

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SPECIAL LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 2022, 7:00PM - 9:47PM**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Barbara Blake, Sheila Peacock (Chair), Alessandra Rossetti**

### **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**

It being a special meeting of the Sub Committee, under Part Four, Section B, Paragraph 17, of the Council's Constitution, no other business shall be considered at the meeting.

### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Legal advisor at the meeting stated that the Sub-Committee considered each application on its merits and were concerned solely with the promotion of the licensing objectives and therefore there was no conflict of interest in regard to the revenue derived from the hire of Finsbury Park.

### **5. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE**

The Chair provided a summary of the procedure for the meeting.

### **6. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT KRANKBROTHERS, FINSBURY PARK, LONDON, N4**

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

- This was an application for a new premises licence.
- The application was seeking a new premises licence from an additional day of licensable activity per year which would sit alongside the existing premises licence.
- The application could be found from page 137 of the agenda papers.

- The licence was to allow for the sale of alcohol and regulated entertainment.
- The capacity within the regulations would allow for up to 9,999 patrons during the hours shown at paragraph 1.2 of the officer's report. However, the applicant requested a limit of 8000 patrons.
- The proposed event site would be to the east of the park and would run parallel to Green Lanes.
- The events were to be ticketed events pre-arranged with the park.
- The applicant currently had a licence which allowed them to hold four event days in total. The days would be discussed and prearranged with the park.
- The site location for the event space would be fully enclosed with fencing.
- A total of four events were held in 2021 by the applicant at the park.
- An issue that had been reported was regarding an illegal rave taking place on the site. However, this issue was not related to the event held by the applicant at the time.
- During the consultation period, Responsible Authorities had been consulted regarding the proposed licence.
- The agenda papers contained the draft Event Management Plan. This plan covered a wide variety of actions that an event organiser would need to satisfy. On page 28 and 29 of the agenda papers, the index of the various matters covered could be found. This included matters such as adverse weather conditions, fire safety, health and safety and other sections.
- The draft site plan showed the approximate layout. Events of this nature was subject to a Safety Advisory Group (SAG) and planning process.
- The grounds upon which representations had been received was based on prevention of crime and disorder, public nuisance, public safety and prevention of children from harm.
- There were a range of issues raised in the representations including the capacity that was requested, the duration of the occupation, the loss of park space, criminal activity and ongoing issues with the park. Concerns also been raised regarding holding an event during a global pandemic.
- Any reference to statutory legislation regarding measures taken to alleviate concerns of the coronavirus was not in the remit of the Sub-Committee.
- Once an event was planned, the offices that attended the SAG including those from Environment Health and Public Health would be able to provide advice and speak with the applicant regarding any specific requirements. The Licensing Authority would also oversee the process.
- The use of the park, condition of the park, seeding and the effect on grass at the site were contractual issues and also not in the remit of the Sub-Committee to consider.
- The representations could be found on pages 153 – 168 of the agenda papers and the representation from Friends of Finsbury Park could be found in the additional papers.

- The park had been considered an antisocial behaviour hotspot and had a history of drug dealing, violence, harassment and sexual assault.
- The Council and Police were actively dealing with the issues at the park.
- The local Safer Neighbourhood Team had informed a local ward meeting that problems were still persisting.
- Additional CCTV cameras were being put up in the park.
- The representation from Public Health had been withdrawn.
- The conditions offered by the applicant was similar to that of the conditions found on the existing licence.
- The Sub-Committee was asked to consider the schedule and were asked to incorporate any conditions as appropriate if the Sub-Committee was minded to grant the application.
- In terms of background, there were two distinct processes that need to be followed when a promoter wished to hold an event in Finsbury Park. Firstly, the operator must gain permission from the park service for the hire of the land. This required a relevant lead member to sign off on a report to allow for hire and agreement to use the park space. Secondly, the applicant required a premises licence in order to carry out the licensing activity.
- No licence could be put to use unless the applicant had the permission of the park authorities to book it for use.
- Once the event was agreed, park officers would work with organisers and Licensing Authority to make sure that the event was managed in a safe way.
- The Licensing Authority would arrange for a SAG meeting to ensure oversight on the event and that conditions were being upheld by the applicant.
- Within the statement of Licensing policy, the Council encouraged the responsible retailer scheme and safety schemes such as the Ask Angela scheme to make sure that promoters had measures for such issues.
- Where the Sub-Committee's discretion was engaged, the Licensing Authority would consider attaching other relevant conditions to the premises licence in order to promote public safety including specific controls on timings.

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

- Public Health had been in communication with the applicant in the last few days and had felt that the matters raised by them had been satisfied by the applicant and therefore had withdrawn their representation.
- She had a copy of the formal withdrawal from Public Health as the relevant Licensing Officer. There was nothing to stop any party that made a representation during consultation period to withdraw their representation and the legislation encouraged discussion between the applicant and objectors to an application.

