NOTICE OF MEETING

AGENDA FOR THE
LICENSING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 26 November 2026, 7.00 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road, N22 8JZ.

Watch the meeting live here or view all of our meetings on Youtube

Councillors: Nick da Costa (Chair), Kaushia Amin, Adam Small, Lucia das Neves (Vice-Chair), Bethany Anderson, Eva Bell, Luisa Brands, Sue Jameson, Ruairidh Paton, Edward Thacker and Elara Shurety

Quorum: 3

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on. By entering the 'meeting room', you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The Chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual, or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of Urgent Business. (Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with under item 11).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

(i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
(ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 29 of the Council's constitution.

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 104)

i) To confirm and sign the minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 26 January 2026 as a correct record.

ii) To note Licensing Sub-Committee decisions from January 2026.

7. REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2027-28 LICENCES (PAGES 105 - 126)

This report proposes an increase of fees for those licensing regimes where the council has the power to set its own fees for 2027 – 28. The fee increases will enable the council to recover its costs in managing and administering these licensing regimes. There is one new charge "promotional activity/product sampling" proposed for administrative procedures for these matters.

8. FUTURE CHANGES TO GAMBLING ACT 2005 IMPACT ASSESSMENTS BRIEFING / AIM TO PERMIT (PAGES 127 - 144)

To inform Committee of the changes to be made to the application process for gambling licences and the introduction of impact assessments.

9. MAYOR OF LONDON CALL-IN POWERS FOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LICENSING AUTHORITY (PAGES 145 - 150)

To inform Members of new legislation introducing a power for the Mayor of London to review and potentially direct changes to certain premises licence decisions made by London licensing authorities, and to advise Members of the likely implications for the Council's licensing functions.

10. PAVEMENT CONDITIONS

Report to follow.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items of urgent business as identified at item 3.

Democratic Services Contact: Nazyer Choudhury, Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Telephone: 020 8489 3321
Email: nazyer.choudhury@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman
Director of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)
George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Wednesday, 18 November 2026

Accessibility Requirements
If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please email Nazyer Choudhury, Principal Committee Co-ordinator at nazyer.choudhury@haringey.gov.uk. Please note that public seating is limited and will be allocated on a first come first served basis.

Advice To Members On Declaring Interests
Information on declaring an interest is set out in the Council's Constitution in Part 5 Section A. However, you may need to obtain specific advice on whether you have an interest in a particular matter.
If you need advice, you can contact:
• Monitoring Officer

• the Legal Adviser to the Committee; or
• Democratic Services.

If at all possible, you should try to identify any potential interest you may have before the meeting so that you and the person you ask for advice can fully consider all the circumstances before reaching a conclusion on what action you should take.

Agenda Item 6

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 26 JANUARY 2026, 7:00PM - 7:18PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Reg Rice, Elin Weston, Adam Small

ATTENDING ONLINE: Councillor Sheila Peacock

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillors Nick da Costa, Kaushika Amin, Nicola Bartlett and Makbule Gunes.

Apologies had also been received from Councillor Sheila Peacock who joined online.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There was no urgent business.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were none.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 6 November 2025 be confirmed and signed as a correct record of proceedings.

7. REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2026-27 - LICENCES

Ms Daliah Barrett, Licensing Team Leader, introduced the report.

The meeting heard that:

- In relation to fees associated with matchdays at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, they are benchmarked against other football clubs such as Arsenal and Chelsea.

The borough was not a 'market borough' and had only a set amount of sites around the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium and off the High Road, Wood Green. The Council benchmarked for the street trading fees each year. The Council still had to make sure that whatever it was charging was covering the full cost and the Council could not be able to make a profit out of it.

- The fees were comparable to other authorities. The Council's fees were slightly higher than the borough of Islington.
- The fees and charges were calculated by the finance officers who would have the budget on street trading and they sent through to Licensing what it could do in relation to the coming year. A couple of years ago, the Council was able to do a 7% increase because the Council were having to pick up shortfalls on the loss in the budget due to alterations in the tables and chairs licences which caused a shortfall. On this occasion, a 5% increase had been advised to Licensing from the Finance team.
- The 5% increase meant that any costs could be recovered in a broad sense. When the review on street trading would be completed, it would look into costs accrued by the Council. There was an ongoing issue on High Road Wood Green where some vendors who were not supposed to be in the area would not move away. No amount of enforcement would move them and it was costing the Council money to take them to court. Individuals would be fined £200 or a similar punishment. The Council was managing to deal with that within the fees being bought in under street trading.

The Licensing Committee RESOLVED:

1. To approve

i) An increase of 5% on existing discretionary fees for 2026 – 27 as set out in the report.

ii) The introduction of promotional activity fees as set out in section 5.7 of the report.

2. To note Licensing Act and Gambling Act premises fees were already set at statutory maximums and made up a significant proportion of the fees collected.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 15 JANUARY 2026, 7:00PM – 11:30PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Makbule Gunes and Nick da Costa

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

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 VICTORIA STAKES,1 MUSWELL HILL, LONDON, N10 (MUSWELL HILL)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- This was a review application.
- The review application had been submitted by a local resident citing concerns about noise, public nuisance and impact in nearby residential properties.
- The premises had a licence that allowed it to supply alcohol.
- A copy of the premises licence could be found in the agenda papers.
- The supply of alcohol was ancillary to a meal.
- As the premises could sell alcohol for consumption on the premises, it therefore benefitted from the automatic right to provide regulated entertainment in the form of live or recorded music between the hours of 08:00 to 23:00 under the exemption regulations.

- During the consultation period, representations were received from the Noise team, residents supporting the review application and residents in support of the premises.
- There was also an informative email included from a planning officer providing an overview of the current situation.

In response to a question from the Sub-Committee, the representative for the premises licence holder, Mr Niall Mccan, stated that the outside area included the area that was ‘covered’. This was referred to as the ‘outside backyard’.

Presentation by the review applicant

Ms Oonagh Shiel, a resident and the review applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was not opposed to the business.
- She was aware that the premises was a much loved, beautiful and valued community asset.
- She had lived in the area for years with very few issues under the previous ownership. When problems did arise, they were dealt with very quickly and respectfully and a review application was never needed.
- How the premises was being run had changed. Since the changes in management, the impact on her home life had been constant, intrusive and exhausting.
- The review was not about one loud night or a single summer event. The disturbance had continued, including weekdays, early mornings and times when the yard was otherwise empty.
- She lived and worked from home. The area was also where her child studied, where her family ate and spent time together.
- Since mid 2025, there had been regular amplified music and loud voices from the covered dining area, early morning and late-night disturbance from cleaning and staff activity, mechanical noise from equipment running on and off overnight and light pollution from lights left on too long after closing time.
- There had also been events of a scale and intensity that completely overwhelmed her household. Her home was very close from the covered dining area and the separation was a thin garden fence, a wooden fence that was slatted, had gaps in parts and was poorly repaired in some parts.
- There had been repeated occasions where she had been able to clearly identify songs, individual conversations inside every room in her home even with all windows and door closed. She could hear individual conversations, speeches and shouting.
- On some occasions, she had her children and had had to leave the home because the noise was simply too overwhelming.
- This was not hyper-sensitivity, but the persistence of noise.
- Residents were describing in terms of noise was not a technical reading, but was the repeated evident experience of noise inside homes over time and confirmed by noise officer attendance.

- The Council's Noise officers had attended and witnessed disturbance from the outdoor area. They had spoken to management.
- Planning enforcement had already reminded the premises of its obligations in relation to the use of the premises.
- Formal reports had been made on the premises, so concerns had been logged consistently through the proper channels.
- There had been a high staff turnover, contradictory explanations about whether equipment was running or not, no consistent point of contact and a lack of clear or reliable responses around mitigation during events, including those operating under temporary event notices.
- She spoke to staff both by phone and in person about excessive noise, rubbish issues and practical mitigation.
- She deliberately asked for communication in writing to avoid misunderstandings and to keep an accurate record. For example, she emailed the licence holder's representative on 17 October 2025 saying she was happy to meet to discuss matters, but did not receive a reply to her email.
- She did not think written communication was unreasonable when impacts were ongoing and serious.
- She did not believe that a well-run premises allowed customers to control sound systems or left music playing in an empty yard.
- She was asking for clear, enforceable conditions that restored basic residential protection and predictability including no live or amplified music, no speakers in the rear covered dining area, clear limits on the use of the space as dining only, a defined closure time for the yard of 22:00 and controls on cleaning, plant and equipment, so residents were not disturbed in their homes.

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

- Under the previous ownership, the premises seemed to be a very well-run pub. The previous owner seemed to be very responsive and wanted to have good relations with their neighbours. She could sense that it was a very community-minded operation.
- In relation to noise, there was a pattern in the week under the previous ownership, but the usage and the intensity of the premises had increased under the new ownership. Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights were busy, because there were afternoon events on a Wednesday afternoon, for example. It became very difficult for her to be able to plan what she could expect in her own home.
- The noise was linked to both the larger events and the more regular day-to-day operations of the premises. She could expect a few busy nights a week.
- Dating from mid-June 2025, there were some WhatsApp messages between her and the premises manager regarding timing of construction work, music playing in the covered dining yard at 06:00. Under the previous ownership, she had a good route of communication with various premises staff. As noise began to get more overwhelming, she tried to email the premises. She contacted the operations manager to explain how it was becoming more and more difficult to work and live in her own home with the noise coming from the pub. Later, the current manager came into the premises and communication continued on email. She spoke to staff in person.

- She had to ring the premises on several occasions to ask them to turn down the music or to tell them that the music was still playing in the covered dining yard when the lights when the pub was closed. She had expressed that she felt written communication was safer given the large number of incidents that were recurring.
- When the premises held wedding a reception, there were speeches set up or microphones set up in the corner beside her living room. She once sent a video to the licence holder of what she could hear inside her home - a very vulgar type of wedding speech.
- The microphone was then moved to the further side of the of the yard which made a big difference.
- She had asked what mitigations were going to be put in place around the time a temporary event notice had been given and did not receive an answer.
- In relation to the additional proposed conditions, the assurances were very welcome, but she would be more comfortable if the conditions were part of the licence.

Presentation by supporters of the review application

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

- The Noise and Nuisance service had received complaints since July 2025. Officers had been and witnessed loud people noise from inside residents' property.
- He had personally met with the operations director in the summertime and explained the uptake of complaints received about noise from the outside area.
- His team had not witnessed any statutory noise issues from the premises.
- He had suggested some conditions for that could mitigate some of the noise and issues reported by the review applicant.
- He was in agreement with most of the conditions proposed by the licence holder, but he was aware that the area was not soundproofed. It was an open area and there were residential properties close by. A large patronage with background noise and speeches provided potential for public nuisance.

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

- One of the proposed conditions was that there should be no outdoor regulated entertainment. A terminal hour for this could be placed to give local residents a quieter period of the day. It was possible to hear a large amount of people speaking and talking in the outside area during large events.
- There had been one report of noise in 2016 followed by 55 reports from July 2025.
- He had received videos of DIY works being carried out at night time, which he brought up with the management. There had been no instances of statutory

nuisance that had been observed such as loud music or anything to issue any enforcement notices.
- Officers had attended the premises twice following reports. He had attended once.

Councillor Cathy Brennan informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She had been contacted by the review applicant and had visited her home. She had been surprised to see that she lived very close to the premises.
- When she had attended the premises in the past, she often found advertisements outside on an A-board stating that the outside area was open for events so it was obviously used quite a lot.
- She liked the premises and felt it was a community amenity. She attended it often.
- The community did not want to lose the pub. However, she could not accept residents' lives being made difficult.
- She could not understand why certain areas needed to be used for wedding speeches when there was an upstairs area.
- The premises was quite large. There was a downstairs area and an upstairs area. The downstairs area inside the premises did not disturb the review applicant.
- She could not understand why the speeches for weddings needed to take place outside under the covered area.
- The outside area was originally designated when it when planning permission was given to use it. There was a specification that no loud music would be played in the area specifically because of the review applicant's proximity to the premises. The area was supposed to be a quiet dining area. The area could not possibly have been intended to have loud parties. She had heard rowdy singing even though many people were not there.
- Patrons did not often sing rowdily in the pub. The rowdy noise would be difficult for the review applicant to live with.
- There had been no complaints previously. There had been lots of complaints recently.
- In relation to the background music, the licence holders may say they were only playing background music, but there was an interpretation of background music. The background music played at the premises seemed to be too loud.

Mr Paul Eagles, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The main issue was the covered courtyard and the lack of planning for the area.
- Over 20 years ago, the planning proposal at the time was to convert what was then a neglected roofless yard into a covered dining area alongside three work and living units.
- The area was a quiet residential area and the Council assured residents that strict conditions would be in place to protect them from noise and disturbance. Permission was granted only for a covered dining area, nothing further. For

many years, this arrangement worked. The operators respected the conditions and residents had no objections.

- In recent years, the conditions had been repeatedly and deliberately ignored. The yard had shifted from a dining space to a premises for events and functions. There was a concern with the increase in noise levels since the last change in ownership. In 2002, the Council had specified particular building materials be used because the shape of the roof would amplify sound. This was why noise even carried over to residents much further down the area.
- On one occasion, when loud music was disturbing his home, his wife and he attended the premises and spoke to the manager and asked him to measure the noise using the premises' own decibel meter. There were measurements recorded between 80dB and 90dB. They were also informed that the DJ regularly hired there had been told he could go up to 100dB. This was incompatible with the residential setting and directly contradicted the planning conditions.
- The planning permission was approved strictly as a covered dining area and was not to be used other than as an ancillary use to the premises. This was so that the premises would not lead to intensification of use and attraction of traffic as that would be detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential.
- There was also to be no amplified or live music. Despite this, the premises' contract stated that the playing of music was allowed until 22:30 for people hiring the premises, directly contradicting the planning restriction.
- The licence holders openly acknowledged a significant number of music breaches over the past two years. As long-standing residents, it was believed the Council now had a duty of care to act.
- The Council should have clear enforceable legal conditions, including a breach of condition notice. These protections were promised when the scheme was approved over 20 years ago and the Council now had the opportunity to put this right.
- He asked the Sub-Committee to insert new conditions. This would include a reinstatement of the regulations of the covered dining area. A prohibition on all amplified sounds and speakers, not just music. A ban on smoking on the first-floor fire escape, ensuring that the fire door was not used and kept open. Finally, a regulation preventing the covered dining area from being hired out by third parties or used for weddings or private functions. It should be for the pub dining area. Thirdly, given the operator's own admissions along with private and Council evidence, the Council should consider what further legal action was appropriate against the licence holders for knowingly disregarding planning controls. The premises had operated successfully for more than a century as a pub and dining room. There was no reason it could not continue to do so legally, responsibly and in harmony with residents.

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

- A prohibition on all amplified sounds and speakers was necessary, not just the one that stated no live or amplified music. There should not be any sound systems because the noise carried too far.
- The planning permission was granted as a dining area but it was being used as an event space. It was never meant to be used as an event space.

- On the occasions when he had been disturbed by noise, it was mostly from the covered yard, but if there was an event on the first floor, it could not necessarily be heard if the fire doors were not propped open with a fire extinguisher. Upon this occurrence, it was as if the music was being played in the covered yard. The shape of the roof was a concertina. This amplified the sound out.
- The Council granted a wedding licence to the premises, but residents had not been affected so badly in the past. The area had been used for many years used as a as a dining area only. He had complained to the Council, but there was no longer a phone line to actually report noise.
- There were there were times when the Council had written to the premises to say they were not allowed background music in the covered yard, but it did not seem like this had been enforced.

Presentation by the premises licence holder

Mr Niall McCann, representative for the premises licence holder, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- This was a licensing hearing, not a planning hearing. Planning was not relevant to the application.
- The premises was not breaching conditions. There was no condition on the premises licence relating to amplified noise outside.
- The licence holders had applied for a certificate of lawful use because, they say (and had witness statement evidence to confirm) that the licence holder had been able to play amplified music in the backyard for a continuous period of over 10 years.
- There had been an impression made that the licence holders had not been willing to engage or had been standoffish and this was incorrect.
- Mr Lewis Johnson's witness statement showed that the licence holders had appended all his emails to the applicant and on numerous occasions had asked to meet.
- It was often the case that the operator of a licensed premises had had not undergone relevant consultation, but this is not the case for this premises.
- The licence holder had spoken to the review applicant by chance having run into her on the street.
- After the application was made, there had been a brief meeting. Unfortunately, this was a video-conference meeting and not in person. It would be useful if meetings could be held with the review applicant at the premises.
- The licence holder was a very friendly individual and not intimidating.
- The review applicant appeared to be happy with the conditions offered. He understood her concern that she wanted the conditions to be enforceable.
- Conditions, once placed on a licence, following a review or following a variation, needed to be enforceable. Breaching a licensing condition was a criminal offence, possibly resulting in prosecution and a large fine.
- He accepted that there had been some failings, but the licence holder had listened for concerns raised and had already taken the appropriate steps.

- The first floor had a fire escape. This door was kept closed at all times (the area was not used for smoking) and there was a sign saying ‘for emergency use only’. This could be conditioned.
- There were two occasions when, with two staff overlooking, the lights had been kept on all night. This had been changed and a timer had been set. A condition had been appropriately offered.
- In relation to the microphone relating to a portable speaker, the licence holder had one very small portable speaker for speeches and there was another speaker that was used for background music. A request was made to move the speaker and this had been done.
- The applicant had already addressed the concerns, but since the review application had been made, expert advice was sought and a detailed report had been completed. Some suggestions had been made about how the premises operated with music the suggestions would be accepted. There was also a noise management policy. There were other conditions.
- In relation to background music, this was not regulated and did not actually require a premises licence. In 2012, the Live Music Act was implemented and any licensed premises was allowed to have live recorded music up to 23:00. In any case, any premises such as a post office or shop was allowed to play incidental music. The two main tests for this was if voices had to be raised to communicate and how much the music was the focus of the premises.
- The applicant was happy for the Sub-Committee to remove automatic right to play recorded music and only have background music.
- Any environmental health officer visiting the premises would know the difference between regulated and background music.
- Noise limiters could be adopted to ensure that even premises staff could not override the system.
- He did not accept that the operation of the premises was substantially different than under the previous ownership.
- The previous owner was a regular at the premises and maintained that the use of the covered backyard area used to be more intense with louder music. This was supported by 186 representations and emails from the review applicant where she had actually made complaints before.
- Public nuisance did not mean that there could not be any noise whatsoever. Mr Bellringer had confirmed that there had not been any statutory noise nuisance, otherwise a noise abatement notice would have been served. Section 102 guidance stated that licensing authorities should focus on the effect the licensable activities had in the area around the premises, which may be disproportionate or unreasonable. What was disproportionate and reasonable depended upon the facts. The premises was on a busy road intersection in a mixed-use area with live/work units which had been constructed relatively recently. The premises had been there for over a hundred years.
- No matter how well run the premises was, it was inevitable there would be an element of noise from staff closing or opening the premises or it could be a patron laughing too loudly over their dinner. This did not necessarily constitute public nuisance.
- The applicant had made numerous complaints. The total number of complaints was around 55. It was likely that many of these had come from the review applicant.

- Making a complaint was not evidence of public nuisance. Officers had attended and not witnessed any public nuisance when they had visited the premises. Two amicable meetings had been held with them.
- There had been video snapshots collated. The premises was videoed constantly. The licence holder had been videoed in his own private apartment. If any premises was videoed constantly, it would always be the case that there would be incidents recorded of one nature or another. This did not mean that every licensed premises should be reviewed and have their licences curtailed.
- The agenda papers reported no evidence of public nuisance.
- No responsible authority had submitted a review application. Many review applications were brought by responsible authorities. This was not the case at this hearing.
- There were no representations from the Licensing Authority or the Police.
- The representation from Mr Bellringer was nuanced. Usually for a 'nuisance' premises, environmental health officers would work to ensure that the premises licence was either revoked or subject to significant penalties. This was not the case at this hearing.
- He was happy to have no regulated music outside and for noise limiters put in place as per Mr Bellringer's representation and the noise management plan.
- The premises had overwhelming support with 186 representations in favour as opposed to seven or eight supporting the review application. That was almost unprecedented. Many who lived close by and had properties overlooking the premises confirmed that there had not been any public nuisance and they had not witnessed any crime and disorder.
- Financial considerations had always been important in Licensing, but they were now key given the current extremely difficult trading conditions of pubs, the Government had fortunately decided that financial decisions or concerns should come to the forefront and the revised section 102 guidance and the recent licensing framework stated that licensing must support broad ambitions including business investment, growth and local jobs.
- There were consequences of cutting the hours of the covered backyard which would remove dinner service altogether (along with the playing of background incidental music). If such measures were taken, the premises would not be viable and this would mean that the premises would shut down resulting in a loss of jobs.
- Licensing Sub-Committees were quasi-judicial and the guidance stated that determinations should be evidence-based and justified as being appropriate for promoting the licensing objectives and proportionate in terms of what it was intended to achieve. He asked that the Sub-Committee be proportionate and appropriate by placing the conditions offered on the licence. These were legally enforceable and went the whole way to addressing concerns raised by the review applicant.
- The licence holder was happy to engage with residents.

