

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 27 JULY 2026, 7:00PM - 9:07PM

PRESENT: Councillors Bethany Anderson (Chair), Edward Thacker and Elara Shurety

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.

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 THE VILLAGE SQUARE, VILLAGE SQUARE, 177 ARCHWAY ROAD, LONDON, N6 (HIGHGATE)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- This was an application for a review of a premises licence due to ongoing noise nuisance and antisocial behaviour emanating from the premises.
- Appendix 1 contained the application form with supporting documents.
- The review application was under the four licensing objectives; the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, the prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.
- The premises was located near residential properties.
- The premises was promoted as a bar with karaoke and a nightclub.
- The premises was originally granted a licence in 2006.
- Complaints of noise nuisance were received from the premises during that time.

- In May 2017, the premises ownership changed to Blue Vegas and operated more like a nightclub.
- The operator at the time was unaware of events being advertised at the premises beyond the hours of the permitted licence. Warnings were given by the Police and Licensing.
- Nuisance complaints continued relating to music noise and people's behaviour associated with the premises.
- In September 2019, Licensing was advised by an enforcement officer that a new operator was on site at the premises and he had been issued with a fixed penalty notice for fly tipping.
- That was the first time that officers became of Mr Katchi Oniuri taking over the premises on his own.
- Noise complaints continued to be received and the Council became aware of the named DPS no longer being involved in the business in July 2021 and this was due to residents highlighting the COVID-19 rules were being breached and noise nuisance coming from the premises.
- Noise and antisocial behaviour complaints continued to be submitted.
- In 2023, Councillor Emery submitted a complaint on behalf of residents relating to noise nuisance impact on nearby residents. This was investigated and a warning was issued.
- In October 2025, an Antisocial Behaviour Officer attended a meeting and feedback was provided by the officer saying that they were faced with about 30 upset residents and the cause of this was antisocial behaviour caused by patrons leaving the premises. They had mentioned drunk and disorderly behaviour when leaving the premises, the use of nitrous oxide with shouting and screaming from the closing time of 03:00 to 05:00. The streets became filtered with rubbish and with nitrous oxide canisters.
- Residents had engaged with the premises directly and were told that the DPS was away and not at the premises day to day.
- Enforcement officers carried out a follow-up visit and premises staff were unable to say who the DPS was.
- There was no display of the premises licence on site. Noise, nuisance, and antisocial behaviour complaints continued.
- The Police attempted to make contact with the licence holder in February 2026 and were unsuccessful initially. On further investigation, the licence holder was found to be abroad and had been away for some months.
- The DPS advised he was having a medical procedure.
- The licence allowed for the sale of alcohol and regulated enter entertainment as well as late night refreshment. A copy of the licence could be found at appendix 2 of the agenda papers.
- The opening hours of the premises was Sunday to Thursday 17:00 to 01:00.
- Friday to Saturday 17:00 to 03:00 with supply of alcohol for consumption on the premises only.
- During the application consultation stage, there was supporting documentation received from the Police, ward councillors and residents.
- Some video footage had also been submitted.

