MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 13 OCTOBER 2026, 7:00PM – 8:15PM

PRESENT: Councillors Kaushia Amin, Nick da Costa (Chair) and Ruairidh Paton

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 CLEOPATRA RESTAURANT & LOUNGE, 21 TURNPIKE LANE, WOOD GREEN, LONDON N8 0EP (HARRINGAY)

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.
- The application had been submitted by the Noise and Nuisance team.
- The application alleged repeated public nuisance arising from the operation of the premises, including excessive amplified music, late-night noise disturbance and operation beyond the permitted hours.
- The review application had been submitted on the basis of the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, public safety and the protection of children from harm. The grounds of the review application related mainly to the prevention of public nuisance issues.
- The premises was located in a terrace of retail units and within a mixed-use area containing commercial premises and residential accommodation surrounding it.

- Residents lived in close proximity to the premises and had raised concerns regarding noise emanating from the venue, patron dispersal, antisocial behaviour and disturbance late into the night.
- Appendix 2 contained a copy of the current premises licence which showed the current operating times.
- The representations received during the consultation period included representation from Planning.

In response to questions, the Licensing Officer informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Once the review application had been submitted, Licensing had received an application for the transfer of the licence.

Presentation by the review applicant

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

- The primary concern was the premises' repeated failure to comply with its licensable hours and resulting failure to promote the licensing objectives, specifically the prevention of public nuisance and prevention of crime and disorder.
- Since October 2024, the Noise team had received multiple complaints regarding noise from the premises, including loud music, bass noise and late-night disturbance affecting nearby residents.
- Officers had witnessed the premises operating beyond its permitted hours on more than one occasion.
- On 4 January 2025, officers attended the premises following a complaint of loud music and found the premises operating after the permitted hours.
- On 25 July 2026, officers again attended at approximately 23:33 and found between 15 and 20 customers drinking alcohol and smoking shisha.
- After the licensable hours, staff were required to close the premises and disperse the customers.
- After the review application had been submitted, further breaches continued.
- On 14 August 2026, the day after submitting the application, officers attended at 23:45 and found patrons inside using shisha and consuming drinks after the authorised hours. The pattern of non-compliance continued.
- He had personally attended the premises on 2 and 3 October 2026 at approximately 23:30. On both occasions, the shutters were lowered and the lights were dimmed to give the impression that the premises was closed. However, people appeared to be inside and were visible within the premises after the authorised hours. He subsequently requested the CCTV footage from the DPS to verify activity inside the premise, but to date, no footage had been provided.
- On 19 September 2026, officers conducting an inspection at approximately 01:18. They observed the premises apparently closed from the outside, but upon entering, found customers present using shisha, staff serving patrons and the till system operating.

- The incidents were not isolated. They demonstrated a clear and persistent pattern of operating beyond authorised hours despite previous interventions, advice from officers and the ongoing review application.
- The evidence indicated that the management had either been unwilling or unable to ensure compliance with the premise licence.
- The Council's view was that the confidence in the current management of the premises had been significantly undermined.
- The repeated breaches together with the continuation of breaches during the review process itself suggested that various measures did not secure compliance.
- He would ask the Sub-Committee to give serious consideration to the revocation of the premises licence as a proportionate and appropriate step to promote the licensing objectives.

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

- On 4 January 2025 he attended the premises and heard the music. It was not a statutory nuisance otherwise he would have issued an abatement notice but it was audible inside a resident's property. Officers went to speak to the management and when checking the licence, it was clear that the premises should have been closed at 23:30 and the time at that moment was 01:15, so the premises was operating past its licensed hours.
- The Noise team had received complaints in July 2026 during the time the 2026 World Cup was in progress. There had been reports from local residents around hearing the football being played inside the premises.
- No officers substantiated any complaints at the time.
- Letters notifying of a breach of licence were sent after officers had witnessed the premises staying open on 25 July 2026.
- Officers were not present at the premises for noise issues on 25 July 2026. They simply attended the premises at 23:33 by chance as they were conducting a licensing visit.
- There had never been any communication letters or discussions with the operator about noise or noise complaints in 2026. The only one was in January 2025.
- During the visit in October 2026, when he first attended, the shutters at the front were drawn all the way down. Hee could see inside and the lights were on. The person who often claimed to be the manager was in the foyer of the front of the premises.
- The premises had a front section, a kitchen and a shisha area towards the rear. The manager came towards the front of the premises and was on his mobile phone and whilst the door was being knocked on.
- The premises had a side entrance and the shutter for this was halfway down and the door was locked.
- He continued to knock on the door whilst the manager was stood there.
- Officers then attended another premises further down the road before returning to the premises five minutes later. The side door shutter was then three quarters of the way down. The lights were completely dimmed to give the impression that there was no one in the premises but one could still see people inside and shisha smoking in the rear area.