In response to questions, Mr McCann, Mr Richard Vivien (also representing the licence holder) and Mr Lewis Johnson, the licence holder informed the Sub-Committee that:

- A single named individual or a specific email address or a phone number would be made available for residents to contact which would be monitored during operating hours which residents could use.
- The noise management policy included a lot of best practice controls such as a limiter on the sound system so that a maximum level could not be exceeded. Every new staff member on the team went through the noise management policy just as new starters in the kitchen would go through the food hygiene policy. The document was operational and dynamic. If something changed, such as where the refuse was collected or what times 'bottling out' happened, then the policy would be revised, usually with the engagement of the Council's environmental health officer. Many licensed premises did not have this agreement in place. It would be implemented by somebody in a manageable role and non-compliance could have employment consequences.
- When a new member of staff started with the business, management would go through the rules and regulations. The licence holder lived on the premises and would be able to regularly monitor all progress at the premises.
- The licence holder would be happy to have a condition whereby training had to be updated after a certain amount of time
- In relation to complaints, the licence holder had responded extremely quickly to any that had been received - within one day - even when had been on holiday. As the licence holder lived on the premises, all complaints went directly to him or the acting manager if he was away.
- The licence holder would be happy to potentially organise resident meetings on a regular or semi-regular basis.
- Some of the conditions requested by residents slightly overlapped with Planning. Some residents did not want any music in the backyard covered area. There would be no regulated music - only low-level background music. The request that nobody smoked on the fire escape on first floor was covered by the second proposed condition. In relation to events, a condition had been offered of a notice of any pre-book event for over 50 people to ensure that people were notified. They wished for the Sub-Committee to adopt these conditions as opposed to any different wording of conditions.
- The licence holder would give notice in writing of any pre-booked event for over people in the backyard to any local resident for request to be notified. The purpose of giving notice was so people were not taken by surprise if there was an event like a wedding. If residents had any concerns about how the event was going to operate, they could phone or email the premises.
- Residents who had made a representation were able to email into the Council saying they wished to be notified or could email the premises directly to ask to be notified of any future events. A notice could be put up as well if required.
- There had been more complaints recently and this was not something that the licence holder could judge. However, it was possible to explain that the operation of the premises had not changed substantially in the last 10 years. If anything, the number of events and the level of music had decreased. In relation to the videos taken, it was explained in detail in the supplemental report that recordings taken with a smartphone were not accurate and was not indicative of public nuisance.

- The report could be found in the additional papers. One of the recordings from 29 December 2025 was taken in an area above the canopied roof. There were residential balconies there or any residential external amenity space. The area was a live/work unit. In the recording, somebody was holding a phone out of a window above the roof canopy and filming the guests of the premises in their dining space. This was not representative of the noise level that was inside a bedroom or inside a living room. Although there were a substantial amount of recordings, there did not appear to be any that were filmed inside a property where somebody would normally be resting or sleeping.
- There would be noise at the premises as there would be in any pub beer garden anywhere, but noise levels that residents experienced within their homes, bedrooms, where they may wish to rest and sleep was at an acceptable level that was not a statutory nuisance and not a public nuisance. The complaints were subject to an investigation and Mr Bellringer had visited and had stated that he had attended the premises including a large wedding reception where there had been noise, but not at a statutory noise nuisance level that was materially interfering with people inside their property.
- The Council had a noise app which acted as a triage system for the Council to assess if a complaint needed need further investigation. In addition to the 55 complaints, none of them had resulted in an officer being able to substantiate a nuisance. When the licence holder first took over the premises, there was an incident whereby somebody took control of the sound system. This would not be possible in the future because the applicant was offering to remove the relaxation of having regulated live and recorded music.

At this point in the proceedings in response to a question, the Legal advisor to the Sub-Committee stated that planning matters were for planning hearings and as this was a licensing application, planning matters could not be considered at the meeting.

In response to further questions, Mr McCann, Mr Vivien and Mr Johnson informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Parking was a planning issue. The premises had held events for over 10 years. If patrons parked illegally, this was covered by other legislation. Many would walk or use public transport. This was not an application for a new licence.
- There would always be quieter and busier times of the year when it would be busy and more staff would be taken on to actually supervise the premises.
- In an event like a wake, it was catered for and the premises needed to buy relevant food. Staff would liaise with relatives of the deceased and it was clear who would attend. This would be the case for any event where the premises was being hired out, it would be possible to monitor how many patrons were in the downstairs, upstairs or outside areas.
- The view of the video taken on 29 December 2025 was an overhead view through the roof space. The sound was recorded at a very low level. To make an analysis, the sound was boosted and analysed. There were many irregularities about the video and a detailed explanation of why it could not be submitted as evidence had been provided. The Council was authorised to assess whether something was a statutory nuisance or not. As per the investigation, no statutory noise nuisance had been found.

- Measurements made on a mobile phone could not be submitted as evidence of a statutory noise nuisance. It was not possible to calibrate and quantify it.
- Mr Richard Vivien had been engaged by the licence holder, but was an independent consultant. If he was not, he would become discredited and not consulted by operators or residents.

Presentation by interested parties

Mr Chris Reed, resident supporting the premises, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He was a regular at the premises.
- The premises was at the heart of the community.
- Both of his children had jobs at the premises.
- He had attended many events and had organised events at the premises. He had also dined at the covered yard.
- A couple of years ago, he saw the premises under the previous owner start to be extremely rigorous about sound levels upstairs with the sound monitor which was rigorously enforced.
- Premises staff rigorously enforced the access to the fire escape and prevent access to the fire escape used to be used for as a smoking area, but this had stopped.
- He had never witnessed any public nuisance, crime or disorder.
- The previous management took a great pride in the relationship with the local community and this had helped the premises become successful. Those relationships allowed issues surrounding sound in particular to be sorted out very fast.
- There had been 55 complaints which had been presented and some local residents were upset. Hoever, he was impressed with what he had heard in terms of the noise management policy adding strict conditions.
- He was in favour of the noise limiters and restrictions.
- In the past, the premises had been at the heart of the community by putting on World Cup matches and these included volume on the television.
- The premises played a role in the local community. Recently there were patrons who attended the premises to do an art class upstairs.
- There may well be a need to be more formal restrictions, but this would need to be decided by the Sub-Committee.
- There premises had been there for 100 years. Part of a landlord's role should be to try and maintain brilliant good with the local community.
- He would like to see the Sub-Committee maintain the licence for the premises.
- He would like to see all sides to find a way to bring back a more neighbourly approach.
- The premises was generally very well run and with some tweaking, it could be run even better for the next 100 years.

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

- The sound limiter was still present at the premises.

- A few years ago, the management of the premises took smoking in the fire escape area very seriously and stickers were placed on the door to make it clear that the area was a fire escape and not for smoking. It was also the glass collector's job to stop patrons from going out the door.
- There appeared to be less focus on the beautiful outward appearance of the premise. Part of this was where the bins were put out.

To conclude, Ms Shiel stated that assurances from the operator was welcome, but residents needed predictability. The review hearing showed that without clear and enforceable limits, problems would recur and residents would be left relying on repeated complaints. She was not asking for the premises to be closed but for conditions that reflected how the premises successfully operated in the past and protected neighbouring homes Clear restrictions were needed on amplified sound in the rear covered area, defined hours for its use and controls on cleaning and equipment. Clear conditions would provide certainty and prevent problematic situations from happening again.

To conclude, Mr Bellringer stated that the Sub-Committee should look through proposed conditions and add any appropriate conditions that they believe would mitigate the noise and give response to local residents.

To conclude, Councillor Brennan stated that she liked the premises, but there seemed to be too much noise coming from the outside area. Voluntary measures were open to interpretation. Clear licensing restrictions were needed as there would be a change of ownership again at some point and the same problem may arise. The premises was originally intended only for quiet dining.

To conclude, Mr Eagles stated that many residents had been affected by the premises and had disturbed rest and sleep. His daughter was regularly affected along with other residents. Planning regulations had been ignored and this had led to public noise and nuisance that residents were complaining about.

To conclude, Mr McCann stated that the licence holder wanted the same thing as the applicant. Specific conditions had been suggested to be placed on a licence that would not just bind the licence holder, but any successors as well. The Sub-Committee was encouraged to adopt the proposed precise conditions because they had been drafted to ensure they were enforceable and made sense. However, there had been three further conditions mentioned which were sensible and the licence holder would happily have these added as well. Firstly, a condition requiring training, a regular catchup-training of staff in respect of the noise management plan. Secondly, making available a phone number for residents to contact the premises. Thirdly, to offer regular meetings with residents. He would like to get to know the local area even more and we would welcome such condition on the licence. The applicant and the licence holder were holding the same positions.

To summarise, Mr Reed, stated that the premises had been present for over 100 years and he wished to see it continue. He looked forward to the Sub-Committee's adopting conditions. He also looked forward to a way for the premises and residents to establish a more formal dialogue where everyone felt heard and their issues addressed.

At 9:10pm, the Sub-Committee adjourned for a short break and reconvened at 7:25pm.

Adjournment and Decision

Later, at 11:30pm, 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 application subject to conditions.

RESOLVED:

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for the review of a Premises Licence at: The Victoria Stakes, 1 Muswell Hill, London, N10 3TH.

In considering the application, 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 objector's representations.

Having carefully considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to GRANT the application subject to the conditions below:

CONDITIONS:

The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 13 & 14 of the application & at page 138 paragraph 7 of the Committee papers in addition to a condition that waste management be dealt with so that the premises be kept in a clean and hygienic condition. The conditions are as follows:

1. There shall be no outdoor regulated entertainment.
2. The fire exit door on the first floor shall be kept closed at all times except in the event of an emergency.
3. The premises licence holder shall ensure that any patrons drinking in the backyard of the premises do so in an orderly manner and are properly supervised by staff so as to ensure that there is no public nuisance.
4. The premises licence holder shall give notice in writing of any pre-booked event for over 50 people in the backyard to any local resident that requests to be notified. 5. The premises shall have a Noise Management Policy which will be made readily available to any statutory authority upon request.
6. No cleaning shall take place between close and 08:00hrs on the following day and all cleaning companies will be asked to instruct their staff to ensure that noise levels are kept to a minimum.

7. There will be no use of microphones in the backyard from 20.30hrs until the premises opens the following morning.
8. All lights in the backyard will be switched off within 30 minutes of the terminal time that the area is permitted to be used by patrons.

(a) The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system as per the minimum requirements of the Haringey Police Licensing Team.
(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.

9. 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. 10. Management must ensure that patrons do not obstruct the public highway in any manner whilst outside the premises.
11. 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.
12. Loudspeakers shall not be located in the entrance and exit of the premises or outside the building.
13. 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 and to the concerns raised by all the objectors and the owners and operators of the Premises and their numerous supporters. It was noted that the main area of concern for the Applicant was the prevention of public nuisance objectives being impacted by the noise emanating the rear covered area of the premises in breach of the planning condition in place, she also raised concerns re public safety, crime and disorder and protection of children from harm. Whilst Planning have confirmed that there is an application for a Certificate of Lawful use under consultation for the rear covered area this is outside the remit of the licencing Sub Committee. In fact there is specific guidance (Section 182) under the Licencing Act which emphasises separating planning and licencing to prevent inefficiency. This means that a licence may be granted which does not mirror planning consent and vice versa. The Committee, whilst noting the numerous noise complaints received by Haringey believes that the conditions referred to above will serve to alleviate the worries and concerns raised by the owners and occupiers of neighbouring property. It should also be noted that the

above conditions are legally enforceable and breaching any of them can lead to a review of your premises licence and / or a prosecution under section 136 of the Licencing Act 2003. The potential sanctions are significant ie 6 months in prison and / or an unlimited fine In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above conditions balanced the interest of the Applicant, the 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. TOTTENHAM POST OFFICE, 824-828 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 0EZ (NORTHUMBERLAND PARK)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- This was an application for the variation of an existing premises licence.
- The application sought to extend the times for alcohol sales.
- A copy of the application could be found at appendix 1 and was seeking a sale of alcohol 07:00 to 02:00 Monday to Sunday for consumption off the premises.
- During the consultation period, representations had been received from the Noise and Nuisance officer, from Police and from residents.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Vishal Patel, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The licence holder had taken over the small family-run post office and convenience store in July 2025 and had operated responsibly with no licensing complaints or incident.
- He fully respected considerations from the Noise team, Police, residents and any ward councillors regarding drinking, antisocial behaviour, nuisance and the Clear, Hold, Build initiative. He supported these efforts and aimed to contribute positively.
- As per the Licensing Act and the Council's policy, decisions should be open-minded and based on the specific evidence presented regarding the premises and not general assumptions.
- He hoped the Sub-Committee approached the hearing fairly.
- None of the representation cited problems caused by the premises. There had been no crime, no noise logs, disorder or any incidents under the applicant's management.
- The concerns raised were area wide and not specific to the well-managed business.
- The application had strong measures for the licensing objective with 24 hour by CCTV with 35 days retention, trained staff, a strict Challenge 25 policy, refusal

to sell to intoxicated customers, well managed logs, external checks to prevent loitering, good lighting, no audible noise outside the premises.

- This had worked flawlessly in the last six months with zero issues.
- The applicant was happy to add conditions, no single sales of alcoholic drinks, enhanced dispersal to support the whole phase.
- As a small business, the applicant needed extended hours to serve shift workers, late commuters and stadium visitors offering safe supervised access over unregulated sources.
- Nearby premises had similar permissions. Without this, it was hard to compete, sustain jobs and keep the high street vibrant.
- If the full seven days to 02:00 was too much, perhaps due to the weekends, the applicant was happy to accept amendments like limiting the terminal hour of 02:00 to Fridays and Saturday nights initially. This would provide meaningful support while monitoring progress.
- The applicant preferred all days, but was flexible and committed to safe operations. Granting this or with modifications aligned with area improvements and would help the 'Build' phase (of Clear, Hold, Build) by supporting a responsible small business.
- He would ask the Sub-Committee to grant the variation as sought or with proportionate conditions including a phased approach to Friday and Saturday to give the small business the support it needed while upholding the objectives.

At this point in the proceedings, the Sub-Committee decided to extend the meeting past 10:00pm in order for the meeting to be concluded.

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

- The premises was within very close walking distance to the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium nearby and therefore the business would benefit from the increased footfall that would happen on event days at the stadium.
- The business could have taken the option of submitting a temporary event notice (TEN) 10 clear working days before a proposed event at the stadium and ask for the ability to extend alcohol sales for a longer period. The previous licence holder had remained on the licence as the DPS and was aware of TENs and the requirements around these. However, a variation was sought for a terminal hour of 02:00 each day. There was nothing in the application about event days.
- His preference would be for the premises to open until 02:00 on event days (at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium) only. The only reason the application had been made was because continually submitting TENs with a small business would be more difficult than simply having a licence. Any resident or passer-by would not reference the premises as being open as late as 00:00. The premises was a family run business and if there were issues in the area, the premises shutter would be brought down and closed to make it safer for staff.
- The application was about continuing to run the business during evening when events were being held. If there was any provision in the Council where it was possible to have a licence for event days then he would be happy to apply for that.
- It was not convenient to apply for a TEN every single time there was an event.

- Extension of operating hours on Friday and Saturday alone should be enough for the applicant. Events at the stadium did not last particularly long on Sundays.

The Licensing Officer stated that events being held in the area would commonly cease by 23:00.

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

- Some of the football matches finished at 22:00 and he wanted to operate when the business would be busier.

The Licensing Officer stated that there were conditions that the Police would want to put in place around alcohol sales times in relation to football matches being played in the area. Some matches had a concerted effort to deter and reduce alcohol sales.

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

- The Sub-Committee could consider Fridays and Saturdays as a starting point. He understood the restrictions from the Police and the premises would be able to comply with regulations. The premises did not have any issues operating and another premises in the area had permission to sell alcohol for 24 hours. If the application was granted so that the premises could operate until 02:00 for Friday and Saturday, the applicant would be happy to accept it.
- If residents reported any issues, he would be happy to amend the operating hours. The applicant wanted to continue serving the community including as a post office.
- The events he referred to were events being held at Tottenham Hotspur Stadium.
- There was a premises nearby which operated during event days and nights and operated very late. The applicant did not wish to lose the patrons in the area and the applicant trying to make sure that patrons would attend his premises and use the services offered.
- Door security staff was already available and usually in place if a large crowd was in the area to make sure that the premises was safe and secure.
- The doors were sound proof so noise did not escape. If people were seen to be standing outside, a staff member would ask them to leave.
- Loitering and drinking outside was happening outside of the premises. It was not possible to control what happened down the street and it was something that the Police would be aware of.
- He would like to start settling up the business and see whether it could grow and improve or be able to provide services to patrons late in the night.
- He wanted the premises to operate during the day and to continue doing so in the evenings as well. The business was seeing patrons going to other areas further down the road where alcohol was sold. The applicant wanted to keep the patrons as customers at the premises as if they attended during the day, then they could also visit the premises during evening. If the patron attended another premises, then they often did not return even during the daytime. To

have extended hours during Fridays and Saturdays would be beneficial, but the main target was to be able to operate during event days. Many football matches often went into extra time or were subject to delay. This was when the events finished late into the night. Having access to these patrons would allow the business to be viable and keep the staff on board.

- The premises was a big property; the space on one side was for the post office, and the other side would be used for alcohol and the central area would be used for groceries. He lived in a flat above the high street above the business and understood what happened if any noise was made. This was why staff were serious about how it was going to run the business and would not wish to operate a licence that would cause any trouble.
- He would make sure the premises complied with regulation and did not create issues for the residents.
- The premises was like a big box with a post office counter on the right-hand side with greeting cards at the front of the area. The middle area had a few racks with different type of foods. There was a freezer with frozen food and there was a big rack where alcohol was sold on the left-hand side. There were two shop front with lots of storage space. The space was not being used at present. The space would be used to display more product.
- There would not be any seating space. The additional area would be used for the groceries as there already was enough space for alcohol.
- The premises could be described as a Tesco with a Post Office.
- The White Hart was a premises in the area that had a 24-hour licence.
- The front of the premises where the business was located was something that had to be considered from a licensing point of view.
- He was aware of what happened in the street. If the premises closed at 23:30, any sales after this point would not be sold by the premises. He also did not have any control over people bringing alcohol from their homes. Antisocial behaviour in the area had been decreasing.
- No attempts had been made to open the premises using a TEN. The applicant had operated a fried chicken shop in the past and had not realised that acquiring a licence would come with challenges. However, being a good business person, he wished to explore potential growth as much as possible.
- He was happy to submit temporary event notices.
- After an event had finished, there were patrons who would like to have alcohol or there were people who worked during late hours. This was why the applicant wanted to operate later on Fridays and Saturdays or the event days. A local event also meant that patrons may be watching the event somewhere in London and heading back home later and this was where customers could be found and be served before they went home.

Presentation by interested parties

Ms Selina Emmanuel informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Her concerns involved the prevention of crime and the prevention of guess more public nuisance. There were also issues regarding existing antisocial behaviour in the area.

- The premises opening for longer hours would exacerbate the issues in the area.
- There were issues with public drinking and loitering in groups outside the premises.
- There were also issues with urinating and vomiting on the street.
- The issues occurred late at night. There were people that could be found loitering up to 18:00.
- The loitering prevented residents in the area from accessing a walkway in the area. There were no cameras in the area.
- Residents had raised concerns repeatedly regarding antisocial behaviour leading to a community crime fighting event that was held by in November 2025.
- The application was unclear because originally the applicant wished to extend operating hours until 02:00, but it appeared that now the applicant wished only to operate until 02:00 on event days.
- She would inform her children not to use the walkway.
- People would come into the area and vomit including on event days.
- People urinated in the area as well.
- People loitered outside the premises.
- Police had been called in the past to tend to issues and there had been knife crime issues including two stabbings.
- The applicant stating that they would put down the shutters in case of issues were thinking of their own safety not the safety of residents.

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

- The people loitering were probably are selling drugs as well as drinking.
- She had seen up to 20 people loitering at times.
- There were vulnerable people that lived around that area.

Councillor John Bevan informed the Sub-Committee that:

- All documentation and representations made against the premises was true and was not exaggerated.
- The area was a problematic area.
- There was sheltered housing behind the premises – an older people's sheltered housing.
- The Police in the past had visited the premises to talk to retailers selling alcohol about what was going on in the area. They had visited the premises as well.
- He walked around the area late at night particularly when there was an event at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium.
- There were never any event attendees at night. By 00:00 or earlier, the area would be completely cleared. This included the recent boxing events.

In response to questions, Councillor John Bevan informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He objected to the application.

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

- It was not clear what the application was asking for and it looked like a request for a variation application.
- When a representation was made about the issues of antisocial behaviour, he then received emails from the applicant to say that the application was only for a matchdays.
- The applicant was informed about the use of temporary event notices.
- There were issues in the area regarding people drinking and people loitering in the street. A premises staying open for longer hours would exacerbate the issue.
- The premises could be subject to a proof of concept via the use of temporary event notices.