Presentation by the review applicant

Mr David Wood, Noise and Nuisance Officer, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The application was due to the premises having failed to uphold two core licensing objectives; the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder.
- The premises operated a late-night karaoke bar. It directly bordered a dense, quiet residential neighbourhood.
- Over a cumulative six-year span between 2026 and 2026 the local community had reported experiencing antisocial behaviour emanating from the premises.
- The Council's records showed that residents were routinely awakened between 03:00 and 05:00 by the business or its patrons.
- Reports included patrons regularly spilling onto the street, shouting and screaming. Surrounding streets were left in a poor state with broken glass and discarded nitrous oxide canisters and balloons.
- Patron disorder had turned violent with documented reports of fights.
- The review application was a last resort. The Council and Police had issued warnings, yet premises management had shown disregard for compliance.
- In September 2020, the Council served a commercial noise warning letter.
- In May 2023, following resident complaints regarding the premises operating out of hours, the Council issued a formal warning letter. The operator promised improvements, but the Council continued to receive complaints.
- In October 2025, 30 distressed residents complained to the Council about the escalating street chaos.
- In March 2026, the Police issued a section 19 closure notice after discovering continued licensing breaches and absence of mandatory SIA door security and evidence of the venue operating past its permitted hours.
- The number of local residents and councillors formally submitting evidence against the premises in this review application was substantial and reflected a deeply impacted community.
- The designated premises supervisor (DPS) had been physically absent from the country for a number of months due to medical reasons.
- Whilst he empathised with his health, the business had continued to trade.
- Written warnings and notices had failed.
- The operator had proven unable to control the public nuisance and crime tied directly to the premises.
- The Police had submitted a representation requesting the licence be revoked.
- The Noise and Licensing teams did not resist the Police's request for revocation. However, should the Sub-Committee choose not to revoke the licence, he requested that the operating hours be reduced to 00:00 with all licensable activities ceasing at 23:30 and a strict 00:00 closing time, seven days a week, alongside the enforceable conditions outlined in his representation.
- Residents had a right to safety and peace in their own homes and need to be protected.
- He urged the Sub-Committee to protect the community and take decisive action.

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

- The DPS had been written to by his team and given multiple chances to comply.
- There had been a lack of SIA security on the door of the premises. This was wilful neglect. Patrons leaving the premises causing nuisance for residents due to a continued lack of SIA had gone on over a number of years.
- The issues had spanned over a period of six years.
- There had been more than 10 complainants making multiple complaints of a of a similar nature.
- There had been a continuous stream of complaints coming into the Council of over 10 complainants.
- The Police had recently submitted a section 19 closure order on the business and that was in addition to all of the interactions that the Noise and Licensing teams had. The Council was extremely limited on resources and the amount of residents impacted meant residents needed protection and the Sub-Committee needed to consider this and put steps in place.
- He had initially asked for operating hours to be set for 00:00 and a number of conditions to be added to address the issues. Subsequent to that, Police submitted their representation showing that community protection warning notices had been issued and a section 19 closure order had been issued. There was also evidence of significant crime going on at the premises.
- He would not resist the Police's representation asking for a revocation of the licence.

Presentation by interested parties

Councillor Nick da Costa informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He spoke on behalf of local residents in support of the review application.
- He remained firmly of the view that revocation of the premises licence was the appropriate and proportionate outcome.
- He wanted successful local businesses and particularly those that contributed positively to the high streets and the local economy. Revocation of a licence should always be a last resort.
- Unfortunately, after many years of complaints, repeated engagement by residents, repeated interventions by the responsible authorities and repeated opportunities for improvement, he now believed revoking the licence was necessary.
- The review application was about a persistent pattern of problems over many years which had a real impact on the lives of local residents.
- Councillor Scott Emery attended the ward panel with residents to discuss concerns about the premises. The message from residents both at the meeting and on the doorsteps and in emails received was consistent. There were not speculative concerns about what might happen.