- Officers that attended 19 September 2026 found shutters pulled down, but still gained access and had observed people smoking shisha, drinking and staff still serving.
- He emailed the DPS on 4 October 2026 and had not received a response.
- Residents had stated that the rear shisha area was exposed to the open air and patrons could be heard in their homes. Certain residents lived on the street behind and were disturbed by the music and the World Cup matches being played live very late at night.
- His concern was that the premises continued to breach its licence even after officer intervention and after the review application had been submitted.
- Additional conditions were only effective when there was a willingness to comply.
- The evidence suggested a continuing pattern of non-compliance, rather than a lack of conditions, which was why he recommended a revocation of the licence to be considered.
- The DPS had not changed. Officers had visited in 2025 and found the premises operating at 01:00 - past 23:30.
- The premises had advertised online that it was open until 02:00.
- His team dealt with noise nuisance and licensing enforcement. When he attended the premises in January 2025, he was responding to noise complaints from local residents. Officers assessed the noise but also then went and spoke to the management.
- Subsequent visits had not been for noise complaints, but there had been continued complaints. There had been five in in July 2026.
- He himself had attended the premises three times. Officers had attended four times in total.
- He had requested CCTV footage on 4 October 2026. To date he had not received anything in return.
- It was not normal for a premises that had a closing time of 23:30 to advertise a closing time of 0200.
- Usually, in the immediate aftermath of a review application, it was normal to see some compliance when a review application had been submitted.

Presentation by the premises licence holder

Mr Gavin Josiah and Mr Robert Sutherland, representing the premises, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Mr Josiah had heard about the breaches in the licence and had been associated with the premises for the past five or six months. As of September 2026, Mr Josiah started working more prominently for the business. He had worked alongside other licensed premises in the past to help them to follow rules and regulations. He was planning on changing things so that the premises complied with all the issues that had arisen. Premises staff were willing to work on any issues. They would like to ask for another chance to put things right.
- Other than the complaints, on all occasions when local authority officers had attended the premises, there had been no nuisance or anything officers felt required to take action on the part of the licence holder in relation to the operation of the premises.
- There were other licensed premises nearby.

- The incident in July 2026 was one where the premises was closed, but there were some people visiting the premises as guests of the operator and staff. On that basis, they had stayed a little bit later than the licensed hours.
- In relation to the other incidents including 2 and 3 October 2026, the premises was closed. People had started to or were leaving the premises from 23:00. If people were present, then they were members of staff and the premises were not operating in any way.
- The premises had a practice whereby staff closed the shutter so that people could not gain access to the premises when it was closed.
- The practice of the premises was that when it closed, everything was turned off, including CCTV.
- It was alleged that on 19 September 2026, the till system was on, but it was not. The CCTV system was also switched off. Everything was switched off to ensure that nothing was operating and the premises was closed.
- The intention was to make sure that the premises was compliant and following the licence. Therefore, they urged the Sub-Committee to give the licence holder another opportunity and not revoke the licence.
- The Sub-Committee may wish to consider imposing suggested conditions.