PC Novak and PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- PC Novak had been a police sergeant for a number of years and had worked on many of the events that took place at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium and he actively discouraged the sale of alcohol during events and any alcohol consumption on the street.
- Police robustly enforced using the public space protection order to confiscate any open cans or bottles of alcohol.
- The Police operated a Clear, Hold, Build framework in the area and had around a 23% reduction in crime.
- In the immediate vicinity of the premises, there had been a very stubborn antisocial behaviour problem linked to alcohol and drugs. This had been acutely felt by the community.
- Many meetings had been held and the issue was raised with MP David Lammy (regarding antisocial behaviour in the area)
- The Police also recently set the ward panel meeting a pledge to the community to reduce violence with injury offences.
- There was a direct link between the sale of alcohol and violence with injury offences.
- The application would be contrary to policing plan and the pledges made to the community.
- The concern was primarily related to the prevention of crime and disorder, the prevention of public nuisance and public safety.
- The premises was located in close proximity of the Clear, Hold, Build footpath and an area that continued to experience significant levels of antisocial behaviour, particularly in the evenings.
- There were reports of public drinking, noise groups gathering late in the night, violence and drugs.
- Extending operating hours would likely increase footfall at times when the issues were more prevalent and when police resources were at their lowest.
- Whilst they appreciate the applicant engagement and willingness to work with Police, the measures proposed did not sufficiently mitigate the risk identified.

- The Police did not support the application and would advise that if the applicant wished to open later for a specific event or occasion, they may wish to give a temporary event notice instead.
- When the applicant stated that other premises in the area had longer hours, it was worth noting that each premises licence was considered on its own merits based on specific locations, operating style and the evidence available at the time of the application.
- Some of the premises had been granted their hours under different circumstances.
- Police concern was not about fairness between the premises in the area but about the current and ongoing risk associated with the specific location particularly antisocial behaviour.

In response to questions, PC Novak and PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- In relation to other licensed premises in the area, the licences were granted when the conditions in terms of antisocial behaviour were different.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that one of the licenced premises was ones that applied in 2005 to have extended hours and make use of new Licensing Act at the time. The Sub-Committee was still able to consider the cumulative impact taking place in a location when determining a new application or a variation that seeking extended times for alcohol sales. Other new premises had opened in the area, but had been food-led premises that served alcohol. There had not been any off-licences or other such premises in that time. The Sub-Committee was able to consider if granting another premises to sell alcohol for extended hours would contribute to improving the area or be a negative impact on the area.

To summarise, Mr Patel stated that the business was flexible and he did understand that each application was assessed on its own merits. The objections were more based on assumptions, rather than fact and issues needed to be looked at by the right authorities. The first shop on the road had a licence to sell alcohol. His premises was five or six shops down the road. The premises had not had any issues. There had not been any concern raised for his premises. He would ask the Sub-Committee to examine the premises and the proposal. The business wanted to make sure that it survived. If the premises was having issues showed that the staff did not have control of the area and was not ready to improve. Late night businesses had a positive impact to residents. If someone was moving into the area, it provided assurance that the high street was progressing and helped attract residents to the area rather than scaring them away. The premises was business led by business people who wanted to work where the business could make money and survive on the high street. He would ask support from the authorities so that the premises could do business. He was always ready to support the Council or the authorities if they wanted an issue addressed. He was happy to change operating hours in future if required. If the application was granted to allow operating extended hours on Fridays and Saturdays, he was happy to have restrictions on the licence. He was also happy to have some conditions on the

licence. He was ready to work with the residents and happy not to sell single cans of alcohol.

To summarise, Ms Emanuel stated that due to the issues in the area, it had become a priority for the Police, the Council and the residents to make the area a safer community for the residents in the area.

To summarise, Councillor Bevan stated that he agreed with everything that had been said which was all true regarding the opposition to the application.

To summarise, Mr Bellinger stated that he did not support the application.

To summarise, PC Novak stated that the applicant should consider how the application benefited the community. The sale of alcohol late at night had a negative impact on the community. The applicant could consider giving temporary event notices. He would not be able to support the application.

Adjournment and Decision

At 11:30pm, 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:

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a variation of a Premises Licence at: Tottenham, Post Office, 824-828 High Road, Tottenham, London, N17 0EZ (NORTHUMBERLAND PARK

In considering the application, 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 report pack, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Human Rights Act and the applicant's and objector's representations. Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to REFUSE the application.

REASONS: The Committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objectors- particularly the Police. The premises is located in a terrace of shops with residential above.

The premises is situated in an area that is currently under special measures due to the level of anti- social behaviour taking place, including street drinking and drug taking. The measures are led by the Police under Clear, Hold, Build. The local operation is focusing in and around Northumberland Park and the aim is to return it to a location which residents, businesses and visitors can enjoy. The Police

representative advised that there is a direct link between the sale of alcohol and violence.

It was noted that the Applicant stated that the reason for their application was not to sell alcohol from 7am until 2am every day. They advised that it was simply to extend the licence to 2am when there was a local event with a post 11pm finish to avoid having to apply for individual Temporary Event Notice (TEMS licence) each time. However it was noted that the Applicants had not tested out how onerous/commercially viable obtaining a TEMS licence would be despite the Committee being advised that there were only two events that finished past 11pm in 2025.

The Committee can see no justification as to the necessity for a variation to the licence as opposed to simply obtaining a TEMS licence as and when necessary. In addition they are permitted to consider the cumulative impact in an area that is blighted with street drinking, and anti-social behaviour. The Committee believes that to extend the licence to 2am would have a detrimental impact on the local community. In light of the above, it was deemed that a refusal of the application balanced the interests of the applicants, the 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.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 2026, 7:00PM – 7:27PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Sheila Peacock and Nick da Costa

ALSO ATTENDING:

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies had been received.

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 RADIAL, UNIT 1 39B, MARKFIELD ROAD, TOTTENHAM, HARINGEY, LONDON, N15 4QT (TOTTENHAM CENTRAL)

This application had been withdrawn.

7. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT STADIUM LOUNGE, RESTAURANT & WINE BAR LTD, 783 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 8AH (NOTHUMBERLAND PARK)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- Section 1.2 of the report outlined the hours being applied for for the provision of regulated entertainment, recorded music, late night refreshment and the sale of alcohol. The premises already had an existing licence and a copy of the licence was included in the agenda papers.

- Representations had been submitted during the course of the consultation period from the Police and the Noise team.
- Attempts had been made between the parties for agreeing operating hours and conditions.
- The Police representation had timings and conditions which appeared to have been agreed.

In response to questions, Mr David Dadds, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He had been in dialogue with the Police earlier in the day to agree wording on the condition regarding the door supervisor. This had been sent to the Licensing Officer.
- All other conditions have been agreed.
- In relation to operating hours, the applicant had requested a terminal hour of 02:30 Friday and Saturday. The applicant was happy to have a terminal hour of 02:00 on Friday and Saturday.
- He had spoken to the environmental health officer and agreed that the change of wording was sufficient.
- The final wording was that “at least one SIA officer was to be on duty from 21:00 on a Friday and Saturday when the premises was operating after 00:00 for licensable activities or for an event. SIA to disperse patrons from the area at close of the venue at 02:00. There is to be a risk assessment if more are required”.
- The terminal hour for the sale of alcohol was 01:30 dispersal would take place thereafter until 02:00.

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

- The phrasing of the condition was correct.
- All other conditions were in-line with what had been agreed with the applicant.

In response to questions, Mr Craig Bellringer, Noise and Nuisance Officer, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He also agreed with the phrasing of the condition.

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

- The Sub-Committee had to come to a decision and as long it was not appealed, the applicant would then surrender the other licence so there would not be two licences.

Adjournment and Decision

At 7:21pm, 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 application subject to conditions and amendments.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

Announcement of decision

The Sub-Committee returned to the meeting room and informed that the grant the application subject to conditions and amendments. The Chair stated that after careful consideration, the Sub-Committee had decided to grant the application subject to the conditions and amendments as agreed with the Police and the Council's Noise and Nuisance team as outlined earlier in the meeting. Full written reasons would be provided within five working days.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councilllor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 MARCH 2026, 7:00PM – 8:58PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Adam Small and Nick da Costa

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were none.

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 VARIATION OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT KFC, 479- 481 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6AQ (TOTTENHAM CENTRAL)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- This was an application for the variation of an existing premises licence.
- The application had been submitted by FT Foods Limited who were seeking to increase the hours for late night refreshment at the premises.
- The applicant had submitted an update requesting alternative hours to be considered and requested an amendment of the terminal hour of operation from 04:00 on Thursday Friday and Saturdays until 03:00 and from 04:00 from Sunday to Wednesday until 02:00.
- If granted, the applicant proposed a condition be added which stated there should be one SIA registered door staff on duty from 23:00 until closing time and the need for additional door staff would be risk assessed.
- This information had been shared with the Police but their objection to the application still stood.

- There was also a representation from a business in the area.

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

- The terminal hour was proposed to be 03:00 Thursday, Friday and Saturday and 02:00 Sunday to Wednesday.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Armin Solimani, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant was applying for extended hours and had considerably reduced the hours applied for in consultation with the Police.
- No agreement had been reached as of yet between the parties.
- The applicant belonged to a very large group of KFC franchises.
- The Head of Operations was present at the meeting and this reflected how seriously the corporate group took the hearing and the application - and how tightly controlled the operation was by the corporate team.
- The restaurant was an existing premises with an unblemished and exemplary licensing record which reflected respect for the licensing regime and robust management.
- The applicant operated for many years without criticism apart from the criticism the Police made of people abusing the premises.
- The applicant operated very late Temporary Event Notices (TENs) without any issues and belonged to a chain which had never been subject to a review hearing.
- The only real concern he saw with the application was the crime and disorder objective and the representations raised by the Police.
- There was no real evidence to suggest possible noise nuisance.
- The environmental health service who were experts on noise nuisance had not made a representation.
- Residents in the local area had not made a representation.
- The only representation that mentioned nuisance was from a competing chicken shop premises. This needed to be considered carefully given it was a trade objection. No clear evidence had been provided as to why a premises run by the objector would cause less nuisance.
- The competing premises had a licence until 02:00 and was a chicken shop that operated late into the night.
- The only real question with the application was whether it would contribute to crime and disorder in the area.
- The reason the Police gave for the application being a crime and disorder issue was that, historically, criminals had used the premises for various activities. They had either hidden drugs on the premises or had meetings there or had used the premises as a lookout post. This was not something the premises could control. Staff could not know when people would be carrying out such activities. There was no suggestion from the Police that the premises was involved or was condoning it.

- The premises had staff, but they were not Police and could not control or investigate these issues.
- The business had proposed the use of SIA staff.
- Having SIA staff in the premises improved safety in the high street generally by adding to surveillance. This was a net benefit to public safety.
- Having SIA staff was not cost effective when the premises closed at 00:00 as it operated in minimum shifts of five hours.
- The applicant needed later operating hours.
- The applicant could not withdraw the hours proposed due to a five-hour shift pattern.
- It was difficult to blame a premises like KFC for facilitating crime or disorder when it was not doing anything to instigate it. It was simply subject to abuse by criminals. This was the job of the Police.
- The Police had rightly added more resources into the area and had undertaken a formal operation as the issue was being brought under control by police action.
- The crime and disorder issue would be resolved with the help if SIA staff.
- Operating to later hours would enable an SIA staff member to be employed which would be better for crime and disorder and this would resolve the only real objection to the very well-managed premises having extended hours to serve chicken and not to serve alcohol.

In response to questions, Mr Solimani and Mr Giggs Kyriacou, Operations Director, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There was no suggestion that the applicant had not cooperated with the Police. Everything had been done to try and resolve the issue. It was as big a problem for the applicant as it was for the Police. The applicant did not want the premises to appear to have a criminal association and wanted have the situation under control. Premises staff could not control how citizens and criminals behaved. Any restaurant operating in the area was likely to have similar issues. Having a trained person as door staff would be useful as it would be very hard for someone to use the premises in a criminal manner when there was a trained SIA staff member on the premises. A CCTV condition was in place and the premises shared CCTV with the Police. No issues had been raised regarding the refusal to share CCTV or being uncooperative. Staff also undertook comprehensive training for conflict management and for dealing with drunk and disorderly people. However, there was a limit to what they could do. The staff could not manage secret criminality. The Police were not referring to people out in the open committing crimes in a restaurant, but rather for staff to do things like being a lookout for Police through the windows. It was not possible for staff to know when people were hiding drugs, as these would be concealed. The most the premises could be asked was to have trained staff and/or SIA staff, have CCTV and cooperate with the Police.
- Staff were trained in conflict resolution, not just in in theory but in practice. Premises staff talked to people who potentially could be loitering. It was never clear if patrons were doing anything illegal. The staff tended to move people away from the premises as the customer base was mixed. This included families, elderly people and young people. The premises catered to everyone.

In the last four years, the premises had engaged closely with the Police who had been encouraged to visit the premises late at night or early in the morning either to use a toilet or to have a cup of coffee. The premises was quite active regarding safeguarding for young people. The premises would be a safe haven in the area. The business operated a lot of restaurants into the early hours without any issues. If there were any issues, staff would work very closely with the authorities to have an improved, safer environment for everyone to live, work and eat.

- The way the SIA condition came about was when the responsible authorities were trying to reach an agreement. One of the suggestions that was made was to have SIA staff which the applicant agreed to. The police officer dealing with the discussion went on annual leave and another officer had taken over. However, it appeared that the Police had then changed their view.
- The applicant had outlined a robust proposal for dealing with the issues that had been highlighted. Other than train the staff, have an SIA staff member in the premises, it was not clear what else could be done to control the situation.
- The applicant operated a large number of premises into the early hours and some operated quite safely without SIA staff because premises staff were highly trained, good at diffusing situations (because the conflict resolution courses). The applicant would only invoke the use of SIA staff if the Police stated some kind of a concern. In order to find a mutually acceptable negotiated solution, the applicant offered the use of SIA staff. The applicant often had SIA staff working during the daytime, during large events. The applicant also operated premises near the Arsenal football stadium. Any events held there would be subject to the use of SIA staff.
- The applicant had training blogs accessible online which could be shared with Police and local authorities if needed. It also included safeguarding and confidential resolution, health and safety and food safety.
- The applicant believed in being part of the community and in the responsibility to keep litter clear. Even when trading during the day, staff picked up litter in the area and not only KFC branded litter.
- The applicant did not wish to have litter being disposed of unnecessarily. In the past, the applicant had worked with local councils sponsoring bins and doing trash walks and was happy to maintain that. In some of the premises the applicant managed, it became a condition to have a litter pick every hour or as soon as the premises closed. One premises was located in Tottenham, was one of the busiest and there was never usually any litter due to staff maintaining the area.
- The applicant had an online system called Prime where any incidents had to be logged no matter how small or serious it was with regard to antisocial behaviour, unruly customers or official visits. If extra door staff was needed due to an event at Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, the premises had a sophisticated sales projection, knew the premises was going to be busy, then extra door staff would be brought in to manage it.
- The applicant had its premises open on New Year's Eve and Christmas Eve and worked with two door staff members in in most of the premises it owned. The applicant had a duty of care to staff, customers, the area and would have a formal risk assessment that would be completed.
- The risk assessment would be available for inspection by the Licensing Authority or the Police if needed. The applicant had a health and safety folder

and this could be inspected to see what the risk assessment was, how it was dealt with and what the risk was. If the system scored over a certain amount, more security would be sought.

- It was common to have a condition phrased in a way which acknowledged a risk assessment although it was difficult to specify how a risk assessment would be triggered. It depended on how much trust the operator was given. The applicant had an asset protection officer that visited various premises every few months and completed risk assessments on the business itself. In the event of an occasion happening nearby, the premises would conduct a risk assessment.
- If people were dealing drugs in the street and they came into the premises and waited there before going outside to deal drugs in the street, it was very difficult to see how this was something any licensed premises could deal with. There was a point at which these became issues that the Police had to deal with. Having an SIA staff member on the door would ensure that people dealing drugs did not do it in front of the premises. Although this would move the issue further down the road, this was the limit of what the premises was able to do.
- The business was a commercial enterprise that wanted to do well. That was a big part of licensing regulations, particularly in light of the London Mayor's and the Government's recent guidance about encouraging growth and growth in the night time economy. The business was a successful well-run business that wanted to do better and grow in a way that helped the community. If the premises operated later hours and made more money, it would use the money to employ an SIA staff member and make the high street and itself safer. The high street already had a lot of restaurants that operated late at night.
- A licensed premises was entitled to grow and this was a positive thing.
- The business did not currently have SIA staff on the premises generally, but did so for events that would have been risk assessed.
- The reason the premises did not SIA staff was because it was not commercially viable to pay for SIA staff for a chicken shop that closed at 00:00. This did not make financial sense.
- The Police had identified issues, including that people dealt drugs outside or near the premises who came into the premises to sit down or to wait or to look out for other people. That was something that could be controlled by an SIA staff member, but was not responsible for managing crime outside of its premises.
- The applicant wanted to do everything possible to reduce crime in the area and to keep the high streets safe. It was important to understand the scope of licensing and the scope of the licensing regime. It was not the job of a premises to do everything it possibly could even beyond its commercial abilities to reduce crime to deal with the licensing objectives. The job of a licensed premises was to uphold the licensing objectives. When a Sub-Committee granted a licence to a premises with certain conditions, those would be conditions the Sub-Committee thought necessary to uphold the licensing objectives. If people felt those licensing objectives were not being upheld, a review application could be submitted. This had not happened. A review application would be submitted to impose different conditions like requiring an SIA staff member. The Police had not considered it necessary to do that. The applicant was offering to appoint SIA staff voluntarily. When it came to assessing the licensing objectives in the context of the application, licensing considerations had to take into account a much wider range of issues like commercial viability, economic viability and

practical reality. The applicant was an operator that tried to be a good neighbour and tried to cooperate, but there were limits to what the premises was able to do as a business and there was the balance in these priorities.

- The premises did not have SIA staff as at present, they were not needed. Incidents that got logged were minor. The Tottenham area was not a lawless area, but a great place to work, live and to go out and eat. The premises was part of the community.
- Mr Kyriacou had worked at the premises sometimes for several hours a day including nights and had not witnessed any drug dealing. This may go on outside, but was not happening to the scale portrayed.

Presentation by interested parties

PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant had made a last-minute proposal to amend their application. It was earlier in the day at 4:33pm
- PC Denham who was now on annual leave had tried to contact the applicant's agent on two occasions to explore the possibility of negotiating reduced operating hours. She had submitted her representation on 26 February 2026 and the applicant had contacted her in March 2026 when they received the representation.
- The use of SIA door supervisors had been offered from 11:00 until closing time. This amendment did not alter the professional assessment of the risks or the basis of the original representation.
- The premises would still be trading significantly later than its current licence and into the time period usually when there was the highest level of crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour in the locality.
- The core concern was the added late night operating hours themselves, not simply the absence of door staff.
- The proposed conditions and amendments had been received very late in the process giving responsible authorities and local residents minimal opportunity to assess or respond to them a considerate manner.
- The proposed changes were not minor. They still represented a substantial extension beyond the existing operating hours and materially increased the time during which customers would congregate, queue and disperse in and around the premises. The original objection stood in full.
- Even with SIA staff provision, extending the hours to the extent now proposed would lead to an overall increase in crime, disorder and antisocial behaviour linked to the premises and its immediate surroundings.
- Door staff could help manage behaviour at the entrance, but they could not remove the wider impact of keeping the premises open and attracting customers much later into the night.
- She could not support the amended application and respectfully invited the Sub-Committee to refuse the variation or alternatively to limit any extension of hours to 01:00 on Fridays and Saturdays and only with robust conditions. At least a minimum of one SIA door staff should be on duty on Fridays and Saturdays.

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

- It was possible that the proposed conditions could mitigate some issues, but later extended hours would still cause issues around the area.
- The premises could risk assess how many SIA door supervisors were needed and what times they needed to be on duty and this would make the premises safer. However, the terminal hour for the premises to close was not acceptable
- Drug offenses and violence against the person offences for the immediate area generally occurred after 21:00 or 22:00 until late.
- PC Denham had tried to consult with the business. On 26 February 2026, she had received no update or answer when she submitted the representation. The Council had sent the representation to the applicant and the applicant had replied on 3 March 2026 saying they had been sent a copy of the representation. The applicant had not stated any reason why there had been no contact and apologised.
- PC Denham then replied to the applicant and informed that she would be available for a call on 3 March 2026, but no contact was made.
- She spoke with the business yesterday as she had been emailed. Today the applicant submitted a ‘last minute’ proposal to amend the application.

Mr Aamer Nawaz, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- His main concerns with the applicant was the antisocial behaviour and the problems that occurred with drugs in the area.
- He had been operating his business in the area and was aware of what went on in the area.
- He would deal with the issues with a positive attitude.
- He was 29 years old when he came to Tottenham to work.
- He bought the premises and started to run his business
- He was now 56 years old.
- He knew the mothers and fathers of the young people frequenting the area.
- Drugs in the area was an ongoing issue.
- There was an issue with the proposed timings and the security for the public.
- It was very dangerous to let the issues carry on in the area because it could lead to other incidents.
- Police had tried to install more CCTV and trying to get rid of the antisocial behaviour during the coronavirus crisis.
- His business helped the Police with data gathering and they did well to try and get rid of all the antisocial behaviour and drug sellers on the high road.
- The application was just inviting more trouble with the situation.
- He had seen trouble in other shops with SIA staff who were only there to monitor small issues. The staff would not be able to manage groups of five or six people at a time.
- Such groups may become violent or intimidating.
- He supported the Police representation.
- He was not comfortable with the application.