- There were accounts from people who had been living with the problems for a prolonged period.
- Ward councillors had continued to receive correspondence from residents raising many of the same issues repeatedly.
- Over six years, there had been repeated complaints, repeated investigations, repeated engagement by the Council and the Police and repeated assurances from the DPS and repeated opportunities to improve.
- Despite the opportunities, the problems had continued and he agreed with the Police's conclusion that revocation of the licence was necessary and this was not a recommendation they made lightly and he believe it deserved significant weight.
- The DPS' additional representations contained a detailed action plan including enhanced staff training, a compliance manager, a written dispersal policy, expanded CCTV, incident recording, ID scanning, and a member scheme. Many of these proposals appeared to be sensible.
- These were the kind of measures that one would reasonably expect to have been in place already at a responsibly managed late-night premises. It was not clear why they had only appeared now once the premises licence itself was at risk.
- He acknowledged the DPS' illness and had genuine sympathy for anyone facing serious health problems. However, a premises licence must be capable of being operated responsibly regardless of the circumstances of one individual.
- If effective management depended entirely on one person's presence, that in itself raised questions about the robustness of the management arrangements.
- Ultimately the Sub-Committee was not being asked whether the new proposal sounded sensible, it was being asked whether after years of complaints, years of opportunities and repeated intervention by the responsible authorities, there was sufficient confidence that the measures would now be implemented consistently and sustainably. He did not believe this to be the case
- Residents had waited patiently. The responsible authorities had been given repeated opportunities. This review application was ultimately about those who lived around the premises. They had shown patience over many years, had reported problems repeatedly, engaged constructively with the Council and Police and hoped that each new promise made would finally resolve matters. Regrettably, they had been let down too many times. They should not be asked to place their faith in yet another promise.
- He asked the Sub-Committee to revoke the licence.

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

- Speaking to residents through emails and regularly in person over the last year, he found that residents wanted to see change. Residents did not deny that they would like to see an operator at the premises that was operating within reasonable hours.
- The premises needed a complete change of management. Residents were saying they were tired of their experiences.
- Parents were worried about their children walking home at night in the area.

- There had been consistent feedback from residents on Cromwell Avenue and on Archway Road.
- He would like to see a responsible operator at the premises, but the licence needed to be revoked first.
- If the DPS wanted to operate the premises, then he should come forward with a new application, with a proper management plan, a noise management plan, a dispersal policy and a security policy. The policies had been offered at a late stage.

PC Ewart informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The Police supported the review application whilst the review applicant sought reduced hours and strengthened conditions.
- He respectfully invited the Sub-Committee to exercise the wider powers available to it.
- Having considered the entirety of the evidence, he maintained that the revocation of the premises licence was the appropriate and proportionate outcome.
- Should members not be minded to revoke the licence, he would invite the consideration of a substantial suspension, removal of the DPS and robust additional conditions.
- The case was not about one fight, one complaint or one licensing breach. It was about a recurring pattern over a number of years.
- The cumulative evidence demonstrated repeated crime and disorder, public nuisance, licensing breaches and management failures despite numerous opportunities to improve.
- The Sub-Committee had seen evidence of violence, antisocial behaviour, noise nuisance, nitrous oxide use, licence compliance failures, CCTV failures, operation beyond authorised hours, formal enforcement action advice engagement, licensing visits, warning letters, a community protection warning and a section 19 closure notice.
- Lesser interventions had already been attempted.
- The Police had carefully considered the written response of the DPS.
- He acknowledged the explanations offered and recognised the references to the DPS's health circumstances and was mindful of this.
- However, the Licensing Act required licensed premises to be properly managed at all times.
- The objections cannot be suspended because of the personal circumstances of the DPS.
- The issue before the Sub-Committee was not whether there were explanations for individual incidents. It was whether, after years of complaints, repeated warnings, enforcement action and formal intervention, confidence remained that the premises could consistently promote the licensing objectives. In his view, that confidence no longer existed.
- Members were required to have regard of the Secretary of State's guidance issued under the Licensing Act together with the statement of licensing policy.

- The guidance made it clear that the review proceedings were preventative, not punitive and that the Sub-Committee should take appropriate and proportionate steps where the licensing objectives had been undermined.
- Repeated informal engagement and formal enforcement had failed to last to secure lasting compliance.
- The Police respectfully maintained the position set out within its written representation.
- He invited the Sub-Committee to revoke the licence
- If the Sub-Committee was not minded to the licence, he would invite it to consider substantial suspension of the licence, removal of the DPS and the imposition of robust additional conditions.

