

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 10 AUGUST 2026, 7:00PM – 9:07PM

PRESENT: Councillors: Nick da Costa (Chair), Eva Bell and Sue Jameson

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 NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT RED CARPET RESTAURANT AND BAR, 99 WEST GREEN ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15 (SEVEN SISTERS)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- The application had been subject to an objection from the Police and the Noise and Nuisance team.
- The applicant had agreed to conditions submitted by the Police.
- The Noise and Nuisance team had also submitted conditions to which the applicant had not agreed to.

- The premises was situated in a terrace of retail units on the ground floor. There were also residential properties above it.
- The business was described as a Caribbean restaurant wishing to provide alcohol and music.

Presentation by the applicant

The applicant, Ms Janet Nyantakyi, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She had made an application to sell alcohol at the premises.
- Council staff attended the premises and informed her that she was not allowed to display alcohol and gave her a warning.
- She removed all alcohol from the display and stopped selling it.
- Council staff visited the premises again and found that she was not selling alcohol.
- She would ask appropriate staff members to help her get a licence to sell alcohol.
- She was only selling food and people in the area were aware there were off licences in the area that sold cheap alcohol and they often went to buy alcohol there and ate at her premises.
- She had put up posters inside and outside the premises informing people that they could bring their own alcohol and spend £25 for food.
- Patrons often brought alcohol and ate at the premises.
- If a patron was misbehaving because of because they were under the influence of alcohol, she found it difficult to ask them to stop because currently, they were buying it from outside the premises. However, if she was selling the alcohol, then she could stop them from buying alcohol.
- Sometimes people would ask her to buy alcohol from across the road and it was a big risk to her to do that.
- She wanted to be able to sell alcohol as she did not want to go back to using universal credit.

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

- She had no staff. She worked alone.
- CCTV and refusal logs had been set up.
- She did not want to claim benefits and was doing everything by herself. She had no support.
- If a patron came in and brought alcohol and started misbehaving, she could control the person because she would control the supply of alcohol. She could then employ someone to work at the premises.
- Mr Maxwell was part of the business, but was not working at the premises.
- Patrons would often eat with drinks.
- She was aware that patrons needed to provide proof of age to be able to buy alcohol.
- She had put up a notice for patrons that they needed to behave themselves and not create noise because residents lived in the area and they did not want to experience noise.
- She had set up 30 chairs at the premises, but only about four or five people ever attended.

- She would employ someone else to manage higher numbers of patrons if the application was granted.
- She had completed a personal licence training.
- She was not buying alcohol for patrons, but patrons expected her to get alcohol from another licensed premises and this was a risk for her.
- Her friends were not running the premises. A friend of hers had to attend a funeral and on that day, she asked another friend to look after the premises so that she could give them a gift and came back. When she came back, she found Council staff at the premises. She did not often leave the place in that way.
- She had put posters on the premises doors showing that she was not selling alcohol anymore at the premises. Council staff had arrived last month and had not seen any alcohol being sold.
- She sold food from 12:00 to 23:00. She was asked to sell alcohol from 12:00 to 22:30.
- She had plans to implement the conditions she had agreed to. This was why she had set up the CCTV.
- Police had asked that alcohol not be sold after 22:30, but meals could be sold until 23:00.
- She had completed training to get a personal licence certificate.
- With a personal licence, she could sell alcohol, she could not sell alcohol to a minor and alcohol must be sold to someone over 18.
- She would look into seeking advice from an agency.
- She felt that she was sufficiently clear enough on what was involved in being granted a licence to sell alcohol.
- Mr Maxwell was helping her manage the business. He would give advice and guidance. For example, the posters that she had put up had been suggested by him. He had explained to her that if patrons drank alcohol and started misbehaving, the premises would be blamed for it.
- If a patron misbehaved or in case of an incident, she would have to call the Police. However, since she opened the premises, nothing like that had happened.
- If she started employing people, she would make sure she would follow the rules and risk assess them to make sure they did what they were supposed to do.
- The application form had been filled in on her behalf because she had tried to do it herself many times, but was unable to get it processed.
- The person who helped her fill in the application did not work at the premises.
- The form had been filled in with assistance. She had not let the person do it by himself. Anytime she filled it in herself, it would be returned back to her.