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

- He operated a similar type of premises to the applicant.
- His premises was open to 04:00, but was much smaller - a third of the size of the applicant's premises.
- The applicant had a premises that could operate like restaurant area, his premises was mainly a takeaway shop.
- He had worked at his premises for 26 years.
- Parents or family members of the community members would be spoken to with regard to the behaviour of the young people or young adults in the area.
- Bringing more Police into the local situation brought more problems to the area.
- His premises was a local shop and not a big corporation. His premises did not attract issues in high quantities, because the community needed his services.
- His premises sold items a lot cheaper than the corporate shops.
- Nobody creating issues in the community would be served.
- It would be clear to the community that anyone causing trouble, antisocial drug behaviour, drunkenness or loitering would not be served.
- The local community and customers to his premises knew him personally. He had created this relationship over the years he had been working in the community.
- He and his son operated his premises.

To summarise, Mr Mr Solimani stated that the terminal hour for the licence was 00:00 every day apart from Sunday. The point seemed to come down to the crime and disorder objective. It was up to the Sub-Committee to decide whether the conditions proposed were enough to mitigate the issues that had been raised. The Police objection did not explain why the proposals made were not good enough or why an SIA staff member would not deal with the problem. The representation simply stated that operating later hours just meant more crime or disorder. However, this was not necessarily true. If the premises operated later hours, but had an SIA staff member, then there was no reason why there should be certain types of crime that could not be kept under control. Police needed to provide evidence when attending a Licensing Sub-Committee. They needed to provide robust reasoning not simply be expected to have their objection be taken as the prime consideration. The premises did not serve 'troublemakers'. The premises was not simply trying to allow illegal activity to go on. The premises tried to stop it where it could and took its role in the community very seriously. There were criticisms made of the applicant's timing of responding to the Police and dealing with representations. The applicant did at least try to engage the interested parties, but sometimes communication issues could occur, but this was not a reason to refuse a licensing application. It was also not fair to describe the proposals as 'new' or 'recent'. They were evolving and the police officer the applicant was dealing with was now on annual leave. The Sub-Committee needed to consider whether it thought an SIA would deal with the problems the Police had raised and whether it thought it was fair for the problems the Police had identified with crime and disorder on the high street to be blamed on the premises. There did not appear to be a realistic link. It was difficult to see how the issue was a problem that a restaurant

could solve. It was a problem for the Police to solve – something they accepted because they had created an operation to try and reduce crime and it was having an effect. The premises would try to do what it could with the provision of an SIA staff member. It had not been explained why the later hours would cause crime and disorder and for that reason he commended the application to the Sub-Committee.

To summarise, PC Qureshi stated that the Police was objecting to the application and still wanted the terminal hour to be 01:00 on Friday and Saturday with one SIA security guard. The main issue was that policing in the area was at 50% under strength. Police did not finish after 22:00. The pool of officers upon calling 999, would come from the response team, not from the local SNT. No SNTs work after 22:00. If the SIA staff member asked individuals in the premises area to leave and they did not, the Police would be called and would have to attend.

To summarise, Mr Nawaz stated that he agreed with the Police.

Adjournment and Decision

Later in the meeting, at 8:57pm, 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 application subject to conditions.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions.

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a variation of a Premises Licence at: Tottenham, Post Office, 824-828 High Road, Tottenham, London, N17 0EZ (NORTHUMBERLAND PARK)

In considering the application, 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 report pack, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Human Rights Act and the applicant's and objector's representations.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to GRANT the application subject to the conditions below:

Late Night Refreshment Sunday to Thursday 2300 to 0200 Friday to Saturday 2300 to 0300 hours

Hours open to Public Sunday to Thursday 1000 to 0200 hours Friday to Saturday 1000- 0300 hours

CONDITIONS:

The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 15-17 of the Committee papers and additional agreed conditions as set out below:

1. The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV System.
2. All entry and exit points shall be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition.
3. The CCTV system shall continually record whilst the premises is open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises.
4. All recordings shall be stored for a minimum period of 31 days with date and time stampings. Viewing of recordings shall be made available upon request of the Police or authorised officer throughout the preceding 31day period, subject to the general Data Protection Regulation and current Data Protection requirements.
5. An incident log shall be kept on the premises and made available on request to an authorised officer of the council, or the police which will record the following:-
a. All crimes reported to the venue
b. All ejections of patrons
c. Any complaints received concerning crime and disorder
d. Any incidents of disorder
e. All seizures of drugs or offensive weapons
f. Any faults in the CCTV system or searching equipment or scanning equipment
g. Any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service

6. A security system with both audio and visual monitoring capability is installed in the restaurant which can be activated by mobile panic buttons. Once activated the system links the restaurant to an external monitoring centre capable of intervening to resolve crime and disorder issues and/or provide the appropriate advice or instruction to support and protect the restaurant's staff and customers. All staff are trained to use this system.
7. At this restaurant all staff will have safety and security training and Conflict Management Training which includes handling those under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
8. Incidents are recorded on an on-line incident record form which is accessible to every manager and store leader.
9. At least one Registered SIA door staff will be on duty between the hours of 2300 and close of business. The number of SIA registered door staff will be increased when the threat of intimidation/risk of harm/violence is assessed to be greater. The Licensee will clearly set out, and provide greater clarity as to its scoring mechanism and what risk/warnings triggers the necessity for additional staff in its risk assessment policy.
10. The Premises Licence Holder is to work in partnership with the Responsible Authorities to promote public safety.
11. The Premises Licence Holder has safety systems in place to protect the safety of customers and staff at all times. It will comply, as far as reasonably practicable, with relevant Health and Safety, Food Safety and Fire Safety Legislation.
12. All staff receive comprehensive safety training to ensure that safe working methods are maintained including training on the evacuation procedure in the event of a fire or other dangerous occurrence.
13. The Premises Licence Holder operates a "No Open Alcohol Containers" policy to prevent persons carrying open alcohol into the in-store area. No glass is allowed on the premises.

14. The Premises Licence Holder carries out litter patrols collecting both KFC's packaging and any other litter that has been carelessly discarded. It is happy to act on recommendations from the Environmental Health Officer on the extent of the patrol, as far as this is reasonably practicable.
15. A litter check will be carried out by Team members and/or /Team leaders outside the restaurant every 30 minutes.
16. Where it is practical to do so, the Premises Licence Holder puts measures in place to limit noise. The doors are self-closing and music is played at low volume. Signage is displayed at the restaurant asking customers to leave the premises quietly.
17. Orders for food stops 15 minutes before closing and customers are reminded of the closing time. If necessary, staff will encourage customers to leave.
18. The restaurant uses third party delivery drivers who will be reminded not to make too much noise or otherwise cause a nuisance. The delivery company is notified of any concerns with the drivers.
19. Delivery drivers are encouraged to wait inside the premises. If they are in their vehicles, they are asked to turn their engine off, the music down, park considerately, and to have respect for our neighbours.
20. The Premises Licence Holder does not permit unaccompanied children under the age of 16 at any time. It does, however, take the safety of children and vulnerable adults very seriously and will ensure that they are protected from harm at all times when visiting the restaurant. KFC has a policy on Safeguarding and Modern Slavery.
21. All management will be trained regarding safeguarding issues.

REASONS: The Committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objectors- particularly the Police, Public Health and the owner of a similar business operating in the immediate area. It took into account that the premises is located along a parade of shops in High Road Tottenham N17, the initial licence was granted in July 2022 and has been run without incident to date. It noted the applicant agreed to reduce the opening hours sought and to employ registered SIA door staff to act as a visible deterrent to antisocial behaviour during the hours of 2300 until close of business. Whilst the area is busy with multiple late evening food establishments and associated anti-social behaviour and street drinking, the Committee can see no justification to object to this application for variation, subject to the attached conditions, and deemed a grant of the application balanced the interest of the applicant, the local residents/business owners 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. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT NISA, MOSELLE RETAIL UNIT, BROADWATER FARM, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6HE (BRUCE CASTLE / WEST GREEN)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- The application had been submitted by Mr Tabrez Hussain had also been nominated as the designated premises supervisor (DPS).
- The application sought the supply of alcohol Monday to Sunday 07:00 to 23:00. The supply of alcohol would be for consumption off the premises.
- The application offered conditions on page 61 of the agenda papers.

Presentation by the applicant

Ms Gill Sherratt, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- This was a family-run business and had been established for over 30 years.
- The business had been started by Mr Hussain's father and uncle and he was now an operations director and ran it with his brother and his cousins.
- The family started their business in 1996 with off licences and moved on to operating convenience stores. They now had 20 convenience stores operating in inner London. Six of these operated 24 hours a day.
- The last licence granted in a cumulative impact zone to the business was in October 2025.
- The business was an extremely responsible professional company.
- They operated their various premises without issues or complaints or risks to the licensing objectives.
- The business provided lots of money to charity and had an extremely proactive relationship with all authorities including the Police, particularly by assisting them with any requests for CCTV.
- Her organisation had represented the business for around 15 years.
- She had considered the statement of licensing policy and conducted a risk assessment when considering the application.
- She was aware that it was located in the Broadwater Farm residential estate.
- The premises related to a council owned premises that had been earmarked specifically for a retail outlet.
- The premises was being redeveloped by the Council who would be the landlord and the applicant was waiting to finalise the lease. This could only be done if the licence was granted from the hours of 07:00 to 23:00.
- Once completed, the applicant intended to invest approximately £500,000 in creating modern facilities.
- Convenience stores were more than just selling groceries. The premises would be a nicer store and alcohol would make about 15% of sales.
- The Public Health representation did not hold up within the context of the Licensing Act.
- Public Health had provided generalised statistics regarding the area; that it was deprived and the risk alcohol presented to vulnerable groups. This, nor the

Council's health and well-being strategy was disputed. However, the applicant had been working amongst residential communities for 30 years, was part of it, understood the demographic, understood the challenges that people faced and the risks that alcohol presented to health and well-being.

- Public Health had stated that they wanted to ensure the Sub-Committee took into account health considerations in any licensing decisions, but Public Health was not a licensing objective. This decision was ratified by the Government in 2017 at their overview of the licensing system at the House of Lords.
- Public Health were suggesting that the Sub-Committee limit the application based on the two licensing objectives; public safety and the protection of children from harm.
- The public safety objection was misguided because public safety was about the physical safety of people in the premises rather than having any broader or social or moral concerns.
- In relation to the objection of the protection of children from harm, retailers could only contribute to that effort by utilising policies, procedures and equipment that they had within their control. The applicant fulfilled this need with a Challenge 25 policy, a CCTV system which would have 20 cameras.
- The evidence before the Sub-Committee was the track record of the business, but also that of the various other responsible authorities in licensing, none of them considered the application to raise any concerns regarding risks to the licensing objective of protecting children from harm.
- Public Health was not asking for the application to be refused, but were focusing in on late operating hours.
- The application requested 16 hours a day for alcohol sales, it was not clear why the last two operating hours was not able to uphold the licensing objectives.
- She would ask that the application be granted as sought. It was a robust application with evidence.

In response to questions, Ms Sherratt and Mr Tabarez Hussain, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Some minor amendments had been provided to the wording where the Police had proposed their conditions. Otherwise, she was in agreement with the conditions.
- She was happy to have a condition that stated the premises would not sell alcohol to those already intoxicated.
- It was not possible for business owners to give staff widespread access to data stored by the premises. It belittled the licensing objectives as people could tamper with systems. Sometimes if Police attended the premises, the relevant person may not be present to grant access to certain requests such as CCTV. This was why a buffer of 48 hours was necessary to make sure the applicant did not breach conditions of a licence.
- The risks at Broadwater Farm were no different to any other application.
- Public Health was not a licensing objective. The risk assessment was based on protection of children from harm and crime and disorder. Various conditions were in place for those such as a Challenge 25 policy and CCTV. The conditions had not been amended by the Police and because they were the national standard to address such issues.

- Risk assessments were not just based on areas. Local shops serviced areas like the area where the premises was based everywhere in the country. It was important to consider the operator and the robust nature of the actual conditions.
- Opening the premises at 07:00, but limiting alcohol sales until 10:00 would not be something the applicant could consider because the business operated 24 hours for the inner-city area and 07:00 to 23:00 for residential areas. Section 182 guidance stated that in relation to the hours for an off-licence business, the opening hours should match the hours for alcohol sales. If this did not happen, then it would cause problems with customers as they would not have the convenience of shopping in one place. If the premises could not sell alcohol for a period of hours, then the premises would have to start covering up the drinks and paying for shutters. Otherwise, the business would be liable to commit a criminal offence.
- The position of Public Health was that the business was acceptable for 14 hours a day. Although there were schools in the area, schools were off all summer and children would be outside their homes from 15:30 and Public Health was stating that the premises was capable of protecting children from harm. It was not clear where the evidence was that that between 07:00 to 09:00 that the premises was suddenly not able to meet the licensing objectives.
- The staff were very well trained in proxy sales and typically, anytime there had been an attempt at a proxy sale, it would be someone underage that had tried to purchase something that had been refused. Shortly after, an adult would come in to the premises and try and buy the same item. The staff were aware of the dangers around proxy sales. This was never an issue in any of the premises managed by the business.
- The use of shutters was legally not justified. There were seldom sales of alcohol in the morning. As part of the section 182 guidance, when a shop opened its doors, all of the products needed to be available on the shelves. It did not mean that people were going to be coming into the premises and buying ten bottles of wine. Legally, the premises was entitled to open the doors and have the alcohol available to customers. Unless there was evidence to suggest that there would be a problem to sell alcohol between 07:00 and 09:00, then the premises should not be expected to meet such a disproportionate condition.
- Alcohol sometimes could not be put them behind the shutters due to fixture fittings or if there was an alcohol promotional fixture, it would not be operationally suitable to place a shutter.

Presentation by interested parties

Mr Joe Garvey, representing the Public Health team, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The Public Health representation exclusively related to preventing, mitigating, targeting and tackling alcohol-related harms.
- Tackling alcohol is a priority for the Council. It was essential to achieving the Council’s health and wellbeing strategy aims including reducing the gap in life expectancy between the east and west of the borough and improving mental health and wellbeing.

- Achieving the outcomes required ensuring licensing decisions took health and community safety into account.
- The Council's goal was to foster a culture that prevented and mitigated against alcohol-related harms.
- The proposed premises sat within Broadwater Farm, a location of significant vulnerability surrounded by dense residential housing schools, care homes sheltered accommodation and drug and alcohol treatment services.
- West Green was a diverse and vibrant ward which should be celebrated. It had almost 15,000 residents, 19% of which were children and young people. The ward was ethnically diverse with nearly 15% of the residents from ethnic minority backgrounds.
- West Green was a ward that was particularly deprived. The premises occupied an area within was ranked in the top 7% of most deprived areas nationally.
- Evidence consistently showed that alcohol harms were more concentrated in deprived communities.
- Local health data from 2024/25 indicated there were alcohol-related admissions and three ambulance callouts for alcohol related incidents that year in West Green.
- The borough continued to face some of the highest alcohol-related harm levels in London. Of particular concern for Public Health was the low rate of successful completion of alcohol treatment. The borough sat at 3.5% successful completion, below England's average of 34.6% and ranked as the second worst London borough in rates of completion. This emphasized the importance of preventing additional pressure on vulnerable communities from alcohol-related harms.
- Within just one mile of the premises, there were 19 infant and primary schools, five secondary schools or colleges one sheltered housing scheme and eight residential or care homes. The Grove, Haringey's flagship specialist drug and alcohol misuse service, was located within a half a mile radius. This meant that individuals in recovery or seeking help would be regularly exposed to a new outlet selling alcohol directly along their route or in their residential area.
- There was a local need for the premises. There were currently no off-licences within a 250 metre radius of the location.
- There was good argument to suggest the premises would benefit the local community.
- The leading concern was the availability of alcohol in an area of high population density and deprivation, with vulnerable communities in close proximity.
- Broadwood Farm was transitioning from an area of high crime and gang activity, high levels of people with mental health conditions, social stigma and historic trauma to an area where the major regeneration initiatives had focused on health, well-being safety community safety, social cohesion, better housing and environment.
- Having alcohol sold early in the morning would go some way in undermining all the ongoing work to make Broadwater Farm a better, healthier community.
- Given the risks identified, particularly relating to those in treatment he would ask the Sub-Committee to consider the measures that would help mitigate potential harm and would like the Sub-Committee to consider restricting the of alcohol sales between 09:00 and 23:00.

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

- Alcohol risks were more concentrated in areas of high deprivation. The proposed amendments to hours would help mitigate against the commercial determinacy of health with quite a proportionate, easily implementable licensing condition that had a very negligible impact on the premises.
- There was not a spike during the hours of 07:00 to 09:00 of people using drug and alcohol treatment service.
- He would request the Sub-Committee and the applicant to consider restricting the alcohol sales given the area of high deprivation and likely alcohol related harms experienced within the community.

To summarise, Ms Sherrat stated that the applicant did consider the issues raised. The applicant was a retailer who had a flawless track record working with local charities, giving money to the kinds of charities that probably would benefit the work in the area. The premises needed to open at 07:00 as it was part of what they did. The applicant was not asking for a 24-hour licence which they could, but recognised the area the premises was located. There was no evidence being presented about proxy sales during the school run and the Sub-Committee had heard that there had been no spike on impact on the rehabilitation services. The Sub-Committee only needed to look at its own statement of licensing policy to see that public safety was not about health, but physical safety. In relation to protecting children from harm, the policies, procedures and track record of the applicant was flawless. The Police hardly changed the conditions proposed because they met the national standard. There were three responsible authorities whose specific job was to protect children from harm and all of them were of the view that the application was acceptable.

To summarise, Mr. Garvey stated that the borough faced some of the highest alcohol related harms in London and this was felt even more acutely in Broadwater Farm, an area of significant deprivation and in the highest density of deprivation across the country. His leading concern was not with the premises itself, but more the availability of alcohol in an area of high population density, deprivation and with vulnerable communities in close proximity, pertinently to The Grove. Given the risks identified particularly to those in treatment, he would ask the Sub-Committee to consider measures that would help mitigate potential harm. In particular, to restrict the sale alcohol between 07:00 and 23:00.

Adjournment and Decision

At 8:57pm, 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 application subject to conditions and amendments.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at, NISA, MOSELLE RETAIL UNIT, BROADWATER FARM, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 6HE (BRUCE CASTLE / WEST GREEN) In considering the application, 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 report pack, and the applicant's and objector's representations. Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to GRANT the application subject to the conditions below:

Sale of Alcohol: Monday to Sunday 0700 to 2300 hours

Supply of alcohol OFF the premises. Hours open to Public: Monday to Sunday 0700 to 2300 hours.

CONDITIONS: The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Applicant at pages 60- 62 and 85-86 of the Committee papers, relating to Robust CCTV, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of proxy sales and sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals and Incident Management policies and in addition to a condition that litter will be dealt with so that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter.

The conditions are as follows:

1. CCTV shall be installed, operated, and maintained, to function all times that the premises is open for licensable activities. Said CCTV will comply with the following criteria:
2. (a) The premises will ensure that the system is checked on a regular basis to ensure that the system is working properly and that the date and time are correct. (b) There will be a camera on the entrance to the premises, to capture a clear image of anyone entering. (c) The system will provide coverage of the interior of the premises accessible to the public: (d) The system will record in real time and recordings will be date and time stamped: (e) At all times during operating hours, there will be at least 1 member of staff on the premises who can operate the system sufficiently to allow Police or authorised Council officers other authorised officers of the Licensing Authority (as defined by Section 13 of the Licensing Act 2003) to view footage on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018). (f) Recordings will be kept for a minimum of 31 days and downloaded footage will be provided to the police or other authorised officers of the Licensing Authority (as defined by Section 13 of the Licensing Act 2003) on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018) within 24 hours of any request. (g) Signage stating that CCTV is in operation will be clearly and prominently displayed at the premises.
3. Staff will be trained in alcohol sales and regular refresher training (every 6 months) will also be undertaken. Training records will be made available for inspection within 48 hours of request by the Police or other relevant officers of a responsible authority.
4. All spirits are to be kept behind the till/counter.
5. All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
6. The premises license holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.
7. Premises will not sell alcohol to those who are already intoxicated.

8. Prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at all public exits from the premises requesting customers respect the needs of residents and leave the premises area quietly. These notices shall be positioned at eye level and in a location where those leaving the premises can read them.
9. Delivery drivers/ riders shall be given clear instructions to use their vehicles in a responsible manner so as not to cause a nuisance to any residents or generally outside the license premises; not to leave engines running when the vehicles are parked; and not to obstruct the highway.
10. The premises licence holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.
11. Waste will be disposed of responsibly to prevent odour, and collection times will be scheduled to minimize disruption.
12. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme. (a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer. (b) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office. (c) Premises will ensure staff is trained in how to identify and prevent the 'proxy' sale of alcohol to minors.
13. A written or electronic record of refused sales shall be kept on the premises and completed when necessary. This record shall be made available to Police and/or the Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.

