MINUTES OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 28 JULY 2025, 7:00PM – 8:25PM

PRESENT: Councillors Anna Abela (Chair), Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Mark Blake, Reg Rice, Elin Weston, Nick da Costa, Kaushika Amin and Adam Small

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence was received from Councillor Makbule Gunes, Councillor Reg Rice and Councillor Nicola Bartlett.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nick da Costa stated that he was a Trustee of Alexandra Palace and Chair of Alexandra Palace Trading Limited.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were none.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

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

7. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

Ms Daliah Barrett, Licensing Team Leader, introduced the report.
The meeting heard that:

- Fast food outlets would not usually be subject to much licensing regulation unless they proposed to operate after 23:00 and offered hot food and hot drink. A licence would then be required and the business may step into the realm of

delivery operations whereby considerations would be made regarding prevention of public nuisance. The Public Health department had worked with the Commercial Environmental Health team to do some work with businesses around how food was cooked and prepared.

- Vapes were not usually subject to licensing processes. However, Trading Standards dealt with the enforcement issues regarding vapes. There was expected to be new legislation regarding tobacco. If a licensed premises were found to be selling vapes to underage individuals or stocking illicit vapes or illicit tobacco, then Trading Standards may submit a review under the Licensing Act.
- In relation to the Government's expected new proposals on licensing regulation, it was likely a new Statement of Licensing Policy would need to be completed. The work around the Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025 may impact on Safety Advisory Groups and possibly other areas of licensing.
- Licensing Sub-Committees could consider the cumulative impact of licensed premises in a given location in relation to considering a licensing application. Police and Public Health would like to have certain areas of the borough defined as a saturated area. This would make the area subject to a presumption of a refusal of a premises licence. However, the Sub-Committee would still make a determination of an application based on the evidence before them.
- Vaping at the Tottenham Hotspur stadium inside the club rooms and the buildings would definitively not be allowed as those areas were enclosed. However, it was notable that the stadium area itself had no specific roof. The football club would be consulted with regarding the issue.
- The circular letter would be sent to representatives of residents. This would be done via the consultation team who would send out the links to all the residents associations that the Council had listed. The economic development team would also share the consultation link with the various trader's associations. Residents that had been in contact with the Council tended to get copied in as well.
- The consultation was a borough-wide consultation. In the past, the Communications team would always include a line that stated if a document needed to be seen in another language, a contact detail would be provided for this. The issue would be explored further with the consultation team.
- Schools and colleges in the borough would be made subject to the consultation. It was already sent to Children's Services and would be subject to their team meetings.
- In the past, discursive events would be held with licence holders, but these had become limited due to budget constraints. The hiring of the space incurred a cost. Work had been done with the Police regarding Ask for Angela, but the Police had allocated a budget for this. When a new applicant became known to Licensing, it was rare to get an application that had no objections. As a matter of course, applicants would then be asked if they had consulted the policy or if they had looked at parts of the policy that would be relevant to their application. They would also be asked to look at the model conditions. Links would be provided to them to do this.
- Licensing communicated regularly with licence holders. A mailshot of licence holders was kept on file if information needed to be communicated to licensed premises. This had been put in place since the coronavirus crisis and had simply carried on. The Regeneration team ran a business newsletter. This too

had been created during the coronavirus crisis to engage with licensed premises.

- In relation to cumulative impact zones, under the licensing regime, the Police and Public Health would only look at off-licences. There was no flexibility under the Gambling Act to be able to have cumulative impact zones. It was something that had been mentioned in the white paper that the Government had released at the time in 2022, but had not been brought forward further.
- Residents using the licensing process to deal with issues relating to vibrations at Finsbury Park would not be useful to them. There was an underground that ran through that area and it was subject to heavy traffic. Some of the resident-based meetings had Hackney residents who had said they had problems with the land owners, that they did not think the area had been built properly and that they were suffering from the vibrations caused from it. Licensing legislation could be used address this if there was a noise nuisance and it was directly in relation to the event. A review application could be submitted. If residents had issues with vibrations, then the occupant of the home would have to get their own independent surveyor to come into their home, take assessments and do readings in order to show the cause or effect. The Council would then need to take a view as to the use of the land.

