

# **MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2026, 7:00PM – 8:58PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Adam Small 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 VARIATION OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT KFC, 479- 481 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6AQ (TOTTENHAM CENTRAL)**

### **Presentation by the Licensing Officer**

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

- This was an application for the variation of an existing premises licence.
- The application had been submitted by FT Foods Limited who were seeking to increase the hours for late night refreshment at the premises.
- The applicant had submitted an update requesting alternative hours to be considered and requested an amendment of the terminal hour of operation from 04:00 on Thursday Friday and Saturdays until 03:00 and from 04:00 from Sunday to Wednesday until 02:00.
- If granted, the applicant proposed a condition be added which stated there should be one SIA registered door staff on duty from 23:00 until closing time and the need for additional door staff would be risk assessed.
- This information had been shared with the Police but their objection to the application still stood.

- There was also a representation from a business in the area.

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

- The terminal hour was proposed to be 03:00 Thursday, Friday and Saturday and 02:00 Sunday to Wednesday.

### **Presentation by the applicant**

Mr Armin Solimani, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant was applying for extended hours and had considerably reduced the hours applied for in consultation with the Police.
- No agreement had been reached as of yet between the parties.
- The applicant belonged to a very large group of KFC franchises.
- The Head of Operations was present at the meeting and this reflected how seriously the corporate group took the hearing and the application - and how tightly controlled the operation was by the corporate team.
- The restaurant was an existing premises with an unblemished and exemplary licensing record which reflected respect for the licensing regime and robust management.
- The applicant operated for many years without criticism apart from the criticism the Police made of people abusing the premises.
- The applicant operated very late Temporary Event Notices (TENs) without any issues and belonged to a chain which had never been subject to a review hearing.
- The only real concern he saw with the application was the crime and disorder objective and the representations raised by the Police.
- There was no real evidence to suggest possible noise nuisance.
- The environmental health service who were experts on noise nuisance had not made a representation.
- Residents in the local area had not made a representation.
- The only representation that mentioned nuisance was from a competing chicken shop premises. This needed to be considered carefully given it was a trade objection. No clear evidence had been provided as to why a premises run by the objector would cause less nuisance.
- The competing premises had a licence until 02:00 and was a chicken shop that operated late into the night.
- The only real question with the application was whether it would contribute to crime and disorder in the area.
- The reason the Police gave for the application being a crime and disorder issue was that, historically, criminals had used the premises for various activities. They had either hidden drugs on the premises or had meetings there or had used the premises as a lookout post. This was not something the premises could control. Staff could not know when people would be carrying out such activities. There was no suggestion from the Police that the premises was involved or was condoning it.

- The premises had staff, but they were not Police and could not control or investigate these issues.
- The business had proposed the use of SIA staff.
- Having SIA staff in the premises improved safety in the high street generally by adding to surveillance. This was a net benefit to public safety.
- Having SIA staff was not cost effective when the premises closed at 00:00 as it operated in minimum shifts of five hours.
- The applicant needed later operating hours.
- The applicant could not withdraw the hours proposed due to a five-hour shift pattern.
- It was difficult to blame a premises like KFC for facilitating crime or disorder when it was not doing anything to instigate it. It was simply subject to abuse by criminals. This was the job of the Police.
- The Police had rightly added more resources into the area and had undertaken a formal operation as the issue was being brought under control by police action.
- The crime and disorder issue would be resolved with the help if SIA staff.
- Operating to later hours would enable an SIA staff member to be employed which would be better for crime and disorder and this would resolve the only real objection to the very well-managed premises having extended hours to serve chicken and not to serve alcohol.

In response to questions, Mr Solimani and Mr Giggs Kyriacou, Operations Director, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There was no suggestion that the applicant had not cooperated with the Police. Everything had been done to try and resolve the issue. It was as big a problem for the applicant as it was for the Police. The applicant did not want the premises to appear to have a criminal association and wanted have the situation under control. Premises staff could not control how citizens and criminals behaved. Any restaurant operating in the area was likely to have similar issues. Having a trained person as door staff would be useful as it would be very hard for someone to use the premises in a criminal manner when there was a trained SIA staff member on the premises. A CCTV condition was in place and the premises shared CCTV with the Police. No issues had been raised regarding the refusal to share CCTV or being uncooperative. Staff also undertook comprehensive training for conflict management and for dealing with drunk and disorderly people. However, there was a limit to what they could do. The staff could not manage secret criminality. The Police were not referring to people out in the open committing crimes in a restaurant, but rather for staff to do things like being a lookout for Police through the windows. It was not possible for staff to know when people were hiding drugs, as these would be concealed. The most the premises could be asked was to have trained staff and/or SIA staff, have CCTV and cooperate with the Police.
- Staff were trained in conflict resolution, not just in theory but in practice. Premises staff talked to people who potentially could be loitering. It was never clear if patrons were doing anything illegal. The staff tended to move people away from the premises as the customer base was mixed. This included families, elderly people and young people. The premises catered to everyone.