REASONS: The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by Public Health at the Hearing. Whilst sympathetic to the objectors it was noted that the Applicant, and its agent, addressed all the concerns raised robustly and had sought to agree conditions with the Metropolitan Police in advance of the Hearing. In particular the Committee took into account what the Applicants agent stated in relation to paragraph 10.15 of the Revised Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licencing Act 2003 (February 2026). This provides that: 'Shops, stores and supermarkets should normally be free to provide sales of alcohol for consumption off the premises at any times when the retail outlet is open for shopping unless there are good reasons, based on the licensing objectives, for restricting those hours.' In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above conditions balanced the interest of the applicant, the 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.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……17 March 2026……

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 JULY 2026, 7:00PM - 8:55PM

PRESENT: Councillors Nick da Costa (Chair), Luisa Brands and Adam Small

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

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. The Sub-Committee decided to hear item 7 first before proceeding to hear item 6.

6. APPLICATION FOR A REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT THE ARCHIVES, UNIT 10, HIGH CROSS CENTRE, FOUNTAYNE ROAD TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15 4QN (SOUTH TOTTENHAM)

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 made by residents following on from noise nuisance emanating from various events taking place at the premises.
- A copy of the licence could be found on appendix 1 of the agenda papers.
- The premises was located in the Tottenham Hale area and was initially described as a multi-use warehouse event space. It contained a bar, an outside courtyard and a roof event space that was not in use when the licence was initially granted due to further planning requirements needing to be met. This was an ongoing matter. The premises had a capacity estimated to be of about up to 1,600, but not all the event space could be in use at the same time.
- The premises had hosted various late night and all-day raves since the grant of the licence.

- The premises was hired out for various events and the licence allowed for the sale of alcohol and regulated entertainment as well as late night refreshment.
- There were supporting representations received from the Noise team and the Police.
- The licence holder had proposed conditions that could be placed on the licence.

In response to questions, the Licensing Officer stated that:

- The premises would put a pause on anything taking place in the outside area on the ground floor. There was also a roof terrace.

At this point in the proceedings, Mr Luke Elford, representing the licence holder, in response to a question, stated that the licence covered three distinct areas; the ground floor, including an outside area, the fifth floor and the roof terrace. Neither the fifth floor nor the roof terrace had actually been used or built. The only areas that were in use was the ground floor which included a courtyard area.

Presentation by the review applicant

Ms Annelie Kopps, resident and review applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Her flat was directly opposite the premises and she had been disturbed by loud music events that had been held at the ground floor in the outside area of the premises.
- Last year and this year in May, there were several events held and in the past she had tried to contact the Noise team and the Police and she had been unsuccessful. She acted as a representative of other residents in her estate and had therefore contacted the Licensing team because she thought a review application might be more successful.
- When the live events were held, they were extremely loud and rendered various homes unusable.
- It was difficult to do anything in her home. The noise impacted on conversations.
- The current licence did not allow the premises to hold music events in the outside area.
- She was not against the premises or music events at the premises indoors, but she did not want to be affected by loud music events taking place outdoors.

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

- The premises had not contacted or updated residents. In May 2026, the last time there were loud events, some other residents contacted the premises and tried to speak to staff to tell them that it was unbearable for them.
- The premises had been open for a few years. She did not attend the premises but assumed there were events happening throughout the year.
- In the last six or seven weeks since her application, there probably had been events held there. Residents had not been disturbed by events held indoors. The outdoor events were a nuisance. There was a noise management plan as part of the licence. This may be need to be reviewed as well to ensure that if events were only held indoors, there would be no noise emission.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that in more recent times, the outdoor space had very loud music being played. This had culminated in the what was experienced the weekend before the review was made. It was of significant disturbance. There had not

been many residents coming forward following a weekend disturbance from a premises at that particular time. Under the initial management, previously, anything that was taking place at the premises was meant to have been background levels of noise. This had since increased.

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

- The conditions offered were all positive. It was positive that the applicant recognised that there were issues. The applicant wanted to engage with local residents, but there was no need for engagement. She simply wanted no outdoor music events at the premises, rather than have to meet the applicant regularly.
- The noise management plan was important.

Presentation by interested parties

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

- The Noise team had a long history of involvement with the premises.
- Over the last two years, the Noise team had received a number of complaints from residents regarding loud music, particularly during the summer months when the outside areas were used for events.
- Since June 2024, the Noise team had received 15 reports of loud music. Whilst the number may not appear significant in isolation, the complaints were concentrated around the periods when outdoor events took place and this demonstrated a reoccurring issue affecting nearby residents.
- The Council had attempted to work with the premises to address the concerns.
- Warning letters were sent in July 2024 and he had held discussions with the management regarding noise control measures. Despite the interventions, complaints had continued.
- On 27 August 2025, the Council served an abatement notice after officers witnessed a statutory noise nuisance from a residence property. This confirmed that the noise from the premises had reached a level that interfered with residents' enjoyment of their homes. Based on experience and observation, the principal issue was the outside area.
- The premises had not demonstrated that it could adequately control noise generated from the outside area. There remained a high likelihood that public nuisance would continue if licensable activities were permitted to take place there.
- The incident that triggered the review had amounted to a statutory nuisance and officers had been present to witness it.
- The premises had directly undermined the licensing objective of preventing public nuisance.
- The Noise team considered it necessary and proportionate to remove licensable activity from the outside area and to oppose conditions prohibiting speakers and the playing of music in the area.
- The measures were targeted at the source of the complaints and intended to protect the immunity of local residents whilst allowing the business to continue operating within appropriate limits.
- A reduction in licensing hours may need to be considered by the Sub-Committee should it conclude that further measures were necessary to promote the licensing objectives.
- Despite engagement warnings and formal enforcement action, the premises had not sufficiently addressed the ongoing noise issues.
- The evidence demonstrated that the prevention of public nuisance was being undermined and the measures proposed by the Noise team were both proportionate and appropriate.

PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She supported the review application.
- The matter had been referred to the Sub-Committee because, despite previous interventions, there remained significant concerns that the operation of the premises was failing to promote three of the licensing objectives, the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and prevention of public nuisance.
- The purpose of the hearing was not to determine whether isolated incidents had occurred.
- Licensed premises inevitably experienced incidents from time to time.
- The issue was whether the management of the premises had demonstrated that it was capable of promoting the licensing objectives and exercising effective control over the operation of the premises.
- The evidence demonstrated a pattern of management failings rather than a single unfortunate event.
- In relation to the prevention of crime and disorder, police records disclosed a number of the incidents connected with the premises over a relatively short period of time. This included a serious assault in which the victim allegedly lost consciousness, reports of theft connected with the events at the premises, stolen bank cards that were then used fraudulently, information relating to use of prohibited drugs and intelligence received from staff expressing concerns regarding management practices and the handling of the incidents.
- Some information suggested that serious incidents occurring within the premises had not been managed appropriately and had not escalated to senior management or the Police when they should have been.
- Although offences were alleged to have occurred, the concern was apparent failure of the management to recognise, response to and properly deal with incidents.
- Effective management was one of the cornerstones of the Licensing Act. Where management systems failed, the licensing objectives were placed at risk.
- In terms of public safety, on 18 May 2026, a compliance inspection was carried out which identified a number of licensing failures, including the absence of a door supervisor, risk assessment and the absence of alcohol sales training records. These failures resulted in a written warning issued to the designated premises supervisor (DPS) at that time, concerning alleged offenses under the Licensing Act.
- Further concerns related to obstructed emergency exits, medical staff missing from the premises, failures by staff to escalate incidents and wider shortcomings in event safety.
- Some matters had been addressed following Police intervention, the concern was that fundamental controls should already had been in place.
- Compliance should not depend upon regulatory intervention before basic licensing responsibilities were fulfilled.
- In relation to public nuisance, the Police fully supported the evidence presented by the Noise Team.
- There was documented history of complaints relating to amplified music and noise breaking out from the premises.
- The service of an abatement notice coupled with continuing complaints from the local residents demonstrated that previous attempts to resolve the issue had not been achieved.
- Good management should protect residents from nuisance just as effectively as it protected patrons from crime or unsafe conditions.
- When all of the evidence was viewed collectively rather than in isolation, a clear picture began to emerge of repeated crime related incidents, compliance failures, public safety

concerns, ongoing nuisance, issues and information suggesting weaknesses in management oversight.

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

- There had been no issues since the new management team had stated at the premises. The use of the outside areas had ceased and there was no music from the outside area and the bulk of complaints were from the use of that area.
- No complaints were ever submitted regarding the use of the inside area of the premises. Noise team worked until 02:00. The premises had a license until 06:00. If some hours were removed, it would be possible to monitor it more closely.

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

- CCTV recordings should be provided immediately to the Police upon request. There had been an improvement with the new management as before there had been an incident of grievous bodily harm (GBH) and Police had not been called.
- After the new management took over, a sexual offence was reported to the Police. This was an improvement where SIA staff had detained the alleged perpetrator.
- In relation to CCTV, she had spoken with the DPS and he admitted that the premises had some 'blind spots'. CCTV was not covering the dancefloor where the incident had occurred. As the CCTV was not comprehensive, this was a breach of licence. Footage was also not given immediately to officers.
- One incident of GBH had happened on 10 May 2026. This was under the previous management. In the early hours of the morning, two suspects punched a victim on the head, causing him to break out and fall to the floor. Premises staff did not call the Police, but called the Ambulance. The victim called the Police whilst at the hospital.
- Another incident involved a sexual assault on a woman. This happened on 5 July 2026 at 04:34 on Sunday morning. Police attended at 04:44. The call was made by a manager at the premises. SIA staff detained the suspect, who was subsequently arrested by police. CCTV covered the location. However, it was not directly viewable on the scene of the incident. The manager admitted the CCTV had several blind spots, including the dance floor area. The premises needed new cameras. Currently, it had about 30 cameras and it needed about 50 to cover the blind spots.
- CCTV at the premises was not fit for purpose.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer clarified that the licence was for the ground floor, the fifth floor and the roof terrace. However, the fifth floor and the roof terrace were not to be used and subject to planning processes.

Presentation by the licence holder

Mr Luke Elford, Mr Spencer Wyatt and Mr William Wintour representing the licence holder, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- A review application such as this was a rare occurrence for a licensing solicitor. A review application where the causes of the issues had been identified and dealt with did not come around often.

- They apologised to the review applicant, the interested parties and to councillors, but could not apologise for undermining the licensing objectives because they had not done so.
- The blame rested on an operator who was no longer part of the premises.
- They understood the negative impact that a poorly run licensed premises could have. Mr Wintour lived about 200 yards from the premises and he had himself experienced the problems that the premises had caused.
- Making a review application took time and effort, time completing forms, gathering evidence and support.
- They regretted not becoming involved in the premises 12 to 18 months ago. If they had done so, it would be unlikely for the application to have been submitted.
- The documentation submitted contained a letter and a suggestion to conditions that may be imposed if the Sub-Committee agreed that the root cause of the issues at the premises had been established and dealt with.
- Establishing the cause or causes of problems in response to a review application was important.
- The Sub-Committee must direct any remedial attention to any causes and do no more than what was appropriate and proportionate. Some of the suggestions that had been made, for example, reducing the hours of operation to suit the Noise team's working pattern were not appropriate and proportionate suggestions. The Sub-Committee was invited to reject these.
- Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour became involved with the premises when it became apparent to the owners of the building that the previous operators were operating in a way that was causing significant distress and nuisance to those nearby. They had over 50 years of venue and event management experience.
- It was disappointing to hear that the CCTV system at the premises was not adequate. The premises had been operating with the CCTV system the licence holder inherited. If more CCTV was required, more CCTV could be added. They were happy to work with the Police on the issue.
- Positive steps were being taking in terms of making the Police aware of upcoming events and also letting them know how the previous weekend had gone and maintaining regular contact.
- Mr Wintour was focused on community and regeneration. He had realised a long time ago that premises like The Archives only worked when they could host more than just music events.
- At another premises, Mr Wintour worked tirelessly to make progress and turn its reputation around. His community spirit in terms of the use of the premises was already taking place. The main room of the premises was being used for a charity telethon by a Jewish charity raising money for sick and disabled children.
- On screens throughout the premises, it was displayed that the premises had raised over £1.2 million in donations.
- A collaborative approach had been taken regarding the review application to safeguard the premises' future.
- They would suggest modifying the licence by adding appropriate and proportionate conditions. These were available to be seen on the agenda papers.

In response to questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- On the evidence the premises was being significantly mismanaged by the previous operator. This all had taken place prior to Mr Wintour and Mr Wyatt becoming involved at the beginning of June 2026.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer stated that the initial licence applied for in 2021 was under the name of Full Steam Trading Limited and that name had continued to be the premises licence holder to date. One individual was the director of that company initially, before Mr Joe Berger took over in September 2022. He remained the director of Full Steam Trading Limited since that time. Mr Wyatt and Mr Fouad were subsequently added as directors since the review application was submitted. Full Steam Trading was the company that had held the premises licence from the start of the premises up to present time.

In response to further questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The company had the same name, but it was the same only by name.
- Mr Spencer was appointed as a director of the company and Mr Elford was on the Companies House website as of 3 June 2026. Mr. Winter, whose actual name was Hussein Ahmed Fouad, was appointed on 8 June 2026.
- Mr Berger was terminated as a director on the 29 June 2026. He was no longer a director and was never involved with the day-to-day management of the business.
- The actual people that were running this premises previously probably would have been the person who was appointed as DPS.
- The new DPS was Mr Wyatt.
- Neither Mr Wyatt nor Mr Wintour had any involvement with the premises previously before June 2026.
- The previous directors and owners had completely exited the business. There was no involvement with them either in the day-to-day running or non-executive directorships or any sort of attachment to Full Steam Trading Limited. They were not on Companies House. They were not persons with significant control. They had no more involvement with the premises.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that Mr Berger had subsequently removed himself from being a director there as of June 2026. Full Steam Trading was headed by Mr. Fouad and Mr. Wyatt.

In response to more questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- They had inherited the paperwork from the previous ownership and it was under revision. There had been events taking place at the premises and the external area had been in use for smokers and for people to sit outside. However, there had been no music in the outside area or external regulated entertainment.
- They would be revising the noise management plan and once it had been fully revised, it would be resubmitted to officers.
- At present, the CCTV was managed by the office itself. It managed the whole CCTV system throughout the building. Unfortunately, one night when an incident occured, there was no one in the CCTV office.
- Page 92 of the agenda papers stated that the external seating area designated on the plan would be cleared by patrons no later than 23:00.
- A new noise management plans were being done. Mr Wyatt was currently going through all of the documents that had been inherited such as noise management plans, security management plans, venue management plans, right to work and other documents. It was an ongoing piece of work. One that he was going to give particular attention to was

the noise management plan for the premises. They were happy to liaise with any of the parties at this meeting on the plan. However, it would reflect no regulated entertainment outside.

- They had already made structural changes which were planned to be implemented straight away which would deter any activities to be held after 21:00 in the garden area. The premises was currently licensed to 23:00, but this was to change to 21:00 regardless of the activity. There were two sections. One was at the front of the rear of the building. It was utilised for a smoking area during licensed events internally.
- The outdoor area would be closed from 21:00.
- The premises was not planning to host any activities outside until the summer of 2027. Until then, extensive changes were going to be made in the garden.
- The external area of the premises was not suitable to host anything after 21:00. It was too close to residents and the licence holder had to take common courtesy into account when making decisions.

To summarise, Mr. Bellringer stated that due to the level of complaints that received for the outside area, the conditions that proposed in the additional papers were needed to reduce the disturbance that was likely to occur. In recent times, with the new management, there had been positive outcomes and obviously he would like that relationship to continue with the new management in place.

To summarise, PC Costache stated that the Police were not seeking to hold the current DPS responsible for matters that occurred before their appointment. However, the Sub-Committee was entitled to consider what had occurred during their stewardship of the premises. During that period, an allegation of sexual assault had arisen. When Police sought CCTV footage to investigate the allegation, management advised that the system did not cover the relevant area. This was difficult to reconcile with the requirement for a comprehensive CCTV system. The absence of coverage in an area where such a serious allegation could arise raised concerns not only regarding compliance with licence conditions but also regarding the robustness of the current management arrangements and their ability to promote the licensing objectives. She acknowledged the premises had submitted suggested conditions. However, an operating schedule was only effective if followed by the premises. Therefore, the Police supported the review application and respectfully invited members to consider the full range of powers available under the Licensing Act 2003. She invited members to determine which outcome was best and appropriate and proportionate to secure the promotion of the licensing objectives. She supported the reduction of hours and the CCTV issue needed to be addressed.

To summarise, Mr Elford stated that there was no evidence to support reducing operating hours. The evidence was that outside events had caused issues and outside events had been ceased. The Sub-Committee was invited to put in place a condition that prevented outside regulated entertainment taking place. The premises would shut the outside area at 21:00. A range of other conditions that addressed the issues that brought forward the review application which had been agreed by other parties. The premises did not pretend that there was not work to do at the premises. The new licence holders had inherited a difficult premises and were doing their best to improve matters. The process was underway. It was continuing at a pace it would be ensured that everything that took place promoted the licensing objectives.

Adjournment and Decision

At 8:55pm, 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 impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence.

RESOLVED: To grant the review application impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence.

Decision notice

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for the review of a Premises Licence at: **THE ARCHIVES, UNIT 10, HIGH CROSS CENTRE, FOUNTAYNE ROAD TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15 4QN (SOUTH TOTTENHAM)**

In considering the application, 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 objector's representations.

Having carefully considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the grant the review application, impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence and remove the use of the Roof Top Terrace from the licence and use of the outdoor court yard for a period of 3 months subject to the conditions below:

Ground Floor (internal)
Monday to Sunday
Sale of Alcohol 1000 to 0600
Provision of Regulated Entertainment 1000 to 0600
Late Night Refreshment 2300 to 0500

5th Floor (internal)
Monday to Sunday
Sale of Alcohol 1000 to 0200
Provision of Regulated Entertainment 1000 to 0200
Late Night Refreshment 2300 to 0230

The opening hours of the premises:
Monday to Sunday 0800 to 0630

CONDITIONS:
The Committee requires the Respondent to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Respondent at pages 16-17 of the additional papers of the Committee papers in addition to Robust CCTV, Noise Management, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals or minors and Incident Management policies
The conditions are as follows:

1. There shall be no outdoor regulated entertainment.

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. Unless and until there is a cited Noise Management and Dispersal Policy agreed to and approved by the licensing authority in writing use of the outdoor courtyard space is suspended.

4. Once the Noise Management and Dispersal Policy is approved and in place the outdoor court yard space will be cleared of patrons by no later than 21.00.

5. There shall be no use of the Roof Top Terrace and any refence to it is removed from the licence.
6.

(a) The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system as per the minimum requirements of the Haringey Police Licensing Team.

(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.

5. 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.

6. Management must ensure that patrons do not obstruct the public highway in any manner whilst outside the premises.

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. Loudspeakers shall not be located in the entrance and exit of the premises or outside the building.

9. 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.
10. The Premises Licence Holder shall maintain a hotline number for all events taking place at the Premises.

11. The hotline number shall be provided to the Licensing Authority and displayed on any social media or communications regarding events.

12. The Premises Licence Holder shall keep a log (which may be electronic) of all calls received by the hotline number, including the name of the caller (if given) and a brief

description of the issue. The log shall be kept at the Premises and made available to Responsible Authority Officers on request.

13. The Premises Licence Holder shall maintain a hotline email address for all events taking place at the Premises.

14. The hotline email address shall be provided to the Licensing Authority and displayed on any social media or communications regarding events.

15. The Premises Licence Holder shall keep a log (which may be electronic) of all emails received by the hotline email address, including the name of the sender (if given) and a brief description of the issue. The log shall be kept at the Premises and made available to Responsible Authority Officers on request.

16. Both the hotline number and email address shall be monitored for the duration of any event by a competent person appointed by the Premises Licence Holder.

17. The logs for both the hotline number and hotline email address shall be kept for a period of 12 months from the date of call or email before they may be discarded.

18. The Premises Licence Holder will arrange regular residents' meetings (which may take place online) to discuss the operation of the Premises. For the remainder of 2026, residents' meetings shall be held once per calendar month beginning in July 2026.

19. The Premises Licence Holder shall advertise the date and time of the residents' meetings by:
a. Affixing an A4 notice at the main entrance to the Premises from the public highway
b. Providing a copy of that notice to the Licensing Authority by email
c. Providing a copy of that notice to any person who has provided the Premises Licence Holder with their email address for that purpose.

20. The date and time of the residents' meetings shall be advertised at least 7 days before the meetings are due to take place.

21. The Premises Licence Holder shall produce a note (which may be AI generated) of each residents' meeting and a copy of that note shall be served on:
a. The Licensing Authority by email
b. Any person who has provided the Premises Licence Holder with their email address for that purpose
within 10 working days of the residents' meeting having taken place.
Copies of these notes (which may be electronic) shall be kept at the Premises and made available on request to Responsible Authority Officers.

22. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme.
(a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and responsible alcohol sales and a record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer.
(b) Relevant material shall be displayed at the premises.

(a) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office.