The Licensing Committee RESOLVED:

1. To approve consultation on the draft Haringey Statement of Licensing Policy 2026-2031 attached as Appendix 1 to this report.
2. To note and agree the arrangements for public consultation as set out within this report at section 6.
3. To note that following the consultation the responses will be brought back to the Licensing Committee who will then make recommendations to Full Council for adoption of the policy.

8. REVISION OF FUNCTIONS AND FEES UNDER MASSAGE AND SPECIAL TREATMENT. REVISION OF CONDITIONS.

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

The meeting heard that:

- Ear piercings (or similar activities) carried out by jewellers needed to be licensed. The ASB Enforcement team had been asked to carry out door-to-door research on premises that did piercings. Fees would be paid by business owners. There were situations where a person would rent a room, such as at a hairdresser, who would then offer massages or special treatments. That individual will pay their own fee.
- The business owner would fill out the form and provide certificates and details of each therapist. The Environmental Health Officer would then check to ensure that the ventilation in the premises was good and that the certificates corresponded with the right people. The fee was to be paid at the time when the application was submitted.

- The classification of treatments listed in the agenda papers were simply a partial list. The more intrusive treatments such as anything that pierced the skin would be categorised as Class 1 and lower levels of treatment such as nails would be categorised as Class 4. However, some of the classifications appeared to have inconsistencies, so the documents would be revised.
- During a renewal, applicants needed to show their public liability insurance. One document that may not be required for three or four years was the general electricity certification - the NICEIC. This would last five years and would not be needed upon renewal every year. The table in the agenda papers would be changed to reflect this around the process for renewing.
- In relation to officers recognising modern slavery, when operations were being done throughout the year, the Commercial Environmental Health team would be contacted and would work in unison with the Police. On a monthly basis, the Home Office would contact the Council to alert which businesses they wished to visit. They would be provided with documents for the business and they would then carry out visits. Looking for modern day slavery was one of the primary purposes of the visits. Sometimes they would be accompanied by Police.
- Commercial Environmental Health Officers that made the visits were trained in looking for modern day slavery.
- Class 2 osteopathy and chiropractors were both not subject to fees, but there were certain types of therapists that had a standard qualification to offer certain treatments.
- Page 122 on appendix 2 of the agenda papers listed the incorrect maximum basic applicant's fee and this would be changed.
- If businesses were closing down, they would apply for a refund.
- The retention sum of £285 as stated on page 122 of the agenda papers would be for each application.
- In relation to beauty parlours, if there was an issue with the licence, concerns could be raised with the Licensing team. However, investigations would be done by Commercial Environmental Health Officers. It was better for Licensing to be contacted as the team needed to engage with the business in the first instance. It would then be referred to the Commercial Environmental Health Officer who would then meet with the business.
- Licensing sent out the applications a month and a half in advance to each of the registered businesses and, provided they submitted the application back before the expiry date of their existing licence, they would be able to continue operating. The ones that did not submit their forms would be added to the list for the ASB team to do doorstep visits.
- Having scores on premises doors was not something that was currently done for premises which dealt with special treatments. A beauty salon would not want to have any negative publicity in any case. The Treatwell app provided an overview of good practice or good reviews on premises. There was some expectation that the Government would address the issue as many types of premises now existed which offered aesthetic works alongside more ordinary beauty treatments. Patrons needed to do their own research and familiarise themselves with the kinds of treatments that they wanted to have done. The beauty industry had considerable demand and this sometimes could result in unfavourable consequences for patrons.

- CoolSculpting was an aesthetic and was not covered by licensing legislation.
- A resource for customer complaints had been considered for hairdressers, barbers and beauty salons. However, this would mean having to find additional resources and this was why it had not been taken forward.

The Licensing Committee RESOLVED:

1. To note the contents of the report and the appendices in the report.
2. To approve the proposed changes to the Massage and Special Treatment licensing process set out in section 4 of the report.
3. To exercise power under s10(1) of the London Local Authorities Act 1991 by regulation to prescribe the revised standard conditions for licensed special treatments establishments and the revised special conditions attached with the report.
4. To approve the fees and charges for this function as set out in Appendices 2 and 3 in the report.

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were none.

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Abela

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……

This page is intentionally left blank