In the last four years, the premises had engaged closely with the Police who had been encouraged to visit the premises late at night or early in the morning either to use a toilet or to have a cup of coffee. The premises was quite active regarding safeguarding for young people. The premises would be a safe haven in the area. The business operated a lot of restaurants into the early hours without any issues. If there were any issues, staff would work very closely with the authorities to have an improved, safer environment for everyone to live, work and eat.

- The way the SIA condition came about was when the responsible authorities were trying to reach an agreement. One of the suggestions that was made was to have SIA staff which the applicant agreed to. The police officer dealing with the discussion went on annual leave and another officer had taken over. However, it appeared that the Police had then changed their view.
- The applicant had outlined a robust proposal for dealing with the issues that had been highlighted. Other than train the staff, have an SIA staff member in the premises, it was not clear what else could be done to control the situation.
- The applicant operated a large number of premises into the early hours and some operated quite safely without SIA staff because premises staff were highly trained, good at diffusing situations (because the conflict resolution courses). The applicant would only invoke the use of SIA staff if the Police stated some kind of a concern. In order to find a mutually acceptable negotiated solution, the applicant offered the use of SIA staff. The applicant often had SIA staff working during the daytime, during large events. The applicant also operated premises near the Arsenal football stadium. Any events held there would be subject to the use of SIA staff.
- The applicant had training blogs accessible online which could be shared with Police and local authorities if needed. It also included safeguarding and confidential resolution, health and safety and food safety.
- The applicant believed in being part of the community and in the responsibility to keep litter clear. Even when trading during the day, staff picked up litter in the area and not only KFC branded litter.
- The applicant did not wish to have litter being disposed of unnecessarily. In the past, the applicant had worked with local councils sponsoring bins and doing trash walks and was happy to maintain that. In some of the premises the applicant managed, it became a condition to have a litter pick every hour or as soon as the premises closed. One premises was located in Tottenham, was one of the busiest and there was never usually any litter due to staff maintaining the area.
- The applicant had an online system called Prime where any incidents had to be logged no matter how small or serious it was with regard to antisocial behaviour, unruly customers or official visits. If extra door staff was needed due to an event at Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, the premises had a sophisticated sales projection, knew the premises was going to be busy, then extra door staff would be brought in to manage it.
- The applicant had its premises open on New Year's Eve and Christmas Eve and worked with two door staff members in in most of the premises it owned. The applicant had a duty of care to staff, customers, the area and would have a formal risk assessment that would be completed.
- The risk assessment would be available for inspection by the Licensing Authority or the Police if needed. The applicant had a health and safety folder

and this could be inspected to see what the risk assessment was, how it was dealt with and what the risk was. If the system scored over a certain amount, more security would be sought.

- It was common to have a condition phrased in a way which acknowledged a risk assessment although it was difficult to specify how a risk assessment would be triggered. It depended on how much trust the operator was given. The applicant had an asset protection officer that visited various premises every few months and completed risk assessments on the business itself. In the event of an occasion happening nearby, the premises would conduct a risk assessment.
- If people were dealing drugs in the street and they came into the premises and waited there before going outside to deal drugs in the street, it was very difficult to see how this was something any licensed premises could deal with. There was a point at which these became issues that the Police had to deal with. Having an SIA staff member on the door would ensure that people dealing drugs did not do it in front of the premises. Although this would move the issue further down the road, this was the limit of what the premises was able to do.
- The business was a commercial enterprise that wanted to do well. That was a big part of licensing regulations, particularly in light of the London Mayor's and the Government's recent guidance about encouraging growth and growth in the night time economy. The business was a successful well-run business that wanted to do better and grow in a way that helped the community. If the premises operated later hours and made more money, it would use the money to employ an SIA staff member and make the high street and itself safer. The high street already had a lot of restaurants that operated late at night.
- A licensed premises was entitled to grow and this was a positive thing.
- The business did not currently have SIA staff on the premises generally, but did so for events that would have been risk assessed.
- The reason the premises did not SIA staff was because it was not commercially viable to pay for SIA staff for a chicken shop that closed at 00:00. This did not make financial sense.
- The Police had identified issues, including that people dealt drugs outside or near the premises who came into the premises to sit down or to wait or to look out for other people. That was something that could be controlled by an SIA staff member, but was not responsible for managing crime outside of its premises.
- The applicant wanted to do everything possible to reduce crime in the area and to keep the high streets safe. It was important to understand the scope of licensing and the scope of the licensing regime. It was not the job of a premises to do everything it possibly could even beyond its commercial abilities to reduce crime to deal with the licensing objectives. The job of a licensed premises was to uphold the licensing objectives. When a Sub-Committee granted a licence to a premises with certain conditions, those would be conditions the Sub-Committee thought necessary to uphold the licensing objectives. If people felt those licensing objectives were not being upheld, a review application could be submitted. This had not happened. A review application would be submitted to impose different conditions like requiring an SIA staff member. The Police had not considered it necessary to do that. The applicant was offering to appoint SIA staff voluntarily. When it came to assessing the licensing objectives in the context of the application, licensing considerations had to take into account a much wider range of issues like commercial viability, economic viability and

