

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 7 MAY 2024, 7:00PM – 9:30PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Kaushika Amin and Barbara Blake

ALSO ATTENDING: Councillor Emily Arkell

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the filming of meetings and this information was noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor Peacock. Councillor Amin was substituting in her place.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

The Chair provided a summary of the procedure for the meeting.

6. APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF AN EXISTING PREMISES LICENCE AT TRADITIONAL CAFE AND TEA HOUSE, 78 MYDDLETON ROAD, WOOD GREEN, LONDON N22 8NQ (BOUNDS GREEN)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

Ms Daliah Barrett, Licensing Team Leader, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- This was not a variation application, but a new application.
- The application was for the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises between 10:00 to 23:00 every day. The premises would be open to the public from 09:00 to 23:59.
- The application form stated that the premises was to be used for use for men only.
- The application went through a consultation process and representations had been received from responsible authorities which were now withdrawn, but representations still stood from residents and Councillor Emily Arkell.
- The Planning Officer in his representation had stated that the application was contrary to planning permission.

In response to questions, Ms Barrett informed the Sub-Committee that:

- An agreement had been made with the Police that the premises would be open between 10:00 to 22:00.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Michael Lambrou, applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The premises had been run for generations and had been passed down since 1989.
- He and his partner ran five shops in the area.
- The premises had never been a men's-only premises and a nursery was located next door.
- Around 60% to 70% of patrons were between 70 to 90 years old.
- The premises had never had a problem with anybody and he knew the road very well.
- He did not know where the understanding that the premises was to be a men's only premises came from as anybody could come into the premises.
- The premises served tea, coffee and sandwiches.
- He had held premises licences most of his life and never had issues.
- The Planning Officer who had submitted a representation had visited the premises on a hot day to find that the glass windows had been covered. The officer asked for curtains to be put up instead and this had been complied with.

In response to questions, Mr Lambrou informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Most of the customers were not heavy drinkers and would likely drink beer and Shandy up to 22:00. This was not a late hour.
- There was concern that a late-night drinking establishment could cause an intimidating atmosphere to the women working on the road or walking down the road. However, many patrons were in their sixties and seventies and had great grandkids. These individuals kept a protective eye on people in the area and the patrons generally were very family oriented.
- The premises prevented problematic individuals from going up and down the road. No noise had been caused to other individuals in the area.
- The patrons were visiting the premises from within a three-mile radius. Generally, from Palmers Green or Wood Green and were largely from Turkish Cypriot or Greek Cypriot backgrounds.
- He had a good relationship with residents and businesses in the area including a woman who sold candles in the area.
- He had not spoken to the nursery in the area, but they had raised no objection regarding the running of the premises with him.
- There was not an excessive consumption of alcohol, the application was partly about holding events such as birthdays or large family events.
- The menus were not advertised but there would be different types of meals served on different days.
- The Planning Officer who had visited the premises had not allowed certain changes to be made at the premises until he had approved the changes. There had been obstacles in place, but when requirements had been met, the premises could appear to be more like a café with menus put up at the front of the premises.

At this point in the proceedings, Ms Barrett stated that the application was for a new premises licence or an extension of hours. This was the first time the applicant was seeking to serve alcohol at the premises. Any changes to the outside of the premises required planning permission.

In response to further questions, Mr Lambrou informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He had held premises licences for more than 30 years. The first one he held was for his late father's restaurant and he was not allowed to make mistakes. This was why food was served with alcohol. If someone ate whilst drinking alcohol, it was less likely they would consume too much alcohol.
- The experience he had would help his business run properly and meet licensing objectives.
- He knew the people that ran businesses across the road and he got on well with them.

In response to a question, Ms Barrett stated that planning permission was not required to put menus in the window. It was always possible to laminate the sign from inside the window. The Planning Officer who had made a representation had referred to new signage above the door and this would need planning permission.

In response to further questions, Mr Lambrou informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He had not seen any evidence of anybody being intimidated to submit a representation against the application. He had never seen anything like that and he would not allow it if he saw it.

