

# **MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 9 JUNE 2025**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Nick da Costa and Gina Adamou

## **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

It being a special meeting of the Sub Committee, under Part Four, Section B, Paragraph 17, of the Council's Constitution, no other business would be considered at the meeting.

## **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. CONSIDERATION OF AN OBJECTION TO A TEMPORARY EVENT NOTICE AT BLOOMING SCENTS CAFE, 639 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 (BRUCE CASTLE)**

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

Ms Daliah Barrett informed the Sub-Committee that:

- This was a temporary event notice (TEN) for an event to take place between 12 to 17 June 2025.
- The TEN would allow the premises to operate additional hours in concurrence with the Beyoncé concerts taking place across those days.
- Representations had been submitted from the Antisocial Behaviour Noise team and the Police.
- The notice would allow licensable activities between 22:00 and 01:00 for up to 100 people with regulated entertainment, sale of alcohol and late-night refreshment.

- The Noise Officer was unable to attend this meeting, but had advised through a note that they had visited the premises to perform a licence check and that there was loud noise at the street level. Advice had been given to the Notice Giver

### **Presentation by the objector**

Sgt Monika Galecka and PC Carey Denham informed the Sub-Committee that:

- A few reports had been received regarding the premises. One involved a phone call made to Police by residents from a nearby care home regarding antisocial behaviour happening in the car park behind the premises. There was playing of loud music, people screaming and alcohol being consumed. The member of the public who made the call that this occurred on a regular basis, particularly on weekends or during events.
- During the Tottenham Hotspur UEFA Europa League victory parade, an incident occurred at the vicinity of the premises (although this potentially was not related to the premises), where a member of the public was robbed of their mobile phone.
- Concerning reports had been received that drugs paraphernalia had been found in the car park at the back of the premises. Snap bags and nitrous oxide canisters were found dumped in the corner of the car park. These were subsequently seized by officers. The car park was not accessible by general members of the public because there was a barrier that lifted via a use of a code. Not everyone would know this code. The car park could also be accessed from the premises by the exit near the toilets and thus could be accessed by anyone. The premises licence stated that the premises staff would ensure entrance and exit by trained security staff. Officers conducting a visit were able to freely enter and exit the premises.
- They did not believe that the Notice Giver would uphold the licensing objectives and would question the reason and the rationale as to why the Notice Giver was requesting to keep the premises open until 01:00 from 12 to 17 June 2025. These were the dates of the events for Beyonce concert and the attendees were anticipated to be mainly families, females and children. Therefore, the Police would like to prevent any offences taking place late into the night.

In response to questions, Sgt Galecka and PC Denham informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The Police did not reach out to communicate with the Notice Giver. In relation to the upcoming events at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, given to how violent the area had become recently, the Police decided simply to object to the notice.
- Normally for temporary event notices, they would like to see how the licensing objectives would be upheld, so suggestions such as extra door supervisors or a dispersal policy or other similar practices needed to be presented.
- There was no security in the back area when Police visited it.
- The drugs paraphernalia was found in the car park, so it was not possible to attribute who the drugs would have belonged to and whether they were linked to the premises or not. However, the calls received by Police related to the back of the premises.

- Nobody from the Police had any communication with the Notice Giver. Approximately 90 temporary event notices had been submitted last month and due to different staffing obstructions, it was not possible to communicate with all those who had submitted a TEN. The Police had taken the view that it would object to TENs in the area during events to prevent crime and disorder.
- The Police had objected to all TENs submitted during when events were held at Tottenham Hotspur Stadium across the footprint of the High Road where there were 19 licensed premises situated. There had been communication between licence holders in the area. Some licence holders had agreed with the measures taken by the Police, because sometimes things get out of control for them on event days. The Police had also advised that it would review its position periodically.
- Police had worked during the boxing events held at the stadium and the High Road was often packed. It was more common to have football matches being held at the stadium. Managing the ingress and egress with 67,000 patrons attending a boxing match proved to be a different challenge. Attendants were particularly violent with many reports of grievous bodily harm. Other licensed premises struggled with controlling the patrons that attended the stadium. SIA staff had also struggled to deal with the events.
- The biggest concern would be at the weekends, as these days attracted more patrons. Although it was understood that gatherings happened all day every day, this was particularly the case during the weekends.
- Police had witnessed the attendance at the car park that could be accessed via the exit door. This area should have security at the door, but it did not.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer stated that from the boxing events, there had been feedback from residents in relation to having to deal with antisocial behaviour that had arisen, not just from noise, but street urination and drug taking. TENs could always be submitted and would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. In relation to noise, the Noise team had visited the premises over the weekend due to reported noise. There was one other licensed premises - a restaurant – located a few doors down.