practical reality. The applicant was an operator that tried to be a good neighbour and tried to cooperate, but there were limits to what the premises was able to do as a business and there was the balance in these priorities.

- The premises did not have SIA staff as at present, they were not needed. Incidents that got logged were minor. The Tottenham area was not a lawless area, but a great place to work, live and to go out and eat. The premises was part of the community.
- Mr Kyriacou had worked at the premises sometimes for several hours a day including nights and had not witnessed any drug dealing. This may go on outside, but was not happening to the scale portrayed.

### **Presentation by interested parties**

PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant had made a last-minute proposal to amend their application. It was earlier in the day at 4:33pm
- PC Denham who was now on annual leave had tried to contact the applicant's agent on two occasions to explore the possibility of negotiating reduced operating hours. She had submitted her representation on 26 February 2026 and the applicant had contacted her in March 2026 when they received the representation.
- The use of SIA door supervisors had been offered from 11:00 until closing time. This amendment did not alter the professional assessment of the risks or the basis of the original representation.
- The premises would still be trading significantly later than its current licence and into the time period usually when there was the highest level of crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour in the locality.
- The core concern was the added late night operating hours themselves, not simply the absence of door staff.
- The proposed conditions and amendments had been received very late in the process giving responsible authorities and local residents minimal opportunity to assess or respond to them a considerate manner.
- The proposed changes were not minor. They still represented a substantial extension beyond the existing operating hours and materially increased the time during which customers would congregate, queue and disperse in and around the premises. The original objection stood in full.
- Even with SIA staff provision, extending the hours to the extent now proposed would lead to an overall increase in crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour linked to the premises and its immediate surroundings.
- Door staff could help manage behaviour at the entrance, but they could not remove the wider impact of keeping the premises open and attracting customers much later into the night.
- She could not support the amended application and respectfully invited the Sub-Committee to refuse the variation or alternatively to limit any extension of hours to 01:00 on Fridays and Saturdays and only with robust conditions. At least a minimum of one SIA door staff should be on duty on Fridays and Saturdays.

In response to questions, PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was possible that the proposed conditions could mitigate some issues, but later extended hours would still cause issues around the area.
- The premises could risk assess how many SIA door supervisors were needed and what times they needed to be on duty and this would make the premises safer. However, the terminal hour for the premises to close was not acceptable
- Drug offenses and violence against the person offences for the immediate area generally occurred after 21:00 or 22:00 until late.
- PC Denham had tried to consult with the business. On 26 February 2026, she had received no update or answer when she submitted the representation. The Council had sent the representation to the applicant and the applicant had replied on 3 March 2026 saying they had been sent a copy of the representation. The applicant had not stated any reason why there had been no contact and apologised.
- PC Denham then replied to the applicant and informed that she would be available for a call on 3 March 2026, but no contact was made.
- She spoke with the business yesterday as she had been emailed. Today the applicant submitted a 'last minute' proposal to amend the application.

