

DECISION NOTICE OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON Thursday, 20th August, 2026

Set out below is a summary of the decisions taken at the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on Thursday, 20 August 2026.

If you have any queries about any matters referred to in this decision sheet please contact Nazyer Choudhury, Principal Committee Co-ordinator.

6. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT 21 PARK ROAD, LONDON N8 8TE (CROUCH END)

Application for a new premises license at 21 Park Road, London, N8 8TE

The Licensing Sub-Committee (“the LSC”) carefully considered the above application. In considering the application, the LSC took 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 report pack, and representations from the applicant and objectors.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the LSC decided to **GRANT** the application, subject to further conditions.

Reasons

Written representations received

The LSC received the following evidence:

1. A report from the Licensing Team Leader, Daliah Barrett.
2. The application completed by Zilan Demir of Atlas Licensing Ltd as agent, on behalf of Ugur Doldur trading as Freshco Basket.
3. Written representations from the Metropolitan Police dated 17 July 2026, withdrawn after the applicant consented to the Police's proposed further license conditions.
4. Written representations from a member of the public.

Oral representations received

The LSC heard from:

1. The Licensing Team leader, Daliah Barrett.
2. The applicant, Ugur Doldur, represented by Licensing Consultant Oisin Daly.

Mr Doldur and Mr Daly made the following representations. Save where necessary, the LSC does not distinguish between things said by each of them. While not seeking to record everything said during the course of the hearing, the LSC noted and placed reliance on the following points in particular:

- Freshco Basket will operate as a neighbourhood convenience store, selling groceries, fresh food & vegetables, chilled food etc. Alcohol will be one part of their business.

- The applicant has 4 years of retail background working in his uncle's shop. This is his own venture, and he intends to be a positive part of the local community.
- The Designated Premises Supervisor named in the application is the applicant's uncle, but the applicant has just obtained his own personal license.
- He will be managing day-to-day operations and training staff in things such as managing deliveries, keeping noise down, checking outside for littering, Challenge 25, and the use of the CCTV.
- The application already contains a number of realistic conditions. In addition, the applicant agreed the further conditions proposed by the Metropolitan Police.
- Three further conditions were either offered during submissions or agreed following questions from councillors.

The member of the public who had made written representations did not attend the hearing and had not engaged with the Licensing Team Leader in the runup. The LSC did not consider it necessary for their consideration of the representations or in the public interest to adjourn and proceeded in their absence, while taking into account the written representations.

Evaluation

The LSC reminded itself that it is required by section 4 of the Act to exercise its functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives:

- (a) the prevention of crime and disorder;
- (b) public safety;
- (c) the prevention of public nuisance; and
- (d) the protection of children from harm.

The LSC was satisfied that it was appropriate to **grant** the license, subject to the three further conditions mentioned above:

- A daily incident log (electric or paper based) shall be kept at the Premises and made available on request to an authorised officer of the Council or the Police or the Fire Service which shall record the following:

- (a) all crimes reported to the venue
- (b) all ejection of patrons
- (c) any complaints received
- (d) any incidents of disorder
- (e) seizures of drugs or offensive weapons
- (f) any faults in the CCTV system
- (g) any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service.

The incident record shall be kept on the premises and be available for inspection by the Police or authorised officers of the Licensing Authority at all times the premises is open.

- No 3rd party orders (Deliveroo, Uber etc.) will be accepted after 22:00.
- The applicant must make available to residents above and immediately neighbouring the premises contact details by which they can alert the applicant to any concerns.

The first two of those conditions had been volunteered by the applicant, and the LSC accepted them. The third condition arose from a question asked by the LSC to the

applicant, and the LSC understood the applicant to be content with it, but in any event it is necessary for the prevention of public nuisance.

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 appellant is notified of the decision.

7. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT UNIT 1 314 WEST GREEN ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15 3AN (WEST GREEN WARD)

Application by Jollof House Ltd on its own behalf for a new premises license at Unit 1, 314 West Green Road, Tottenham, London, N15 3AN

The Licensing Sub-Committee (“the LSC”) carefully considered the above application. In considering the application, the LSC took 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 report pack, and representations from the applicant and objectors.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the LSC decided to **GRANT** the license, subject to some further conditions.