Presentation by interested parties

Councillor Emily Arkell informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was objecting to the application because a group of residents had approached her as a ward councillor.
- Some residents did not want to be identified because they did not want to face any repercussion and intimidation from the road they frequented on a daily basis.
- A largely men only club would contribute to an intimidating atmosphere for women on the street. The issue of street harassment of women on the road had been raised with her as a councillor. She had shared these reports with the Safer Neighbourhood Policing team.
- The concern about harassment of women in the area and the surrounding area led to a recent ward panel meeting hosted by the Safer Neighbourhood team to prioritise women's safety in the Bounds Green ward and had its most recent meeting on the 22 January 2024.
- There had been no building control for the approval of the premises since it had been reopened. The most recent application was in June 2023, according to the Council's planning portal. There were only a string of refused applications at that address and if the building had not been approved as safe to use by building control, this seemed to be a public safety issue and was relevant to considering a premises licence.
- A resident who had been in contact with her today, passed by the premises earlier and saw someone smoking inside the premises. This was against the law. Smoking inside the premises should trigger a fire alarm, yet this did not happen today when the resident passed by. It was not clear if the premises had functioning smoke alarms.
- Residents did not want to publicly object and put their name on a licensing objection when some of the people that who frequented the premises had been described as

unfriendly. Older men were intimidating to some local residents who used the shopping facilities in the area.

- The patrons of the premises had complained about local residents who had expressed concerns about the patrons at the premises to the Bowes Park Community Association and the Wheel of Myddleton Road Group.
- There was a nursery next door to the premises and the parents and staff who worked there had to negotiate groups of men drinking and smoking outside the doors in groups next to the nursery.
- The reasons outlined above regarding public nuisance, safety and protecting children from harm provided sufficient reasons why the application should be refused as it could increase public nuisance, crime and disorder and endanger public safety.

Ms Caroline Simpson informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She concurred with the comments made by a Councillor Arkell.
- That was no need for another premises of that nature in the area.
- Although the applicant had stated that the premises was not a men's only premises, it did not appear that way as she had never seen a woman enter the premises and she went up and down the street very often.
- It was detrimental to the area to have another premises such as this in the area and the application should be refused.
- The hours applied for on the application were too long.
- If patrons were eating a meal, they may be able to drink alcohol from 23:30 or 00:00.
- She knew women who worked on the street who stated that they felt uncomfortable about the premises and were not in favour of it getting a premises licence.

In response to questions, Councillor Arkell informed the Sub-Committee that:

- In relation to the ward panel meeting, this was usually organised by the Safer Neighbourhood Bounds Green team. There were particular issues with street harassment in Myddleton Road (not necessarily specific to the premises). Working for women's safety in the area was a priority for the team.
- Those reporting that they were not comfortable with submitting an objection appeared to be credible as she had received these reports from several individuals who had decided not to submit an objection.
- Some residents had complained to the Bowes Park Community Association and the Wheel of Myddleton Road Group around some of the issues in the area and this had prompted complaints regarding some of the premises in the area.
- There had been no complaints from the nursery to her regarding smoking. However, smoking did affect young people and the premises being granted a licence could encourage more smoking in the outside area next to the nursery.

To summarise, Mr Lambrou stated he had been running licensed premises for a long time. He got on with everybody in the area. Women did frequent the premises, not as much as men did, but everyone was allowed to visit. The situation with the curtains in conjunction with not being able to put up a sign caused confusion to passers-by. It was not possible for him to put up menus until the issue had been sorted. All individuals were safe in the area.

To summarise, Councillor Arkell stated that in relation to public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children from harm, she would urge members of the Sub-Committee listened to residents on the road and the surrounding area. She urged the Sub-Committee to refuse the application.

To summarise, Ms Simpson stated that she did not think the application was necessary for the road and the premises was definitely a male space dominated space. As a woman, she did not feel comfortable with the application or the premises.

The Sub-Committee concluded the hearing of this application at 7:58pm and went on to withdraw and consider the application at 8:37pm.