Presentation by interested parties

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

- His initial representation recommended the refusal of the application.

- This position was grounded in a history of unauthorised licensable activities and poor management oversight.
- On 9 March 2026, the Council issued a formal warning letter to the applicant following complaints that the premises was operating without a licence. Despite this warning, it was ignored.
- Officers visited the premises on 21 March 2026 and observed unlicensed alcohol sales, including alcohol displayed behind the bar, a priced menu and patrons drinking inside.
- A further inspection on 17 April 2026 uncovered evidence of unlicensed alcohol sales evidenced by an alcohol stocked fridge, bins filled with empty bottles and post-it notes used as order receipts for alcohol purchases.
- Based on this history of non-compliance and the risk to licensing objectives, the Licensing Sub-Committee subsequently rejected three temporary event notices that the business had submitted.
- Since that time, officers had conducted a follow-up visit on the 10 July 2026. On that occasion, officers noted that the business had taken steps towards compliance. A sign was displayed confirming the business had adopted a bring your own alcohol policy.
- No alcohol was observed for sale on site or behind the counter and staff actively communicated this policy to officers on site. Even though officers were not easily identifiable as council officers.
- Whilst this recent compliance was an encouraging sign that the applicant was beginning to engage responsibly within the statutory framework, his duty remained to safeguard local residents and promote the licensing objectives, specifically the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder.
- His position remained unchanged.
- The licence should not be granted.

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

- The applicant had not filled him with confidence that she would be able to run the business at present time.
- The applicant had been represented in the past by Mr Maxwell who had advised that he trained people in licensing, so he could provide assistance to the applicant. However, based on the evidence at this meeting, this did not appear to be the case.

To summarise, Mr Wood stated that the core issue was the licensing objectives, specifically the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime disorder. He had set out clear history of non-compliance at the premises, even though warning letters had been served. The history of non-compliance informed the rejection of the three temporary event notices and this demonstrated that the decision to be made by the Sub-Committee should be made in the same manner. The applicant had a chance

when they had been written to and they refused to comply and he did not have confidence that the applicant would be able to do so.

To summarise, Ms Nyantakyi stated that since she started the business, she did not have any problems at the premises. She would ask that she be given a chance to continue to sell alcohol. There were a lot of shops in the area that were selling alcohol, but she did not know why it was different for her premises.

Adjournment and Decision

At 7:54pm, 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 refuse the application.

RESOLVED: To refuse the application.

Decision Notice

The Licensing Sub-Committee has carefully considered the application for a premises licence together with:

The Licensing Act 2003;
The Council's Statement of Licensing Policy;
The Secretary of State's Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003;
The application and supporting documentation;
The representations made by the applicant;
The representations made by the responsible authorities; and
The oral submissions made at the hearing.

Having considered all the evidence before it, the Sub-Committee has decided to REFUSE the application.

Reasons for the Decision

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee attached significant weight to the representations of the Noise and Nuisance Service and the documented history of non-compliance at the premises.

The Sub-Committee noted the evidence that:

A warning letter had been issued to the applicant following concerns that licensable activities were being carried on without the benefit of the required authorisation. Subsequent visits by Council officers found evidence of alcohol sales taking place without a premises licence.

Further inspections identified additional evidence consistent with unauthorised alcohol sales.

Three Temporary Event Notices associated with the premises had subsequently been refused due to concerns arising from the compliance history of the premises.

The Sub-Committee accepted that more recent inspections indicated that the applicant had ceased selling alcohol and had implemented a "bring your own alcohol" policy. The Sub-Committee also acknowledged the applicant's efforts to install CCTV and her willingness to accept a number of proposed licence conditions. In particular, it was noted that the applicant had agreed to the conditions proposed by the Police.

However, whilst these recent positive steps were noted, they were insufficient to overcome the Sub-Committee's concerns.