Reasons

Written representations received

The LSC received the following evidence:

1. A report from the Licensing Team Leader, Daliah Barrett.
2. The application completed by the applicant company, Jollof House Ltd.
3. Written representations from the Metropolitan Police dated 17 July 2026, later withdrawn.
4. Written representations from the Council’s Noise & Nuisance team, later withdrawn.
5. Written representations from various members of the public.
6. Written representations from Councillor Seema Chandwani, West Green Ward.
7. A summary of the intended submissions (provided late) on behalf of the applicant.

Oral representations received

The LSC heard from:

3. Mr Garnet Prah-Arthur on behalf of the applicant company.
4. Mr Christopher Bourn, a local resident.
5. Mr Asad Omar, a local resident.
6. Cllr Seema Chandwani, ward councillor.

Mr Prah-Arthur made the following representations. While not seeking to record everything said during the course of the hearing, the LSC noted and placed reliance on the following points in particular:

- The applicant is looking forward to being a positive part of the local community and introducing jollof, a West African food, to an area that may be unfamiliar with it.
- The business will operate as a restaurant, with alcohol only ancillary to customers who are seated. There will be no vertical drinking.
- He has accepted the additional conditions, and reduction to hours during which alcohol will be served, proposed by the Metropolitan Police. They have also accepted the conditions proposed by the Council's Noise and Nuisance team.
- Although the application sought opening hours from 07:00 and alcohol served from 09:00, this was just a contingency in case there were ever special occasions or events which they wanted to host. Their actual intention was to open around 10:00-11:00. If the LSC felt it better, he had no objection to alcohol service being permitted only from 11:00.
- Mr Prah-Arthur has previously worked as a security guard and holds an SIA license, so is familiar with controlling anti-social behaviour.
- He will ensure no loud music is played, there is no congregating outside, and delivery drivers – both making deliveries to and collecting orders from the premises – are controlled to the extent he is able to. In relation to parking in particular, he will ensure his staff park lawfully.
- The business has another location where the bulk of cooking will be done, so the potential for fumes, steam etc. will be more limited, but in any event the extraction equipment already on site is in good working order.
- He is willing to make available contact details using which local residents can contact the business to raise concerns.
- He would be willing to accept a condition along the lines of hosting a meeting with residents once every six months to discuss concerns.
- He accepted that the fire door from the unit, which opens into a communal area for the residents, should remain closed save in emergencies.
- He has already agreed a contract with Veolia for waste disposal.
- He would ensure that there was a proper fire risk assessment in place before any cooking was commenced at the premises.

Cllr Chandwani made the following representations. While not seeking to record everything said during the course of the hearing, the LSC noted and placed reliance on the following points in particular:

- Around 4-5 years ago, the area had been significantly blighted by drug use and anti-social behaviour. A significant amount of work by many stakeholders had gone in to improving this situation. Residents wanted to ensure there was no backsliding. This was context for the situation.
- Residents were concerned about pressure on parking, as there has been a recent cluster of businesses opening in the close area.
- The previous occupant of the premises had not managed to build good engagement and relationships with residents.
- Although some residents had expressed concerns to her, which she wanted to bring before the LSC, she also wanted to note there were equally-many residents excited about the opening of a further business.
- There had potentially been a lag in the Council delivering more cohesive placemaking for the immediate area, and there was more work that could be done, though she realised this was outside the remit of the LSC.

Mr Omar made the following representations. While not seeking to record everything said during the course of the hearing, the LSC noted and placed reliance on the following points in particular:

- He had not understood why a license had been sought to serve alcohol from 09:00. This had concerned him as there are a number of schools nearby, including very close by, and a bus stop outside which was used by schoolchildren.
- He would have less concern if alcohol service was only begun from 11:00, and was pleased Mr Prah-Arthur was willing to revise this.
- There was an adjacent outdoor space which would make a very nice outdoor seating area, and he was concerned that it should not be allowed to become one as this was a space for the residents.