RESOLVED:

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at Traditional Cafe & Tea House, 78 Myddleton Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8NQ. It was clarified at the beginning of the meeting that this was a new application and not a variation. In considering the application, the Committee took account of the London Borough of Haringey's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Licensing Act 2003, the Licensing Act 2003 section 182 Guidance, the report pack, and the applicant's and objector's representations.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the application subject to the conditions below:

1. Sale of alcohol ON the Premises

Monday to Friday- 1800 hours to 2200 hours

Saturday & Sunday – 1000 hours to 2200 hours.

2. Hours open to the Public

Monday Sunday- 0900 hours to 2230 hours

Conditions:

1. The premises cannot be operated as a social club for men only.
2. The premises shall open to the general public at the hours shown above.
3. Place menus in the windows where these are clearly visible
4. Alcohol shall only be sold ancillary to patrons consuming a meal and seated at tables.
5. No gambling will be permitted on site.
6. No gaming machines permitted on site.
7. The windows of the premises will be clear to enable a view from the street into the premises.
8. All staff involved in the sale of alcohol shall receive induction and refresher training relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence.
9. All training relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence shall be documented and records kept at the premises. These records shall be made available to the Police and/or Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year.
10. A 'Think 25' proof of age scheme shall be operated and relevant material shall be displayed prominently within the Premises – including in a visible location:
 - (a) At the entrance to the Premises;
 - (b) Behind the bar;
 - (c) In any other area where alcohol can be purchased by a customer.

11. A written record of refused sales shall be kept on the premises and completed when necessary. This record shall be made available to Police and/or the Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.
12. No alcoholic drinks or glass containers shall be taken out onto the public highway.
13. The premises licence holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from smoking related litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.
14. Notices shall be prominently displayed at all exits requesting patrons to respect the needs of local residents and businesses and leave the area quietly.
15. Patrons permitted to temporarily leave and then re-enter the premises, e.g. to smoke, shall not be permitted to take drinks or glass containers with them.
16. A digital CCTV system to be installed in the premises.
 - A. Cameras must be sited to observe the entrance doors from both inside and outside.
 - B. Cameras on the entrances must capture full frame shots of the heads and shoulders of all people entering the premises i.e. capable of identification.
 - C. Cameras must be sited to cover all areas to which the public have access including any outside smoking areas.
 - D. Provide a linked record of the date, time of any image.
 - E. good quality images - colour during opening times.
 - F. Have a monitor to review images and recorded quality.
 - G. Be regularly maintained to ensure continuous quality of image capture and retention.
 - H. Member of staff trained in operating CCTV at venue during times open to the public.
 - I. Digital images must be kept for 31 days. The equipment must have a suitable export method, e.g. CD/DVD writer so that Police can make an evidential copy of the data they require. Copies must be available within a reasonable time to Police on request
17. An incident logbook shall be kept at the Premises and made available on request to a police officer or authorised officer of the Licensing Authority. The logbook shall record the following:
 - (a) all crimes reported to the venue;
 - (b) All ejections of patrons;
 - (c) Any complaints received;
 - (d) Any incidents of disorder at or associated with the premises.
 - (e) All seizures of drugs and offensive weapons;
 - (f) Any faults in the CCTV system

REASONS:

The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objectors. It was noted that the Police and the Local Authority had raised objections to the application, but had proposed amended conditions to the application, which the applicant had agreed to. It was noted, to the credit of the applicant that he had agreed those conditions prior to the hearing. As such, those conditions are incorporated in the grant of this application.

Although the application has been granted, it has not been granted in full. In particular, the hours for the sale of alcohol have been limited to between 6:00 PM and 10:00 PM on weekdays.

The committee heard very serious and credible objections from residents and a Councillor for the ward who spoke on behalf of other residents who had indicated that they were worried about speaking and objecting to this particular application. Counsellor Arkell informed the Committee that the application should be rejected on the basis that it would likely only be frequented by men, despite the Applicant's representations that it was not a men's only club. The objectors also informed that there had been issues of harassment and an intimidating atmosphere on the street, particularly towards women, and that a safer neighbourhood meeting had been arranged to discuss the situation on the street. During questioning Councillor Arkell accepted the safer neighbourhoods meeting was not held specifically in relation to this establishment, but in relation to the general atmosphere on 78 Myddleton Road, due to the fact that there were already two similar establishments on the street.