REASONS:

The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by all the supporters of the application and the owners and operators of the Premises and the Metropolitan Police.
It was noted that the main area of concern for the Applicant was the prevention of public nuisance objectives being impacted by the noise emanating from the outdoor court yard space and roof top terrace. Given the number of noise complaints associated with the premises the Committee feels strongly that use of the roof top space should be removed from the licence and before any use of the outdoor court yard space can be considered the owners and operators must prove that they can put in place plans to manage the noise and dispersal in relation to the indoor space.
The Committee, whilst noting the numerous noise complaints received by Haringey before the current owners and operators took over, firmly believes that the conditions referred to above will serve to alleviate the worries and concerns raised by the owners and occupiers of neighbouring property.
It should also be noted that the above conditions are legally enforceable and breaching any of them can lead to a review of your premises licence/a prosecution under section 136 of the Licencing Act 2003. The potential sanctions are significant ie 6 months in prison and / or an unlimited fine.
The representative for the owners and operators made reference to Section 177A of the Licensing Act 2003 however this venue has a 1000 plus capacity far in excess of the 'no more than 500 persons' referred to in section 177A subsection 2 (1 C) therefore the Committee did not deem it relevant for the purpose of the current application.
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. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT THOMPSON'S BEER SHOP, 26 VERYAN COURT, PARK ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON N8 8JR (CROUCH END)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- The applicant sought the ability to provide the sale of alcohol Monday to Wednesday from 13:00 to 22:00, Thursday 13:00 to 23:00, Friday and Saturday 12:00 until 23:00 and Sunday from 13:00 to 20:00 for the supply of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises.
- Should the licence be granted, the premises would be able to benefit from the automatic right to be able to provide regulated entertainment
- The application had received representations from the Police and the Noise team, but these representations had been withdrawn.
- There were resident representations and a petition submitted from local residents.
- Section 1.4 of the report should be disregarded by the Sub-Committee.

- The premises was situated in a terrace of residential properties with retail units underneath. The applicant described the business as an independent beer shop and tap room specialising in the sale of craft beer, real ale, cider and related products for consumption both on and off premises.
- The applicant had offered not to do outdoor seating as part of the application.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Alex Holbourn, applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He wished to thank the residents who had taken the time to submit representations.
- He understood why issues had been raised and he hoped to reassure residents and the Sub-Committee that the application promoted the licensing objectives.
- The business was intended to be a positive addition to the area.
- He had lived locally in Crouch End for almost 15 years and opening Thompson's Beer Shop was not simply a business opportunity for him. It was something he wanted to create for the community in which he lived.
- He would be running the shop himself
- He did not wish to create an environment that caused nuisance to neighbours or changed the character of the area.
- The business would be, first and foremost, a specialist independent craft beer shop. Alongside the retail side of the business, patrons would be able to enjoy a carefully selected range of beers and other drinks on the premises.
- His intention was always for the premises to be somewhere quiet, relaxed and welcoming where people could enjoy a good beer in a calm environment.
- The premises was not intended to operate as a pub or a venue focused on late night drinking.
- The premises itself was a very small with space with only a handful of seats. There was no capacity for large groups or a lively drinking atmosphere.
- He wanted the business to become part of the local community. He intended to work with other independent local businesses wherever he could. This could be through collaborations, supporting artists, events, or encouraging people to visit independent shops and restaurants that made the area already special.
- He wanted to add something different to the local high street and make a positive contribution to the community.
- Many of the concerns that had been raised related directly to the four licensing objectives. The prevention of public nuisance, prevention of crime, and disorder, public safety, and the prevention of children from harm.
- He understood the concerns and had worked with the responsible authorities throughout this process. To address the concerns directly, he had agreed to the conditions put forward by the responsible authorities.
- There would be no outdoor seating. Patrons would not be congregating outside the premises. Any recorded music would only ever be low-level background music for customers inside the premises. These were measures specifically intended to minimise any risk of public nuisance.
- He would actively manage the area immediately outside the premises.
- Patrons would not be permitted to take drinks outside and he did not intend the frontage to become a smoking area. If patrons wished to smoke, they would be asked to leave their drinks inside and move away from the front of the premises. If anyone started gathering outside, staff would politely move them move them on.
- He wanted to be a good neighbour and intended to manage the premises accordingly.

- In relation to the rear of the building, the outdoor area at the back of the premises would not be used by patrons at any time. It was not intended to be a customer space and there would be no drinking, seating or gatherings there. Residents used that area and children played there. He hoped this provided reassurance in relation to both public safety and the protection of children from harm.
- In relation to the feedback around earlier closing times, he accepted these, but would ask the Sub-Committee to allow the terminal hour for the sale of alcohol on Friday and Saturday to be 22:00, with last orders taken at 21:30. This reflected the agreement reached with the Police who considered the application and were satisfied these timings were appropriate subject to the agreed conditions. He hoped this reassured the prevention of crime and disorder objective.
- The application was being considered by all of the responsible authorities. Police, the Noise and Nuisance team and the London Fire Brigade had all agreed the licence could be granted provided the agreed conditions were followed.
- If, after operating successfully and demonstrating that the business was well managed, he wished to introduce a very small amount of seasonal outdoor seating with restricted hours. This would be a separate application so it could considered on its own merits.
- He would ask the Sub-Committee to reconsider the proposed condition prohibiting vertical drinking. Whilst he understood its intention, he did not believe it was practical or proportionate as he could not reasonably control whether a person briefly stood with a drink. His commitment was to ensure the premises did not operate as a noisy or a bar-like drinking venue and he therefore asked the Sub-Committee not to impose the condition.
- The premises was not a chain or an investment property. It was his business and he would be running it day to-day. His reputation, his livelihood and his relationship with the local community were tied to the business. It would not make sense for him to create problems for the people he hoped would become his customers.
- He wanted Thompson Beer Shop to become known as a quiet, welcoming, independent beer shop that added something positive to the local area.
- If concerns were ever raised, he would engage openly with residents and the Council to resolve them quickly.
- He hoped he had demonstrated that the application promoted each of the four licensing objectives and he asked the Sub-Committee to grant the application subject to the agreed conditions.

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

- There were no independent craft beer shops in Crouch End.
- The premises would be a dedicated craft beer shop with three fridges, a few craft beers on draft. It would have a few seats. There was nothing like this in Crouch End.
- He did not anticipate the maximum capacity of the premises to exceed more than 10 at any one time.
- He would be happy for a telephone number or an e-mail address to be shared with residents if they had any concerns and he would be happy to have this as a condition on the licence.

Presentation by interested parties

Ms Helen D’Ambrosio, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Residents were concerned that the area had a residential building. There were 18 flats. The only place that had patrons coming in to consume food and smoothies was a cafe

which closed at 16:00. Residents were worried about having drunk people on their doorstep.
- There were already young people who could be seen outside front doors who smoked and threw cigarette butts outside. They also drank alcohol and left cans in the area.
- In the afternoon, there were lots of noisy school children who ran around the area. Having people drinking outside would expose children to the premises and its activities.
- In relation to noise, it was unclear how loud the music is going to be until a business opened up.
- There was a big difference regarding how well the premises operated with the new management as there had been an improvement. However, before there was loud music played at the premises. The premises now had a different clientele including families. The music level was not too high.
- The applicant was willing to work with residents and listen to concerns.

In response to questions, Ms D'Ambrosio informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The new agreements including a terminal hour of 22:00 on Friday and Saturday would address most of her concerns as long as there was not any disorderly behaviour on outside the flats in the pavement or a mess left afterwards. Various shops tended to clean the front of their shops because they did not want it to be messy.
- She did not want to have anybody drinking in the outside area.
- Residents were worried about having people drinking on the in the premises and in the outside area. Off licences did not actually offer consumption of alcohol inside the premises. Patrons brought the alcohol and took it away. No music was played either.

To summarise, Ms D'Ambrosio felt that the applicant had presented well and appeared to want to work with residents.

To summarise, Mr Holbourn stated that he hoped a case that makes it reassuring that it.

Adjournment and Decision

Later, at 8:55pm, 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 application subject to conditions and amendments.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

Decision Notice

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at, Application for a New Premises Licence at Thompson's Beer Shop, 26 Veryan Court, Park Road, Hornsey, London N8 8JR.

In considering the application, 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 report pack, and the applicant's and objector's representations in

particular the withdrawn objections of the Metropolitan Police, the London Fire Brigade and Haringeys Noise and Nuisance Team

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the application subject to the conditions and amendments below:

Regulated Entertainment: Recorded Music
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 21:30 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 22:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 19:30 hours
Sale of Alcohol
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 21:30 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 22:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 20:00 hours
Supply of alcohol **ON** and **OFF** the premises.
Hours open to Public
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 23:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 23:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 20:00 hours

CONDITIONS:

The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to most of the conditions proposed by the Metropolitan Police at page 139-142 of the Committee papers, relating to Robust CCTV, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals or minors and Incident Management policies and in addition to a condition that litter will be dealt with so that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter. However it should be noted that there is no restriction on vertical drinking.

The conditions are as follows:

1. CCTV shall be installed, operated, and maintained, to function all times that the premises is open for licensable activities. Said CCTV will comply with the following criteria:
(a) The premises will ensure that the system is checked on a regular basis to ensure that the system is working properly and that the date and time are correct.
(b) There will be a camera on the entrance to the premises, to capture a clear image of anyone entering.
(c) The system will provide coverage of the interior of the premises accessible to the public:
(d) The system will record in real time and recordings will be date and time stamped:
(e) At all times during operating hours, there will be at least 1 member of staff on the premises who can operate the system sufficiently to allow Police or authorised Council officers to view footage on request.
(f) Recordings will be kept for a minimum of 31 days and downloaded footage will be provided to the police or other authorised officers on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018) within 24 hours of any request.
(g) Signage stating that CCTV is in operation will be clearly and prominently displayed at the premises.
An incident and refusal log [whether kept in written or electronic form] shall be kept at the premises, and made available on request to the police or an authorised officer, which will record:
(a) Any and all allegations of crime or disorder reported at the venue

(b) Any and all complaints received by any party
(c) Any faults in the CCTV system
(d) Any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service
(e) Any refused sales of alcohol
(f) Any and all ejections of patrons
All staff involved in the sale of alcohol shall receive induction and refresher training (every 12 months) relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence.
All training relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence shall be documented and records kept at the premises. These records shall be made available to the Police and/or Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.

2. All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
Suitable beverages other than alcohol (including drinking water) shall be available for consumption.
The maximum number of people on the premises at any one time shall not exceed the capacity limit.
All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
The premises license holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from smoking-related litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.

3. The premises will not sell alcohol to any person or on the behalf of any person, who appears to be drunk.
A personal licence holder is to be present on the premises and supervise the sale of alcohol, or a trained member of staff nominated in writing by the DPS shall always be on duty throughout the permitted hours for the sale of alcohol and when the premises are open to the public.
Prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at all public exits from the premises requesting customers respect the needs of residents and leave the premises area quietly. These notices shall be positioned at eye level and in a location where those leaving the premises can read them.
All refuse and bottles shall be disposed of in bins quietly so as not to disturb neighbours or residents.

4. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme.
(a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and responsible alcohol sales and a record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer.
(b) Relevant material shall be displayed at the premises.

(b) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office.

5. Means of direct contact via telephone/email to be provided to local residents.

6. Periodic meetings with local residents to be arranged to address any concerns raised.

7. There shall be no use of the rear yard area of the premises or the area directly in front of the premises for the consumption of alcohol.

REASONS:

The Committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objector(s). Whilst sympathetic to the objector(s) it was noted that the

Applicant addressed all the concerns raised robustly and had sought to agree conditions with the Metropolitan Police in advance of the Hearing.

In particular the Committee took into account that the Applicant agreed to reduce his trading hours and to confirm that any application re outdoor space would be made separately. He further agreed to provide contact details so that residents might contact him directly with any concerns/complaints re his business.

In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above conditions balanced the interest of the applicant, the 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.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Nick da Costa

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……

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 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 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 was 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 ……

This page is intentionally left blank

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……

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 ……

Report for:	Licensing Committee 26th November 2026
Item number:	7
Title:	Review of Fees and Charges 2027-28 - Licences
Report authorised by:	Eubert Malcolm – Director of Environment
Lead Officer:	Daliah Barrett – Licensing Team Leader – Daliah.barrett@haringey.gov.uk
Ward(s) affected:	All
Report for Key/ Non-Key Decision:	Non-Key

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 The Councils income policy requires an annual review of the level of the fees and charges levied upon service users. The aim of the review is to ensure that income generated ensures full cost recovery and that charges remain in line with increases being experienced in the cost of delivering services.

1.2 A small number of items relating to certain approvals, consents, permits and licences cannot be made by the Executive and are therefore reserved for consideration and decision by the Council's Licensing Committee. That committee is being asked to approve the fees and charges for 2027 - 28

This report proposes an increase of fees for those licensing regimes where the council has the power to set its own fees for 2027 – 28. The fee increases will enable the council to recover its costs in managing and administering these licensing regimes. There is one new charge “promotional activity/product sampling” proposed for administrative procedures for these matters.

2. Recommendations

2.1 That the licensing committee approve fees set out in appendix 1:

i) An increase of 3.5% on existing discretionary fees for 2027 - 28

2.2 Note Licensing Act and Gambling Act premises fees are already set at statutory maximums and make up a significant proportion of the fees collected.

3. Reasons for decision

3.1 It is a requirement of the Council's income policy to review fees and charges annually. The financial position of the council supports the view that levels of fees and charges should be maximised commensurate with full cost recovery of costs taking into account all relevant factors including the effect on service users and any consequent demand for services. A licensing scheme must be reasonable and proportionate to the cost of all the procedures and formalities under the scheme.

3.2 The Supreme Court case of Hemmings and others v Westminster City Council concluded that the amount of the fee is required to be determined every year and further to that a local

authority was precluded from making a profit from the licensing scheme. Furthermore, where a fee covers the costs both of application and of subsequent administration including enforcement, separate fees should be set for each activity.

3.3 Local Government Association Guidance on locally set licensing fees.

The Local Government Association ('LGA') has produced guidance regarding locally set fees for licensing functions. In setting the fees and charges the Council has considered national guidance from the LGA on locally set licence fees. The aim of this is to ensure that the setting of the various fees is proportionate and transparent. In line with this, the legislation only allows Councils to set fees and charges to recover costs incurred.

3.4 To ensure that fees remain reasonable and proportionate it is necessary to establish a regular and robust review process. Annual reviews allow for the fine tuning of fees and allow the Council to take steps to avoid either a surplus or deficit in future years. Where fees charged result in a surplus, then this surplus will be used to reduce the fees charged in the following year. Deficits will similarly be recovered. When setting the fee for administering an application the following costs have been taken into consideration:

a) Basic office administration to process the licence application, such as resources, photocopying, IT data entry.
b) The average cost of officer time where a premises visit is required as part of the authorisation process.
c) Third party costs from experts, such as veterinary attendance during licensing inspections at animal related premises.
d) Liaison with interested parties such as the police and the fire brigade.
e) Management costs for reviewing and authorising the issue of a licence.
f) Expenditure in arranging hearings to consider applications.
g) On costs including IT development, travel expenses, legal and office re-charges, general office expenses such as postage and stationery.
h) Production of licensing policies.
j) Web materials. Advice and guidance.

3.5 When calculating the ongoing enforcement element of a fee the following has been included:

a) The cost of risk-based visits to premises in between licensing inspections and responding to complaints. The figures are based on average officer time, travel and on costs.
b) Expenditure associated with arranging committee meetings to respond to problems.
c) Registers and national reporting.
d) The cost of enforcing against unlicensed businesses excluding any court costs as may be recovered through the courts.

3.6 The fee level must be set to recover the actual costs incurred by the Council in running the regime but not to make a profit. Although the Council does not receive any applications or issue licences for some regimes it still must set a fee to recover the costs of carrying out that function. In this instance the costs are estimated based on similar types of application processes and licences.

3.7 The Council may set fees under the following licensing regimes:

- Auctions
- Animals • Boarding Cats, Boarding & Home Boarding Dogs • Dangerous Wild Animals • Breeding Dogs • Doggy Day Care Establishments • Kennels and Catteries • Animal Exhibitions • Selling Animals as Pets • Hiring out horses • Zoo Primate Licensing.
- Licensed Sex Shops/ Cinema/ Hostess Bar

- Sexual Entertainment Venues
- Entertainment (Other)- Exhibition License • Hypnotism • Sports Ground
- Special Treatment Premises
- Scrap Metal Dealers - Site Licence • Scrap Metal Dealers - Collector's Licence

3.8 Fees under the following licensing regimes are set by statute:

- Gambling - Casino
- Bingo Premises
- Gambling Betting (Other) • Betting Tracks
- Family Entertainment Centre
- Adult Gaming Centre
- Alcohol Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits
- Club Gaming Machine Permit
- Club Gaming Permit
- Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permit (Unlicensed FEC)
- Gaming Machine Permit
- Use Notices
- Occasional use notice
- Lottery

- Explosives and Poisons
- Manufacture and Storage of Explosives
- Poisons
- Fireworks

- Premises licences and club premises certificates issued under the Licensing Act 2003.
- Personal Licence
- Temporary Event Notice

- Pavement Licences

4. Alternative options considered

4.1 Do nothing - this has been discounted as our costs have not disproportionately reduced and if we were not to increase fees we would be subsidising the licensing process.

4.2 Reduction in discretionary fees - consideration has been given to reducing the discretionary fees such as street trading and special treatment but this has been discounted as our costs have not disproportionately reduced and if we were to reduce fees, we would therefore be subsidising this expenditure, which is not permitted.

4.3 A significant increase in fees has been considered but discounted due to this not being cost neutral and would be likely to result in a surplus which is not permitted and may impact negatively on businesses during the current financial climate.

5. Background information

5.1 There are general principles applied to the setting of licence fees:

- they cannot be used to generate a profit, in some cases costs are also permitted to cover other aspects of providing the regulatory scheme, such as enforcement, and fees should be reviewed regularly, any surplus should be identified and carried over to the following year
- it is acceptable to carry forward deficits from previous years

- income from licence fees may only be spent on the specific regime from which they were generated
- fees may not be discriminatory or to be used as an economic deterrent. When not prescribed by statute, licence fees are set on a cost-recovery basis.

5.2 Below are details of the statute and restrictions that apply:

- Pavement licensing - reasonable charges may be made for the cost of administering and enforcing the regime, up to a statutory maximum £500 for new applications and £350 for renewals.
- Licensing Act 2003 – centrally set out in regulations by Parliament.
- Gambling Act 2005 – decided by the Council subject to statutory maxima.
- Street trading fees – reasonable charges may be made for the cost of administering and enforcing the regime in relation to licensed traders. This includes promotional activity on the public highway.
- Massage and Special Treatment -reasonable charges may be made for the cost of administering and enforcing the regulations
- Sex establishment fees – reasonable charges may be made for the cost of administering the regime and enforcing it in relation to licensed traders.
- Leaflet distribution – reasonable charges may be made for the cost of administering the regime and enforcing it in relation to licensed distributors.
- Animal welfare and licensing – cost recovery fee calculation regime set out in government guidance.

5.3 The proposed schedule of fees and charges is set out in appendix 1.

5.4 Where fees are calculated on a cost recovery basis, the proposed fees have been increased by approximately 3.5% to account for rising service delivery costs. The Council overall is under increased pressure from rising inflation and other pressures such as nationally agreed wage increases, energy price increases etc that are having an impact on the price of consumables and the cost of delivering services. Some licensing fees are statutory, but as detailed in section 4.4 above, most other licensing functions are subject to operating under cost recovery in charging reasonable charges, and as such are not immune to the pressures of rising costs.

6.0 Contribution **to the Corporate Delivery Plan 2024-2026 High level Strategic outcomes.**

6.1 **Place and economy.**

6.2 Haringey has a thriving and fair economy from which everyone benefits. The Borough of Culture year will involve a wide range of licensing processes such as localised pop-up market events and integrated market stalls and creative vendor spaces for local food and craft entrepreneurs. The fees set for street trading for example will help support these initiatives to take place lawfully in the public domain.

6.3 Haringey's economy has resilient high streets & town centres at its heart, and businesses are supported to start and grow. The income from fees and charges help to manage demand and cover costs for providing services.

7.0 Climate Change

7.1 The Council is committed to updating its standard street trading conditions, so the following matters are included:

- Ban on single use plastic and polystyrene in street trading.

- Ban on the sale of plastic and helium balloons.
- Requirement and guidance on the use of sustainable food packaging, utensils, drinks containers and bags
- Traders encouraged to make use of litter bin for recycling.
- Commits to encouraging and providing guidance to street traders:
- Encourage traders to use sustainable sourcing of food and drink.
- Encourage traders to use sustainable sources of energy for their trading activities.
- Traders to have adequate receptacles in place to deal with customers' rubbish responsibly.

8. Finance

8.1 This report seeks approval from the Licensing Committee to apply a 3.5% increase to all discretionary fees and charges for 2027/28. 3.5%in line with the wider Council's Fees & Charges policy. The annual review Licensing fees and charges ensure that income generated contributes towards the full cost of administering, managing and delivering the relevant licensing services.