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

- Past history was often a good guide to future conduct. He had lost all confidence to better future conduct from the premises.
- The worst time for complaints appeared to be in the later hours.
- There appeared to be propensity of evidence that stated that there had been antisocial behaviour issues associated with the premises. The gas cannisters being found across the area was likely to have come from the premises as the evidence would suggest it. There were numerous residents that had given evidence to that effect.
- Residents were compassionate, caring, nice people and ideally would not want the DPS to lose the licence. However, it was important to protect compassionate, caring, nice people from the fear of crime and from a premises that continually breached the licensing objectives to the point where it caused a public nuisance and a public safety issue.

Ms Hui Li To, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Being a landlord, she was constantly being called by the tenants regarding the premises.
- The DPS advised that her tenants could come to speak to premises staff regarding issues, but this did not beget any progress.
- The first complaint to the council by one of her tenants was in 2019.
- After the coronavirus crisis, the premises became very loud.
- Tenants suffered from sleepless nights due to tension and depression and to their work.
- Many tenants worked from home. Many could not work during the night and could not sleep properly.
- Tenants had complained the premises operated beyond the permitted hours.
- Premises staff said they could not do anything about it.
- She often got vomit on her door doorstep.
- Surrounding areas had many empty cups plastic cups.
- Noise was often made people were trying to enjoy their weekends. Fridays Saturdays were the most disruptive.
- She had long-term tenants who had lived in the area for four or five years.
- The premises was physically like a mirror image of her property.

- The DPS had demolished their corridor, making the premises larger. The noise then directly impacted her side of the house.
- Her tenants lived in a studio and did not have other rooms to go to.
- The noise was damaging to their health and one tenant had said that he could not sleep well or earn as much money from work due to lack of concentration.
- She had lived in the house for 40 years and had not had a problem living there until 2017.
- She would be happy to see the premises restore the corridor it once had and maintain a terminal hour of 23:30.

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

- In the previous week, she saw a video where patrons were sat outside the premises and people spill out on her doorstep. They looked like they were under the influence of drugs. This was at 02:00.

Ms Miriyam Bromnick, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was keen to keep the high street and did not want to be opposed to people having parties and fun nights out.
- Frequently on Saturday and Sunday mornings, she found nitrous oxide cardboard boxes and canisters on her front garden or on her garden wall as did many of her neighbours.
- Her bedroom was probably 60 metres away from the front door of the of the premises.
- She was often disturbed by noise from the premises.
- When the premises door opened, she could hear people and music.
- In relation to public safety, the combination of intoxicated people, those who had taken illegal drugs and the shouting that went on late at night made it feel like Cromwell Avenue was a hostile environment.
- She felt unsafe in her own home often on Friday and Saturday evenings.
- Police had advised residents to go out and take photographs or to make recordings.
- Occasionally she had to come home late. On one occasion, in order to get from the cab to her front door, she felt very threatened and had to ask the cab driver to wait until she was able to let herself into the front door.
- It was very distressing to feel like this in her own home. She felt that she was representing neighbours, families and other people of her age.
- In relation to public nuisance, her sleep was often disturbed on Friday and Saturday nights. There was shouting, screaming, music emanating from the premises door and often aggressive social behaviour from people walking down the street.
- The amount of noise meant that it was often impossible to sleep and it impinged on her health and well-being.
- Others in the area were also affected.

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

- One of her neighbours said she came home late at night and there were some people in her front garden misusing drugs. There was an incident when they along with patrons from the premises had spread out into the street, had put barriers up and stopped the cars driving down the street.
- There was 30 or 40 people standing in the street.
- She was too scared sometimes to even open her blinds to see what was going on outside.
- She could hear the noise and felt quite afraid in her own home and disturbed. It felt like a volatile environment in a quiet residential part of Highgate.
- If the premises could be a business that could supervise its patrons, check people as they came out and with a terminal hour of 00:00, it may be better, but it was difficult to know for sure.
- The premises did not seem to be part of a controlled situation and perhaps may have gone too far to be recovered.
- She did not understand why the premises had such a late terminal hour.
- Many people would be drunk in front of her door some may be on drugs.
- Most of the disruptions came later in the evening. The worst of the noise was between about 02:00 and 04:00.

