p>

applicant's involvement once a licence was granted.

The Applicant was very vague in response to matters put to him at the licensing sub committee hearing and seemed to be unable to answer basic questions regarding the level of his involvement with the premises, the use of CCTV and whether he had previously met the Police at the premises unequivocally.

The evidence put before the committee regarding which members of the applicant's family had been involved in particular incidents was at best vague and not credible.

In all the circumstances, the committee was not satisfied that licensing objectives relating to the protection of children from harm and prevention of crime and disorder were unlikely to be upheld if a licence was granted.

The committee only made its decision after having heard all the parties' representations and considered that its decision to refuse a premises license was appropriate and proportionate