The Sub-Committee was then addressed by residents. Mr Tom Graham representing The Friends Finsbury Park, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was difficult to form an opinion when there was a drip feeding of information that was provided.
- The Friends of Finsbury Park had 3,500 followers on Twitter and 400 members formally. The group represented Finsbury Park as a 'friends group' and sought to promote and preserve the park.
- Generally speaking, the Friends of Finsbury Park was not opposed to events being held at the park.
- The group supported well-managed, locally focused, low-impact events.
- The year of 2021 was a difficult year for many people, but for the park it had been a positive year as it had been considerably well used. Residents in Haringey, Hackney and Islington had found respite, peace and exercise using the park.
- The applicant was the only major event holder at the park last year. However, there was a real noise impact and disturbance to people making good use of the park.
- The impact made by the applicant at the park was significant. There appeared to have been a sewage leak and the grass and the ground had not yet recovered from when it was used last by the applicant. Granting the application would likely have such further consequences and this would have an impact on residents.
- The process of the application felt rushed and with 36-37 'TBCs' in the documents submitted, it did not feel like this was a straight forward basis on which to make a decision.
- The Council had put forward a specific focus on reducing antisocial behaviour, crimes against women and drug dealing and Finsbury Park suffered from these issues. Although the applicant would do their best to control the event, there was a pernicious side-effect to an increased number of people occupying the park that was beyond the control of the applicant.
- It was very challenging to work very hard as a community to attempt to mitigate negative effects on the park whilst the Council was licensing activities at the park.
- The group was not seeking a cancellation of the activities held by the applicant, but the group was not in favour of the expansion of the event.
- The group would ask that Sub-Committee consider the hours for the sale of alcohol as last year 1000 people protested on proposals to have a permanent pub in the park.
- The group would request that the licence not be granted indefinitely as the Cabinet Member overseeing parks had talked about a review of the major events policy and it did not seem appropriate to grant the application if the review was to be submitted later in the year.
- The group would ask that the Sub-Committee consider applying the noise monitoring and noise limits that the Council insisted on for the Wireless Festival and other major events that took place in the park.

- There was not a fundamental opposition to events generally and the applicants had taken positive steps in previous years, but Finsbury Park was an important green space and the Sub-Committee needed to take into consideration the impact the events had in the area.

Ms Diane Burridge, representing Friends of Gillespie Park, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The group objected to the general use of any part of the park used for large commercial events.
- There was concern about the general impact on the whole park and the effect it would have on residents as there would be people walking through the park, disturbance would be caused by patrons not getting access to the park and patrons being turned away.
- The park should not be used as a pub or to encourage alcohol use as the park was used by children.
- It was not clear how patrons outside the perimeter of the park would be controlled.
- It was unclear how the few toilet facilities would be utilised. The toilets also had long queues for use.
- The event would bring in vehicle movement, air and noise pollution.
- The event would, in effect, last 20 days from 31 July to 19 August. The setting up, delivery, maintenance and closing down of the event would take up the space making disturbances in the area where people went jogging.
- There would be an amplification of noise which was a concern.
- The music echoed around park. The park did not allow live amplified music at present and it would be disturbing to the ambience of the area. The open spaces would be somewhat restricted for families who were unable to go away in August. Finsbury Park was essential for people's wellbeing.

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

- She would not encourage alcohol use at the park as it was used by many families.
- A large number of people would be attending the area than normal and activities that attracted large number of people was not suitable for the park.

In response to a question, Ms Barrett stated that, for Finsbury Park, there was a number of what would be considered nearby residential facades that cut across the Haringey, Hackney and Islington and there were monitoring locations that had been put in place for approximately 40 years. When the licence for the Wireless Festival was reviewed in 2018, one of the conditions as part of the review was for the monitoring points to be re-evaluated. As a result of that reassessment, background noise levels had decreased. This meant that there was a lower threshold for background noise and therefore the noise management plan had to be

taken into consideration as the applicant could only go 15dB (decibels) over the set background noise levels. This meant a general overall reduction in sound output at large events. On the Festival Republic licence, there was a condition that required a reassessment to be carried out every year to make sure that the to ensure minimal background noise settings.

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

- Above Finsbury Park, there were another 1000 homes, which meant there would be more residents impacted by the application.

Ms Sarah Potter informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was part of the Highbury Community Association. Many of the residents lived in Islington but wished to associate themselves with the objection made by the Friends of Finsbury Park.
- The application would give way to crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour which residents would be affected negatively due to the increase of patrons to the event.

At this point the proceedings, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy representing the applicant, stated that the applicant was working towards the noise levels set in 2018. These were the same limits worked to by the Wireless Festival. In 2021, the applicant had only generated four noise complaints from the event held at the time. The applicant felt that it was a good achievement for such a commercial event.

Mr Konrad Borowski informed the Sub-Committee that:

- His representation could be found on page 167 of the agenda papers.
- There was an overlap between the variation application and the new premises licence application.
- The area of the park where the event was to be held was only 17 meters away from flats on the opposite side of Green Lanes.
- It was not reasonable to hold an event similar to the one outlined by the applicant so close to residents.
- He lived half a mile from the proposed event area.
- He lived in a converted house on the top floor and during the summer, his home became hot.
- He would be faced with a difficult decision on whether to open his windows and allow sound to enter his home or shutting them and potentially suffering from heat exhaustion or heat stroke.