8.2 In setting locally determined fees and charges, the Council has had regard to guidance issued by the Local Government Association (LGA) for licensing functions. The proposed fees have been reviewed to ensure they are reasonable, transparent, and reflective of the costs incurred in delivering the service.

8.3 Fees for premises licences under the Licensing Act 2003 and Gambling Act 2005 are prescribed nationally and are already charged at the statutory maximum levels. Consequently, no inflationary increase has been applied to these fees for 2027/28.

9. Head of Legal & Governance

9.1 The Head of Legal and Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report and comments as follow:

9.2 There are a variety of legislative powers that entitle the Council to charge fees for different licensing activities. In some instances, the Council has no discretion as to the level of the charge. In other cases, the specific legislative provisions allow authorities to decide whether to charge and how much.

9.3 Regulation 18(4) of the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 requires that any discretionary charges that the Council imposes must be reasonable and proportionate to the costs, the procedures and formalities under the licensing scheme and must not exceed the cost of those procedures and formalities.

9.4 Regulation 2 and Schedule 1 of The Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 provide that decisions on certain approvals, consents, permits and licenses (for example premises licences; licenses for street trading) cannot be made by the Executive. Likewise, fees and charges for such approvals, consents, permits and licenses may not be determined by the Council's Executive.

.

9.5 In accordance with Part Three Section B of the Constitution, the Licensing Committee has responsibility for the determining fees and charges under the Licensing Act 2003 and the Gambling Act 2005. In addition, the Committee exercises the functions which are stated not to be the responsibility of The Executive/Cabinet in Regulation 2 and Schedule 1, Paragraph B (Licensing and Registration) of The Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended) and in any Statute or subordinate legislation further amending these Regulations. This includes the fees and

charges that are the subject of this report.:

9.6 The fees and charges for 2027-28 are being increased by inflation reflecting the increased cost of service provision.

9.7 There is no legal reason why the Committee should not adopt the recommendations in this report.

10. Equality

10.1 The council has a Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share protected characteristics and people who do not
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not

10.2 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty. Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

10.3 Through this decision, an increase of 3.5% on existing fees is being proposed. This is to cover the costs of administering and providing the licensing services. This change will have a low impact overall although we understand that some individual licensees might be impacted by the 3.5% rise. We don't hold specific data on protected characteristics of licensees and we do not anticipate disproportionate impacts on any particular groups with protected characteristics. The London Local Authorities Act itself does not allow authorities to issue street trading licenses to anyone under the age of 17. The Council has no discretion in this regard.

11 Use of Appendices

11.1 Appendix 1 -List of fees and charges showing 3.5% increase on discretionary fees.

.

Appendix 2 – EQIA Screening tool

	A	B	D	E
1	**Regulatory Services contd.**	**Current Charge**	**Proposed Charge**	**% Increase**
2		£	£	
3	**THE FEE MAXIMUMS ARE PRESCRIBED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE LEVEL OF FEE APPLIED LOCALLY IS DETERMINED BY THE FULL LICENSING COMMITTEE (Fees set to comply with Secretary of State Maximum Levels)**			
4	**Premises Licence**			
5	**Bingo Club**			
6	New Application	3,150	3150.00	N/A
7	Annual Fee	900	900.00	N/A
8	Application to Vary	1,575	1575.00	N/A
9	Application to transfer	1,080	1080.00	N/A
10	Application for re-Instatement	1,080	1080.00	N/A
11	Application for Provisional Statement	3,150	3150.00	N/A
12	Licence Application (provisional Statement Holder)	1,080	1080.00	N/A
13	Copy Licence	15	15.00	N/A
14	Notification of change	23	23.00	N/A
15	**Betting Premises (excluding Tracks)**			
16	New Application	2,700	2700.00	N/A
17	Annual Fee	600	600.00	N/A
18	Application to Vary	1,350	1350.00	N/A
19	Application to transfer	1,080	1080.00	N/A
20	Application for re-Instatement	1,080	1080.00	N/A
21	Application for Provisional Statement	2,700	2700.00	N/A
22	Licence Application (provisional Statement Holder)	1,080	1080.00	N/A
23	Copy Licence	15	15.00	N/A
24	Notification of change	23	23.00	N/A
25	**Tracks**			
26	New Application	2,250	2250.00	N/A
27	Annual Fee	900	900.00	N/A
28	Application to Vary	1,125	1125.00	N/A
29	Application to transfer	855	855.00	N/A
30	Application for re-Instatement	855	855.00	N/A
31	Application for Provisional Statement	2,250	2250.00	N/A

31	Application for Provisional Statement	2,250	2250.00	N/A
32	Licence Application (provisional Statement Holder)	855	855.00	N/A
33	Copy Licence	15	15.00	N/A
34	Notification of change	23	23.00	N/A
35	**Family Entertainment Centres**			
36	New Application	1,800	1800.00	N/A
37	Annual Fee	675	675.00	N/A
38	Application to Vary	900	1000.00	N/A
39	Application to transfer	855	855.00	N/A
40	Application for re-Instatement	855	855.00	N/A
41	Application for Provisional Statement	1,800	1800.00	N/A
42	Licence Application (provisional Statement Holder)	855	855.00	N/A
43	Copy Licence	15	15.00	N/A
44	Notification of change	23	23.00	N/A
45	**Adult Gaming Centres**			
46	New Application	1,800	1800.00	N/A
47	Annual Fee	900	1000.00	N/A
48	Application to Vary	900	1000.00	N/A
49	Application to transfer	1,080	1080.00	N/A
50	Application for re-Instatement	1,080	1080.00	N/A
51	Application for Provisional Statement	1,800	1800.00	N/A
52	Licence Application (provisional Statement Holder)	1,080	1080.00	N/A
53	Copy Licence	15	15.00	N/A
54	Notification of change	23	23.00	N/A
55	**Temporary Use Notices** - £500.00 per application	500	500.00	N/A
56	**Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permit (more than two machines) Occasion on which fee may be payable**			
57	Grant	150	150.00	N/A
58	Existing operator Grant	100	100.00	N/A
59	Variation	100	100.00	N/A
60	Transfer	25	25.00	N/A

61	Annual Fee	50	50.00	N/A	
62	Change of name	25	25.00	N/A	
63	Copy of Permit	15	15.00	N/A	
64	**Licensed Premises Automatic Notification Process (Up to two machines) Occasion on which fee may be payable**				
65	On notification- up to 2 category C or D machines only	50	50.00	N/A	
66	**Club Gaming Permits Occasion on which fee may be payable**				
67	Grant	200	200.00	N/A	
68	Grant (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100	100.00	N/A	
69	Existing operator Grant	100	100.00	N/A	
70	Variation	100	100.00	N/A	
71	Renewal	200	200.00	N/A	
72	Renewal (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100	100.00	N/A	
73	Annual Fee	50	50.00	N/A	
74	Copy of Permit	15	15.00	N/A	
75	*Club Machine Permits Occasion on which fee may be payable*				
76	Grant	200	200.00	N/A	
77	Grant (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100	100.00	N/A	
78	Existing operator Grant	100	100.00	N/A	
79	Variation	100	100.00	N/A	
80	Renewal	200	200.00	N/A	
81	Renewal (Club Premises Certificate holder)	100	100.00	N/A	
82	Annual Fee	50	50.00	N/A	
83	Copy of Permit	15	15.00	N/A	
84	*Family Entertainment Centre Gaming Machine Permits Occasion on which fee may be payable*				
85	Grant	300	300.00	N/A	
86	Renewal	300	300.00	N/A	
87	Existing operator Grant	100	100.00	N/A	

88	Change of name	25	25.00	N/A	
89	Copy of Permit	15	15.00	N/A	
90	**Prize Gaming Permits Occasion on which fee may be payable**				
91	Grant	300	300.00	N/A	
92	Renewal	300	300.00	N/A	
93	Existing operator Grant	100	100.00	N/A	
94	Change of name	25	25.00	N/A	
95	Copy of Permit	15	15.00	N/A	
96	Registration of small Lotteries				
97	Fee for initial registration:	40	40.00	N/A	
98	Fee for annual renewal:	20	20.00	N/A	
99	**1. REGISTRATION OF PREMISES FOR COMPETITIVE BIDDING** (Locally set – no present holders) (GREATER LONDON COUNCIL GENERAL POWERS ACT 1984)				
100	Fee for Registration	320	320.00	N/A	

^ Statutory Fees ^

	A	B	D	E	F	G	H
1	**Regulatory Services contd.**	**Current Charge 2026/27**	**2027/28**	**increase 3%**	**rounded figure**		
2		£					
3							
4	**6. Sex Entertainment Venue**						
5	New Registration fee:	4050	4191.75	3.5%	4192		
6	Annual Renewal fee	2611	2702.39	3.5%	2702		
7	Hypnosis	675	698.63	3.5%	699		
8	**7. Special Treatment Premises(See Regulations for Class Classification)**						
9	**Class 1:**						
10	Applicants fee	733	758.66	3.5%	759		
11	Per additional person authorised to give treatment	533	551.66	3.5%	552		
12	**Class 2:**						
13	Applicants fee	733	758.66	3.5%	759		
14	Per additional person authorised to give treatment	138	142.83	3.5%	143		
15	**Class 3:**						
16	Applicants fee	276	285.66	3.5%	286		
17	Per additional person authorised to give treatment	131	135.59	3.5%	136		
18	**Class 4:**			3.5%			
19	Applicants fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214		
20	Per additional person authorised to give treatment	118	122.13	3.5%	122		
21	Exempt MST registration fee	105	108.68	3.5%	109		
22	per additional extempt therapist	37	38.30	3.5%	38		
23	**Scrap Metal**						
24	Collectors	345	357.08	3.5%	357		
25	Site	469	485.42	3.5%	485		
38	Licence to store explosives where no minimum separation distance or a 0 metres minimum separation distance is prescribed	1 year	113.00				
39		2 years	147.00				
40		3 years	181.00				
41		4 years	215.00				

41	metres minimum separation distance is prescribed	4 years	215.00		
42		5 years	248.00		
43	Renewal of licence to store explosives where no minimum separation distance or a 0 metres minimum separation distance is prescribed	1 year	56.00		
44		2 years	90.00		
45		3 years	125.00		
46		4 years	158.00		
47		5 years	193.00		
48	All year round licence - in addition to storage licence fee		500.00		
49	Variation (i.e. changing name/address of licence holder on current licence)		38.00		
50	**Regulatory Services. Exhibition Licenses**	**Proposed Charge**			
51		£			
52					
53	**(Licensing Fees set locally)**				
54	(Only one Licence at the present time – Alexandra Palace)				
55					
56	**FEES PAYABLE ARE ON THE FOLLOWING SCALES Capacity (Maximum permitted number of persons)**				
57	Up to100	1208.94	1251.25	3.5%	
58	101-200	2403.82	2487.95	3.5%	
59	201-300	3612.67	3739.11	3.5%	
60	301-400	4768.28	4935.17	3.5%	
61	401-500	5978.44	6187.69	3.5%	
62	501-1000	7774.29	8046.39	3.5%	
63	1001-1500	10244.50	10603.06	3.5%	
64	1501-2000	14813.59	15332.07	3.5%	
65	2001-2500	18323.01	18964.32	3.5%	
66	2501-5000	38710.80	40065.68	3.5%	
67	5001 plus	62974.88	65179.00	3.5%	
	For new applicants an introductory				

67	5001 plus	62974.88	65179.00	3.5%
68	For new applicants an introductory discount of 50% for the Licenses up to 100 persons non-refundable			
69	Additional charge for each extension of hours beyond 11.00 p.m. per day	1,151.37	1,191.67	3.5%
70	Additional charge for each extension of hours beyond 2.00 a.m. per day	2,289.35	2,369.48	3.5%
71	Transfer Fee	3,440.64	3,561.06	3.5%
72	Duplicate Licence	4,541.22	4,700.16	3.5%
73	**Exhibition Licenses**	5,693.76	5,893.04	3.5%
74	Booking Office Licence	7,774.29	8,046.39	3.5%
75	Transfer of above	10,575.25	10,945.38	3.5%
76	Variation of Annual Licence	14,813.15	15,331.61	3.5%
77	**Pavement licence (set in regulations)**	New app -£500		
78		Transfer - £350		
79				

^Other^

	A	B	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	**Regulatory Services**	**Current Charge 2026/27**	**2027/28**	**increase 3%**	**rounded figure**					
2		£								
3										
4	**1.STREET TRADING**									
5	**a)APPLICATION FEES FOR LICENCES**									
6	Traditional Stalls, Tottenham Hotspur Match day	181	187.3	3.5%	187					
7	Trading and Displays Outside Shop Premises	181	187.3	3.5%	187					
8	Application/renewal for 3 Years	181	187.3	3.5%	187					
9	Application/renewal for 2 years or less	122	126.3	3.5%	126					
10	Application for temporary licence for six months or less	74	76.6	3.5%	77					
11	Application for temporary licence for six month or less on private land	353	365.4	3.5%	365					
12	Application for Promotional activity perday/per installation.	497	514.4	3.5%	514		additional costs for trailers			
13	Additional person per day	67	69.3	3.5%	69					
14	Application for Promotional activity for organised events affiliated with Spurs	Cost on application								
15	**Street Festivals/approved events** Temporary licence for 1 day	37	38.3	3.5%	38					
16	**Tables and chairs outside catering establishments** Application/renewal for 1 year	96	99.4	3.5%	99					
17	Temporary Licence for six months or less	62	64.2	3.5%	64					
18	**Variations of Licences**									
19	Application for variation made at time of renewal	no fee								
20	Application for variation made during term of Licence	119	123.2	3.5%	123					
21	**b)WEEKLY CHARGES PAYABLE IN ADDITION TO ABOVE FEES**									
22	Tottenham Hotspur Match day stalls selling refreshments	71	73.5	3.5%	74					
23	Tottenham Hotspur match day non-food stalls	28	29.0	3.5%	29					
24	Small stalls trading 6 days or more	49	50.7	3.5%	51					
25	Temporary small stalls trading two fixed days	37	38.3	3.5%	38					

23	days	37	38.3	3.5%	38
26	Refreshment and all other large stalls	92	95.2	3.5%	95
27	Approved extensions to large stalls (per sq. metre)	22	22.8	3.5%	23
28	Displays of good outside shops (per Sq. metre)	22	22.8	3.5%	23
29	Tables and chairs outside catering establishments (per sq. metre)	20	20.7	3.5%	21
30	Temporary licence for 6 months or less on private land (not Spurs related)	1050	1086.8	3.5%	1087
31	Private Land (Spurs match days non -food stall)per year*	945	978.1	3.5%	978
32	Private Land (Spurs match days food stall)per year*	1050	1086.8	3.5%	1087
33	**Other Additional Charges**				
34	Removal by council of goods, stalls, tables, chairs left in street outside trading hours	315	326.0	3.5%	326
35	Daily storage of same by Council	217	224.6	3.5%	225
36	Removal and disposal of refuse by council in default of licence holder	Actual cost incurred + 30% Establishment Charge			
37	**Refunds by Council** Refusal to renew licence (other than temporary licence)	Whole Fee			
38	Refusal to grant a licence	50% of fee			
39	**Enforcement**				
40	Release fee for the removal and one day storage of a vehicle seized In lieu of legal proceedings	339	350.9	3.5%	351
41	Additional daily charge (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays	193	199.8	3.5%	200
42	**Refunds by council** Refusal to renew licence	Whole Fee			
43	Refusal to grant licence	50% of fee			

44	**Markets in Haringey (POP UPS)**					
45	1 trading day	36	37.3	3.5%	37	
46	3 trading days -(1 LOCATION ONLY NON TR	57	59.0	3.5%	59	
47	**Yearly /12months trading at a market (1 day per month) non transferable or refundable**	176	182.2	3.5%	182	
48						
49						
50	Market Operator application fee - (CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION TO OPERATE A TEMP/POP UP MARKET AT A GIVEN LOCATION)	184	190.4	3.5%	190	
51	1 TO 50 PITCHES PER DAY	105	108.7	3.5%	109	
52	1 TO 75 PITCHES PER DAY	158	163.5	3.5%	164	
53						
54	**Occasional Licence**					
55	Occasional sales stalls or pitches (discretionary reduction for educational, charitable establishments)		250 + 20 per stall (car boot)		250 +20	
56						
57	Leaflet distribution		80 per person per day*			
58	STREET TRADING ENFORCEMENT					
59	CONTRAVENTIONS	FPNs (limits set in statute)				
60	Contravention of a condition of a street trading licence or temporary licence	100				
61	Making a false statement in connection with an application for a street trading licence or temporary licence	125				
62	Resisting or obstructing an authorised officer	250				
63	Failure to produce a street trading licence when asked to by an authorised officer	100				

61	licence	125				
62	Resisting or obstructing an authorised officer	250				
63	Failure to produce a street trading licence when asked to by an authorised officer	100				
64	Illegal Street Trading	150				
65						
66	Non football trading day/Events	276	285.66	3.5%	286	
67						
68						
69	*Leadlet distribution - Not on match or event days in High Road Tottenham or Finsbury Park.					
70						
71	*Trading on Private land near Spurs on event days - £380 per event day.					
72						
73						

^Street Trading^

	A	B	C	E	F	G
1	**Activity**	type	**Current Charge 2026/27**	**2027/28**	**increase 2.1%**	**rounded figure £**
2						
3	**Animal Boarding (commercial)**	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
4	1 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
5	2 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
6	3 year licence	Grant fee	416	430.56	3.5%	431
7	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		463	479.21	3.5%	479
8						
9	**Animal Boarding (Domestic)**	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
10	1 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
11	2 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
12	3 year licence	Grant fee	416	430.56	3.5%	431
13	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		463	479.21	3.5%	479
14						
15	**Dog Breeding**	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
16	**If also a**					
17	1 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
18	2 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
19	3 year licence	Grant fee	387	400.55	3.5%	401
20	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		270	279.45	3.5%	279
21						
22	**Pet Shops**	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
23	1 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
24	2 year licence	Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
25	3 year licence	Grant fee	416	430.56	3.5%	431
26	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		463	479.21	3.5%	479
27						
28	**Keeping or training animals for exhibition (3 year licence by default) (performance)**	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
29		Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
30	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		132	136.62	3.5%	137
31						
32	**Dangerous Wild Animal**					
33	1 Species	App Fee	552	571.32	3.5%	571
34		Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214

34		Grant fee	207	214.25	3.5%	214
35	Additional species of variation to add		207	214.25	3.5%	214
36	Vet Fees - dependant on inspection		767	793.85	3.5%	794
37						
38	**Riding Establishment**	on request				
39						
40						
41	**Additional Licensable activites**		207	214.25	3.5%	214
42						
43	**Variation to licence/ re-evaluation of star rating**		207	214.25	3.5%	214
44						
45	**Transfer of licence due to death of licensee**		207	214.25	3.5%	214
46						
47	**Replacement of licence**		25		N/A	25
48						
49						
50	any additianal visits by city of London Vets will be charged seperately.					
51						
52	each activity is broken down to number of animals which is shown on your website but does not change the fees					

^Animal^

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment Screening Tool				
1	Lead officer contact details: DALIAH BARRETT			
2	Date: 21/10/26			
3	Summary of the proposal: FEES AND CHARGES			
	Response to Screening Questions	**Yes**	**No**	Please explain your answer.
a) Type of proposal				
4.	Is this a new proposal or a significant change to a policy or service, including commissioned service?		X	The various pieces of legislation administered in the team all require a fee to be paid by the applicant to ensure a valid application is submitted. The fee submitted pays for the processing and or enforcement of that particular licensing regime.
5.	Does the proposal remove, reduce or alter a service or policy?		X	
6.	Will there be a restructure or significant changes in staffing arrangements? Please see the restructure pages for guidance for restructure EqIAs.		X	
7.	If the service or policy is not changing, have there been any known equality issues or concerns with current provision. For example, cases of discrimination or failure to tackle inequalities in outcomes in the past?		X	
b) Known inequalities				
8.	Could the proposal disproportionally impact on any particular communities, disadvantaged or vulnerable residents?		X	We do not have geographical locations information/evidence held of applicants. the traditional traders reside all over London and any temp traders are able to apply and get a

				temporary one off trading at any given time there are no restriction as to who can apply, but all applications are considered under the criteria set in the legislation by ensuring there would be sufficient space in the street and that they are not selling restricted commodities such as knives, second-hand heaters etc. Both of these matter are set in legislation and the Council ensure compliance.
9.	Is the service targeted towards particular disadvantaged or vulnerable residents? *This can be a service specifically for a group, such as services for people with Learning Disabilities. It can also be a universal service but has specific measures to tackle inequalities, such as encouraging men to take up substance misuse services.*		X	We do not have any evidence that certain wards are more affected than others or any proxy indicators that certain groups are disproportionately impacted.
10.	Are there any known inequalities? For example, particular groups are not currently accessing services that they need or are more likely to suffer inequalities in outcomes, such as health outcomes.		X	
11	If you have answered yes to at least one question in both sections a) and b), Please complete an EqIA.			If a decision is taken not to proceed with a full EqIA, please document carefully your reasons here: *For example:* • *The proposal is likely to have no/minimal impact on groups that share the protected characteristics or other disadvantaged groups* • *The service currently is effective in tackling inequalities and it is not changing*

				• *Any changes will not have any impact on service users, residents or staff*

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Licensing Committee 26th November 2026

Item number: 8

Title: Future changes to Gambling Act 2005
Impact Assessments Briefing / Aim to permit

Report authorised by : Eubert Malcolm – Director Environment

Lead Officer: Daliah Barrett - Licensing Team Leader.