Mr Aamer Nawaz, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- His main concerns with the applicant was the antisocial behaviour and the problems that occurred with drugs in the area.
- He had been operating his business in the area and was aware of what went on in the area.
- He would deal with the issues with a positive attitude.
- He was 29 years old when he came to Tottenham to work.
- He bought the premises and started to run his business
- He was now 56 years old.
- He knew the mothers and fathers of the young people frequenting the area.
- Drugs in the area was an ongoing issue.
- There was an issue with the proposed timings and the security for the public.
- It was very dangerous to let the issues carry on in the area because it could lead to other incidents.
- Police had tried to install more CCTV and trying to get rid of the antisocial behaviour during the coronavirus crisis.
- His business helped the Police with data gathering and they did well to try and get rid of all the antisocial behaviour and drug sellers on the high road.
- The application was just inviting more trouble with the situation.
- He had seen trouble in other shops with SIA staff who were only there to monitor small issues. The staff would not be able to manage groups of five or six people at a time.
- Such groups may become violent or intimidating.
- He supported the Police representation.
- He was not comfortable with the application.

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

- He operated a similar type of premises to the applicant.
- His premises was open to 04:00, but was much smaller - a third of the size of the applicant's premises.
- The applicant had a premises that could operate like restaurant area, his premises was mainly a takeaway shop.
- He had worked at his premises for 26 years.
- Parents or family members of the community members would be spoken to with regard to the behaviour of the young people or young adults in the area.
- Bringing more Police into the local situation brought more problems to the area.
- His premises was a local shop and not a big corporation. His premises did not attract issues in high quantities, because the community needed his services.
- His premises sold items a lot cheaper than the corporate shops.
- Nobody creating issues in the community would be served.
- It would be clear to the community that anyone causing trouble, antisocial drug behaviour, drunkenness or loitering would not be served.
- The local community and customers to his premises knew him personally. He had created this relationship over the years he had been working in the community.
- He and his son operated his premises.

To summarise, Mr Mr Solimani stated that the terminal hour for the licence was 00:00 every day apart from Sunday. The point seemed to come down to the crime and disorder objective. It was up to the Sub-Committee to decide whether the conditions proposed were enough to mitigate the issues that had been raised. The Police objection did not explain why the proposals made were not good enough or why an SIA staff member would not deal with the problem. The representation simply stated that operating later hours just meant more crime or disorder. However, this was not necessarily true. If the premises operated later hours, but had an SIA staff member, then there was no reason why there should be certain types of crime that could not be kept under control. Police needed to provide evidence when attending a Licensing Sub-Committee. They needed to provide robust reasoning not simply be expected to have their objection be taken as the prime consideration. The premises did not serve 'troublemakers'. The premises was not simply trying to allow illegal activity to go on. The premises tried to stop it where it could and took its role in the community very seriously. There were criticisms made of the applicant's timing of responding to the Police and dealing with representations. The applicant did at least try to engage the interested parties, but sometimes communication issues could occur, but this was not a reason to refuse a licensing application. It was also not fair to describe the proposals as 'new' or 'recent'. They were evolving and the police officer the applicant was dealing with was now on annual leave. The Sub-Committee needed to consider whether it thought an SIA would deal with the problems the Police had raised and whether it thought it was fair for the problems the Police had identified with crime and disorder on the high street to be blamed on the premises. There did not appear to be a realistic link. It was difficult to see how the issue was a problem that a restaurant

could solve. It was a problem for the Police to solve – something they accepted because they had created an operation to try and reduce crime and it was having an effect. The premises would try to do what it could with the provision of an SIA staff member. It had not been explained why the later hours would cause crime and disorder and for that reason he commended the application to the Sub-Committee.

To summarise, PC Qureshi stated that the Police was objecting to the application and still wanted the terminal hour to be 01:00 on Friday and Saturday with one SIA security guard. The main issue was that policing in the area was at 50% under strength. Police did not finish after 22:00. The pool of officers upon calling 999, would come from the response team, not from the local SNT. No SNTs work after 22:00. If the SIA staff member asked individuals in the premises area to leave and they did not, the Police would be called and would have to attend.

To summarise, Mr Nawaz stated that he agreed with the Police.

### **Adjournment and Decision**

Later in the meeting, at 8:57pm, 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 variation of a Premises Licence at: Tottenham, Post Office, 824-828 High Road, Tottenham, London, N17 0EZ (NORTHUMBERLAND PARK)

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, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Human Rights Act 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:

**Late Night Refreshment** Sunday to Thursday 2300 to 0200 Friday to Saturday 2300 to 0300 hours

**Hours open to Public** Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 0200 hours Friday to Saturday 1000- 0300 hours

CONDITIONS:

The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 15-17 of the Committee papers and additional agreed conditions as set out below:

1. The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV System.
2. All entry and exit points shall be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition.
3. The CCTV system shall continually record whilst the premises is open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises.
4. All recordings shall be stored for a minimum period of 31 days with date and time stampings. Viewing of recordings shall be made available upon request of the Police or authorised officer throughout the preceding 31 day period, subject to the general Data Protection Regulation and current Data Protection requirements.
5. An incident log shall be kept on the premises and made available on request to an authorised officer of the council, or the police which will record the following:-
  - a. All crimes reported to the venue
  - b. All ejections of patrons
  - c. Any complaints received concerning crime and disorder
  - d. Any incidents of disorder
  - e. All seizures of drugs or offensive weapons
  - f. Any faults in the CCTV system or searching equipment or scanning equipment
  - g. Any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service
6. A security system with both audio and visual monitoring capability is installed in the restaurant which can be activated by mobile panic buttons. Once activated the system links the restaurant to an external monitoring centre capable of intervening to resolve crime and disorder issues and/or provide the appropriate advice or instruction to support and protect the restaurant's staff and customers. All staff are trained to use this system.
7. At this restaurant all staff will have safety and security training and Conflict Management Training which includes handling those under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
8. Incidents are recorded on an on-line incident record form which is accessible to every manager and store leader.
9. At least one Registered SIA door staff will be on duty between the hours of 2300 and close of business. The number of SIA registered door staff will be increased when the threat of intimidation/risk of harm/violence is assessed to be greater. The Licensee will clearly set out, and provide greater clarity as to its scoring mechanism and what risk/warnings triggers the necessity for additional staff in its risk assessment policy.
10. The Premises Licence Holder is to work in partnership with the Responsible Authorities to promote public safety.
11. The Premises Licence Holder has safety systems in place to protect the safety of customers and staff at all times. It will comply, as far as reasonably practicable, with relevant Health and Safety, Food Safety and Fire Safety Legislation.
12. All staff receive comprehensive safety training to ensure that safe working methods are maintained including training on the evacuation procedure in the event of a fire or other dangerous occurrence.
13. The Premises Licence Holder operates a "No Open Alcohol Containers" policy to prevent persons carrying open alcohol into the in-store area. No glass is allowed on the premises.

14. The Premises Licence Holder carries out litter patrols collecting both KFC's packaging and any other litter that has been carelessly discarded. It is happy to act on recommendations from the Environmental Health Officer on the extent of the patrol, as far as this is reasonably practicable.

15. A litter check will be carried out by Team members and/or /Team leaders outside the restaurant every 30 minutes.

16. Where it is practical to do so, the Premises Licence Holder puts measures in place to limit noise. The doors are self-closing and music is played at low volume. Signage is displayed at the restaurant asking customers to leave the premises quietly.

17. Orders for food stops 15 minutes before closing and customers are reminded of the closing time. If necessary, staff will encourage customers to leave.

18. The restaurant uses third party delivery drivers who will be reminded not to make too much noise or otherwise cause a nuisance. The delivery company is notified of any concerns with the drivers.

19. Delivery drivers are encouraged to wait inside the premises. If they are in their vehicles, they are asked to turn their engine off, the music down, park considerately, and to have respect for our neighbours.

20. The Premises Licence Holder does not permit unaccompanied children under the age of 16 at any time. It does, however, take the safety of children and vulnerable adults very seriously and will ensure that they are protected from harm at all times when visiting the restaurant. KFC has a policy on Safeguarding and Modern Slavery.

21. All management will be trained regarding safeguarding issues.

**REASONS:** The Committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objectors- particularly the Police, Public Health and the owner of a similar business operating in the immediate area. It took into account that the premises is located along a parade of shops in High Road Tottenham N17, the initial licence was granted in July 2022 and has been run without incident to date. It noted the applicant agreed to reduce the opening hours sought and to employ registered SIA door staff to act as a visible deterrent to antisocial behaviour during the hours of 2300 until close of business. Whilst the area is busy with multiple late evening food establishments and associated anti-social behaviour and street drinking, the Committee can see no justification to object to this application for variation, subject to the attached conditions, and deemed a grant of the application balanced the interest of the applicant, the local residents/business owners 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. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT NISA, MOSELLE RETAIL UNIT, BROADWATER FARM, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6HE (BRUCE CASTLE / WEST GREEN)**

**Presentation by the Licensing Officer**

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

- The application had been submitted by Mr Tabrez Hussain had also been nominated as the designated premises supervisor (DPS).
- The application sought the supply of alcohol Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00. The supply of alcohol would be for consumption off the premises.
- The application offered conditions on page 61 of the agenda papers.