In response to questions, Mr Josiah and Mr Sutherland informed the Sub-Committee that:

- On 14 August 2026, patrons paid on their way out. It was the practice of the premises for everything to be turned off by 23:00 so that there could be no suggestion that the premises was open and operating after 23:00 or past any closing time.
- In respect of people leaving, they generally did leave within proper time periods, but the premises was closed from 23:00. The premises, since the visit in August 2026, had complied with that. If people were present, then they were either cleaning the premises or they were there as a guest of the licence holder or they were in the process of departing from the premises.
- They were not able to explain why the advertised hours for the premises online appeared to show a 02:00 closing time.
- For the past five or six months, Mr Josiah had been trying to look for improvements for revenue and look at the problems the premises had been having with licensing.
- An agreement was in place for Mr Josiah to take over the premises in September 2026.
- Plans were in place to improve the situation.
- There was going to be a major turnaround within the premises.

In response to questions, the Licensing Officer stated that shisha smoking was not a licensed activity.

In response to further questions, Mr Josiah and Mr Sutherland informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The consumption of alcohol or food would not be licensable, but the sale of the hot food after 23:00 or the sale of alcohol would be licensable.
- None of the noise complaints had been substantiated.
- There may have been noise at the premises in the past, but there had been no substantiated nuisance.
- Nuisance would differ from noise based on time, the type of noise that was being generated and other things. These things needed to be taken into account and was part of the training the Noise team would have undertaken. The team would determine if the noise was a nuisance.
- In relation to the incident in July 2026, the consumption of alcohol and the smoking of the shisha was not licensable. The premises was not open.
- The only people drinking and smoking were members of staff or guests of the licence holder.

In response to questions, the Licensing Officer stated that another premises nearby, Double Apple, was several shop units away from the premises. The immediate neighbour to the premises was another restaurant. Double Apple's business dealt with shisha and food.

In response to further questions, Mr Josiah and Mr Sutherland informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was documented that on 19 September 2026, multiple people were seated in the premises and had paid as they left. It was not unusual for people to settle their bill at the end of the evening.
- It was the case that the incident in August 2026 may well have had patrons at the premises, but the ones in October 2026 did not.
- There were no documents to suggest that the people visiting the premises on certain dates were guests rather than patrons.
- To avoid the noise levels and the nuisance from the noise, sound checkers were in place and a record of this would be kept on the phone. They would stay in the premises at all times. It would be possible to view these over a 3-month period.
- The premises would be strict with the closing hours.
- The lights would be turned on at 23:00 and people would start to leave. By 23:30, all shutters would be down. This would be maintained. Mr Josiah would enforce this. The closing time online indicated the premises closing time as 23:30, not 02:00.
- CCTV was shut down at 23:00. Licensable activities stopped at 23:30. The premises was closed from 23:00 ,so that was why CCTV was also switched it off at that time.
- It was unusual to not have CCTV during a period of egress from a premises where alcohol was served.
- Mr Josiah was responsible for the day-to-day management of the business.
- The reference in relation to the 'manager' on the incident on 23 September 2026 did not refer to Mr Josiah.

To summarise, Mr Bellringer stated that the concern was the premises' repeated failure to comply with its licence, undermining the licensing objective to prevent public

nuisance and crime and disorder. Since October 2024, officers had received numerous noise complaints and had repeatedly found the premises operating beyond authorised hours. Breaches were witnessed on the 4 January 2025, 25 July 2026, 14 August 2026, 19 September 2026 and 2 and 3 October 2026 with patrons continuing to consume alcohol smoke shisha after the permitted closing time. There was concern regarding the breaches continued after the review application had been served demonstrating a persistent disregard for the premises licence and previous enforcement action. This was considered to be part of a clear pattern of non-compliance and there was a loss of confidence in the current management's ability to uphold the licence and objectives. The Sub-Committee was invited to give serious consideration to the revocation of the licence as the appropriate and proportionate response.

To summarise, Mr Sutherland stated that in relation to the licence holder's response, he would commend the comments from Mr Josiah who had come across as a genuine individual who had indicated that he wanted to improve the premises and ensure compliance. In respect of the issues of noise, he would ask the Sub-Committee to disregard the issues of noise because there was no corroborating evidence in relation to them. If action had been taken, then there would be a different perspective.