- He was in his 70s and heat exhaustion and heat stroke was a genuine concern for people in his age group.
- He did not see why he needed to suffer for the applicant to make a profit.
- There are people living in the Haringey area not too far from the park who would also suffer from noise.
- In relation to the application seeking an extra day of licensable activity, if the use of the extra day fell on a Friday, then this would affect people working from home. Therefore, the extra day of licensable activity should not fall on a working day.
- In addition, park users would be affected by noise.
- On the Event Management Plan, there was no noise management plan included and was listed as 'to be provided'. It was not clear why it had not been provided.

Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy, representing the applicant, stated that the noise management plan had not been included in the Event Management Plan because the applicant was constantly looking to improve it. It would be submitted in a month's time.

Mr Gordon Hutchinson informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He lived close to the park.
- He was a devotee of the park and endorsed Ms Burridge's comments.
- The borough holding large scale commercial events over the period of school holidays was unacceptable for many local residents for Haringey, Islington and Hackney.
- The Council should return to its previous policy and not allow such large-scale events to be held over the summer.
- Approximately ten years ago (and beyond), the borough welcomed small scale community led festivals.
- The large-scale commercial events needed to come to an end.
- He was concerned about the environmental damage that would be caused to the park as a result of the event. It was a vital amenity and affected residents in the area.

At this point in the proceedings Ms Barrett stated that the Sub-Committee could not consider the commercial use of the park or the environmental impact of the park as a result of the event as it was not in the remit of the Sub-Committee to do so. This consideration sat with the Parks Service as the landlords of the park.

Ms Gina Harkell informed the Sub-Committee that:

- By increasing the number of attendees from 6000 to 8000, the area of grass destroyed from August 2021 would increase by 20-30%.
- Last year, two rainy weekends resulted in at least 10 acres of compounded mud which was covered in topsoil and then reseeded. Grass grew quickly in September 2021 and stopped in Autumn 2021 and now looked fragile.

- In relation to crime and disorder, the key environmental impact was damage to the park.
- The major public nuisance as a result of the application was the amount of noise that the event would generate.
- The noise limit set by the Council was not likely to be correct as the event was too noisy. Residents had complained about this issue for many years and the volume of the event was not tolerable and it would last for ten days, with ten hours of constant drum and bass and shouting over the PA system.
- Last year, residents living in the general vicinity of the Finsbury Park and Haringey Green Lanes area suffered the most as the applicant had set up the stage facing Endymion Road.
- It was not clear how the application could be justified with regard to allowing such high volume music events as residents would not be allowed to play amplified music in their own homes and gardens as it would break local bylaws.
- It was not clear what the applicant was doing to protect patrons from potentially suffering tinnitus or selling drugs in the park.
- She was opposed to the application.
- The population in the area was too dense for the event to be held in the area. A more appropriate place to hold such events was in places such as Essex or Hertfordshire. If festival goers could go to Glastonbury, then they could attend an event in Hertfordshire.

At 7:58pm, the Sub-Committee adjourned to address a technical issue. The meeting resumed at 8:10pm.

Mr Julian Butterfield, Mr Mick Bowles and Mr Kieran Clancy, representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant had been operating events for 15 years and events at Finsbury Park since 2018, had received low number of complaints and had garnered generally positive feedback from local authorities.
- The events featured international artists.
- The patrons were aged 18-30, largely from Greater London area, many of whom were from Haringey.
- This application related to a new application for an additional day attached to an existing event weekend.
- The variation application sought to increase the number of attendees from 6000 to 8000 each day for the existing licence.
- The granting of the premises licence did not grant the use of the park.
- The application should be permitted as the applicant had a proven track record of successfully staging events in Finsbury Park with a low negative impact on the local

community whilst having a positive engagement with the local authority and demonstrable responsiveness to issues that arose.

- Despite doubling the number of event days from two to four between 2019 and 2021, the number of noise complaints had decreased by 60%, totalling four noise complaints in 2021.
- The application was clearly within the remit of the Licensing Policy.
- The application had received no representations from the Police or the Public Protection teams from Haringey or the neighbouring boroughs.
- One representation had been received from the Public Health team requesting further information. This information had been provided to them and Public Health had withdrawn their representation. There were no remaining representations from responsible authorities.
- The applicant felt this reflected confidence in the event's operations and the robustness of the conditions to meet the licensing objectives.
- Some of the representations appeared to conflate the applicant's events with other larger ones. These fears had not been reflected by the responsible authorities.
- Most points of concern were covered by the licensing conditions.
- It was important to reiterate that the increase in capacity would not lead to an increase in sound levels. The licensing conditions in relation to sound levels was based on the national guidance and local policy.
- The increase in capacity crowd between 2019 and 2021 resulted in a reduction of noise complaints by 60%.
- In relation to the management of the event, the directors had a practical involvement in licensing, resident engagement and operation of the event supported by a team of professionals.
- The staff had a vast amount of collective experience and had staged hundreds of events.
- Key contractors and suppliers are likely to be the same as the ones used last year.
- The site layout would be the same as 2021.
- The conditions attached to the current premises licence was suitable and proportionate.
- The comparison to the Wireless Festival was not accurate. Even with the increased capacity, the event being held by the applicant was one-fifth of the size of large-scale events at the park.
- A well managed and well licensed event on a smaller scale led to a lower risk of disruption.
- In 2021, there was a low level of noise complaints, despite the stringent levels. The addition of live music was not anticipated to increase disturbance.
- The noise hotline would be in operation throughout the event.

