

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 1 DECEMBER 2025, 7:00PM – 7:25PM

PRESENT: Councillors Sheila Peacock (Chair), Nicola Bartlett and Nick da Costa

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

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 NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT 2A COFFEE & POOL, 336 HIGH ROAD, LONDON, N22 8JW (WOODSIDE)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- The application could be found in appendix A of the report.
- The application was for a new premises licence.
- Representations had been received and revised operating hours had been agreed with the Police. The sale of alcohol would be for consumption on the premises would Sunday to Thursday 10:00 to 23:30 and 10:00 to 00:00 Friday to Saturday
- Late night refreshment would be served 23:00 to 00:00 on Friday and Saturday.
- The area would be closed to patrons from 22:00 hours.
- Conditions had been agreed with the Noise team and the conditions could be found in appendix B of the agenda papers.
- The premises had been previously licensed but this was dissolved. The Police had carried out a raid on the 21 February 2025 for drug related issues, but the

Police found the venue was taking part in casino style illegal gambling events. The premises then closed thereafter.

Presentation by the applicant

The representative for the applicant, Mr Noel Samaroo informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant was actually a limited company.
- Mr Toshi was the director of the company and was also the listed DPS on the application.
- Additional papers had been submitted to the Sub-Committee to help and guide the Sub-Committee through any questions they may have. Documents included photographs and provided a structured end-to-end compliance narrative including an executive summary, a chronological case summary, formal rebuttals and a full governance suite. Policies such as the CCTV policy, the dispersal policy, staff training log, incident log operating controls and photographic evidence had been included.
- The papers had been designed to give the Sub-Committee a clear auditable assurance-based framework, demonstrating how the applicant would promote the four licensing objectives.
- Police, Licensing and Environmental Health had withdrawn their representations following agreements of reduced hours and additional conditions.
- The applicant was aware the location was a difficult area and there had been some antisocial behaviour in the past.
- It was very important to have engaged with the Police, the Environmental Health and Noise teams to draw up conditions with which they were satisfied.
- The single remaining representation was from a local resident. The issues raised had been addressed in the already submitted additional papers.
- The concerns raised were generalised and speculative. However, the operation framework presented was supported by documented CCTV governance, dispersal controls, a dispersal policy, training compliance and occupational management. It provided tangible and enforceable mechanism aligned with the statutory guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act.
- The premises was already operating responsibly as a cafe and pool venue.
- There was no evidence of crime, disorder or nuisance arising from the current operation.
- Granting a licence with conditions would enhance the regulatory oversight in the area by bringing alcohol service into a fully controlled, monitored and reviewable environment.
- The material within the additional papers provided full assurance that the licence and objectives would be robustly and continuously promoted.
- His organisation would provide the business to a 'hold your hand' scheme for the first six months and there would be an open door policy where the business could call and ask for advice on an ongoing basis. This was supported by Licensing Connect, a digital online system.

- The training for the staff was important and premises staff would be able to watch four or five videos answer questions on it. There was also WAVE training.

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

- The rear fire door being replaced to conform with the relevant order and the CCTV being upgraded that had been done uh Mr.15:18Costa. The the fire door had been upgraded to have a push handle rather than a turn handle. There was also a comprehensive CCTV system that covered the inside and front area of the premises.
- Providing a direct contact number for residents who wanted to share concerns and periodically meet with them if there were any concerns was already something that had been suggested and a print out with the phone number had been made to hang on the premises window.
- There was a generalised concern about crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour in the wider area. There was no history whatsoever of any crime, disorder, or nuisance arising from the premises. The premises had been trading for a while, but without alcohol. It had been managed very well without incident demonstrating that the operation was low risk and controlled. Secondly, the it had been suggested that granting a licence would increase antisocial behaviour. This was not supported by any evidence put before the Sub-Committee. The statute guidance under the Licensing Act was clear in that decisions must be based on the merits of each application and not speculative or assumptive viewpoints. Thirdly, every issue raised in the representations had been fully mitigated in the additional papers. These had been done with extensive operating controls and these were things that had been spoken about with the Police. Some of the conditions were robust, but necessary. Responsible authorities originally raised concerns, but withdrew their representations. He was disappointed that the objector was not at this meeting.
- Fourthly, concerns had been raised about noise, smoking and dispersal. All these points were specifically addressed through a formal dispersal policy, a controlled smoking limit of five people after 22:00, closure of the external area at 22:00, the only background music would be played. There was no application for regulated entertainment, DJs or live music. 19:58Even though up until 23:00, there was a deregulation of rules. But this was not the venue the premises was trying to operate. Doors and windows would be closed after 23:00 and there would be a staff-led management of egress. The dispersal policy was clear that there would be staff outside the premises when people were leaving and to make sure people did not congregate outside. The granting of the licence provided enhanced regulatory oversight, unlike a premises that was unlicensed. Alcohol sales would be subject to enforceable conditions, 31day CCTV retention, accident and incident books would kept, a Challenge 25 Policy and active liaison with responsible authorities would be maintained.
- The outside space was going to be closed from 22:00.
- The pool area was not for men only. The premises was mainly a place where people can go and play pool, have a coffee, and if they wanted to have a glass of wine or a drink, then they could. The premises was not an alcohol-led venue.

The front area was maybe a third of the premises. The rest of it was two or three pool tables to the back. The original plan had three pool tables, but was changed when it was decided that there was not enough room.

- The area at the front of the premises would not have any vertical drinking. There would be no vertical drinking, except in the pool area.

In summary, Mr Samaroo stated that the agenda papers were a complete 'compliance architecture' of the premises aligned with the Licensing Act and with the responsible authorities now satisfied having withdrawn representations, the applicant had demonstrated a structured policy driven and operating model subject to continuous monitoring, documented controls, direct address in all matters raised. He would invite the Sub-Committee to grant the premises licence with the agreed conditions.

Adjournment and Decision

At 7:25pm, 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 subject to conditions.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions.

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at, 2A Coffee & Pool, 336 High Road, London, N22 8JW. 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:

Sale of Alcohol:

Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 2330 hours

Friday to Saturday 1000 to 0000 hours

Supply of alcohol ON the premises.

Late night refreshment: Friday–Saturday 23:00–00:00

Hours open to Public:

Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 0000 hours

Friday to Saturday 1000 to 0030 hours

The outside area must be closed to patrons at 22.00 hours .

CONDITIONS: The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 28-31 of the Committee papers, & the additional

papers relating to Robust CCTV, Dispersal, Staff Training and Incident Management policies and in addition to the following conditions:

1. Means of direct contact via telephone to be provided to local residents.
2. Periodic meetings with local residents to be arranged to address any concerns raised.

REASONS: The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the sole objector. Whilst sympathetic to the objector it was noted that the Applicant, through its agent, addressed all the concerns raised including the premises' current lawful operational status.

At the same time the Committee would like it noted that it is preferable for Applicants to attend licencing hearings in person as they are usually best placed to answer any queries.

However it is also noted that the Applicant, through its agent, has agreed to provide a direct means of access via telephone and arrange periodic meetings with residents to address any concerns that may be raised in the future. In addition it was noted that the representations by both the Metropolitan Police and Environmental Health had been formally withdrawn prior to the Hearing. In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above conditions balanced the interest of the applicant, 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. 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. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Sheila Peacock

Signed by Chair

Date