

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2025, 7:00PM – 9:17PM

PRESENT: Councillors Kaushika Amin, Nick da Costa and Lester Buxton (Chair)

ALSO ATTENDING: Councillor Adam Small

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

MOVED by Councillor Nick da Costa, SECONDED by Councillor Kaushika Amin,

RESOLVED: That Councillor Lester Buxton be elected as Chair for the meeting.

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor Sheila Peacock, Councillor Lester Buxton 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 REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT HORNSEY ARMS LTD, FORMERLY HORNSEY TAVERN, 26 HORNSEY HIGH STREET, LONDON, N8 (HORNSEY)

Shortly before the meeting opened, the Sub-Committee was informed that the licence holder's representative sought an adjournment.

Mr David Dadds, the licence holder's representative, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He required more time to prepare for the hearing and had been given further documentation in the prior week, but had not been able to address all of it.
- All efforts had been made to go through all documents given to him but he had not had the opportunity to go through all of the documentation with the licence holder.
- He wished to submit video evidence and had not been able to do this.

- In relation to providing his representation to the Sub-Committee, he had at least 38 observations to make and this would take at least an hour and a half. All parties would need time to go through the information.
- He wished to make some serious allegations regarding how the papers had been presented and to ensure that the case was put forward in a proper manner.
- He had not had the time to prepare and respond in a meaningful way. If the representation was rushed, it would be unfair on the licence holder.
- Timing, preparation and equity of arms was important.
- It was more likely that it was suitable that the case be heard during the day rather than during the evening in order to avoid the meeting running into the late hours of the night.

The Chair stated that the letter from Catherine West MP would be disregarded as part of the hearing and the Sub-Committee sought further detail on which documentation specifically was being referred to at this point.

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

- When he received the additional papers on 23 July 2025, he was able to compare it against the papers that had already been submitted. There were some additional papers and it had taken him about 10 hours to go through the all data.
- On Thursday of the prior week, an additional 160 papers had been submitted. Although some of these documents were duplications, he had spent five hours going through the papers. However, he had not had time to go through them fully with the licence holder and to look at the CCTV evidence available to him.
- He had done his best to go through all the documentation and evidence, but could not do this over the weekend because he had two hearings the day before this meeting and he had used all the time available to him.
- There was provision to allow the Sub-Committee to adjourn for the sake of the public interest.

Mr James Rankin, representing the Police, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He objected to the application to adjourn in the strongest possible terms.
- This would be a third adjournment in relation to the hearing.
- The original hearing was listed for 16 June 2025 and had been initially adjourned upon the request made by the licence holder's representative. The hearing was relisted for 3 July 2025, but one of the councillors lived very close to the premises and therefore the meeting had to be adjourned.
- At the last meeting, it was only towards the end of it that the licence holder's representative asked for the meeting to be adjourned.
- The licence holder's representative had been served with all the papers that he had requested. They were served to him on the day before the last hearing. In fairness to the Police, it was a late request, but the papers were served.
- On this occasion, the Police served the papers that the licence holder's representative had requested last week Thursday. However, the licence holder's representative had stated that he was busy with two other hearings and this was bad luck.
- The licence holder's representative should have instructed counsel in his office who could have represented his client, but decided to keep the brief for himself and then state that he had been unable to apply himself to the case due to overwork and overprovision of cases.

Councillor Adam Small informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There was a strong public interest argument with regard to the need to proceed due to the impact the premises was having on residents. The Sub-Committee had been repeatedly asked to proceed as best as possible to suit all parties and had been flexible.
- Speaking on behalf of residents, it was important to note the severe impact that the continuing operation of the premises was having on residents.