**Presentation by the applicant**

Ms Gill Sherratt, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- This was a family-run business and had been established for over 30 years.
- The business had been started by Mr Hussain's father and uncle and he was now an operations director and ran it with his brother and his cousins.
- The family started their business in 1996 with off licences and moved on to operating convenience stores. They now had 20 convenience stores operating in inner London. Six of these operated 24 hours a day.
- The last licence granted in a cumulative impact zone to the business was in October 2025.
- The business was an extremely responsible professional company.
- They operated their various premises without issues or complaints or risks to the licensing objectives.
- The business provided lots of money to charity and had an extremely proactive relationship with all authorities including the Police, particularly by assisting them with any requests for CCTV.
- Her organisation had represented the business for around 15 years.
- She had considered the statement of licensing policy and conducted a risk assessment when considering the application.
- She was aware that it was located in the Broadwater Farm residential estate.
- The premises related to a council owned premises that had been earmarked specifically for a retail outlet.
- The premises was being redeveloped by the Council who would be the landlord and the applicant was waiting to finalise the lease. This could only be done if the licence was granted from the hours of 07:00 to 23:00.
- Once completed, the applicant intended to invest approximately £500,000 in creating modern facilities.
- Convenience stores were more than just selling groceries. The premises would be a nicer store and alcohol would make about 15% of sales.
- The Public Health representation did not hold up within the context of the Licensing Act.
- Public Health had provided generalised statistics regarding the area; that it was deprived and the risk alcohol presented to vulnerable groups. This, nor the

Council's health and well-being strategy was disputed. However, the applicant had been working amongst residential communities for 30 years, was part of it, understood the demographic, understood the challenges that people faced and the risks that alcohol presented to health and well-being.

- Public Health had stated that they wanted to ensure the Sub-Committee took into account health considerations in any licensing decisions, but Public Health was not a licensing objective. This decision was ratified by the Government in 2017 at their overview of the licensing system at the House of Lords.
- Public Health were suggesting that the Sub-Committee limit the application based on the two licensing objectives; public safety and the protection of children from harm.
- The public safety objection was misguided because public safety was about the physical safety of people in the premises rather than having any broader or social or moral concerns.
- In relation to the objection of the protection of children from harm, retailers could only contribute to that effort by utilising policies, procedures and equipment that they had within their control. The applicant fulfilled this need with a Challenge 25 policy, a CCTV system which would have 20 cameras.
- The evidence before the Sub-Committee was the track record of the business, but also that of the various other responsible authorities in licensing, none of them considered the application to raise any concerns regarding risks to the licensing objective of protecting children from harm.
- Public Health was not asking for the application to be refused, but were focusing in on late operating hours.
- The application requested 16 hours a day for alcohol sales, it was not clear why the last two operating hours was not able to uphold the licensing objectives.
- She would ask that the application be granted as sought. It was a robust application with evidence.

In response to questions, Ms Sherratt and Mr Tabarez Hussain, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Some minor amendments had been provided to the wording where the Police had proposed their conditions. Otherwise, she was in agreement with the conditions.
- She was happy to have a condition that stated the premises would not sell alcohol to those already intoxicated.
- It was not possible for business owners to give staff widespread access to data stored by the premises. It belittled the licensing objectives as people could tamper with systems. Sometimes if Police attended the premises, the relevant person may not be present to grant access to certain requests such as CCTV. This was why a buffer of 48 hours was necessary to make sure the applicant did not breach conditions of a licence.
- The risks at Broadwater Farm were no different to any other application.
- Public Health was not a licensing objective. The risk assessment was based on protection of children from harm and crime and disorder. Various conditions were in place for those such as a Challenge 25 policy and CCTV. The conditions had not been amended by the Police and because they were the national standard to address such issues.