- In relation to representations on drugs and crime, whilst the lack of representations submitted by the Police could be considered a positive sign, the applicant had engaged with the North Area BCU Partnership and Prevention Officers during the application process who were supportive of the plans.
- In terms of the condition of the site post event, the reparations had been dealt with to the park team's satisfaction and a letter had been received confirming that this was the case.
- In relation to risks relating to coronavirus infections, last year the applicant had implemented requirements for vaccine passports and lateral flow testing on the entrance to the event. UK government guidelines would be followed in 2022 and any planning related to the coronavirus would be submitted as part of the event management planning to the SAG and Public Health.
- In terms of local consultation, as per previous years, there would be two local residents' virtual consultation meetings held in March and June 2022. These meetings would be open to all residents to discuss the event and its impact on residents.
- There would be a local community website where all relevant information would be uploaded including a complaints number and an email address to contact the applicant.

In response to questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Security staff would be appointed to patrol the perimeter of the event site.
- The applicant would serve spirits with mixes, beer and wine cocktails. No super strength alcohol would be sold.
- The crime reduction, noise management and other plans which had not been submitted to the Sub-Committee would be put forward during the SAG process. It was the role of responsible authorities to take an active approach to examining the remainder of the documents and they would have an opportunity to do so in the lead up to the event.
- The event could not go ahead unless the responsible authorities were happy with the submission of the documents.
- Page 57 of the agenda papers meant to state that the bar staff would need to refer to the personal licence holder in the event of a refusal of the sale of alcohol so that the refusal could be recorded.
- The part of the agenda papers referring to 'under 21' meant to refer to the Challenge 25 policy.
- The alcohol management plan needed to be updated.
- All 122 toilets would be provided as per the Event Industry Forum guidance. The updating of the documents were an ongoing process, the site drawing and layout of the toilets had not been updated to match the numbers in the plan. The additional toilet blocks would be added to the existing location.

- In relation to the Event Management Plan (EMP), it was expected that the process would develop as more meetings were held.
- Unless the responsible authorities approved the final EMP, the event could not go ahead.

Ms Barrett stated that plans submitted with an application such as the one submitted by the applicant would not be expected to demonstrate all operational details and some of the details relating to large outdoor festivals could be dealt with as part of the SAG process. The events safety guide, purple guide and other guides provided guidance to the outdoor events industry regarding capacity, toilets, medical provision and other issues. The applicant would submit their updated plans with the layout including bar location, toilets, queueing methods and other details. The document submitted by the applicant was sufficient to be able to allow the Sub-Committee to consider the application. The Police Licensing team were aware of the events and had considered the application. The patrol teams would be on duty to perform reassurance visits. This would include meeting the applicant and address any queries. The event would not have Police presence in the control room throughout the event.

In response to further questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant had a no single use plastic policy on site. The applicant would use plastic cups, but this would mean a deposit of £1.00 would need to be paid and the deposit would not be returned to the patron unless the cup was returned.

Mr Graham stated that it was difficult to identify objectively what was to be considered as particularly pertinent with regard to the application.

In response to further questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Toilets would be placed as part of the ingress and egress routes between Manor House station and Finsbury Park station.
- Tower lighting would be put up to stop public urination.
- Litter picking teams would be employed at the event.
- The applicant had their own bins and the locations of these would be agreed with the parks team. In relation to crowd control, the applicant had a detailed plan and dispersal policy.
- Two consultations would be held in March and June and a letter drop would be completed to notify residents. The distribution for the letter drop would be agreed with the Council. The appropriate contact details will be on the leaflet and on the community website.