The licence holder's representative was recalled to address matters arising. In response to questions, Mr Dadds informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He had been served papers very late – the day before 17 July 2025 (the date of the hearing) – hundreds of pages of documents. He dealt with these documents as much as he could before the hearing.
- On 23 July 2025, he received another set of documents exceeding 100 pages. He had spent 10 hours preparing.
- On the last occasion that the hearing was scheduled to be heard, he was away for one week and when he returned, he dealt with the papers that was served on 23 July 2025.
- A set of late papers had been submitted the prior week on Thursday which arrived at 3:00pm. This totalled 160 pages. There was no counsel in his office immediately available at that time and he had other cases to deal with.
- He was doing this case pro-bono and he could not instruct anyone.
- Adjoining the meeting was in the public interest.
- It was important that the hearing be adjourned partly due to having adequate preparation time to be able to respond and to be able to get together technical information such as CCTV which would take time.
- When the Sub-Committee proceeded with its hearing on 17 July 2025, he had all the police reports up until 3 July 2025 and he had been able to address those. He was served additional papers the day before 17 July 2025 and could not produce relevant CCTV footage. Some of the CCTV related to matters arising after 3 July 2025 and to matters regarding 6, 14, 15, 23 and 27 July 2025.
- He was prepared to deal with documentation dating up until 3 July 2025, but did not want to exclude the additional information that had been served. In the Police reports, it was reported that there had been violence against a person on 6 July 2025, but when Police attended there was no crime and ultimately, it was classified as a hoax call.
- There was another false or malicious call that was made in July 2025. On 23 July 2025 at 03:00 and there was CCTV evidence to suggest that the premises was closed at 02:41 and the alarm was installed. There was evidence to show that it was malicious and the licence holder should have the opportunity to address the issue.
- The Police would argue for many of the reported occurrences that by the time they arrived, the incident would have come to an end.
- Although he had asked for the additional information to be included, he had not had the time to prepare and respond.
- The latest reference from a police report he had seen was on 27 July 2025.
- Some of the calls made to the Police could be seen as a hate crime as some of the malicious calls were against a protected characteristic group of the community and it was a hate crime to make malicious calls in that way.
- He had approximately 38 reported incidents where he could attest that there was no crime or any matters rising. There was evidence to demonstrate malicious intent. The Police would argue that although they had not observed an incident occurring, it did not mean that it did not happen.

- He wished to use the evidence in the last month to show what had happened using the CCTV at the same time that a call was made to the Police before they turned up with cars.
- It was difficult to have CCTV recording after 30 days had elapsed. Matters complained about before June 2025 would mean that it was difficult to get hold of CCTV evidence.
- He had been provided with the Police reports on 16 July 2025 and did not have the opportunity to go back and look at the CCTV evidence.
- As the typical argument from the Police was that although an incident had not become a crime, it did not mean that a crime had not happened, he was preparing to demonstrate what had actually happened in the last month using CCTV.
- Evidence had now been served regarding July 2025 that assisted the licence holder and he did not wish for these to be excluded.
- If any of the newly submitted documents were to be excluded, he would wish to take no part in the review hearing as it would be unfair to have to do so.

Adjournment and Decision

At 7:42pm, the Sub-Committee withdrew from the meeting together with the Legal adviser and clerk to deliberate in private. The Sub-Committee had heard and considered representations from all those who spoke. Legal advice was given to the Sub-Committee on the options open to them and the need for any decision to be proportionate. The Sub-Committee decided to refuse the application to adjourn.

Announcement of Decision

Members returned to the meeting at 7:55pm and the Chair informed those present of the decision to refuse the application to adjourn.

The Legal advisor stated that regulation 12 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Hearings) Regulations 2005 gave the Sub-Committee the power to adjourn where it was considered necessary. The Sub-Committee's attention was also drawn to rule 28 of the local procedure rules. This rule dealt with cases where a party wished to rely on documentary evidence, but had not fully complied with the requirement to present its documents within ten working days before a hearing. In such situations, the Sub-Committee had to make a decision on whether to admit evidence submitted far less than 10 working days in advance by reference to reasons for the late production, how far any other party may be prejudiced by the late production of the documentary evidence, the extent of the prejudice to the party seeking to rely upon the evidence if its submission was refused and whether it would be desirable in the public interest to adjourn the hearing for any period of time to allow any other party a reasonable opportunity to consider the documentary evidence.

The Chair stated that the Sub-Committee had carefully considered the decision and its decision was to refuse the application to adjourn. The Sub-Committee decided to permit the licence holder's representative and the Police to make reference to the Police reports that had been submitted in the prior week. The Sub-Committee noted that the licence holder's representative may suffer prejudice with the inability to file a rebuttal against this. The Sub-Committee considered the public interest for finding a resolution and the decision the Sub-Committee would take was that proceeding with the hearing struck the correct balance and the Sub-Committee would take into account the limited opportunity for rebuttal evidence by the licence holder's representative when making a decision on the application. The evidence would be weighted within the Sub-Committee's final decision.

