Environment & Neighbourhoods

Licensing Team Leader Daliah Barrett -Williams

Haringey LONDON

Mr Onuiri

Your ref:

Date: 03rd August 2026

Our ref:

BY EMAIL

Dear Sirs,

COMMITTEE HEARING RESOLUTION

Application by the Noise Responsible Authority ("Noise") supported by the Police for Review of a Premises Licence at Village Square, 177 Archway Road, N6 5BT.[1]

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

[1] Page numbers in this decision refer to pages in the Agenda Pack; pages prefixed with AP1 and AP2 refer to pages in the pack of Additional Papers and Additional Papers 2 respectively

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.

The DPS did not seriously contest the incidents set out in the packs or in oral representations. His position was that (to the extent that they arose from anti-social behaviour by those outside the premises) he had no power to prevent them. He explained that his business model as a karaoke bar was as a late-night business. The majority of his customers tend to be female, and they would arrive at his premises after midnight, after other premises closed. This in turn led to men turning up outside, who caused the trouble but were not his customers. He mentioned several times that he had been told by those outside the premises that he had no right to try to control them.

As to the music and noise emanating from the premises, he commented that the customers like it when there is loud music and it's loud.

In answer to questioning about the occasions when the licensing information was not posted at the premises, he explained that they had been removed by inebriated customers. He was asked whether that meant he was serving too much alcohol, and he responded (edited for clarity):

> *"...when you say...you're serving too much alcohol...a glass of wine or two can intoxicate someone do you know...threshold of whoever you're serving. So it's only when you start to see them misbehave, you know, that's when...you stop serving the alcohol and when you see...them do that and they start to actually tear things off the wall or tear property*

off the wall, then that's where the security comes in and obviously...they're asked to leave, you know, and that's that's uh that's just the best we can do."

This answer concerned the LSC.

He gave evidence that he had started to implement the action plan, and the bar was now much quieter; he described it as being *"like a graveyard now"*.

Evaluation

The LSC reminded itself that it is required by section 4 of the Act to exercise its functions with a view to promoting the licensing objectives, of which three were in issue on this application:

(a) the prevention of crime and disorder;

(b) public safety;

(c) the prevention of public nuisance; and

The LSC was satisfied on the evidence provided that the operation of the premises to date had seriously undermined each of those objectives.

While the DPS submitted that the crowd outside the premises causing anti-social behaviour were not his customers, the LSC was clear that whoever they were, they were there as a result of his operation of the premises and the DPS was unable to control their behaviour.

The appropriate action

For the above reasons, the LSC determined it appropriate to exercise its statutory powers so as to promote the licensing objectives.

The LSC noted that the successful – loud - business model outlined by the DPS was what led to the breaches. The LSC could not see that the new members only business model would work for the DPS.

The LSC did consider imposing conditions to implement the Action Plan the DPS proposed, and suspending the licence to give the the DPS time to make necessary changes and deliver training to staff; given the DPS's evidence that the action he had already taken had reduced takings and in his words turned the premises into a graveyard, however, and the DPS's years' long track record of non-compliance, the LSC was not satisfied that the DPS could be trusted to operate the premises in accordance with any such conditions.

It is no part of the LSC's function to try to define a business model for the premises that it could both be confident the DPS would continue and that would uphold the licensing objectives.

Accordingly, the LSC resolved to **revoke** this licence as set out above.

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.

Yours sincerely,

Daliah Barrett
Licensing Team Leader
Haringey Licensing Service
On behalf of Licensing Authority

Licensing Team
Level 4, Alexandra House
Station Road
London, N22 8HQ

T 020 8489 8232
E licensing@haringey.gov.uk
www.haringey.gov.uk