Presentation by the premises licence holder

Mr Katchi Oniuri, the DPS, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He had managed the premises continuously since 2018.
- He acknowledged the concerns that had been raised by local residents, Police and Licensing.
- He appreciated the importance of the licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance.
- As a long-standing business owner within the borough, he shared the objectives and had always sought to operate responsibly.
- In October 2025, he was required to travel abroad to undergo a complex and delicate surgical procedure.
- His recovery took considerably longer than anticipated and he was only able to return to United Kingdom in July 2026.
- During the period, he was absent from the day-to-day management of the premises due to the circumstances beyond his control.
- Since he had returned, he had carefully reviewed every concern that had been raised regarding the operation of the premises.
- Rather than simply responding to the review application, he had treated it as an opportunity to improve how the premises operated and how to introduce additional safeguards that went significantly beyond existing conditions.
- One of the most consistent issues had been antisocial behaviour occurring outside the premises.
- He wished to explain that many of the individuals responsible for the disturbances were not patrons. They frequently congregated outside premises

without entering it and used the surrounding public highway, particularly Cromwell Avenue as meeting place. These individuals had been involved in excessive noise, balloon inhalation, disorderly behaviour and, on occasions, fighting.

- Security staff had repeatedly attempted to disperse the groups.
- However, once individuals were on the public highway and were not patrons of the premises, the powers premises staff had were extremely limited.
- Security personnel were readily challenged by individuals who insisted that they were entitled to remain on the public highway.
- Despite limitations, the premises never ignored the problem.
- The business introduced physical road barriers on Cromwell Avenue after 00:00 to discourage certain vehicles from parking and gathering in areas.
- Although this had helped on many occasions, some individuals still found alternative access routes maintaining their usual congregating point.
- Recognising that more robust measures were required, he had now introduced a completely different new operating model for the business.
- The new measures had already been implemented included converting the premises to a members' only venue. Each person wishing to use the premises must become a registered member.
- Another measure to be taken would be an electronic ID scanning system.
- The premises had introduced ID scanning system technology at the entrances to the premises. This was to enable him to verify the authenticity of identification documents preventing underage guests, detect fraudulent identification record, identify repeat offenders and enforce bans against individuals.
- He had been exploring opportunities to share appropriate CCTV surveillance and relevant security information with the Police and the Council where legally permissible.
- His objective was to improve communication, support investigations and demonstrate complete transparency in operation.
- He would expand CCTV coverage.
- CCTV coverage had been expanded to include additional external areas surrounding the premises, particularly locations where groups had historically gathered. This would enable the premises to identify where individuals involved in antisocial behaviour had attended the premises or whether they were entirely unrelated to the premises.
- Where any member was identified as engaging in unacceptable behaviour outside the premises, appropriate disciplinary action would be taken including suspension or permanent exclusion.
- He would ask the Sub-Committee to allow sufficient time for the enhanced controls to demonstrate their effectiveness.
- He remained fully committed to working constructively with Metropolitan Police, Licensing, Environmental Health and local residents. Should any further recommendations be considered reasonable and proportionate, he would work collaboratively to implement them.
- The continued success of the premises depended upon maintaining a safe respectful and well-managed environment for both customers and neighbours.