Mr Dadds stated that he and the licence holder would withdraw from the meeting room.

The Sub-Committee proceeded to hear the review application.

Presentation by the Licencing Officer

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

- The times at which the premises operated could be found on section 1.3 of the Licensing Officers report. The premises operated Monday to Sunday until 03:30.
- A copy of the licence could be found in appendix 2 of the agenda papers.
- Representations had been made by the Police, ward councillors and residents.
- The representations stated several complaints regarding antisocial behaviour and other issues. The representations could be found at appendix 3 of the agenda papers.
- The premises had been taken over by the current licence holder in October 2021.
- The premises was subject to a review application submitted by residents on 14 March 2022 due to noise and other issues arising at the premises. At that hearing, the Sub-Committee determined to add conditions to the licence.
- The licence was then transferred in March 2024 to another company (Hornsey Arms Ltd).
- The licence holder was also the director for the company.

Presentation by the review applicant

Mr Craig Bellringer, Noise and Nuisance, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There had been a history of complaints regarding the premises dating back to 12 September 2022.
- Since the review application had been submitted there had been 82 reports of music and noise from patrons. Some of the reports were outside the office service hours. This would be 18:00 until 02:00.
- On 13 January 2024 at 22:57, officers attended a local resident's property who could hear excessively loud music. A noise abatement notice was submitted to the licence holder for the incident.
- On 29 March 2024 at 00:01, a report had been received from a resident that loud music was playing. Officers attended and observed loud music in the resident's bedroom. A fixed penalty notice was issued and this was paid by either the DPS or by a member of the premises staff.
- On Saturday 15 February 2025, officers attended the premises and could hear a specific song playing inside a resident's property and deemed the noise to be a nuisance. An abatement notice was issued that was eventually unpaid. Subsequently, an appeal had been initiated for the abatement notice and the notice itself had to be withdrawn due to the company having changed its name. The notice had been issued to Hornsey Tavern and subsequently the name of the premises was changed to the Hornsey Arms. This meant that the abatement notice had to be withdrawn.
- He had met with the licence holder three times. Once on 29 January 2024, alongside the landlord regarding the appointment notice, the ongoing issues and how noise could be mitigated. There was also discussion on how not to allow third parties like DJs to bring their own noise equipment and put all of the music to be routed through a noise limiter.
- He had met previously with the licence holder on 29 June 2023 along with the licence holder's licensing consultant and he explained about the recent reported music playing at the premises and what action could be taken if further instances were reported.
- He had also met with the licence holder on 17 November 2022. He offered advice and explained reports being received from residents and how this could be mitigated. Some of the reports were around the use of the smoking area in front of the premises, noise from patrons, drinking and people loitering outside after the premises had shut.

- A review application was submitted by a resident in April 20 22 and during the course of the hearing, he had asked for a reduction of hours and additional conditions. However, in light of the representations made by the Police, he would support a revocation of the licence.

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

- There had been four or five issues since the review application had been submitted in June 2025. The last few had been about loitering and noise.
- All complaints received had been logged into the system and residents knew the hours during the service ran. Complaints were still received outside of the service hours.
- He was not aware of any malicious attempts in reporting issues with the premises. In order for officers to take enforcement actions, the specific issue needed to be witnessed by officers. On one occasion after an incident, officers issued an abatement notice as the premises was deemed to be excessively loud. Two further fixed penalty notices were issued subsequently. Officers were present at the premises to assess the situation.
- The licence holder was not taking notice of the requested improvements. The advice that the licence holder had been given was not being followed and complaints were still being received from residents.
- One unpaid abatement notice had to be withdrawn as the premises had changed its name.
- The licence holder had undertaken some soundproofing. When he had attended the premises on 15 February 2025, he spoke to the licence holder who had tried to show pictures of the soundproofing that had been undertaken. The licence holder was asked to send over an email with details of the soundproofing but no email was ever received. During the time he was present at the premises, the front door was wide open with people singing karaoke on the right-hand side of the premises. There were multiple people situated out at the front and soundproofing was located near the back end of the premises, but there was no soundproofing near the front.
- There were approximately seven people outside at the front of the premises.
- He had only seen one SIA staff member. There was no reason for not having a second one. It was a female security officer.
- The current management was not a fit and proper individual to hold a licence as they were not capable.

