

Application for the Review of a Premises Licence for North Eight, Hornsey Arms Ltd, 26 Hornsey High Street, London, N8.

The Licensing Sub-Committee (“the LSC”) carefully considered the above application. In considering the application, the LSC took account of the Licensing Act 2003 (“the Act”), the Revised Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 in February 2025 (“the section 182 guidance”), the Haringey Statement of Licensing Policy 2021-2026, the report pack, and representations from the applicant and objectors. Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the LSC decided to **revoke** the license.

Reasons

Representations received

The LSC received the following evidence:

1. A report from the Licensing Team Leader, Daliah Barrett;
2. Representations from the applicant, the Noise responsible authority (“Noise RA”);
3. Written and oral representations in support of the application from:
 - a. Councillor Adam Small, Hornsey ward; and
 - b. Metropolitan Police (“the Met Police”), represented by PC Denham, PC Jones, PC Gray, and James Rankin (Counsel);
4. Written representations only in support of the application from:
 - a. Cerys Edwards, Hannah Mason & Karina Leigh;
 - b. Jill Patterson;
 - c. Henry Rudd-Clarke;
 - d. Holly Gordon;
 - e. Markos Manoledakis & Glykeria Karanika; and
 - f. Lowena Waries; and
5. Representations opposing the application from the license holder, Hornsey Arms Ltd (“Hornsey Arms”), represented by James Kearns, and David Dadds (solicitor).

Save where specifically necessary, for those parties with multiple representatives (the Met Police and Hornsey Arms), these reasons do not distinguish between the different speakers.

Application for adjournment

At the outset of the hearing on 5 August 2025, Hornsey Arms applied for the LSC to adjourn the hearing. Their grounds for doing so were, in summary, that they had received further disclosure from the Met Police the previous week, on 31 July. This was approximately 160 pages of CAD reports relating to July 2025. The fact that these were recent meant that Hornsey Arms still had CCTV available to cover the incidents in question. They wished to consider the incidents in more detail with a view to adducing CCTV evidence to show that, in essence, at least some of the calls to the police did not match the reality of what had occurred. This could be relevant to the weight the LSC should attach, not only to the CADs disclosed in this batch, but all of the earlier CADs too. They stated that if the LSC did not adjourn, they would withdraw as they did not feel the hearing would be fair.

The LSC sought the views of the other parties. The Met Police opposed the request on the basis that the lack of capacity to deal with this before the hearing was not a good

reason. Cllr Small opposed the request on the basis that there was a strong public interest in determining the review application given the nature of the allegations made. The LSC sought legal advice. It noted that under Reg.12 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005, it may adjourn a hearing where it considers this to be necessary so that it can consider the representations made by parties. It also noted that, although the parties had not expressly made submissions on this basis, some guidance as to relevant factors could be found by applying by analogy Rule 28 of the Local Licensing Procedure Rules, which covers situations where a party wishes to rely on documents which have been submitted before the start of the hearing, but after the normal deadline (Rule 25) of ten working days before the hearing. The rule requires the LSC to consider, among other things, whether it would be desirable in the public interest to, on admitting documents late, adjourn the hearing to allow any other party to consider the documents.

Having considered the above, the LSC decided to refuse the application for an adjournment. It was willing to consider the documents despite their being submitted late; Hornsey Arms positively requested this, and it was not clear that any other party opposed this. But it was not necessary (in terms of Reg.12) for its consideration of the representations to adjourn to give a chance for the rebuttal evidence to be provided. This was because it would be able to take into account, to a degree which it judged appropriate, the submission when reaching its overall assessment of what weight to place on the CADs. This would mitigate any prejudice to Hornsey Arms (in terms of Rule 28(f)) caused by the refusal.

After the LSC announced this decision, the representatives of Hornsey Arms left the meeting. The hearing proceeded in their absence.

Substantive representations

Craig Bellringer made representations on behalf of the Noise RA as to the basis of the application for a review. While not seeking to summarise everything said by Mr Bellringer, the LSC noted the following points in particular:

- In April 2022 there had been a previous review of the premises license, initiated by a local resident, which had resulted in further conditions being added to the licence;
- There was a subsequent history of complaints going back to September 2022;
- On three occasions thereafter, officers met with Mr Kearns and/or other representatives of Hornsey Arms to discuss how Hornsey Arms could successfully mitigate issues;
- On 13 January 2024, officers attended and issued an abatement notice;
- On 29 March 2024, officers attended and issued a Fixed Penalty Notice;
- On a date in February 2025, officers (Mr Bellringer) attended and issued a further Fixed Penalty Notice;
- Complaints were continuing, with 4-5 received since this review was initiated;
- This venue probably had the most complaints of any public house in the borough;
- The initial application for a review had requested further conditions as this was at the time felt appropriate based on what Noise knew, but in light of the further representations now before the LSC, in particular the Met Police, Noise were supportive of revoking the license; and

- In Mr Bellringer's opinion, Mr Kearns was not a fit and proper person to hold the license given his failure to take adequate steps to mitigate the issues despite the engagement and enforcement described.