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

- He felt bad hearing the representations from residents.
- He spent a lot of time dispersing people from outside the premises, getting them away, getting them to go home. He would do this as those individuals would know him as the owner of the premises. Individuals often left when they were told to.
- Most of the individuals that came and congregated outside were not patrons of the premises.
- He had done everything to try and get the individuals away. Sometimes they would say that they did not have to leave as they were not actually occupying the premises.
- The records showed most of the actions he had taken just to try and protect Cromwell Avenue including putting barriers up even though he knew it was not legal to do so.
- The premises was his only source of livelihood.
- Over the years, due to what had been happening, the sales had declined drastically due to measures he had taken.
- He had banned a lot of people from coming into the premises. He had done this even though they were big spenders.
- He would rather make less money and have peace and quiet and make sure residents slept comfortably on a Friday and a Saturday.
- The music levels had been reduced. Patrons liked the music loud but this had been reduced nonetheless.
- If given a chance to implement changes, there would be a favourable impact in the area. This was already happening in the last six to eight months, even though the business had declined, the atmosphere was calmer. There were no more fights or calling of the Police required.
- What happened in the past was simply out of his hands. He did what he could, but had to be away the last few months due to his health situation.
- He was generally present at the premises, particularly on Friday and Saturday. He saw everything first-hand. He tried to control fights or stop fights. He had stopped intoxicated patrons from buying more alcohol.
- Over the last few years, the premises had been built on a reputation of being a late-night premises.
- Many patrons came into the area from other places. This would be around 00:00 or 01:00.
- The premises usually got to have sales for about two hours and at 03:00, the patrons would be dispersed. Reducing the operating hours to 23:00 would heavily impact the business.
- When he first opened the premises, people had said it was a nightclub, but it was not a nightclub, it was a karaoke bar where people came and to unwind and relax.
- He did not originally envisage the premises becoming popular.
- Most patrons were women and this attracted men to the area. Rather than wait in front of the door, they would go to the side of the bar and this was why they congregated at Cromwell Avenue. The area was a public highway.
- When the female patrons left the premises, they would be 'naturally attracted' to the men who were waiting for them outside. He could not stop the women

from going into the area where the men were situated. He would tell the patrons to go home and inform them that residents lived nearby.

- He was aware of the petitions that had been signed regarding the premises and he tried to disperse the people, but it was too difficult to do it all the time. Sometimes fights broke out.
- Implementing a members' only club would stop people from inside the premises and meet people directly outside it as he could impose lifetime bans.
- Identification would be provided and checked. There was software to check identification authenticity.
- Names could be checked against the database of known individuals and this would help restrict who was allowed into the premises.
- Members would be allowed a guest and when the guests attended, they could be registered.
- The premises was aware of those would have caused trouble in the past at the premises. Those individuals had been banned.
- He had been at the premises since 2018 and he was aware of who his patrons were. The people congregating outside the premises could seem intimidating at times. There was very little that could be done. The female patrons would attend the premises for karaoke so he could not tell the patrons to not attend the premises and he was unable to tell the individuals outside that they could not occupy a public highway.
- Over the last six years, the individuals loitering had been attending the area, but in the last three to six months, the business had dwindled, the music was not loud as before and fewer people came into the premises.
- CCTV had always been available. The only time it was not available was when he was abroad. He had CCTV footage on his phone and his tablet computer.
- Major renovation works had been done at the premises and the room where the CCTV was had been set up on the last day before he left. Unfortunately, he left with little notice.
- He was still monitoring events on CCTV when abroad and when Police wanted to have access, he had to set it up for the premises staff. The first day that Police attended, Police could not get hold of the footage as he had to get his staff to set up the CCTV over the phone. The Police came back later and was able to get access to the footage.
- The business was a very difficult business to run. The person he put in charge to manage the premises whilst he was away did the best he could.
- The individual had worked with him for five years and there was another individual who had worked with him for about three years who was previously the DPS.
- Both individuals were familiar with the premises licence.
- The premises licence had been placed on the wall, but patrons sometimes were drunk and they pulled the licence off the wall. This should have been put that back without Police intervention. The usual SIA staff member was not available due to a bereavement in his family. Another SIA staff member was eventually employed.
- In relation to the matter of the male individuals meeting the female patrons outside the premises, most of the patrons knew the men. Some of them would wait outside as part of a prearrangement. He would try to get them into their

cars and go home. He would explain to them that residents were sleeping and this could not happen every weekend.