Presentation by interested parties

Councillor Adam Small informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He wished to set out why he believed that the licence holder had shown themselves unfit to hold a licence and why he believed that revocation was necessary.
- The premises had repeatedly and egregiously failed to uphold the most basic requirements set out in the Licensing Act 2003.
- These were not just a few isolated incidents or minor oversights, but a sustained pattern of serious failings that had caused serious distress, fear and concern to Hornsey residents. All four licensing objectives had been undermined.
- In relation to crime and disorder, since March 2024, there had been over 39 Police call outs to the premises on over 25 separate dates. Between February and April 20 25, there were 24 calls to the premises in just two months, nearly all related to violence.
- Since the review application had been submitted, there had been over 21 calls to the police with 13 relating to violence. By the time the Police were called, issues had

escalated to the maximum possible extent and the calls made after midnight usually represented hours beforehand of increasingly rowdy and disruptive behaviour. This had been set out extensively by residents in their submissions to councillors.

- There were two other pubs within 500 metres of Hornsey high Street and the amount of complaints in comparison to the premises was not comparable.
- The levels of violence, crime and disorder that had been seen at the premises were not one-off disturbances but represented a sustained pattern of disorder directly linked to the premises and its mismanagement.
- The licence holder had repeatedly failed to control the conduct of patrons both inside and outside the premises. Despite Police intervention and action taken by the Sub-Committee in the past, the licence holder had demonstrated very little commitment to barring difficult customers or barring those that had committed crimes.
- On one recent occasion when the Police intervened to address a violent fight, the licence holder explicitly told officers that he was happy for the individuals to remain and there was documented evidence that the individuals involved in violent incidents were allowed to return to the premises at later dates. No attempts had been made to bar the individuals from the premises.
- Conditions imposed previously by the Sub-Committee required two door supervisors on duty and the licence holder admitted that despite extensive issues with crime and disorder, he only had one SIA staff member and had stated that he prioritised profit over safety and legal obligations.
- In relation to public safety, it was possible to see glass around the surrounding streets, from months of fighting, smashing bottles, glasses and windows, vomit and urine outside the doors, large drunken crowds spilling into the busy high street creating serious hazards to both residents and road users.
- As a councillor regularly walking past the area, these problems were present even in the daylight and at times when children were walking home from nearby schools.
- Video footage submitted by residents showed people running along the street to try and escape men fighting in broad daylight.
- Other evidence included a female patron who was served alcohol to the point of vomiting and then attempting to drive home.
- Whilst he accepted that the licence holder was not responsible for the attempt to drive drunk, the licence holder was responsible for intoxicating a patron to such a state that she and others required hospitalisation.
- In relation to the prevention of public nuisance, noise complaints stretched as far back as June 2023. Residents had repeatedly stated that they were unable to sleep or had been woken up three or four times a week. Even after the noise abatement notice had been served along with the fixed penalty notices, residents were still woken up multiple times. One resident was forced to raise the issue with their workplace HR department because they were so exhausted and were repeatedly turning up to work distraught.
- Another resident had described changing the daily routine routines to avoid their own high Street and living in constant anxiety about return returning home after dark.
- Most residents accepted that living on top of a pub would come with disturbances. What they did not and should not have to accept was that the disturbances continued into the late hours and in spite of the licence holder's accepted legal responsibilities.
- In relation to the protection of children from harm, children had been served alcohol on the premises with one confirmed case of a 16 year-old being served at around 03:00. There was also a further concern from Police who had body worn camera footage indicating that there had been very young people drunk in the pub late into the night.