- The conditions the applicant was working to at Finsbury Park on various roads was between 55-60 decibels which was low in comparison to other places in London.
- The applicant was happy to accommodate any ongoing concerns. For example, if the applicant received feedback regarding the direction of PA and residents felt that they were being disturbed, then the direction of the PA could be changed. The design of the PA could also be changed if any improvement could be made to it.
- The applicant was providing due attention to the issues and hopefully residents would notice an improvement during the event in 2022.
- Although there were more than four complaints present at the meeting, the applicant could only deal with the complaints received. The applicant worked closely with Haringey to make sure people were aware of the events last summer. But if it was the case that not enough people were aware of the events, then there would be an increase in residents receiving letter drops in any case to allow residents to voice their concerns.
- It was useful to speak to residents regarding concerns they may have. Therefore, it would be helpful for residents to attend a video conference meeting and inform about the specific issues that they felt could be addressed by the applicant. This allowed the applicant to address issues in a tailored way for residents.
- The applicant worked very closely with the Licensing Authority through the entire event process and therefore the lack of representation from the Licensing Authority indicated a strong working relationship and a positive view with regard to the way the events had been run between 2018 to 2021.
- The event site was big enough to hold 8000 people. There were also financial reasons to expand capacity as there had been an increase in cost for obtaining supplies. This would help make the event more sustainable.
- If the applicant received a complaint during the event, a noise monitoring officer would be sent to the complainant's home and a noise test would be taken. If the noise levels were too high, then the noise at the event would be lowered. This would be made available throughout the time in which the event was held.
- The independent monitoring of sound would be done by Vanguardia which was a national company which performed sound monitoring for various large events.
- The application was for one event held on one Friday a year for the hours applied for to be held consecutively with the Saturday and Sunday with the licence already held by the applicant. This would take place either the day before the first weekend or the day before the second weekend.

To summarise, the applicant would take on board the comments made by the residents regardless of the decision made by the Sub-Committee.

To summarise, Mr Graham stated that he was grateful to the applicant in engaging in comments made in good faith but would ask the Sub-Committee to not allow the expansion in capacity if the application was granted as there would be various consequences as a result of allowing an increase in crowd capacity.

At 9:23pm, the Sub-Committee adjourned to consider the application.

## **RESOLVED**

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a new premises licence for Krankbrothers at Finsbury Park, London N4. 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 applicants and objectors written and oral representations.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to grant the application for a new premises licence for licensable activities on one Friday a year adjacent to an existing event weekend, subject to conditions to promote the licensing objectives.

### **The Licence is granted as follows:**

#### **Operating times:**

#### **Supply of Alcohol**

Friday 1300 to 2200 hours

For consumption ON the premises only

#### **Regulated Entertainment :Films, Live Music, recorded music and dance**

Friday 1300 to 2200 hours

#### **Hours open to the public:**

Friday 1300 to 2200 hours

### **The capacity under this licensee is 8000**

The following conditions are imposed to promote the four licensing objectives and to mirror the conditions on the existing licence:

1. The Licence holder can only operate this licence on a Friday that immediately precedes a weekend event.
2. All conditions agreed as in the final Event Management Plan will be adhered to.

### **THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND DISORDER**

3. No licensable activities shall be permitted to take place under this licence unless the Event Management Plan, Fire Risk Assessment, and Crowd Management Plan for that event have been approved by The Haringey Safety Advisory Group. Any deviation from this documentation during the event shall only be made in exceptional circumstances, and the details shall be recorded in the event log with detailed reasons at the time. These changes will be raised at the next available Event Liaison Team meeting onsite.

4. The event will use and maintain an event log. This will be kept up to date by Event Management and will be used to record all significant policy decisions made during the event by staff. This log will be available at every Event Liaison Team meeting and will be available for inspection by the responsible authorities, as defined in the Licensing Act 2003, at any time.
5. There shall be a written drugs policy in place for the event. This policy will be agreed between the licence holder and the Haringey Police Licensing Team in writing and this policy will be implemented whilst licensable activity is taking place.
6. This policy will include reference to psychoactive substances and must ensure a zero-tolerance policy in this area. This policy must be agreed at least 14 days prior to the start of each event.
7. There will be a written ejection policy in place for the event. This policy will be agreed between the licence holder and the Police Licensing Team in writing and this policy shall be implemented whilst licensable activity is taking place. This policy must be agreed at least 14 days prior to the start of each event.
8. The premises licence holder will ensure that customers will not be allowed to bring their own alcohol on to the site.
9. The premises licence holder will ensure that customers do not bring glass bottles onto the site.
10. Contact telephone numbers for the designated premises supervisor, event managers and site managers shall be provided to Haringey Safety Advisory Group before the start of each annual event.
11. No staff member while on duty and / or in uniform will consume alcohol or drugs on site or be under the influence of alcohol or drugs at any time whilst working.
12. All accidents, however minor, will be recorded in the on-site accident book and be reported to the event management team where applicable within 24 hours.
13. The premises licence holder shall publish a message on the event website at least 1 month prior to the event containing the following information;
  - a. Challenge 25 Policy for entry to the event and for bar service whilst licensable activities are taking place.
  - b. No alcohol permitted to be brought onto the site and searches will be made on entry
  - c. No glass drinking vessels and bottles allowed on site
  - d. Disabled access and facilities information
  - e. Details of medical facilities
14. The premises licence holder shall ensure that there are measures in place to accurately record and monitor entry numbers to the site. Upon request by a responsible authority, as defined in the Licensing Act 2003, the holder of the premises licence or an agent on behalf of and under the authority of the licence holder shall provide precise information regarding the number of people present on the site at the given time.
15. The premises licence holder shall ensure that all members of staff and SIA personnel