- He had not knocked down any walls. The only renovation work he had done was have the walls painted.
- A glass of wine or two could intoxicate someone. Alcohol would stop being served when patrons appeared to misbehave.
- When patrons started to tear items off the wall or tear property off the wall, security would intervene.
- Patrons were constantly watched.
- Minor incidents could start fights. Disputes about the karaoke machine itself had led to fights in the past.
- Problem started at the end of the night when the crowds were dispersed. Once they went outside, the situation became difficult to manage.
- He accepted that it was his duty to take reasonable steps to manage the dispersal of patrons and minimise the impact of the premises on local residents.
- Sometimes he felt that his hands were tied due to people coming into the area from elsewhere. He tried to disperse them, but they would tell him that they were not his patrons and they could not talk to him.
- Measures had not previously been put in place because he thought his best efforts at the time would be adequate.
- The premises had cut out all additional noise. Residents lived at the back and above the premises.
- The party wall was the same as it was with the residents at the back. He assumed the issue had been resolved because he had cut down the music and got rid of the subwoofers that was making all the noise. Residents were welcome to come and listen for themselves on a Friday or Saturday. The music levels were so low now that most patrons no longer attended the premises because of it.

To summarise, Mr Wood stated that the large body of evidence showed that this was not a new or sudden problem. The evidence submitted by the authorities and residents showed a cumulative six-year period of documented non-compliance, Police interventions and severe antisocial behaviour. The Noise team had issued noise warnings. Police had stepped in with severe community protection warnings and a section 19 closure notice. The public and residents needed to be protected from unmanaged street chaos, violence and noise. The business had clearly crossed a line and the Sub-Committee needed to step in. The Noise team stood firmly behind that recommendation as the most appropriate and proportionate step to promote the licensing objectives. If the Sub-Committee chose not to revoke the licence, it was the position of the Noise team that operating hours be reduced to 00:00 with all licensable activities ending at 00:00 alongside the other conditions outlined.

To summarise, Councillor da Costa stated that he wished to thank residents for their representations. He still did not have faith that the licensing objectives were going to be upheld by the premises. The DPS claimed that he did not have any control and acknowledged in this meeting that he did not have control of patrons within his premises or outside the premises. Whilst people may congregate outside the premises, it was still the premises' responsibility to have a dispersal policy in place.

The DPS also mentioned people outside refusing to move on and yet, he did not believe the Police had received any calls from the premises saying it was struggling with people congregating outside the premises. He wanted to see a vibrant high street and local businesses flourishing. However, in this instance, the licensing objectives had, on repeated occasions, been breached. The residents of Highgate did not feel they had confidence that the licensing conditions put in place or the action plan put in place would be upheld and were worried that more complaints would be submitted. Revoking the premises licence allowed a 'clean slate' approach to the premises and a new application could be submitted in the future for a new business which would go through the licensing process to ensure conditions were put in place. He did not feel that the action plan or the representations from the DPS had diminished his call for a revocation of the licence.

To summarise, PC Ewart stated that revocation of the licence was the most serious power available. However, Parliament provided it for cases where lesser interventions had failed. He felt that this was such a case. The DPS had said that he did not have any control over the people outside the premises and the evidence consisted of police incident logs, inspection records, intelligence reports, compliance visits, community protection warnings and a section 19 closure notice. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt was not the legal test needed to be made at this meeting. The Sub-Committee determined the application on the civil standard of proof, namely the balance of probabilities. The Police view was still unchanged and he asked the Sub-Committee to revoke the licence in order to protect the public.

To summarise, Ms To stated that the nature of the business needed to change. She did not think it was suitable as a nightclub as it attracted crime and drugs.

To summarise, Ms Bromnick stated that she also supported the request for revocation of the licence. Her biggest concern was public safety. Patrons inside the premises did not appear to be under control and it was beyond the control of the management to control what was happening outside the premises. There were fights and destructive behaviour from patrons. She was also concerned for the female patrons as well as people using the streets outside the premises. This was not a suitable business to be located in the area and 'clean slate' approach was the only viable option.