Mr James Rankin, representing the Police, PC Denham, PC Jones and PC Gray, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Since 17 July 2025, the Police had changed its position and would like to seek a revocation, because it was not hyperbole or exaggeration to say that the premises was lawless and out of control.
- Usually, when papers were served to licence holders by responsible authorities, that would be a change in behaviour. However, the reverse had happened in this case. The issues with the premises had become worse since the service of the papers. In the lead up to the hearing on 17 July 2025, there were 21 calls to the premises for 13 separate dates.
- Between 4 July 2025 and 30 July 2025, a period of over three weeks, there had been 16 calls to the premises for nine separate dates. Eight of those nine were instances of violent disorder. A total of 11 different people called the Police. This was not a question of malicious intent because of those 11, six were residents and the others were from Verisure (the alarm company) and premises staff.
- There had been 77 calls in last year to the premises from 48 dates where the Police had attended on behalf of 48 victims. A total of 36 of those had been for instances of violence.
- It was possible that by the time the Police turned up, the incident would have come to an end, but it was also possible that when two Police officers turned up to an incident involving 70 to 80 people in a melee, clearing the pathway was a better course of action than arresting people for affray. The reason nobody was arrested was because the Police were doing good police work.
- The Police kept a league table of problematic premises and the premises in question was eighth in that league table. However, it was also important note that the table included three stadium venues and Alexandra Palace. All of which had huge capacities.
- Serious allegations had been made against some of the officers and the Police took great exception to any suggestion that officers may have misled the Sub-Committee.
- The Police had never sought to say that an offence had been committed each time a police report had been created. The Police had been called to the premises in order to deal with instances of violence.

In response to questions, Mr Rankin, PC Denham, PC Jones and PC Gray informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Verisure was the alarm system that was used by the premises staff. Direct calls to the Police could also be made by staff.
- There was one transcript in the police reports which stated that a premises staff member was being grabbed by patrons, were refusing to leave and had been assaulting staff. There was 30 to 60 patrons refusing to leave and although security was present, it was not possible to manage the situation. This was a common occurrence.
- The premises were making calls or using the Verisure system because they needed the Police to manage a situation where they had lost control of the premises.
- There were no other pubs calling the Police to manage such situations so frequently. What would usually happen if a premises was subject to problems was that the licensing officer would go into the premises and speak to premises staff and place measures to prevent problems from taking place. The premises was continually calling Police and Police had needed to use police dogs. Police dogs were only ever used on rare occasions, were difficult to get hold of and only used in the most serious situations. The number of calls coming into Police through the use of a panic alarm from the premises was extremely high.
- An action plan had never been implemented. There had been a video conference meeting which was followed by a visit to the premises on 14 March 2025 when a

number of breaches of conditions were observed and there was only one SIA officer on duty rather than two. The premises did not have a refusals book and there was an issue with the CCTV which had since been rectified. Various promises had been made at the meeting such as using Licensing Connect (the licence holder's representative's own software system) and the premises staff would be subject to WAVE training. Three days later, a series of assaults had allegedly taken place. One on 17 March 2025 and then nine hours later on 18 March 2025 as Police were called to a fight where there were two SIA officers present but the premises staff could not control the people that were present at the premises.

- The police reports indicated that the licence holder had lost control of the premises. There was one incident where members of the traveling community had left over the bar and had taken items from the other side. Many of these issues were resolved by the licence holder having recovered money for damage or apologising for an incident or paying compensation, including to an entertainer who had been thrown against the wall. This way of resolving issues at a licensed premises was not very competent.
- Careful consideration had been given regarding the provision of a closure notice when engagement with the premises had begun on 14 March 2025. However, Police had been promised that there would be an increase in CCTV coverage and that this coverage would be throughout the entirety of the premises, that staff would be using Licensing Connect and that staff would undertake WAVE training. A closure order was re-considered at a later date, but by then a review application had already been submitted.
- All the issues reported by the Police fell under antisocial behaviour. Many of them fell under violent disorder, but all of them counted as antisocial behaviour. However, whenever a pub was being cleared of patrons by Police, it was often the case they would be scrambling inside and outside the premises with other incidents occurring at the same time. There was a fine line between whether an incident was antisocial behaviour or violent behaviour.
- The volume of Police attendance exceeded expectations for a normal licensed premises. The number of times the premises required a team of Police officers at night for a pub of 50 to 60 people was very high. Multiple units were needed to attend the premises, including dog units. When Police time was taken in dealing with issues regarding a licensed premises, they were not dealing with a sexual assault, robbery or burglary. Simply a mismanagement of a pub many times over.
- The high number of police reports indicated a serious risk public safety.
- There had been several breaches of licensing conditions such as a 16-year-old being served alcohol while already intoxicated, no CCTV, no SIA staff, or a refusals log had been present at the premises. The issue with the refusals log had been rectified as the premises had signed up to Licensing Connect which had an electronic version.
- No refusals had been seen registered in the refusals log.
- The 16-year-old had been verified as being 16.
- The police report had mentioned that the licence holder had driven off on one occasion whilst the Police were dealing with a violence incident. It was not responsible for a licence holder to do that.