Finally, there were also concerns about the fact that the hours requested would be nearly all day, which would entail groups of men drinking and smoking in an establishment right next to a nursery. Further and similar objections were raised by Caroline Simpson who concurred with the representations by Counsellor Arkell.

Mr Lambrou in support of his application and following questioning both from objectors and the committee indicated that he had been running licenced premises for some 30 years without any complaints. He explained that most of his patrons were elderly, perhaps from 70 to 90 years old and that there had not been any complaints from neighbours.

He confirmed that the alcohol would be served with a meal and so that would avoid any potential for drunkenness or rowdy behaviour. He acknowledged that few women attended his establishment and the potential for an unwelcoming atmosphere, but that by accepting the agreed conditions those concerns had been addressed and that in fact his establishment was open to all.

He explained that the opaque windows would be dealt with and that he was waiting on issues surrounding planning permission but he has agreed to conditions to make the windows transparent. Furthermore, he also agreed that he would put menus in the windows which would make the venue more inviting for all parties, and not only to a male crowd.

He also indicated that he had not received any complaints from the nursery next to him and that his elderly clientele and patrons had a personal interest in ensuring the area was safe for women and children.

The Committee after having heard both from the applicant and the objectors took into account all of the factors and noted the serious concerns raised by the objectors, but accepted the assurances given by the applicant in terms of the steps that would be taken and the conditions that have been agreed which would reduce the risk of it becoming a men only club, late drinking or creating an intimidating atmosphere.

The limitation on serving alcohol to only 6pm-10pm during weekdays is tied to the fact that the nursery would be open throughout the day during weekdays and with the aim of achieving the licensing objective of "protecting children from harm". The grant of the extended hours during the week is consistent with that.

In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above variations and conditions balanced the interest of the applicants, the residents and the licencing objectives.

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 applicant is notified of the decision. Stop. This decision does not take effect until the end of the appeal. Or, in the event that an appeal has been lodged, until their appeal is dispensed with.

7. APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF AN EXISTING PREMISES LICENCE AT THE VICTORIA TOTTENHAM, 34 SCOTLAND GREEN, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 9TT (TOTTENHAM HALE)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

Ms Daliah Barrett, Licensing Team Leader, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The application was seeking an increase of licensing hours on Friday for regulated entertainment from 22:00 to 01:00, late night refreshment from 23:00 to 01:00 and the sale of alcohol from 10:00 to 01:00 for consumption on the premises. The terminal hour for the closure of the premises would be 01:30.
- Representations had been made from the Noise and Nuisance team and residents both in support and against the application.
- There were residential properties in the surrounding area and the premises was located near to another licensed premises, a pub, which only operated on home matchdays for Tottenham Hotspur Football Club.
- There was another licensed premises which also was a pub and this was located near the premises as well.
- The Planning Officer had advised that the current planning permission only allowed for the premises to operate until 23:00 on any day and any proposal to play music, live concerts or amplified music required planning permission.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Liam O'Hare, representative for the applicant and Ms Sarah Colgate, applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Since the premises had been taken over by the applicant a year ago, the applicant had transformed it from being a football matchday space to something more akin to the more traditional role the premises would have served in the past.
- Open seven days a week, the applicant saw the premises as having the potential to offer a more diverse and exciting premises for the community.
- Street parties for the King's coronation had been organised and a function room was offered free of charge for all of the community to use any day of the week. This had been done by building a space for everyone to feel at home and creating a space which was welcoming and fun. The premises had hosted wedding parties, children's parties, school parties, Christmas parties and Sit and Paint evenings. Trader partnership evenings had also been held and this helped build and serve the community.
- The applicant was seeking a couple of extra hours on Fridays.
- Saturdays were run weekly since reopening with no negative impact on the licensing objectives. This must be apparent to the Sub-Committee as there were no responsible authorities present at the meeting. This was a vote of confidence from the experts on

the present operation and the way it had conducted itself by promotion of the four key licencing objectives at the core of its operation.