To summarise, Mr Onuiri stated that he had already implemented changes and he would like to see the changes take effect. He believed strongly that they would create a positive impact on the business. He would ask that the business be given one more chance. He had control over the patrons in the premises, but did not have control over the people who congregated outside. He would like to be given the opportunity to make further improvements on progress already made.

Adjournment and Decision

At 9:07pm, 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 review application and revoke the licence.

RESOLVED: To grant the review application and revoke the licence.

The Licensing Sub-Committee (“the LSC”) carefully considered the application, taking 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 Agenda Pack and Additional Papers (two packs), representations from the applicant and objectors and videos and photographs.

The Review application (pp9-13) originally sought variation of the conditions to reduce the licensed hours and opening hours so that the premises would close by midnight and to impose additional conditions as set out at pp48-50. In their representations as RA (pp63-66), the Police sought revocation. If the LSC chose not to revoke, the Police sought removal of the DPS, a reduction in hours and additional licence conditions.

Following consideration of the Police representations, at the hearing Noise indicated that they would not resist the Police request that the licence be revoked

HOURS

Existing hours Sale of Alcohol

Sunday to Thursday 1700 to 0030

Friday to Saturday 1700 to 0230

Recorded Music

Sunday to Thursday 1700 to 0030

Friday and Saturday 1700 to 0230

Live Music

Sunday to Thursday 1700 to 0030

Friday and Saturday 1700 to 0230

Late Night Refreshment

Sunday to Thursday 2300 to 0030

Friday to Saturday 2300 to 0230

Licensable activities Christmas Eve and New Years’ Eve until 0230 hours.

The opening hours of the premises

Sunday to Thursday 1700 to 0100

Friday to Saturday 1700 to 0300

Opening hours Christmas Eve and New Year’s Eve until 0300.

Decision

The LSC decided to revoke the Licence

Reasons

Prior to the hearing, the Council had received representations from the Designated Premises Supervisor Mr Onyekachi Onuiri ("DPS") including an action plan for improvement of operation of the business.

Oral representations received

At the hearing the LSC received oral representations from:

Seeking/supporting the review

1. David Wood representing Noise
2. Councillor Nick da Costa, ward Councillor, representing residents
3. PC Ewart representing the Police
4. Hui Li To, landlord of neighbouring premises
5. Miriam Bromnick, local resident Opposing the review
6. The DPS

Each person giving oral representations was asked question by the LSC and others who had made representations.

Substantive representations

The LSC had considered the Agenda Pack before the hearing. The premises is located on the ground floor at the end of a terrace of shops with residential above and to the rear; it stands on the corner of Archway Road. The premises are promoted as a bar with karaoke. The evidence packs set out a history of regular and serious complaints of repeated breach of the licence together with observed breaches by RAs, over a period from 2020. Breaches include staying open well beyond closing time, noise nuisance and a continual background of drink-fuelled antisocial behaviour including fighting outside the premises together also with repeated use of nitrous oxide. On a number of occasions no SIA has been seen to be present on the premises. Noise detailed an extensive history including the issue of 1 letter warning of a statutory nuisance and 2 formal licensing breach letters since 2020; Police identified 10 incidents, service of a Community Protection Warning, a formal licensing breach letter and a s19 Closure Notice all since 12 May 2025. The representations from those non-RA supporters of the Review confirmed the picture provided by evidence packs. Cllr da Costa presented the views of a number of residents who had expressed their views to him. He noted the DPS's proposed action plan, but pointed out that "These are the kind of measures that one would reasonably expect to have been in place already at a responsibly managed late night license premises and the obvious question that the subcommittee should be asking is why have they only appeared now once the premises license itself is at risk." Ms To told the LSC about the complaints that her tenants had made to her in particular about the noise from the premises. Ms Bromnick explained that she felt genuinely fearful on the street outside her own home as a result of the behaviour of those at and outside the premises.

7. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

CHAIR: Councillor Bethany Anderson

Signed by Chair

Date