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

- There had been instances of violent behaviour having occurred at the premises during school leaving time which had been reported to him but not regularly. Most cases of violent behaviour had been noted in the evening.
- The premises caused maximum amount of stress on residents as a result of the disorder. The premises was considered unbearable. Residents had given up tendencies within three months so that they could leave the level of distress caused by

the premises. Residents in the area would not even go close to the premises day or night.

- One of the reasons why he was involved in objecting to the application was due to the number of people who were too concerned about their own safety to put their name forward as an objector as there was concern about violent reprisals.
- Many residents had sent emails and had come into surgeries. He had also had regular contact with staff members who worked at the school nearby. Those who lived further away raised the issue of the premises from complaints or queries related to other issues. A local member of Parliament had also been made aware of the issues regarding the premises and then passed the matter onto Haringey councillors.
- He had not tried to engage with the management of the premises as officers were already involved. Since the review application had been submitted, all correspondence had been with officers.
- A resident at a nearby school had noticed the disturbances late at night and were going out earlier in the morning with other members of school staff from a school nearby to clear debris around the area. The disturbances were taking place earlier and earlier which was impacting the school.

In response to further questions, Mr Rankin, PC Denham, PC Jones and PC Gray informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It would be beneficial to maintain focus on the issues at the premises rather than the patrons who attended the premises and may attend another premises elsewhere.
- There was no series of conditions that would satisfy Police at this stage of the process because issues had reached such a state that the only possible resolution would be revocation of the premises licence. If the premises started to be run by a new owner, they would simply inherit the current clientele of patrons. Typically, when a licence was revoked, a premises usually stopped operating for a few months before a new operator would take over the premises, refurbish it and attract a new clientele of patrons.
- There was one reference to a police report in relation to a malicious telephone call. This was in relation to a report regarding an instant on 13 July 2025. This could be found on page 60 of the agenda papers. The individual listed was from an anonymous person. If it was the case that all calls being made to the Police were malicious, then all the calls made would be from an anonymous individual. From May 2024 to December 2024 five of the calls made to the Police came from the premises, one came from Verisure, three came from named residents and one came from an anonymous individual.
- In January 2025, four calls came from the alarm company, two from premises staff, no residents and one anonymous telephone call.
- In February 2025, eight calls made to the Police came from Verisure, two came from premises staff, two came from residents and one came from the Council's CCTV system.
- In March 2025, two calls came from premises staff, three from identified residents and one anonymous call. No calls came from Verisure.
- In April 2025, seven calls were made by premises staff, two from Verisure and two from identified residents.
- In May 2025, one call came from premises staff, none from Verisure, five from residents.
- In June 2025, six calls were made from residents, one from premises staff, no calls were made from Verisure. There were no anonymous calls.
- In July 2025, six calls were made from residents, one from Verisure, and three from premises staff.
- Most calls were made from premises staff or the alarm system.

To summarise, Mr Rankin stated that it could not be possible to have a more overwhelming case in favour of revocation of the premises licence.

To summarise, Councillor Small stated he had nothing further to add.

To summarise, Mr Bellringer stated that due to the number of complaints and based on the action taken along with the residents' reports and Police evidence, he would recommend that the licence be revoked.

Adjournment and Decision

At 9:17pm, the Sub-Committee withdrew from the meeting together with the Legal adviser and clerk to deliberate in private. The Sub-Committee had heard and considered representations from all those who spoke. Legal advice was given to the Sub-Committee on the options open to them and the need for any decision to be proportionate. The Sub-Committee decided to grant the application and revoke the licence.

RESOLVED

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 licence.

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 licence 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 licence, 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 licence; and
- In Mr Bellringer's opinion, Mr Kearns was not a fit and proper person to hold the licence 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 licence holder had repeatedly and egregiously failed to uphold requirements of their licence 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 licence 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 licence 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 licence 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 "distraught";
- 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 licence 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 licence 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 licence 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 licence 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 licence.

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.

7. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Lester Buton

Signed by Chair

Date5 August 2025.....