- The applicant recognised there was a planning informative, but believed there was no breach in planning regulation. The reasons raised by Planning and what it was trying to achieve by the proposed condition were ably protected by the Licencing Act.
- Steps taken to address any noise issues had been agreed between the applicant and the Noise and Nuisance team. All of the conditions suggested were already in place operationally and had just been formalised by bringing them into the licence.
- The Council's experts in the field had agreed with the applicant regarding operations on the premises and that they were not present at the meeting should provide confidence to the Sub-Committee because of the operation and the way it was run to such a high standard.
- A second opinion was sought from Keystone Law who negotiated the lease for the applicant and the planning application was granted for a function room where music would be played. The wording of the condition prohibited live concerts and other sounds emanating from the premises in such a way to cause a nuisance after 23:00 to an adjacent occupier. The condition would only be a breach if music, live concerts and other amplified sound emanated from the site after 23:00 and that was to cause a nuisance in the opinion of the Environmental Health Service. If such activities took place after 23:00, but did not cause a nuisance, as the applicant had been operating for the last year on Saturdays, there was no breach of condition.
- If the Sub-Committee was minded to accept a variation request, there was to be an additional 17 conditions added to the licence to reduce crime, address noise, nuisance and the protection of children from harm.
- In relation to noise nuisance specifically, the suggested condition was amplified music and bass would not be played at a level that would cause unreasonable disturbance to the occupants of any of the properties in the vicinity. There were another four similar conditions to this. This was why the Noise and Nuisance team was not present at the meeting.
- The applicant had also operated, since the premises opened, a limiter on the sound system and that reduced noise impact on the residents. Residents also lived above the premises and this had been managed very well.
- To those residents not familiar with the premises, the applicant extended a warm invitation to them and would offer telephone numbers or email addresses so that they could make direct contact with the applicant.
- Security would be present providing the area with more surveillance, more protection and better residential amenity. It also meant that complaints could be dealt with in real time, professionally with a balance between trading and operation respectfully in the area.
- The applicant employed a broad range of strategies to promote violence against women and girls. Ask for Angela was in place to protect vulnerable people and the applicant was vigilant on drink spiking.
- Patrons to the premises had changed from football fan visitors to regular members of the community.

In response to questions, Mr O'Hare and Ms Colgate informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There were a number of policies in place when events had concluded. The front area was used to contain guests so anybody waiting for buses or taxis could wait in the waiting area, not outside in the street. The space was also a place where patrons could charge their phone so that women would not have to leave the premises with a low charge on their phone.

- The premises was located by large bin full this bin was subject to a lot of litter. The applicant considered the outside of the premises as its own space and took pride in the area to make sure that the area was safe and presentable. The applicant would be happy to accept a condition that the area would be cleaned during hours of operation as the applicant already did this.
- Patrons and those needing toilet facilities could use them.
- They had seen and heard about public urination outside the immediate premises and although premises staff would take responsibility to deal with this, it was not possible for the applicant to deal with every issue occurring in the outside area.
- CCTV had been placed outside the premises and residents who lived across the road had commented that they felt much safer and seen a reduction in drug use in their alleyways and sort of entrances.
- Signature resembling a petition had been collected by asking patrons to support the application in the manner of a short statement written above the petition itself. The petition was not forced on patron.

At this point in the proceedings, Ms Barrett clarified that the petition had not been forced on patrons, but had not come in time for the consultation period and there were no valid addresses on the petition itself. However, the Sub-Committee could still consider the document.

In response to further questions, Mr O'Hare and Ms Colgate informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The premises was a small independent business facing a difficult economic situation. It was important to build economic resilience so that the longevity of the business could be assured. That was a demand in the community and the premises hosted weddings, birthday parties and other events. In order to meet this demand, Saturdays had been booked throughout the summer period. However, the terminal hour of 23:00 was not late enough for many patrons and therefore the premises was losing out on business as patrons sought other venues.
- The Mayor of London had identified a 18:00 to 06:00 economy and those who worked in this economy was part of the community.
- The applicant had an extreme sensitivity to the residents that lived above the premises, across from the premises and next to the premises. The applicant had letters of support from residents, but also from those who were anxious of larger crowds becoming a regular weekly occurrence. The applicant was trying to manage its own crowd and put in place a gradual dispersal policy. This partly depended on having taxis collecting patrons from the premises. It was positive that many of the patrons were women, some of whom who came in on their own and some who lived in the area.
- The applicant had spoken to the Police who was satisfied that the premises was meeting its objectives for the prevention of crime and disorder. Environmental Health had also agreed conditions with the premises to assuage any concerns that local residents may have.
- The premises only used plastic or reusable containers and did not allow glass to be taken outside the premises. Anybody who wished to use the toilet could do so and signs had been put up at the premises to inform patrons to leave quietly. Residents had also been given the phone number to the premises to let the applicant know if there were any issues.