Councillor Adam Small, councillor for Hornsey ward in which the premises are located, made representations supporting the application for a review. While not seeking to summarise everything said by Cllr Small, the LSC noted the following points in particular:

- The license holder had repeatedly and egregiously failed to uphold requirements of their license in ways which undermined all four of the licensing objectives and caused fear and distress to residents;
- On crime and disorder:
 - There had been an high number of calls to the police in respect of this property, showing a sustained pattern of disorder directly linked to the premises and its management;
 - The license holder had shown little to no commitment to taking steps to adequately manage this;
 - Conditions previously imposed had required the presence of two SIA officers, but the license holder had admitted to the Met Police having only one due to prioritising profits;
- On public safety:
 - He walked past the location regularly and attested to a litter of scattered glass, vomit and urine, present during the daytime;
 - On one occasion, a female patron had been served alcohol to the point she vomited, which was the responsibility of the license holder;
- On public nuisance:
 - Residents have reported they are regularly woken up in the night due to noise from the premises and its patrons;
 - One resident had raised this with their workplace HR due to their persistent exhaustion;
 - One resident had described to him changing their daily routines to avoid returning after dark;
 - One resident had given up a tenancy 3 months early to be able to move away from the area;
 - Residents he had spoken to accepted that living near a pub could involve a certain amount of disruption, but this persisted far beyond reasonable times and limits. They used words to him such as being "distracted";
- On the protection of children:
 - There were multiple instances of underage children being served alcohol, including one as young as 13;
 - There were three large schools close to the premises;
 - There were some instances – although not regularly so – of violent behaviour around school leaving time;
 - Staff from one local school had reported to him that they were having to attend early in the morning to clean up "debris" (he was not able to clarify further what this meant) before children arrived;
- One of the reasons he was making representations was that many concerned people had not wished to put their names publicly to supporting this application due to fear of reprisals against them; and
- There were no other pubs in his ward in relation to which he had any remotely comparable complaints.

The Met Police made representations as the Police responsible authority. Save where specifically necessary, this summary does not set out which particular person made representations on a given point. While not seeking to summarise everything said by the Met Police, the LSC noted the following points in particular:

- Although the Met Police had originally taken the position that further conditions were appropriate, further recent incidents led them to the view that this would not in fact be sufficient and revocation was appropriate. To the reverse of what one normally saw, since the review began the situation at the premises had become worse. From 4 July to 30 July, there were 16 calls to the premises on 9 different days, with 8 of those days being related to violent disorder. Those calls had come from multiple sources: six different residents, Verisure (Hornsey Arms' alarm company), premises security, and bar staff themselves;
- As of 28 July 2025, the premises was ranked 8th in the borough for reported incidents of violent crime in the last 12 months, which was particularly significant given the borough hosts multiple major venues;
- The CAD reports were not and had never been put forward on the basis that offences occurred on each and every occasion. They are records that the police were called to deal with an incident;
- The reports gave an impression that bar staff had lost control of their own premises and were calling police to help manage this. The CAD report from 3 July 2025, which was a call by bar staff, was referred to as an example of this. The representatives were not aware of any other pubs calling the police in this manner. The fact that on one occasion a dog unit had to be called – which is extremely rare – is an indication of the seriousness, and the number of calls while a review was underway was shocking;
- Although it may be that many few callouts did not result in arrests or investigations, there could be many reasons for this, and it did not necessarily indicate the call was malicious or mistaken. For examples of how this could arise, it may be that by the time police arrive on the scene, or indeed as a result of them arriving, any disturbance is over. When officers attend a melee of 70-80 people, the aim is normally not to arrest people but to disperse; this is good policing. Potential victims may decide not to give their names or evidence. In addition to this point, it should be noted that even incidents which did not result in criminal investigations etc. would undoubtedly still amount to anti-social behaviour. The overall volume of attendances was significantly above and beyond the norm;
- Although Hornsey Arms had suggested some of the calls may be malicious, the following points could be made:
 - There was only one reference in the CADs to a suspected malicious call: 13 July 2025. This was a statement by bar staff, not by the police;
 - A significant number of the calls came from Verisure (the company providing Hornsey Arms' panic button alarm), from bar staff, and from door supervisors. There were incidents in the CADs which showed the panic button being pressed multiple times, up to 15 in one instance;
 - It was useful to note the representative breakdown of sources of different calls. The LSC heard monthly figures from January 2025 to July 2025 and also a combined figure for March 2024 to December 2024, but as these were not always broken down in the same way, rather than recording each set of figures individually it simply notes that from May 2024 to the current