- Risk assessments were not just based on areas. Local shops serviced areas like the area where the premises was based everywhere in the country. It was important to consider the operator and the robust nature of the actual conditions.
- Opening the premises at 07:00, but limiting alcohol sales until 10:00 would not be something the applicant could consider because the business operated 24 hours for the inner-city area and 07:00 to 23:00 for residential areas. Section 182 guidance stated that in relation to the hours for an off-licence business, the opening hours should match the hours for alcohol sales. If this did not happen, then it would cause problems with customers as they would not have the convenience of shopping in one place. If the premises could not sell alcohol for a period of hours, then the premises would have to start covering up the drinks and paying for shutters. Otherwise, the business would be liable to commit a criminal offence.
- The position of Public Health was that the business was acceptable for 14 hours a day. Although there were schools in the area, schools were off all summer and children would be outside their homes from 15:30 and Public Health was stating that the premises was capable of protecting children from harm. It was not clear where the evidence was that that between 07:00 to 09:00 that the premises was suddenly not able to meet the licensing objectives.
- The staff were very well trained in proxy sales and typically, anytime there had been an attempt at a proxy sale, it would be someone underage that had tried to purchase something that had been refused. Shortly after, an adult would come in to the premises and try and buy the same item. The staff were aware of the dangers around proxy sales. This was never an issue in any of the premises managed by the business.
- The use of shutters was legally not justified. There were seldom sales of alcohol in the morning. As part of the section 182 guidance, when a shop opened its doors, all of the products needed to be available on the shelves. It did not mean that people were going to be coming into the premises and buying ten bottles of wine. Legally, the premises was entitled to open the doors and have the alcohol available to customers. Unless there was evidence to suggest that there would be a problem to sell alcohol between 07:00 and 09:00, then the premises should not be expected to meet such a disproportionate condition.
- Alcohol sometimes could not be put them behind the shutters due to fixture fittings or if there was an alcohol promotional fixture, it would not be operationally suitable to place a shutter.

### **Presentation by interested parties**

Mr Joe Garvey, representing the Public Health team, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The Public Health representation exclusively related to preventing, mitigating, targeting and tackling alcohol-related harms.
- Tackling alcohol is a priority for the Council. It was essential to achieving the Council's health and wellbeing strategy aims including reducing the gap in life expectancy between the east and west of the borough and improving mental health and wellbeing.

- Achieving the outcomes required ensuring licensing decisions took health and community safety into account.
- The Council's goal was to foster a culture that prevented and mitigated against alcohol-related harms.
- The proposed premises sat within Broadwater Farm, a location of significant vulnerability surrounded by dense residential housing schools, care homes sheltered accommodation and drug and alcohol treatment services.
- West Green was a diverse and vibrant ward which should be celebrated. It had almost 15,000 residents, 19% of which were children and young people. The ward was ethnically diverse with nearly 15% of the residents from ethnic minority backgrounds.
- West Green was a ward that was particularly deprived. The premises occupied an area within was ranked in the top 7% of most deprived areas nationally.
- Evidence consistently showed that alcohol harms were more concentrated in deprived communities.
- Local health data from 2024/25 indicated there were alcohol-related admissions and three ambulance callouts for alcohol related incidents that year in West Green.
- The borough continued to face some of the highest alcohol-related harm levels in London. Of particular concern for Public Health was the low rate of successful completion of alcohol treatment. The borough sat at 3.5% successful completion, below England's average of 34.6% and ranked as the second worst London borough in rates of completion. This emphasized the importance of preventing additional pressure on vulnerable communities from alcohol-related harms.
- Within just one mile of the premises, there were 19 infant and primary schools, five secondary schools or colleges one sheltered housing scheme and eight residential or care homes. The Grove, Haringey's flagship specialist drug and alcohol misuse service, was located within a half a mile radius. This meant that individuals in recovery or seeking help would be regularly exposed to a new outlet selling alcohol directly along their route or in their residential area.
- There was a local need for the premises. There were currently no off-licences within a 250 metre radius of the location.
- There was good argument to suggest the premises would benefit the local community.
- The leading concern was the availability of alcohol in an area of high population density and deprivation, with vulnerable communities in close proximity.
- Broadwood Farm was transitioning from an area of high crime and gang activity, high levels of people with mental health conditions, social stigma and historic trauma to an area where the major regeneration initiatives had focused on health, well-being safety community safety, social cohesion, better housing and environment.
- Having alcohol sold early in the morning would go some way in undermining all the ongoing work to make Broadwater Farm a better, healthier community.
- Given the risks identified, particularly relating to those in treatment he would ask the Sub-Committee to consider the measures that would help mitigate potential harm and would like the Sub-Committee to consider restricting the of alcohol sales between 09:00 and 23:00.

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

- Alcohol risks were more concentrated in areas of high deprivation. The proposed amendments to hours would help mitigate against the commercial determinacy of health with quite a proportionate, easily implementable licensing condition that had a very negligible impact on the premises.
- There was not a spike during the hours of 07:00 to 09:00 of people using drug and alcohol treatment service.
- He would request the Sub-Committee and the applicant to consider restricting the alcohol sales given the area of high deprivation and likely alcohol related harms experienced within the community.