Adjournment and Decision

At 8:15pm, 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, suspend the licence for a period of six weeks, remove the DPS and impose additional conditions.

RESOLVED: To grant the review application, suspend the licence for a period of six weeks, remove the DPS and impose additional conditions.

Decision Notice

The Licensing Sub-Committee carefully considered the application for the review of a Premises Licence at: **APPLICATION FOR A REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT CLEOPATRA RESTAURANT & LOUNGE, 21 TURNPIKE LANE, WOOD GREEN, LONDON N8 0EP (HARRINGAY)**

In considering the application for revocation, 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 Human Rights Act, The Environmental Protection Act 1990 part III The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 the report pack, and the applicant's and respondents representations.

Having carefully considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the review application, impose conditions and amendments and suspend the premises licence for a period of 6 weeks to allow for the appointment of a new Designated Premises Supervisor (''DPS'') subject to the conditions below:

Sale of Alcohol
Monday to Sunday **1200 to 2230**

The opening hours of the premises:
Monday to Sunday 0730 to 2330

The rear yard is to be closed to patrons by 2130

CONDITIONS:
The Committee requires the Respondent to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Committee.
The conditions are as follows:

1. A new DPS shall be appointed within 6 weeks of this decision.

2. The premises shall have in place a Noise Management and Dispersal Policy which will be made readily available to any statutory authority upon request.

3. The rear yard space will be cleared of patrons by no later than 21.30.

4. Advertising should be strictly in line with licensed operating hours.

5.

(a) The premises shall install and maintain a 24 hour CCTV system.

(b) All entry and exit points will be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition.

(c) The CCTV system shall continually record whilst the premises is open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises and will include the external area immediately outside the premises entrance.

(d) All recordings shall be stored for a minimum period of 31 days with date and time stamping.

(e) Viewing of recordings shall be made available immediately upon the request of Police or authorised officer throughout the entire 31-day period.

6. A staff member from the premises who is conversant with the operation of the CCTV system shall be on the premises at all times when the premises is open. This staff member must be able to provide a Police or authorised council officer

copies of recent CCTV images or data with the absolute minimum of delay when requested.

7. No noise generated on the premises, or by its associated plant or equipment, shall emanate from the premises nor vibration be transmitted through the structure of the premises which gives rise to a nuisance.

8. The Premises shall be kept in a clean and tidy condition and waste management shall be dealt with effectively and expeditiously to ensure no nuisance or annoyance is caused to any owner or occupiers of neighbouring properties.

REASONS:

The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant noise nuisance officer re the premises repeated failure to comply with its licence, undermining the licensing objective to prevent public nuisance and crime and disorder. They heard that since October 2024, officers had received numerous noise complaints and had repeatedly found the premises operating beyond authorised hours. It was of particular concern that the breaches continued after the review application had been served demonstrating a persistent disregard for the premises licence. It was further noted that multiple websites advertised the premises as having much later operational hours.

This was considered by the Applicant to be part of a clear pattern of non-compliance and there was a loss of confidence in the current management's ability to uphold the licence and objectives. The Sub-Committee was invited to give serious consideration to the revocation of the licence as the appropriate and proportionate response however it ultimately determined that this measure would be too strong given the committee heard from the proprietor at the hearing who advised that he is planning to address the issues raised.

Nevertheless given the representations of the Applicant re repeated breaches of the licence associated with the premises the Committee feels strongly that a new DPS should be appointed and operations suspended for 6 weeks to allow for the appointment of same.

The Committee, whilst also noting the representations made on behalf of the Respondent concerning the lack of corroborating evidence re the issue of noise, firmly believes that the conditions referred to above will serve to alleviate the worries and concerns raised by the Applicant whilst also allowing a new DPS the chance to improve the premises and ensure compliance going forward.

In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application to review with the above conditions balanced the interests of the Applicant, the Respondent, local 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 apparent is notified of the decision. This decision

does not take effect until the end of the appeal. Or, in the event that an appeal has been lodged, until their appeal is dispensed with.

7. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Nick da Costa

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……