time, the total number of calls was given as 77. Of these, the number from Verisure, bar staff and door supervisors was somewhere between 34 and 38 (different Met Police representatives doing the calculation arrived at different figures). This indicated that somewhere between 40%-50% of the calls originated from Hornsey Arms and its staff or agents;

- Of those which came from other sources, many of the calls were from people who identified themselves, which are less likely to be malicious. Only a small number were anonymous;
- There were specific breaches of the license conditions which had been noted on previous occasions:
 - There was only one SIA at the door, instead of the required two. Mr Kearns told the Met Police on 14 March 2025 that it would ruin his business if he were forced to incur this cost;
 - On 16 January 2025, a 16-year old male was served by bar staff “to keep him calm”, at a time after 2am;
 - There was no refusals log (it appears this has been rectified); and
 - There were issues with obtaining CCTV (it appears this has been rectified);
- On one occasion, Mr Kearns had driven away from the premises while police were on-site managing an incident. This was not responsible; and
- In the opinion of the Met Police, the failures on the part of Hornsey Arms were causing a risk to public safety, and the premises did not have the capacity to meet its licensing obligations.

Hornsey Arms had elected to leave the meeting after the decision to refuse an adjournment was announced. The LSC still considered their written representations, and (insofar as it was able to do so) the points made by Hornsey Arms while requesting an adjournment.

Evaluation

The LSC reminded itself that it is required by section 4 of the Act to exercise its functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives:

- (a) the prevention of crime and disorder;
- (b) public safety;
- (c) the prevention of public nuisance; and
- (d) the protection of children from harm.

Prevention of crime and disorder

The LSC was satisfied that the premises was a significant hotspot for crime and disorder. It carefully noted the submission by Hornsey Arms that the volume of CAD reports was misleading because a significant proportion did not result in arrests etc. It further noted that Hornsey Arms had wanted to submit CCTV evidence which it said would show the CAD reports from July 2025 did not reflect the reality. It bore this in mind when deciding how much weight to place on the CADs. On balance, it felt able to conclude that the totality of the Met Police evidence supported their representations for the following reasons:

1. A key piece of data the Met Police had put forward was not based on the CADs: the bar charts in the second letter of PC Denham dated 31 July 2025. This represented the number, not of callouts or CADs, but of crime reports – a much

smaller number. This was still sufficient to place it within the top 10 in the borough. The LSC had not heard any reason to doubt this;

2. The CADs were still worth placing weight on. Notwithstanding the slight lack of clarity as to the exact number of calls which originated from Verisure, bar staff, or the door supervisors, the LSC was satisfied that the answer was in the range 40%-50%. The LSC did not think it plausible these could be malicious calls. They must have represented the honest view of Hornsey Arms and its staff that the police needed to be called;
3. The LSC accepted that members of the public who are willing to identify themselves when calling the police are less likely to be making malicious or hoax calls. It could not rule out that possibility entirely, but it accepted that at least a significant proportion of the remaining 50%-60% of the CADs would represent the honest view of members of the public that the police needed to be called; and
4. The Met Police had given cogent reasons why the mere fact that no arrests or prosecutions resulted from a callout did not necessarily mean there had been no criminal activity. It had further noted that an incident which is not criminal may still be an incident of public disorder, anti-social behaviour, or impinging on public safety.

While Hornsey Arms had wished to go through CAD reports individually and comment on their outcomes, and the LSC noted the “grid” produced by them for that purpose, going through the reports in that way would be to get lost in the trees while failing to see the forest. The LSC was not trying to investigate the truth of each individual incident but satisfy itself as to the overall picture.

Accordingly, the LSC was satisfied that the current operation of the license undermined the objective of preventing crime and disorder, because significant levels of crime and disorder were occurring at the premises.

Public safety

The LSC reminded itself that this licensing objective relates to the safety of the people using the premises. It felt there was evidence that the current operation of the premises undermined this licensing objective, noting particularly the incident reported by Cllr Small of a lady being served alcohol to the point of vomiting, though similar concerns could also be seen in the Met Police representations (undated letter from North Area Police Licensing Team, subheading “Post 1st visit”).