At this point in the proceedings, Ms Barrett stated that the premises operated across the week and it was another premises that was only open on football matchdays. Another licensed premises also operated in the area and faced the High Road which had a terminal hour on Friday and Saturday until 00:30. This could cause the impact of one premises closing and patrons then going to another premises in the area which would be open later. In relation to the provision of toilets, this was covered by Tottenham Hotspur and additional infrastructure that needed to be put in place for sporting or other special events. In relation to glass, it was up to the Sub-Committee to decide requirements regarding the use of glass containers that the premises may have.

Presentation by interested parties

Ms Anita Lashley, resident supporting the application, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She had lived in the area for 36 years.
- Before the premises had opened under the current operator, she would walk past it as it did not look very inviting, but last summer after it had been reopened, she found herself becoming a patron of the premises and went to play a game of pool and drink a soft drink. The premises had become a safe place for her to have a drink on her own.
- The premises was secure and she had built up some good friendships.
- After work, she was able to go into the premises and have a drink.
- The premises was community focused and during the King's coronation, there was a large street party which had food stalls and the wider community had joined in. This was a fun day for the Tottenham area.
- During Christmas time, a tree was put up and carols were sung.
- The premises tried to bring the community together by putting on events and could be likened to a community centre.

To summarise, the fortune of the premises had been transformed since it had been taken over by the applicant and her team and the local community was taking advantage of facilities and investment had been made to bring the premises into the modern era. Pubs had lost its community spirit and the applicant was trying to reignite this. The applicant was asking for extra hours to take advantage of Friday openings at the stadium nearby, but also for residents who get free use of space. This kept money circulating in the local economy. The applicant ran a successful business and was looking to expand. The business needed to build financial resilience. There were no responsible authorities present at the meeting. The Sub-Committee should give this consideration when determining the licence. The conditions agreed with the Noise and Nuisance team would directly address noise issues in a more robust way than the planning conditions which was set with ambiguity. What would be in place would be a modern premises licence with checks and balances in place. The applicant hoped to make the premises a place for everyone in the area.

To summarise, Ms Lashley stated that the diversity of the community in age and culture made the premises a diverse home for functions such as birthday parties, engagements, weddings and children's parties.

At 8:37pm, the Sub-Committee withdrew to consider the application.

RESOLVED:

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a variation of the Premises License at The Victoria Tottenham, 34 Scotland Green, Tottenham, London, N17 9TT. In considering the application, the Committee took account of the London Borough of Haringey's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Licensing Act 2003, the Licensing Act 2003 section 182 Guidance, the report pack, the applicant's and objectors' written representations.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the application and was satisfied that the Licence could be varied to include the following:

1. **Regulated Entertainment: recorded music**

Friday- to 1000 to 0030.

2. **Late Night Refreshment**

Friday- to 1000 to 0030.

3. **Sale of alcohol.**

Friday- to 1000 to 0030.