- have received training commensurate to their role, and have been fully briefed prior to the start of the event on the information contained within the Event Management Plan documents relevant to their role.
16. The premises licence holder shall have procedures in place to;
    - a. Manage the occupancy levels within areas to enable a safe and quick evacuation in the event of an emergency; and
    - b. Allow unrestricted and unobstructed access for emergency vehicles.
    - c. The premises licence holder shall ensure that bag searches are carried out as customers enter the event.
  17. The premises licence holder shall ensure that any person appearing to be under the influence of illegal drugs shall be refused entry.
  18. Any person deemed unfit due to drink or drugs at the event shall be asked to leave the event after organisers have considered that it is safe for them to leave the site.
  19. Last entry to customers shall be 20:00hours. There shall be no admittance to customers after this time.
  20. The licence holder shall ensure that patrols of the site area are performed by security staff of the site whilst the site is closed to the public.
  21. A response team staffed entirely of SIA licensed personnel shall be available for deployment during the event.
  22. There shall be a fence around the full perimeter of the licensable area. All fencing used shall have no gaps greater than 30 cm in the bottom and shall be at least 2 meters high. The only exemption to this is where there are entrances and exits, or existing fence lines in existence which are deemed suitable both by the event organisers and the Met Police.
  23. All staff shall be issued with a wristband, lanyard, or similar, which identifies them as staff working at the event.
  24. The specific number of volunteers, stewards, marshals and frontline SIA staff shall be recorded in the Event Management Plan. They will be based on a capacity of staff and customers for the entire licensable area. The numbers of staff will reflect the different challenges of the individual days various events and will not be generic.
  25. The licence holder shall maintain a register giving details of each and every person employed in the role of security and shall provide upon request by any Police Officer or authorised officer of the licensing authority, the following details:-
    - a. The licence number, name, date of birth and residential address of that person;
    - b. The time at which he/she commenced that period of duty
    - c. The time at which he/she finished the period of duty
    - d. If that person is not an employee of the licence holder, the name of the person by whom that person is employed or through whom the services of that person were engaged;
  26. The register shall be made available to a Police officer or the Licensing Authority on request.
  27. This register may be in paper or digital format.
  28. Every entry and exit point to the venue shall be supervised by SIA licensed security

- personnel.
29. All security persons shall have access to a radio to communicate to other staff on site.
  30. There shall be an area within the licensable area dedicated to dealing with vulnerable adults.
  31. There shall always be on duty at this location a person nominated as in charge. Staff working in this area shall have access to a radio connecting with the event management.
  32. A Medical Team will be set up on-site with trained and experienced staff available to care for ill, intoxicated or vulnerable adults until they are ready to leave safely.
  33. There shall be a facility on site to deal with persons taken unwell or injured during the course of the event. This facility shall be open at all times that the site is open to members of the public. An SIA accredited person shall be present at all times that the facility is open to members of the public.
  34. The medical facility shall have access to a radio connecting to the site control. The numbers of medical personnel will be set and recorded in the event management plan taking into account any statutory guidance available at the time of the event.

#### **PUBLIC SAFETY**

35. Sanitary accommodation will be supplied in line with guidance from The Event Safety Guide (or such other document amending or replacing the same) to the event.
36. There shall always be on site a person nominated by the licence holder to liaise with the Licensing Authority to deal with any issues arising as a result of licensing checks performed at the event.

#### **THE PREVENTION OF PUBLIC NUISANCE**

37. The Premises Licence Holder shall employ a team of suitably qualified Noise Consultants to monitor on-site and off-site noise. Off-site noise levels will be agreed with the Council's Environmental Health Officer in advance.
38. The Premises Licence Holder will take all reasonable steps to ensure that a leaflet drop is carried out locally in advance of the events advising of a complaints line. This line will be installed on site and manned throughout the open hours of any events. All calls to this line will be logged and the log made available to the Licensing Authority.
39. The Premises Licence Holder will not undertake any flyposting in connection with any events that are organised for Finsbury Park.

#### **THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN**

40. The licence holder shall ensure that all members of staff involved in the sale of alcohol receive training with regards to age restricted sales. This training must include the following:
  - a. The licensing objectives.
  - b. Recognising signs of drunkenness and recognising intoxication through drugs.
  - c. Challenge 25 and appropriate forms of identification.
  - d. Refusals logs including when and how to use them.

41. This training will be documented, signed by any person involved in the sale of alcohol on site to state that they understand the training, and kept for a minimum of 6 months following the event.
42. No person shall sell alcohol until they have received the training and signed the training document.
43. Signage advising customers that Challenge 25 is in operation shall be prominently displayed at each bar.
44. No supply of alcohol shall take place at any bar unless a personal licence holder is present in a supervisory capacity.
45. Each bar shall have on display a document showing details of the bar. These details shall be; the name of the bar manager, their personal licence number, and the hours of operation.
46. All bar managers shall have access to a radio link with the event management team and security teams.
47. All personal licence holders shall be made aware of the licence conditions. Personal licence holders shall sign a declaration to confirm that they have been received a copy of the licence conditions. This shall be documented, and a copy of the conditions shall be made available at each bar.
48. A sign shall be placed at each bar encouraging persons to drink responsibly.

