

# **MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON FRIDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER, 2022, 2:00PM – 3:45PM**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Nick da Costa, Ajda Ovat (Chair) and Sheila Peacock**

### **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**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

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

### **6. OBJECTION TO A TEMPORARY EVENT NOTICE FOR PRINCESS BANQUETING, 502-508 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM HIGH ROAD, LONDON N17 (TOTTENHAM HALE)**

#### **Presentation by the Licensing Officer**

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

- The Licensing team had sent the notification of the objection made by the Police to the Notice Giver informing them that if they wished to pursue the Temporary event, then the Licensing Authority should be notified. The request had been sent back yesterday.
- The Temporary Event Notice (TEN) could be found in appendix 1 of the agenda papers and the event was proposed to start at 18:00 on 2 September 2022 until 4 September 2022 with a terminal hour of 03:00.

- It was not possible for the Sub-Committee to exercise an option whereby the event could be held, but only with the existing conditions present on the licence as the premises did not have a licence.
- Due to the scheduling, it was not possible for the Notice Giver to be able to appeal the decision as any appeal needed to be made to the magistrates court after five working days of the decision being given.
- All temporary events must meet general licensing requirements such as health and safety regulations, fire regulations and the licensing objectives.
- A temporary event notice had previously been submitted for events to be held on 26 August to 28 August 2022 and this had been objected to by the Police on the crime and disorder objective.
- The premises was also subject to a premises licence application to be heard by a separate Sub-Committee.

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

- The Licensing Authority had received two applications for a premises licence from two different applicants. One had been withdrawn and the other had been submitted by Mr Stegariu who had completed two consultations and had submitted a copy of the sub-lease to show he could have use of premises. However, it was reported later that the freeholder had not signed any such documents.

### **Presentation by the Notice Giver**

The Notice Giver, Mr Alexander Paphiti and his representative Mr Fabian Simms informed the Sub-Committee that:

- They were starting a new business in South Tottenham and the area had many different communities.
- They wanted to work with Licensing and Police to resolve any issues.
- Work had been done to go above and beyond to adhere to the licensing objectives. However, the goalposts appeared to be moving and the company had recently been brought by Mr Stegariu, who had no association with Parkway Estates.
- The premises did not have a licence and those involved with the premises would like a premises licence to be granted eventually said that progress could be made and a business model could be implemented.
- The TEN had been given so that a soft opening could be made for the premises and as a test run.
- The number of patrons that could occupy the premises ranged between 200 to 250 people.
- The premises also had three fire exits. The third fire exit could be found in the kitchen and would be used for staff which ranged between 25 to 35 people.
- He also wanted to bring in a DJ and there was nothing wrong with the use of DJ as some licensed premises could not afford to hire a live band and some bands did not play the right music for the right premises.
- The use of a DJ did not mean that the premises would act as a nightclub.
- The premises looked to entertain families and book events. The premises was not looking to operate in a manner which meant that patrons would have to pay on the door in order to come in.
- Adequate searches would be made on patrons and every aspect of the event would be controlled in order to uphold a licensing objectives.

- Those involved with the premises wished to prove themselves capable of running it.
- They wanted to employ people at the premises.
- There were two car parks adjacent to the premises that would be used. There would be six to eight SIA staff and one would act as a carpark attendant monitor.
- Any tickets sold by the premises would have a map of where the car parks would be placed.

In response to questions, Mr Paphiti and Mr Simms informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The soft opening would work alongside bookings. Friends and family had been invited to the event in the anticipation that a counter notice would not be issued.
- Tests were being made on how functional the premises would be, including staff. He would invite Police and Licensing representatives to the event and in future, events maps would be placed on any tickets that were sold.
- Various emails had been submitted between those involved with the premises and the Licensing team. This included information about the SIA staff, function of the business and how it would run. Emails from 14 July onwards showed communication between Mr Stegariu and Mr Paphiti with provided written statements informing that the premises would be used for seated table service. Furthermore, there would be certain conditions stopping the premises from acting as a nightclub. Various categories such as access and egress were addressed in addition to the use of SIA staff.

