

## **REPORT OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE No. 1, 2025/26**

### **FULL COUNCIL 24 November 2025**

Chair: Councillor Anna Abela      Deputy Chair: Councillor Sheila Peacock

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This report to Full Council arises from consideration of the following report by the Licensing Committee on the 06 November 2025; revised Statement of Licensing Policy 2026– 2031.

The Council in its role as a Licensing Authority under the Licensing Act 2003 (LA03) has a duty to determine, publish and keep under review its Statement of Licensing Policy, which has a five year shelf life but can be replaced at any time during that five-year period.

#### **2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE / OUTCOME ON DRAFT STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY**

We considered the consultation response/outcome on the draft Statement of Licensing Policy and discussed the following:

- In relation to page 21 of the agenda papers, paragraph 2.20 and 2.21, it was not clear on how it related to the Statement of Licensing Policy. The meeting felt it should be removed. It was agreed that paragraphs 2.20 and 2.21 would be removed under the current draft.
- Page 22 of the agenda papers (on counterterrorism) should specify the name of the Act, because it was not present in the paragraphs. There may be a lot of applicants who would not be aware of the regulations. The second sentence which read 'licensing law was not a mechanism for the general control of antisocial behaviour by individuals' was not related to counterterrorism. Antisocial behaviour was different from concerns about counterterrorism. The inclusion of the sentence did not offer clarity on the outline of anti-terrorism requirements.
- Page 26 of the agenda papers discussed alcohol related hospital admissions. The paragraph stated that alcohol was responsible for and continued to 2.5 times higher in males and females with figures of 7,000 deaths annually, 167,000 years and the cost to the NHS of £4 billion. It was not clear if these were national figures or just Haringey specific figures or national average figures.
- In relation to page 40 and 41 of the agenda papers, Tottenham Hotspur Stadium had a whole process around the bag size that people were permitted to bring into the stadium. They also had an airport style entry into the premises. Bags would be scanned and searched by the staff on the way in. Councillors could be invited to view the checks. There

had also been complaints made regarding the security checks made when NFL (National Football League) events were held at the stadium. More detailed bag and safety checks would be brought up with Tottenham Hotspur.

- In relation to paragraph 3.23 on page 72 of the agenda papers, the sentence 'all Londoners are able to travel, work and go out safely and confidently at night without fear of being victims of criminal offences' should be changed to read with the words 'it is the Council's ambition that all Londoners should be able to' or just 'Londoners should be able to travel' or 'all women should be able to travel safely in London'.
- A night-time economy was not necessary for an efficient public transport service.
- In relation to comments made in the report on page 20 of the agenda papers referring to vision for London as a 24-hour city, the meeting felt that these comments should be removed. Many residents across the borough may be concerned if the Council made blanket statements about supporting the 24-hour economy. The Committee agreed to delete paragraphs 2.16 to 2.19 on pages 20 and 21 of the agenda papers.

In relation to the consultation responses to the Statement of Licensing Policy and the equalities assessment, the meeting heard:

- The Ask for Clive initiative had not been included in the policy. The London Borough of Hackney had several nightclubs, whereas Haringey had one. Hackney also had the remit to issue licences to sexual entertainment venues (SEVs). Some of the clubs in Hackney, if they were catering to different parts of the community, then they would have different measures in place. Haringey was recently seeing some LGBTQ events coming into the borough, mainly in the South Tottenham area. Hackney were making some changes to their cumulative impact policies impacting on some of the businesses in the Hackney borough. Haringey had resolved not to have SEVs in the borough and this had been in place for many years.
- Events typical of SEVs taking place at a Haringey premises could be done, but had to be once a month. The premises that took advantage of the opportunity engaged in the Ask for Angela scheme. An Ask for Clive scheme within these events could be done. Licensing and a Police Licensing Officer would be happy hold discussions with the event organisers regarding the scheme.
- On page 33 of the agenda papers, under 2.14 on the prevention of crime and disorder, a bullet point could be added to promote awareness of the Ask for Angela and/or the Ask for Clive campaign.
- On page 73 of the agenda papers, under 3.25, the words 'in the night time economy' would be removed, but could be placed elsewhere as a reference, possibly on paragraph 2.6 on page 20 of the agenda papers which referenced planning.

- Councillor Ruth Gordon would be invited to the Licensing Committee to provide an update at a future meeting of the work the Council was doing in relation to Licensing.
- The accredited Hackney Nights scheme had a zero-tolerance approach to hate harassment. A similar scheme in Haringey had not been pursued as the borough was not similar to Hackney. Haringey did not have the same makeup of high vertical drinking establishments. This was partly why Hackney had saturation policies in place. Instead, Haringey had set up a responsible retailer scheme. This was about encouraging retailers to ensure that they were following the law, aware of their conditions, doing all that they could to retail responsibly - not just with alcohol but across other items such as vapes, or cigarettes or food. Haringey's night-time economy was more food led.
- In relation to the Council setting up a paid for advice service in relation to licensing matters, the Council would need more resourcing because the Licensing team would need to ensure that the contributing Licensing Officer's role was a separate role so that the Council did not have a conflict of interest with ongoing licensing cases. The officer giving the advice needed to keep a close neutral position as, in the event the applicant did not have a licence granted, it was possible that the applicant may consider the advisor to be partly to blame.

### **The Committee RESOLVED**

To ask Full Council at its next meeting to adopt the draft revised Statement of Licensing Policy 2026– 2031, set out at Appendix 1 of the attached report.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Full Council is recommended:

To adopt the draft revised Statement of Licensing Policy 2026– 2031, Noting and taking into account the EQiA at App 3 of the attached report.