In response to more questions, Sgt Galecka and PC Denham informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Police had witnessed the attendance at the car park that could be accessed via the exit door. This area should have security at the door, but it did not.

### **Presentation by the Notice Giver**

Ms Eugenia Moffatt informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was surprised by the Police representation.
- On the day of one of the events, there were 35 or 36 Police officers using the bathroom. This included all the parking attendants all the officials. It was an area which acted like a safety net. No one had mentioned that there was any cause for concern.

- The premises was not structured as a pub or a drinking establishment, but had tables and chairs where patrons could sit on sofas and have drinks with their family and friends.
- The parade had people on the High Road and people in the area had difficulty coming out of the shops. Enough security staff was in place to take care of this.
- She felt she was being victimised.
- The premises was big enough to occupy the event and was generally larger than all the shops on the High Road.
- The car park did not belong to her and she did not have control over it.
- Officers who used the bathroom facilities would say that a qualified security staff opened the door for them to use the bathroom.
- Security staff had been standing by the toilet facilities and ensured that the toilets were clean.
- There was an issue with drugs on the High Road, but this had never been associated with the premises.
- From the Sainsbury's to the corner shops, every premises in the area had to deal with the drug problems in the location.
- She did her best to move people on.
- She did not understand why the issues were exclusively being associated with the premises.
- Many after-parties went on at the shops next to the premises.
- Anytime there had been a licensing issue raised, she would take steps to address it.
- A sum of £5,000 had been invested to ensure that the premises operated properly including with sound limiters. There was concern that after the investment had been made, the business would not be given a chance to operate.

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

- This past Saturday, from about 19:45 to 20:00, two officers who came to the premises, saw the security at the door and asked to see the licence. Staff took the licence off the wall and gave it to the officers. The officers had said that they had heard sound emanating from the premises. They spent about 10 to 15 minutes at the premises. They explained they had not recorded any formal sound levels at the premises and were simply passing by.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer explained that noise levels would only ever be set for occurrences such as stadium events. There were not usually set levels for café's and restaurants or other such premises. It was also notable that Ms Moffatt had stated that she had invested money into the business. This appeared to be related to noise limiting

matters which were supposed to be in place from when the premises was subject to a variation application.

The Legal advisor to the Sub-Committee stated that the variation application was heard on 4 November 2024. When Noise officers considered noise in relation to public nuisance, this would be based on the officer's knowledge and experience, rather than any set level.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that the noise management plan had not been submitted to the Licensing Authority as per the hearing on 4 November 2024.

In response to a question, the Legal advisor to the Sub-Committee stated that the licence listed in the agenda papers was the licence as it would have been varied, were the conditions of its variation complied with. As the Notice Giver had not complied with the variations, it had not yet been varied.

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

- The TEN was not for continuous use from 12 June at 22:00 to 17 June at 0100 - a total of 99 consecutive hours. It was just for the days where the Beyonce concert was on concert, because the terminal hour for closure was 22:00. This was the time when the concert also ended. A lot of trade was lost partly due to parking issues. The only time patrons came into the premises was when events at the stadium were being held. All the businesses on the High Road tried to take advantage of an opportunity like that.
- It was worrying to hear the Police say that for the next three months, all TENs would be objected to if any events were to be held at the stadium. This would be detrimental for businesses.
- There were other vendors in the area such as the burger vans from the Tottenham Community Centre. They could trade after events and they often came in only during the events days.
- There would be three or four security staff on hand. There would be over 10 staff on duty the days of the event. One person had even been employed to supervise the toilet.
- She had expected Licensing to let her know If there were any concerns with the TEN. The Police had said that they spoke to all the other businesses, but no one had spoken to her. She had not been aware of any incidents occurring as a result of the boxing matches.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer explained that the Tottenham Sports Centre often hired out their land. There were traders on the land and the contract was between them and Tottenham Sports Centre. It was not a Licensing issue. In emails with the applicant's representative, the applicant had been informed that they could submit any written submissions for the hearing. In one of the emails submitted, it had been stated that the temporary event was not really an event, but just a method to operate later into the night.

### **Adjournment and Decision**

At 12:47pm, 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 issue a counter notice.

RESOLVED: To issue a counter-notice to prevent the event going ahead.

### **Announcement of Decision**

Members returned to the meeting at 1:01pm and the Chair informed those present of the decision to issue a counter notice to prevent the event going ahead. The Chair confirmed that written notification of the decision would be sent in due course.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....