Mr Bourn made the following representations. While not seeking to record everything said during the course of the hearing, the LSC noted and placed reliance on the following points in particular:

- He understood that the terms of the lease of the unit from Notting Hill Genesis (the freeholder) had been varied to now permit a restaurant or alcohol business. The location had not initially been designed for this.
- For example, the extraction system which vented into a communal area in a space with a height of only around 10ft. There was no proper chimney.
- Notting Hill Genesis had recently advised residents that a fire safety check of an external wall had been failed. The London Fire Brigade, when advising that they had no concerns, had not known about this. The fire safety profile of a full kitchen in the unit would be significantly different, and he was concerned about a fire risk to residents.
- The previous occupier had had a commercial bin, but it sat in the residential bins area. There were issues with, for example, the waste collection company collecting it loudly at 3am-4am.
- He was pleased to hear from Mr Prah-Arthur that he was keen to communicate with neighbours, and he too hoped that a good relationship could be built.

Evaluation

The LSC reminded itself that it is required by section 4 of the Act to exercise its functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives:

- (e) the prevention of crime and disorder;
- (f) public safety;
- (g) the prevention of public nuisance; and
- (h) the protection of children from harm.

The LSC was broadly comfortable that this application, including the conditions proposed by the Metropolitan Police and the Council's Noise & Nuisance team and later agreed by the applicant, was consistent with those objectives. Some points had arisen during the course of the hearing which led to the conclusion that some further changes to the license terms & conditions were appropriate.

Accordingly, the LSC resolved to **grant** this license, subject to the following further modifications:

1. Time during which the sale of alcohol is permitted to be 11:00 – 22:30, Monday to Sunday.

2. A condition that the applicant host meetings at least annually at which residents can attend to raise any concerns connected to the licensing objectives.

The first condition was in effect volunteered by the applicant. However, for the avoidance of doubt the LSC considered it necessary for the protection of children from harm. It did not seem to be seriously suggested that this would impact the business in any material way. If it was ever desirable to have one-off events outside those times, the applicant would be at liberty to apply for a TENS.

The second condition was necessary for the prevention of public nuisance. Although during the meeting, the LSC had put a question to the applicant as to whether he would host meetings every six months, having deliberated the LSC considered this was unduly burdensome and not necessary; the applicant was a business, not a community facilitator or organisation. Whilst a condition along these lines was necessary, it was sufficient for the licensing objectives to reduce the frequency to being at least annual.

In relation to the extraction of fumes etc. from the kitchen, the LSC during its deliberations noted that the conditions proposed by the Council's Noise & Nuisance team, accepted by the applicant, already contained the following condition: “

“No fumes, steam, or odours shall be emitted from the licensed premises so as to cause a nuisance to any persons living or carrying on business in the area where the premises are situated. “

The LSC was satisfied that with this condition in place, it was not necessary for it to impose any further conditions in relation to this. Although it had heard concerns about this point, the LSC could not at this point in time make a finding on the balance of probabilities that the extraction equipment would not in fact be sufficient, and accordingly this condition was sufficient to promote the licensing objective of preventing public nuisance: This condition already requires the applicant to manage fumes etc. appropriately.

In relation to the alcove adjacent to the premises, which it seems has been a concern for residents when the premises were operated by other companies, the LSC was not in fact clear whether the applicant has permission under their lease to use this area for seating. However, whether or not that was the case, it was clear from the floor plan with the application that the alcove was not going to form part of the licensed area, and the LSC could therefore not see any basis for concern that the applicant would use the area for seating or other licensable activity. There was therefore no need to add a condition about this.

Conclusion

A number of other matters and concerns were raised during the hearing. The LSC reminded itself that it had no power to deal with broader matters which did not fit within the licensing regime. It would be unlawful for it to impose conditions which went outside that, and it had no power to decide on the Council's behalf to take any particular steps.

The LSC was, however, pleased to hear the applicant express his commitment to complying with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements, such as those around fire safety, waste disposal etc., and to respecting the concerns of residents around parking. It is also reassured that the applicant will be required to abide by the terms of the lease (albeit it has not seen those terms) and any planning law requirements.

However, because these matters sit outside the licensing regime, these matters form no part of the LSC's consideration of the application or its decision as to conditions to impose, and are simply noted.

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 appellant is notified of the decision.