At 2:42pm, the Sub-Committee adjourned for a short while in order to address a technical issue. The Sub-Committee reconvened at 2:45pm

At this point in the proceedings, Ms Barrett stated that none of the points raised in relation to addressing issues at the premises was necessarily relevant to the objection to the temporary event notice.

The Legal advisor stated that the objection to the temporary event notice was a standalone hearing and would not be able to consider the application that had been made separately for the premises licence.

In response to further questions, Mr Paphiti and Mr Simms informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The premises would deal with 200 patrons and have 20 to 30 staff members. A routine had been implemented and this would be followed to ensure that the premises ran smoothly including having a safe dispersal process.
- Mr Paphiti would direct people slowly and calmly to the exits and there were sufficient exits for the amount of patrons attending.
- The request for late night refreshments had been made so that patrons could be staggered out slowly.
- Part of the role of the DPS was to provide a safe environment for staff and public.
- Patrons would be adequately searched.
- An intoxicated person would be given coffee and water and told that no further alcohol would be served to them. Any further issues would result in the patrons being extracted from the premises and this would be recorded into the books held at the premises.
- The previous individuals that had operated at the premises had no dealings with the Notice Giver.
- The patrons expected to be in attendance would be sent messages and called in the scenario that the event was allowed to go ahead. The expected number of patrons

would be approximately 80 to 100 patrons. The reference to the approximate figure of 250 patrons was in relation to ordinary circumstances when a premises licence had been granted.

- Not all individuals that had been invited to the event were expected to attend.
- It was not the intention of those involved with the premises to have a hearing for the TEN on the day of the event. The notice had been submitted two to three weeks ago and the Notice Giver did not have any control for when the hearing would be scheduled.
- Six SIA staff had been recommended for the event, but the event organisers had chosen to go with eight SIA staff members for added security.
- Mr Paphiti was experienced in monitoring licensed premises whilst it was under operation.
- Appropriate signage would be put up and training would be given to staff.
- All processes would be in place to uphold the public nuisance objective.
- Adequate dispersal processes would be in place.
- No underaged person would be served alcohol.
- Staff were already generally trained and alcohol would only be served with a table meal.
- The event needed to be successful from the perspective of the event holders as they wished for the premises to obtain a premises licence eventually.
- All relevant documentation had been provided to the Council regarding taking necessary steps to ensure that the licensing objectives were upheld.
- Mr Stegariu had not been involved with any of the past activities associated with the premises.

To summarise, Ms Barrett stated that that the Police had stated that the public nuisance and crime and disorder objectives would not be upheld if the event was to go ahead considering the hours that had been requested.

To summarise Mr Simms and Mr Paphiti stated that other licensed premises in the area had operated temporary events until 04:00. The issues relating to the previous owners of the premises was not associated with the event organisers who wanted to prove that they were able to run the premises. All necessary precautions had been put in place and it was difficult for the Notice Giver, as the past activities of the premises had been inappropriately placed on his behalf. It was important to demonstrate that the premises were functional and was able to operate. They insisted that the event be allowed to go ahead and that the premises would be set up to provide food and drink. Adequate security would be in place and staff members would be adequately trained. As a DPS, Mr Paphiti had worked personally and professionally in licensed premises for over eight years and operated his own licensed premises. Mr Paphiti was happy for the event to be seen as a test of his ability to run the premises.

At 3:15pm the Sub-Committee adjourned to consider the application.

## **RESOLVED**

The Sub-Committee carefully considered the objection for a Temporary Event notice for Princess Banqueting, 502-508 High Road, Tottenham High Road, London, N17. In considering the objection, the Sub-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 agenda papers and the Notice Giver's and objector's written and oral representations.

Having considered the objection and heard from all the parties, the Sub-Committee decided that it was appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives for a counter notice to be served.

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....