To summarise, Ms Sherrat stated that the applicant did consider the issues raised. The applicant was a retailer who had a flawless track record working with local charities, giving money to the kinds of charities that probably would benefit the work in the area. The premises needed to open at 07:00 as it was part of what they did. The applicant was not asking for a 24-hour licence which they could, but recognised the area the premises was located. There was no evidence being presented about proxy sales during the school run and the Sub-Committee had heard that there had been no spike on impact on the rehabilitation services. The Sub-Committee only needed to look at its own statement of licensing policy to see that public safety was not about health, but physical safety. In relation to protecting children from harm, the policies, procedures and track record of the applicant was flawless. The Police hardly changed the conditions proposed because they met the national standard. There were three responsible authorities whose specific job was to protect children from harm and all of them were of the view that the application was acceptable.

To summarise, Mr. Garvey stated that the borough faced some of the highest alcohol related harms in London and this was felt even more acutely in Broadwater Farm, an area of significant deprivation and in the highest density of deprivation across the country. His leading concern was not with the premises itself, but more the availability of alcohol in an area of high population density, deprivation and with vulnerable communities in close proximity, pertinently to The Grove. Given the risks identified particularly to those in treatment, he would ask the Sub-Committee to consider measures that would help mitigate potential harm. In particular, to restrict the sale alcohol between 07:00 and 23:00.

### **Adjournment and Decision**

At 8:57pm, 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 and amendments.

**RESOLVED:** To grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at, NISA, MOSELLE RETAIL UNIT, BROADWATER FARM, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6HE (BRUCE CASTLE / WEST GREEN) 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: Monday to Sunday 0700 to 2300 hours

Supply of alcohol OFF the premises. Hours open to Public: Monday to Sunday 0700 to 2300 hours.

CONDITIONS: The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 60- 62 and 85-86 of the Committee papers, relating to Robust CCTV, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of proxy sales and sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals and Incident Management policies and in addition to a condition that litter will be dealt with so that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter.

The conditions are as follows:

1. CCTV shall be installed, operated, and maintained, to function all times that the premises is open for licensable activities. Said CCTV will comply with the following criteria:
2. (a) The premises will ensure that the system is checked on a regular basis to ensure that the system is working properly and that the date and time are correct. (b) There will be a camera on the entrance to the premises, to capture a clear image of anyone entering. (c) The system will provide coverage of the interior of the premises accessible to the public: (d) The system will record in real time and recordings will be date and time stamped: (e) At all times during operating hours, there will be at least 1 member of staff on the premises who can operate the system sufficiently to allow Police or authorised Council officers other authorised officers of the Licensing Authority (as defined by Section 13 of the Licensing Act 2003) to view footage on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018). (f) Recordings will be kept for a minimum of 31 days and downloaded footage will be provided to the police or other authorised officers of the Licensing Authority (as defined by Section 13 of the Licensing Act 2003) on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018) within 24 hours of any request. (g) Signage stating that CCTV is in operation will be clearly and prominently displayed at the premises.
3. Staff will be trained in alcohol sales and regular refresher training (every 6 months) will also be undertaken. Training records will be made available for inspection within 48 hours of request by the Police or other relevant officers of a responsible authority.
4. All spirits are to be kept behind the till/counter.
5. All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
6. The premises license holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.
7. Premises will not sell alcohol to those who are already intoxicated.

8. Prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at all public exits from the premises requesting customers respect the needs of residents and leave the premises area quietly. These notices shall be positioned at eye level and in a location where those leaving the premises can read them.

9. Delivery drivers/ riders shall be given clear instructions to use their vehicles in a responsible manner so as not to cause a nuisance to any residents or generally outside the license premises; not to leave engines running when the vehicles are parked; and not to obstruct the highway.

10. The premises licence holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.

11. Waste will be disposed of responsibly to prevent odour, and collection times will be scheduled to minimize disruption.

12. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme. (a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer. (b) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office. (c) Premises will ensure staff is trained in how to identify and prevent the 'proxy' sale of alcohol to minors.

13. A written or electronic 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 submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by Public Health at the Hearing. Whilst sympathetic to the objectors it was noted that the Applicant, and its agent, addressed all the concerns raised robustly and had sought to agree conditions with the Metropolitan Police in advance of the Hearing. In particular the Committee took into account what the Applicants agent stated in relation to paragraph 10.15 of the Revised Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licencing Act 2003 (February 2026). This provides that: 'Shops, stores and supermarkets should normally be free to provide sales of alcohol for consumption off the premises at any times when the retail outlet is open for shopping unless there are good reasons, based on the licensing objectives, for restricting those hours.' 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.

**8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....17 March 2026.....