Prevention of public nuisance

The LSC reminded itself that public nuisance carries a broad meaning in this context, as confirmed by paras.2.21-22 of the section 182 guidance. The LSC was satisfied that there were high levels of noise nuisance being experienced by local residents. While it took into account all of the representations submitted, including the written representations from members of the public listed at the start of these reasons, it found particularly helpful the representations of Cllr Small, which illustrated in strong terms the extent of the impact on people living nearby.

Accordingly, the LSC was satisfied that the current operation of the premises undermined this licensing objective.

Protection of children from harm

The LSC felt there was evidence that children were being subjected to harm, or a risk of harm. It noted three points in particular. First, there was evidence of children under the age of 18 being served alcohol: Met Police evidence in relation to incident on 18 January

2025, written evidence of Henry Rudd-Clarke in relation to incident on 24 April 2025, oral representations of Cllr Small in relation to a 13-year old being served. Second, there was evidence of violent altercations during the daytime: Video evidence viewed by LSC of an altercation. Third, there was evidence that the school neighbouring the premises had to take extra steps to clear up before their students arrived: Oral representations of Cllr Small.

Accordingly, the LSC was satisfied that the current operation of the premises undermined this licensing objective.

The appropriate action

For all of the above reasons, the LSC determined it appropriate to exercise its statutory powers under section 52(4) of the Act so as to promote the licensing objectives.

In deciding which of the powers available to it was appropriate to use, the LSC followed paras.11.20-22 of the section 182 guidance by asking what the cause of the concerns was. It took the view that this was a sustained and total loss by Hornsey Arms of the ability to control their own premises, coupled with continual failure to take steps to address this.

The loss of control was expressed multiple times in representations from different parties. The LSC considered that some of the CADs provided anecdotal evidence to bear this out, noting incidents on 2 June 2025 (4:30am “The pub has pressed two panic alarms multiple times in last 2 mins. We can hear screaming and shouting on the radio but have not been able to speak to anyone. They have pressed the alarms approx 7 times.”) and 3 July 2025 (call at 2:15am “I have been grabbed by customers – they are refusing to leave and have assaulted me as I have been trying to get them out. There are approx 30-60 people here all refusing to leave – the security are contacting you now – we have 2 security on scene but cannot manage the situation. – I have been physically grabbed by these people.”) For clarity, the LSC notes these incidents as representative only: they are not the totality of the evidence on the basis of which it was persuaded of this. Further, the Met Police reported that Mr Kearns told them during their visit on 14 March 2025 that he consumed alcohol while on-site, which gave them concerns, that the LSC concurs with, about his ability to operate the premises and maintain control.

The repeated failure to take satisfactory steps was likewise repeated by multiple parties. The Noise RA and Met Police both detailed steps taken to try and engage with Hornsey Arms management, which the LSC took into account. The LSC did not disregard the fact that some steps were taken by Hornsey Arms; see, for example, the undated letter from North Area Police Licensing Team, subheadings “Police engagement” and “2nd visit”. However, it was clear that these steps were not effectively implemented. The evidence was overwhelming that the incidents and concerns continued notwithstanding these steps, and the LSC could not detect any significant improvement brought about thereby. The LSC did not consider that additional conditions on the license would suffice. Additional conditions had been imposed at the previous review in 2022, but the current problems existed regardless. There had also been a history of patchy compliance with conditions and failure to effectively implement remedial measures.

The LSC also did not consider that removing the designated premises supervisor would suffice. The DPS, Ms Jemma Crucifix, had not been put forward to make representations on behalf of Hornsey Arms and little to no mention of her was made in the representations by any party. The LSC felt it clear that the poor management ran deeper

than decisions made by her as an individual, and reflected on the company practice and policy. It was difficult to see how an alternative DPS would be able to restore control. Finally, the LSC did not think that suspending the license would suffice. The representations were clear that the issues at this venue were on a different scale to other similar venues. They had been given opportunities since the 2022 review to work with the Noise RA and Met Police to improve their position. This had not been successfully done. This was the paradigmatic case where, per 11.23 of the section 182 guidance, “premises are found to be trading irresponsibly” such that the LSC “should not hesitate... to take tough action”.

Accordingly, the LSC resolved to **revoke** this license.

Appeal rights

This decision is open to appeal to the Magistrates Court within the period of 21 days, beginning on the day upon which the appellant is notified of the decision. This decision does not take effect until the end of that period, or, in the event that an appeal has been brought, until that appeal is either finally determined or abandoned.