Ward(s) affected: All

Report for Key/ Non Key Decision:

1. Describe the issue under consideration

To inform Committee of the changes to be made to the application process for gambling licences and the introduction of impact assessments.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

N/A

Recommendations

To note the briefing

3. Reasons for decision

N/A

4. Alternative options considered

N/A

5. Background information

6. The English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act received Royal Assent on 26 April 2026 ("Act"). Section 87 of the Act introduces Gambling Impact Assessments by inserting two new sections to the Gambling Act 2005 ('the 2005 Act'), namely sections 153A and 165A. The sections are to be brought into force by regulation on a date yet to be appointed.

7. ISSUES

Once in force these amendments will allow a licensing authority to publish a 'Gambling Impact Assessment' (GIA) where the authority considers the grant of any 'relevant licence' in respect of premises in one or more parts of their area is not likely to be reasonably consistent with one or more of the licensing objectives because:

7.1 The cumulative impact of relevant licences in respect of premises in the affected part(s), or Other reasons which relate to that licensing objective, or those licensing objectives, and to the affected part(s).

A 'relevant licence' has been defined as being a bingo premises licence, adult gaming centre premises licence, family entertainment centre premises licence or a betting premises licence. As part of any published assessment, the authority

must set out evidence for how they have come to the opinion that the grant of any 'relevant licence' would not be reasonably consistent with the objectives set out above.

7.2 Authorities will also be required to review any published GIA from time to time, and should the authority take the view that the assessment should be revised or withdrawn, they must publish any revision.

7.3 Where an application is submitted for a relevant licence and a GIA has been published and the authority has included in its Statement of Gambling Principles that there will be a presumption to refuse applications for relevant licences. Then it will be deemed lawful for the authority to refuse such application solely on the ground that it falls within the scope of the GIA, thus undermining the current obligation to 'aim to permit' under section 153 of the Act.

7.4 The amendments allow licensing authorities to limit premises licence numbers. The proposal includes provision to allow licensing authorities to frame the GIA by reference to the grant of relevant licences in excess of a number specified in the assessment. An application would fall within the scope of the GIA if the grant of such application would result in the number of relevant licences specified in the assessment being exceeded.

7.5 The amendments however also state that refusing an application will be unlawful where the applicant asserts in the application that the grant would be reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives or objectives set out in the GIA and provides evidence that the grant would be reasonably consistent with the objectives.

7.6 Whilst Haringey currently has 61 relevant betting premises, Officers will review the position and any guidance which is subsequently produced so that the Licensing Authority is in a position to consider the matter fully when the powers come into force.

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 Committee should note the content of this report.

9 Contribution to the Corporate Delivery Plan 2022-2024 High level Strategic outcomes'

N/A

10 Carbon and Climate Change

N/A

11 Statutory Officers comments (Director of Finance (procurement), Head of Legal and Governance, Equalities)

N/A

Finance

N/A

Procurement

N/A

Head of Legal & Governance [Name and title of Officer completing these comments]

N/A

Equality

N/A

12 **Use of Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Gambling Impact assessments/ Aim to permit Briefing

13 Background papers

This page is intentionally left blank

Briefing on Government Reforms to the Gambling Act 2005

Gambling Impact Assessments and Changes to the "Aim to Permit" Principle

Author: Licensing Team Leader
Committee: Licensing Committee
Classification: For Information
Date: 26TH November 2026

Purpose

To brief Members on emerging reforms to the Gambling Act 2005 that are intended to strengthen the powers of local authorities to manage the location and concentration of gambling premises and to address gambling-related harm within local communities.

The briefing outlines:

- The proposed introduction of **Gambling Impact Assessments (GIAs)**.
- Proposed changes to the operation of Section 153 of the Gambling Act 2005 ("aim to permit").
- The implications of these reforms for local authorities.
- The current legal status of the reforms. (they are NOT yet enacted)

1. Note the Government's proposed reforms to gambling premises licensing.
2. Note that the proposed Gambling Impact Assessment powers are not yet in force.
3. Note that the Council must continue to determine applications under the existing provisions of the Gambling Act 2005 until the reforms are commenced.
4. A further update when Government guidance and commencement regulations are published.

Legal Status of the Reforms

Members should note that while provisions relating to **Gambling Impact Assessments (GIAs)** and amendments affecting the operation of the Section 153 "aim to permit" principle have been included within the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026, the relevant provisions have **not yet been commenced** and are therefore **not currently in force**. Further commencement regulations, secondary legislation and guidance are expected before licensing authorities can exercise these powers.

- The existing provisions of the Gambling Act 2005 continue to apply.
- Licensing authorities remain under a statutory duty to "aim to permit" gambling premises where applications satisfy the relevant statutory requirements.
- Licensing authorities cannot currently refuse applications on the basis of a Gambling Impact Assessment.
- No implementation date has yet been published and detailed guidance from the Gambling Commission remains outstanding.

Accordingly, Members should regard the reforms outlined in this report as **anticipated future changes rather than current powers available to the Council**. Applications must continue to be determined under the existing legislative framework.

Background

Under Section 153 of the Gambling Act 2005, licensing authorities are required to "aim to permit" the use of premises for gambling provided that applications are:

- In accordance with relevant codes of practice;
- Reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives;
- In accordance with guidance issued by the Gambling Commission; and
- In accordance with the authority's Statement of Principles.

Historically, this has created a presumption in favour of granting gambling premises licences where statutory requirements are met. Licensing authorities have generally been unable to refuse applications solely because there are already a large number of gambling premises in an area or because local residents object to further provision.

The reforms have emerged from the Government's review of gambling legislation and longstanding concerns raised by councils, public health organisations and the Local Government Association regarding gambling-related harm and the concentration of gambling premises within vulnerable communities.

Gambling Impact Assessments (GIAs)

What are Gambling Impact Assessments?

The reforms would enable licensing authorities to prepare and publish **Gambling Impact Assessments (GIAs)** for specific geographical areas. These assessments would allow councils to identify areas where additional gambling premises may contribute to local harm or undermine the licensing objectives.

The purpose is broadly comparable to the cumulative impact approach used in alcohol licensing. A GIA may consider:

- Concentrations of gambling premises.
- Gambling-related harm.
- Local deprivation.
- Presence of vulnerable populations.
- Local community impacts.
- The cumulative effect of additional premises.

Types of Premises Potentially Affected

The reforms are expected to apply to:

- Betting shops.
- Adult Gaming Centres.
- Family Entertainment Centres.
- Bingo premises.

Proposed Changes to Section 153 ("Aim to Permit")

Current Position

The current legislation requires authorities to "aim to permit" gambling premises where statutory criteria are met. Licensing authorities cannot generally take account of demand or market saturation when considering applications.

Proposed Position

The reforms would significantly modify the practical effect of Section 153.

Where a Gambling Impact Assessment has been adopted, licensing authorities would be able to establish a presumption against granting certain gambling premises licences within areas covered by the assessment. Applicants would then need to demonstrate that granting the licence would remain consistent with the licensing objectives.

This would represent a substantial departure from the current position and provide councils with a stronger basis for resisting new gambling premises in areas where evidence indicates gambling-related harm or over-concentration.

Implications for Local Authorities

Greater Ability to Manage Clustering

Authorities would gain powers to address concentrations of gambling premises in particular areas where there is evidence that additional premises may contribute to harm or undermine licensing objectives.

This responds directly to concerns expressed by many councils that existing powers do not adequately allow them to manage gambling saturation.

Stronger Focus on Gambling Harm

The reforms are likely to encourage greater use of:

- Public health evidence.
- Gambling harm research.
- Local Area Profiles.
- Vulnerability mapping.
- Community safety information.
- Socio-economic indicators.

Enhanced Local Decision-Making

Licensing authorities would be able to develop locally tailored policies and identify areas where additional gambling premises may be inappropriate based on local circumstances and evidence.

Examples might include areas with:

- Existing clusters of betting shops.
- High levels of deprivation.
- Schools and youth facilities.
- Gambling treatment services.
- Identified gambling-related harm.

Increased Evidence and Resource Requirements

Should the reforms come into force, councils wishing to utilise the new powers would need to develop and maintain a robust evidence base, including:

- Local gambling profiles.
- Mapping of existing premises.
- Public health and deprivation data.
- Community consultation outcomes.
- Analysis demonstrating cumulative impact.

This is likely to require additional officer resources and partnership working with public health, community safety and external stakeholders.

Potential for Appeals and Legal Challenge

Any future refusals based upon a GIA are likely to be closely scrutinised and may result in appeals, particularly during the early implementation period. Licensing authorities will need to ensure their policies and evidence base are robust, proportionate and capable of withstanding challenge.

Implications for the Council

Should the reforms be commenced, the Council would have an opportunity to:

- Develop a borough-wide Gambling Impact Assessment.
- Strengthen its response to gambling-related harm.
- Better manage the location and concentration of gambling premises.
- Support wider public health and community safety objectives.
- Exercise greater local control over future gambling developments.

However, the successful use of these powers would depend upon the availability of robust evidence and the adoption of an appropriate policy framework.

Conclusion

The proposed introduction of Gambling Impact Assessments and modification of the Section 153 "aim to permit" principle represent the most significant proposed reforms to gambling premises licensing since the enactment of the Gambling Act 2005. If commenced, they will provide local authorities with significantly stronger powers to manage gambling premises and address gambling-related harm.

However, Members should note that these changes are **not yet in force**, and the Council must continue to determine applications in accordance with the current provisions of the Gambling Act 2005, the Council's Statement of Principles and guidance issued by the Gambling Commission until the relevant provisions are formally commenced by Government.

Future Changes to the Gambling Act 2005

Gambling Impact Assessments and the “Aim to Permit” principle

Licensing Committee | 26 November 2026
For information

Key message: proposed reforms could strengthen local control, but they are not yet in force.

Executive summary

What Members need to take away from the briefing

1. Reform direction

Proposals would give licensing authorities a stronger evidence-based role in managing the location and concentration of gambling premises.

2. Two central changes

Gambling Impact Assessments (GIAs) and a material change to the practical effect of Section 153, the “aim to permit” duty.

3. Current legal position

The briefing states the relevant provisions are not yet commenced. Existing Gambling Act 2005 provisions continue to apply.

Member focus Note the direction of travel now; do not treat the proposed GIA powers as available decision-making tools until commencement, secondary legislation and guidance are in place.

Current framework: Section 153

What “aim to permit” means today

Current duty

Licensing authorities are required to “aim to permit” the use of premises for gambling where applications satisfy the statutory criteria.

Demand or market saturation is not generally a basis for refusal.

1. **Codes of practice**

   Application is in accordance with relevant codes of practice.

2. **Licensing objectives**

   Application is reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives.

3. **Commission guidance**

   Application follows Gambling Commission guidance.

4. **Statement of Principles**

   Application accords with the authority’s Statement of Principles.

Proposed Gambling Impact Assessments

A locally evidenced approach to areas of concern

A GIA could identify geographical areas where additional gambling premises may contribute to local harm or undermine the licensing objectives.

Concentration

of gambling premises

Harm

gambling-related harm

Deprivation

local deprivation

Vulnerability

presence of vulnerable populations

Community

local impacts

Cumulative effect

of additional premises

Premises expected to be affected

Betting shops • Adult Gaming Centres • Family Entertainment Centres • Bingo premises

How the proposed decision framework would shift

From a strong presumption to evidence-led local control

CURRENT

“Aim to permit”

Where statutory requirements are met, the framework generally favours grant. Existing concentration and resident objection alone do not provide a general saturation-based refusal route.



PROPOSED

GIA-backed presumption

Where a GIA has been adopted, the briefing anticipates a presumption against certain new gambling premises in the covered area, with applicants needing to demonstrate consistency with the licensing objectives.

Important: this is an anticipated future framework, not a current power.

Implications for local authorities

More leverage, but a higher evidential and governance burden

Manage clustering	Potential to address concentrations where evidence shows additional premises may contribute to harm.
Use broader evidence	Public health, local area profiles, vulnerability mapping, community safety and socio-economic indicators.
Tailor local policy	Identify areas where additional premises may be inappropriate based on local circumstances and evidence.
Resource the evidence base	Develop and maintain profiles, mapping, consultation and cumulative-impact analysis.
Prepare for challenge	Policies and evidence will need to be robust, proportionate and capable of withstanding appeal.

What this could mean for Haringey

Practical opportunities and dependencies highlighted in the briefing

Potential opportunities

- Develop a borough-wide Gambling Impact Assessment
- Strengthen the response to gambling-related harm
- Better manage premises location and concentration
- Support wider public health and community safety objectives

Key dependencies

- Robust local evidence base
- Appropriate policy framework
- Officer resource and partnership working
- Government commencement, secondary legislation and guidance

Suggested preparatory focus

The briefing supports early consideration of data, mapping, public-health evidence and partnership arrangements, while keeping formal licensing decisions within the existing statutory framework until the new provisions are commenced.

Legal status and Member takeaways

What remains unchanged until commencement

NOT YET IN FORCE The briefing states that the relevant GIA and Section 153 changes have not yet been commenced.

Continue under the Gambling Act 2005	Applications must continue to be determined under the existing legislative framework and current Statement of Principles.
Do not rely on a GIA to refuse today	The briefing expressly states that licensing authorities cannot currently refuse an application on the basis of a Gambling Impact Assessment.
Await implementation detail	No implementation date is stated in the briefing; further regulations, secondary legislation and Gambling Commission guidance are expected.
Return to Committee	A further update should follow when guidance and commencement regulations are published.

Committee position: note the proposed reforms and the current legal status.

Report for: Licensing Committee

Item number: 9

Title: Mayor of London Call-In Powers for Licensing Applications: Implications for the Licensing Authority

Report authorised by : Eubert Malcolm Director for Environment

Lead Officer: Daliah Barrett – Licensing Team Leader

Ward(s) affected: All wards

Report for Key/ Non Key Decision: N/A

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 To inform Members of new legislation introducing a power for the Mayor of London to review and potentially direct changes to certain premises licence decisions made by London licensing authorities, and to advise Members of the likely implications for the Council's licensing functions.

1.2 New regulations coming into force on 3 November 2026 establish a framework under which the Mayor of London may review and intervene in certain premises licence and variation applications considered to be of strategic importance to Greater London. The powers have been introduced pursuant to the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Act 2026 and represent the most significant change to London's licensing governance arrangements since the implementation of the Licensing Act 2003.

1.3 Whilst the majority of premises licence applications will continue to be determined locally, some larger or strategically significant applications will be subject to additional notification requirements and may be reviewed by the Greater London Authority (GLA).

2 Recommendations

2.1 The Licensing Committee is recommended to:

- Note the introduction of the Licensing Act 2003 (Applications of Potential Strategic Importance to Greater London etc and Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2026.
- Note that the regulations are expected to come into force on 3 November 2026 and will create a strategic review role for the Mayor of London in relation to specified licensing applications.

2.2 Alternative Options Considered

2.3 This is a statutory requirement and the Council has no discretion to do otherwise.

2.4 Reasons for decision

2.5 The Government has introduced the Licensing Act 2003 (Applications of Potential Strategic Importance to Greater London etc and Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2026, establishing a mechanism whereby specified licensing applications can be referred to the Greater London Authority and reviewed by the Mayor of London. The stated purpose of the new arrangements is to allow wider strategic considerations relating to London's economy, culture and night-time economy to be taken into account in a limited number of licensing cases which may have implications beyond the local authority area in which they are situated.

3 Background information

3.1 Applications within Scope

3.2 Applications capable of being designated as being of potential strategic importance include:

- Premises in Fee Bands D or E (rateable value exceeding £87,000).
- Premises in Fee Bands B or C proposing licensable activities beyond 11.00pm.
- Premises with a proposed capacity exceeding 5,000 persons.
- Premises licence applications seeking a licence for a limited period of less than three months.
- Fee Band B or C premises proposing regulated entertainment in the form of live music.

Members should note that meeting any one of the above criteria may require notification to the GLA.

4. New Decision-Making Process

4.1 Where an application falls within the prescribed categories, the licensing authority will be required to notify the Greater London Authority.

4.2 The process will operate broadly as follows:

1. The Council receives a qualifying application.
2. The application is notified to the GLA.
3. The GLA has up to 10 working days to determine whether the application should be treated as one of potential strategic importance.
4. Where a hearing is required, the Mayor's office may participate in the hearing proceedings.
5. Following the Council's determination, the Mayor has up to 20 working days to decide whether to exercise the call-in power and direct the licensing authority to alter its decision. During this period the authority's decision does not take effect.
6. If exercised, the Mayor's substituted decision becomes the operative decision for appeal purposes

5. Considerations for the Mayor

5.1 The strategic review power does not replace the licensing objectives contained within the Licensing Act 2003. The prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance and protection of children from harm will remain the statutory tests against which applications are assessed.

5.2 However, the Mayor is expected to have regard to a proposed London Strategic Licensing Policy, which is intended to provide a framework for considering wider strategic priorities including:

- Economic growth;
- Culture and creative industries;
- Tourism;
- London's night-time economy; and
- Strategic development objectives

6. Implications for Haringey

6.1 The introduction of the new regime has several implications for the Council:

- Additional administrative requirements will arise through mandatory notification of qualifying applications.
- Officers will need to build additional stages into application processing procedures.
- Application determination timescales may increase where referrals are made to the GLA.

6.2 Governance Implications

- Decisions of Licensing Sub-Committees may become subject to further review by the Mayor in prescribed cases.
- Strategic London-wide considerations may feature more prominently in larger or high-profile licensing applications. **Impact on Applicants**

Applicants for larger premises, entertainment venues and significant regeneration schemes may need to factor additional review periods into project delivery timescales.

7. Risk Management

7.1 At present, the practical impact of the new powers remains uncertain. Public statements indicate that the Mayor intends to use the powers sparingly and primarily to support economic growth and the hospitality sector. Nevertheless, there remains potential for increased complexity, extended determination periods and additional procedural requirements for qualifying applications. The Licensing Service will monitor implementation of the regime and report further to Members should significant operational issues arise.

8. Legal Comments

8.1 The introduction of the Licensing Act 2003 (Applications of Potential Strategic Importance to Greater London etc and Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2026 creates a new statutory process requiring London licensing authorities to notify specified applications to the Greater London Authority (GLA) and provides a mechanism through which the Mayor of London may intervene in certain licensing decisions of strategic importance to Greater London.

8.2 The Council will remain the licensing authority for the London Borough of Haringey and will continue to determine applications in accordance with the provisions of the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy. The licensing objectives remain unchanged and continue to be the primary statutory considerations in determining licensing applications.

8.3 Where an application falls within one of the prescribed categories, the Council will be under a legal duty to notify the GLA and comply with the procedural requirements established by the Regulations. Failure to comply with those requirements could expose the Council to legal challenge and may affect the validity of a licensing determination.

8.4 The Council's licensing procedures, guidance documents, delegated authority arrangements and administrative processes may require review and amendment to ensure compliance with the new legislative framework. Appropriate officer training will also be required prior to implementation.

8.5 The Monitoring Officer should be kept informed of any consequential amendments required to the Council's constitutional or procedural arrangements arising from the implementation of the Regulations.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 There are not expected to be any significant direct financial implications arising from this report at the present time. However, implementation of the new regime is likely to result in additional administrative responsibilities for the Licensing Service, including:

- Identifying applications that fall within the prescribed categories.
- Issuing statutory notifications to the GLA.
- Managing additional correspondence and consultation requirements.
- Liaising with the Mayor's office in relevant cases.
- Monitoring extended determination periods and revised statutory timetables. These additional duties may create a modest increase in officer workload and administrative costs. Any such costs will initially be met from existing service budgets.

9.2 There is also potential for indirect financial impacts where applications become subject to extended determination periods arising from GLA consideration and Mayoral review procedures. This may result in increased officer time being required to manage complex or high-profile applications.

9.3 At the time of writing, no additional funding arrangements have been announced by central government or the Greater London Authority to support implementation of the new regime. Any significant budgetary implications identified following implementation will be reported to Members through the Council's established financial monitoring processes.The licensing objectives remain unchanged and continue to provide the statutory framework for decision making.

10. Equalities Implications

10.1 There are no direct equalities implications arising from this report. Any future licensing decisions will continue to be made in accordance with the Council's Public Sector Equality Duty and relevant legislative requirements.

11. Conclusion

11.1 The introduction of the Mayor of London's call-in powers represents a significant development in the governance of alcohol and entertainment licensing in London. Whilst only a limited number of applications are expected to be affected, the changes introduce a new strategic tier of oversight and may have operational and procedural implications for the Council, applicants and local communities. Members are therefore asked to note the new arrangements and their potential impact upon licensing decision-making in Haringey.

Appendix A

Key Dates

Milestone	Date
Regulations published	October 2026
New regime commences	3 November 2026
GLA assessment period	Up to 10 working days
Mayoral review period following local authority decision	Up to 20 working days