Supply of alcohol ON the Premises

4. **Hours open to the public**

Friday 1000 to 0100

CONDITONS

Prevention of crime & disorder

- A digital CCTV system to be installed in the premises and cameras must be sited to observe the entrance doors from both inside and outside.
- Cameras on the entrances must capture full frame shots of the heads and shoulders of all people entering the premises i.e. capable of identification.
- Cameras must be sited to cover all areas to which the public have access including any outside smoking areas.
- Provide a linked record of the date, time of any image.
- good quality images - colour during opening times.
- Have a monitor to review images and recorded quality.
- Be regularly maintained to ensure continuous quality of image capture and retention.
- Member of staff trained in operating CCTV at venue during times open to the public.
- Digital images must be kept for 31 days. The equipment must have a suitable export method, e.g. CD/DVD writer so that Police can make an evidential copy of the data they require. Copies must be available within a reasonable time to Police on request
- An incident logbook shall be kept at the Premises and made available on request to a police officer or authorised officer of the Licensing Authority. The logbook shall record the following and should be completed within 24 hours of the incident:
 - (a) all crimes reported to the IN
 - (b) All ejections of patrons;
 - (c) Any complaints received;
 - (d) Any incidents of disorder at or associated with the premises.
 - (e) All seizures of drugs and offensive weapons;
 - (f) Any faults in the CCTV system.
 - (g) Any refusal of the sale of alcohol
 - (h) any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service.

Prevention of public nuisance

- Amplified music and bass shall not be played at a level that will cause unreasonable disturbance to the occupants of any properties in the vicinity.
- No music will be played in, or for the benefit of patrons in any external areas of the premises, including the rear garden.
- The use of the rear garden area shall terminate at 2230 hrs on days when regulated entertainment is being provided.
- All windows and external doors shall be kept closed after 22:30 hours, or at any time when regulated entertainment takes place, except for the immediate access and egress of persons.

Patrons must not drink from glass bottles or glasses outside of the Premises.

The Protection of Children from harm

- A 'Think 25' proof of age scheme shall be operated and relevant material shall be displayed prominently within the Premises – including in a visible location: (a) At the entrance to the Premises; (b) Behind the bar; (c) In any other area where alcohol can be purchased by a customer.
- A written record of refused sales shall be kept on the premises and completed when necessary. This record shall be made available to Police and/or the Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.

REASONS

The Committee gave serious consideration to the application and heard from the supporters of the applicant who were present at the hearing, as well as the written objections presented to the committee.

The committee acknowledged the strength of the application in terms of the positive impact the applicant's business has had on the surrounding area and that there was strong support for the application.

In response to issues of concern raised by the written objections, the Councillors queried the applicant over various issues. The committee acknowledged in response to questioning that the business had policies in place, for the late night dispersal of Patrons, for clearing away litter, and for patrons waiting for taxis not to have to wait outside. The Committee acknowledged that the urination may not be directly as a result of patrons from the applicant's business. The committee acknowledged the offer by the applicant to clear away litter from outside its premises regardless of who it was generated by. They also stated that they provide plastic glasses to be taken outside already.

However, the Committee noted that there was a serious concern about the impact to residents of increasing the hours on the one remaining evening (Friday) as requested. The applicant already has increased hours for the other days. It was also noted that there were 2 other pubs with late hours. The objections related to the increased noise from patrons late into the evening, the associated litter, and patrons gathering outside of the property late into the night either to drink or smoke outside of the premises.

The committee did note that the applicant had engaged with residents and had put forward a plan to limit noise using the plans described above as well as having a noise limiter, which is already being used.

The Committee had regard to the Haringey Council's policy, which states *"although the council will treat each on its individual merits, generally, it will not grant permission for licensable activities beyond 2330 hours on Sundays to Thursdays and midnight on Fridays and Saturdays, in respect of public houses situated in areas having denser residential accommodation. The Council would expect good reasons to be given to support any application for extensions beyond these hours including addressing possible disturbance to residents and local parking. Additionally, in these areas, consideration would be given to imposing stricter conditions in respect of noise control."*

It was noted that this was a dense residential area and that there were already two other similar pubs in the area, which is a cul-de- sac. In order to balance the rights of the applicant and the residents and having considered the licencing policy, it was agreed that the application should be granted, but with a reduction in the hours requested to 00:30 with closing hours at 01:00 rather than 01:30 as had been requested. The committee noted that the later closing hours would inevitably mean more noise from patrons drinking and smoking, possibly outside of the premises later into the night which would impact on the quality of life for the neighbouring residents.

In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above variations and conditions balanced the interest of the applicants, the residents and the licencing objectives.

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 the appeal period or, in the event that an appeal has been lodged, until the appeal is dispensed with.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair

Date