In addition, the Committee has imposed the following conditions:

49. The Licence holder must ensure that staff undertake WAVE (Welfare and Vulnerability Engagement ) training
50. The Licence holder must implement the Ask for Angela Scheme or a similar Policy to deal with recognising and addressing vulnerability and sexual violence.

Reasons:

The Committee carefully considered the new premises licence application to add Friday to one of the weekend events held by the licence holder under their existing premises licence. The objections to the application centred around the proximity to residential premises, noise nuisance, other disturbances, the inaccessibility of parts of the park, the impact of the pandemic, crime including anti-social behaviour, drug dealing, violence/harassment and the environmental impacts of the proposed events on the park.

It was beyond the Committee's remit to consider the environmental impact on the park and the Committee noted that any events would have to comply with the Covid 19 legislation and requirement in operation at the time. In relation to the other concerns the Committee did not think that an additional event day would have such a significant impact on residents that the licensing objectives would be undermined. The Committee were concerned about violence in the park including harassment towards women and therefore appropriate conditions have been imposed.

The Committee heard that there were 4 noise complaints from events in 2021 and that although the capacity under the new licence would be larger, the noise level would not increase because the audience was larger. The new licence would also include live music but the Committee were assured that the same noise limits from previous events would be required and that the noise levels would not increase.

The licence holder committed to continue to engage with residents and the Committee were satisfied that the SAG process would finalise the Event Management Plan and Noise Control plan that had been queried, to ensure a well run event.

The Committee were satisfied that the licence holder had a track record of successfully staging events in Finsbury Park and had demonstrated responsiveness to issues and concerns that residents had raised, including planning consultation meetings, widening the leaflet distribution and providing better contact information for complaints. It believed that with the above conditions, the licence could be granted without undermining the licensing objectives of the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, public safety and the prevention or children from harm.

## **7. APPLICATION FOR A VARIATION OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT KRANKBROTHERS, FINSBURY PARK, LONDON, N4**

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

- This was a variation application to increase the capacity of all the events from 6000 patrons to 8000 patrons.
- The application also sought to add regulated entertainment such as live music and display of film on Saturday and Sunday.
- Large events were subject to due process via the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) meetings. These had been attended by blue light agencies and the responsible authorities. The applicant provided the Event Management Plan (EMP) as it was being updated. Meetings were held on a monthly basis in the run-up to the event.
- Representations could be found from pages 329 and were on the basis of all four licensing objectives.
- The representation made by Public Health had been withdrawn.
- There were two distinct processes that needed to be complied with by the applicant. This included the park hire process and the application for a premises licence.

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

- The infrastructure for the event would be increased and there was likely to be an increase in toilet facilities, security staff, food vendors, medical staff and other areas.

In response to questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy representing the applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- There was a slight overlap between the event planning and the event licensing process.
- In relation to the licensing process, the applicant had to demonstrate that adequate systems were in place to promote licensing objectives.
- For the SAG process, it was important to outline the details of how the event would be managed and operated.
- The site area was just under 21,500 square metres. In terms of audience capacity, the footprint did not need to be increased. The industry guidance allowed for two people per square metre and this would allow for 8000 people in addition to the infrastructure.
- The principles in relation to the management process had been set out. The relevant documents would be reviewed by the responsible authorities but this was a separate process to the licensing process.

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

- Page 318 of the agenda papers set out the conditions that the applicant believed were sufficient to accommodate the application.

Mr Tom Graham, representing the Friends of Finsbury Park, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was not clear exactly what issues were relevant with regard to the consideration of the application.
- He would ask that the capacity crowd not be increased from 6000 to 8000 patrons and that no films be displayed during the afternoons when the park was not being used to screen live music and other activities.

Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy, representing the applicant, stated that the applicant had no intention to screen films during the afternoon.

Ms Dianne Burrige, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was not clear how the vehicle movement along the road would be managed for the 20 days in which the applicant would occupy the area as the road was used by joggers and walkers.
- It was not clear how disturbance would be managed by staff when patrons were turned away from the event.

Ms Barrett stated that the park service would work to resolve with the applicant timings for vehicle movement. There would be curfew times to allow children to be able to get through the park without vehicle movement. This was a conversation that would take place between the applicant and the park representatives.

Mr Konrad Borowski informed the Sub-Committee that:

- It was not clear how the increase in the capacity crowd of 6000 patrons to 8000 patrons would not increase the sound levels.
- The introduction of live music was also likely to increase the volume of the event as musical artists often desired to be able to hear the music that was played at a loud level.

Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy, representing the applicant, stated that they were confident that noise levels would not increase despite the increase in patrons. There would be no need to increase the volume and any playing of live music was not likely to be any louder than the regular levels of noise at the event. There were often regular breaks in live music due to band change overs in any case. Furthermore, leafleting to local residents with the complaint line details and any additional conditions would be sent to residents from this year and every year in the future.

Ms Barrett stated that there was already a condition on the licence which stated that the premises licence holder would take all reasonable steps to ensure that a leaflet drop was carried out locally in advance of the event advising of the complaints line.

Mr Hutchinson, resident, stated that no leafleting had been done by the applicant in the previous year.

In response to questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Mr Bowles would be attending an Ask Angela and Welfare Officer training driven forward by Tower Hamlets and Hackney councils. The training would be brought into his team for the events being run at Haringey and event staff would be sent forward to attend the training.
- The applicant had agreed with Public Health that they would address the matters that Public Health had raised as part of the planning process.
- The applicant would not object to a condition requesting the implementation of the Ask Angela policy.

Ms Barrett stated that when Public Health raised queries about high strength alcohol, this was in relation to high strength beers, ciders and lagers. It came about as a result of incidents of street drinkers in a given area. This was something Public Health put on all representations and was better utilised for small off licences where there may be street drinking issues to stop selling high strength alcohol to street drinkers. In relation to the officer training, it was called Wave Training and was being delivered by the Police.

Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The applicant was looking to increase capacity from 6000 to 8000 patrons.
- There would be no significant increase in the footprint of the event area.

- The event management plan would be similar to the one used in 2021.
- There would be some differences in the application due to the increase in capacity but the specific operational measures would be covered at the SAG meetings. These would be attended by the responsible authorities and the applicant would work closely with them.
- The whole planning process would be appropriate to the application of the event if the licence was granted.
- He would take on board the comments made by residents.

In response to questions, Mr Butterfield, Mr Bowles and Mr Clancy informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Consideration of the viability of the event would be taken into account if the Sub-Committee did not approve the increase in capacity from 6000 to 8000 patrons.

Ms Barrett stated that there was a condition on the licence which stated that a licensable area would be dedicated to dealing with vulnerable adults.

To summarise, Mr Graham stated that he understood the difficulties of the process. However, there was a challenge regarding holding large events at Finsbury Park. He understood that although festivals would continue to go ahead at the park and until the Council updated its major events policy, he would encourage the Sub-Committee that the applicant be restricted to holding the event to 6000 patrons in addition with the conditions outlined at the meeting. It was difficult have a structured discussion around the application due to the drip-feeding of information, withdrawal of representations and the consideration of what could or could not be discussed by the Sub-Committee.

To summarise, Ms Burrige stated that on behalf of Friends of Gillespie Park she was concerned regarding the use of Finsbury Park for the event and the disturbance it would cause. She was concerned for the cyclists and joggers who wish to relax and experience a peaceful atmosphere.

To summarise, Mr Borowski stated that he did not agree to the increase of capacity from 6,000 patrons to 8,000.

To summarise, Mr Hutchinson stated that the applicant's website appeared to promote environmental credentials but the applicant was aware of the substantial environmental impact of music festivals. The use of Finsbury Park, especially in the area the applicant was proposing to hold the event, was a totally inappropriate area to hold the event. The area of the park was prone to flooding and the grass put in last year had died. The site was surrounded by 100 year-old London Plane trees and the soil compaction could negatively affect the life of the trees.

At 9:23pm, the Sub-Committee adjourned to consider the application.

**RESOLVED**

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a variation to the premises licence for Krankbrothers at Finsbury Park, London N4. 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 objectors' written and oral representations.

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to grant the variation by increasing the capacity under the licence from 6000 to 8000 and by adding the following licensable activity:

**Regulated Entertainment: Live Music and Films**

Saturday	1300 to 2200 hours
Sunday	1300 to 2130 hours

In addition, the Committee has imposed the following conditions:

1. The Licence holder must ensure that staff undertake WAVE (Welfare and Vulnerability Engagement ) training
2. The Licence holder must implement the ask for Angela Scheme or a similar Policy to deal with recognising and addressing vulnerability and sexual violence.

Reasons:

The Committee heard that for the increased capacity the infrastructure would be increased and there was likely to be an increase in toilet facilities, security staff, food vendors, medical staff and other areas. However, the industry guidance allowed for two people per square metre so the footprint of the site would not need to increase to accommodate the increase in capacity.

Concerns about harassment and violence to women would be addressed by the above 2 conditions to promote the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objective.

Residents raised concerns about increased noise because of live music and a larger audience but the Committee was assured by the applicant that although the capacity under the variation would be larger, the noise level and disturbance would not increase as a result. The same noise limits from previous events would be in operation as they have been agreed as part of the licence conditions. The Committee accepted this and noted that local residents would be leafleted with details of the complaint line.

The Committee concluded that the licensing objectives would not be undermined by granting the application with the existing conditions and those imposed on the variation.

CHAIR: Cllr Sheila Peacock

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....