The Sub-Committee's concerns were significantly informed by the applicant's responses during the hearing. Having heard directly from the applicant, the Sub-Committee was not satisfied that she had demonstrated a sufficient understanding of the responsibilities that accompany the grant of a premises licence.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that:

The Applicant demonstrated a limited understanding of key licensing concepts and conditions that she had agreed to comply with. She failed to demonstrate that she understood the meaning of the conditions she had even agreed to or even how to implement them.

The Applicant was unable to demonstrate a clear understanding of the measures required to promote all of the licensing objectives, including the prevention of public nuisance, public safety and the protection of children from harm.

The Applicant appeared unfamiliar with policies and procedures that would be required for the safe and lawful operation of licensed premises.

Although the Applicant stated she had undertaken personal licence training, her answers during the hearing did not reassure the Sub-Committee that the content of that training had been properly understood or could be effectively applied in practice.

The Applicant confirmed that she currently operated the premises alone and had no staff.

The Applicant's responses to questions about her own "bring your own alcohol" policy and subsequent customer pressure for her to buy alcohol from across the road & her inability to demonstrate that she could refuse such requests, further concerned the sub-committee.

The applicant's evidence regarding the support she received in the management of the premises and in preparing the application lacked clarity.

The applicant acknowledged that another person had completed the application form with her assistance and the Sub-Committee was left with concerns regarding her understanding of the contents of the application and the operational arrangements proposed.

The Sub-Committee was particularly concerned that the applicant did not provide credible or sufficiently detailed explanations as to how she would manage licensed activities, ensure compliance with licence conditions, promote the licensing objectives, or respond to incidents arising at the premises.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered whether the grant of the licence, subject to conditions, would be an appropriate and proportionate response. However, it concluded that conditions alone could not adequately address its concerns. The issue was not simply the content of the proposed conditions, but whether the applicant had demonstrated the knowledge, understanding and management capability necessary to implement and maintain them.

The Sub-Committee found that the applicant had failed to satisfy it that she could operate the premises in a manner consistent with the promotion of the licensing objectives.

In particular, the Sub-Committee considered that the grant of the licence would undermine the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance objectives.

Whilst the Sub-Committee acknowledged the applicant's difficult personal circumstances, her desire to develop her business, and the positive steps recently taken towards compliance, these factors could not outweigh the concerns arising from the previous history of non-compliance and the lack of confidence demonstrated during the hearing regarding her ability to uphold the licensing objectives.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee determined that refusal of the application was both appropriate and proportionate.

Informative

Whilst the Sub-Committee has refused the application, Members recognise that the applicant has recently taken steps towards compliance and may wish to make a further application in the future.

The Sub-Committee would encourage the applicant to obtain further independent advice and training before submitting any future application. In particular, the applicant should seek to develop a fuller understanding of:

The four licensing objectives;
The responsibilities of a premises licence holder and designated premises supervisor;
Challenge 25 and age-verification procedures;
Incident, refusals and complaints recording;
Public nuisance prevention measures;
Staff training and management procedures; and
The operation of licensed premises in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003.

The applicant may find it helpful to review the licensing guidance available on the London Borough of Haringey's website, including information relating to premises licences and the responsibilities of licence holders. Haringey Council's guidance

explains the licensing objectives and the expectations placed upon operators of licensed premises.

The applicant may also wish to obtain advice from:

Haringey Council's Licensing Team;

An accredited licensing training provider offering Award for Personal Licence Holders (APLH) and licensing compliance training;

A suitably qualified licensing consultant or solicitor; or

A recognised trade body operating within the licensed hospitality sector.

The Sub-Committee would encourage the applicant, before making any future application, to ensure that she has a clear operational management plan, understands all licence conditions proposed, and can demonstrate how the licensing objectives will be actively promoted at the premises.

Right of Appeal

The applicant may appeal this decision to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of being notified of the decision.

7. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT INTERNATIONAL SUPERMARKET, 455-457 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, N17 (TOTTENHAM CENTRAL)

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

CHAIR: Councillor Nick da Costa

Signed by Chair

Date 10 August 2026.....