MINUTES OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 JULY 2026, 7:00PM - 8:55PM

PRESENT: Councillors Nick da Costa (Chair), Luisa Brands and Adam Small

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

There was no urgent business.

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. The Sub-Committee decided to hear item 7 first before proceeding to hear item 6.

6. APPLICATION FOR A REVIEW OF A PREMISES LICENCE AT THE ARCHIVES, UNIT 10, HIGH CROSS CENTRE, FOUNTAYNE ROAD TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15 4QN (SOUTH TOTTENHAM)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- This was an application for a review of a premises licence made by residents following on from noise nuisance emanating from various events taking place at the premises.
- A copy of the licence could be found on appendix 1 of the agenda papers.
- The premises was located in the Tottenham Hale area and was initially described as a multi-use warehouse event space. It contained a bar, an outside courtyard and a roof event space that was not in use when the licence was initially granted due to further planning requirements needing to be met. This was an ongoing matter. The premises had a capacity estimated to be of about up to 1,600, but not all the event space could be in use at the same time.
- The premises had hosted various late night and all-day raves since the grant of the licence.

- The premises was hired out for various events and the licence allowed for the sale of alcohol and regulated entertainment as well as late night refreshment.
- There were supporting representations received from the Noise team and the Police.
- The licence holder had proposed conditions that could be placed on the licence.

In response to questions, the Licensing Officer stated that:

- The premises would put a pause on anything taking place in the outside area on the ground floor. There was also a roof terrace.

At this point in the proceedings, Mr Luke Elford, representing the licence holder, in response to a question, stated that the licence covered three distinct areas; the ground floor, including an outside area, the fifth floor and the roof terrace. Neither the fifth floor nor the roof terrace had actually been used or built. The only areas that were in use was the ground floor which included a courtyard area.

Presentation by the review applicant

Ms Annelie Kopps, resident and review applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Her flat was directly opposite the premises and she had been disturbed by loud music events that had been held at the ground floor in the outside area of the premises.
- Last year and this year in May, there were several events held and in the past she had tried to contact the Noise team and the Police and she had been unsuccessful. She acted as a representative of other residents in her estate and had therefore contacted the Licensing team because she thought a review application might be more successful.
- When the live events were held, they were extremely loud and rendered various homes unusable.
- It was difficult to do anything in her home. The noise impacted on conversations.
- The current licence did not allow the premises to hold music events in the outside area.
- She was not against the premises or music events at the premises indoors, but she did not want to be affected by loud music events taking place outdoors.

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

- The premises had not contacted or updated residents. In May 2026, the last time there were loud events, some other residents contacted the premises and tried to speak to staff to tell them that it was unbearable for them.
- The premises had been open for a few years. She did not attend the premises but assumed there were events happening throughout the year.
- In the last six or seven weeks since her application, there probably had been events held there. Residents had not been disturbed by events held indoors. The outdoor events were a nuisance. There was a noise management plan as part of the licence. This may be need to be reviewed as well to ensure that if events were only held indoors, there would be no noise emission.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that in more recent times, the outdoor space had very loud music being played. This had culminated in the what was experienced the weekend before the review was made. It was of significant disturbance. There had not

been many residents coming forward following a weekend disturbance from a premises at that particular time. Under the initial management, previously, anything that was taking place at the premises was meant to have been background levels of noise. This had since increased.

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

- The conditions offered were all positive. It was positive that the applicant recognised that there were issues. The applicant wanted to engage with local residents, but there was no need for engagement. She simply wanted no outdoor music events at the premises, rather than have to meet the applicant regularly.
- The noise management plan was important.

Presentation by interested parties

Mr Craig Bellringer, Noise and Nuisance Officer, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The Noise team had a long history of involvement with the premises.
- Over the last two years, the Noise team had received a number of complaints from residents regarding loud music, particularly during the summer months when the outside areas were used for events.
- Since June 2024, the Noise team had received 15 reports of loud music. Whilst the number may not appear significant in isolation, the complaints were concentrated around the periods when outdoor events took place and this demonstrated a reoccurring issue affecting nearby residents.
- The Council had attempted to work with the premises to address the concerns.
- Warning letters were sent in July 2024 and he had held discussions with the management regarding noise control measures. Despite the interventions, complaints had continued.
- On 27 August 2025, the Council served an abatement notice after officers witnessed a statutory noise nuisance from a residence property. This confirmed that the noise from the premises had reached a level that interfered with residents' enjoyment of their homes. Based on experience and observation, the principal issue was the outside area.
- The premises had not demonstrated that it could adequately control noise generated from the outside area. There remained a high likelihood that public nuisance would continue if licensable activities were permitted to take place there.
- The incident that triggered the review had amounted to a statutory nuisance and officers had been present to witness it.
- The premises had directly undermined the licensing objective of preventing public nuisance.
- The Noise team considered it necessary and proportionate to remove licensable activity from the outside area and to oppose conditions prohibiting speakers and the playing of music in the area.
- The measures were targeted at the source of the complaints and intended to protect the immunity of local residents whilst allowing the business to continue operating within appropriate limits.
- A reduction in licensing hours may need to be considered by the Sub-Committee should it conclude that further measures were necessary to promote the licensing objectives.
- Despite engagement warnings and formal enforcement action, the premises had not sufficiently addressed the ongoing noise issues.
- The evidence demonstrated that the prevention of public nuisance was being undermined and the measures proposed by the Noise team were both proportionate and appropriate.

PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She supported the review application.
- The matter had been referred to the Sub-Committee because, despite previous interventions, there remained significant concerns that the operation of the premises was failing to promote three of the licensing objectives, the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and prevention of public nuisance.
- The purpose of the hearing was not to determine whether isolated incidents had occurred.
- Licensed premises inevitably experienced incidents from time to time.
- The issue was whether the management of the premises had demonstrated that it was capable of promoting the licensing objectives and exercising effective control over the operation of the premises.
- The evidence demonstrated a pattern of management failings rather than a single unfortunate event.
- In relation to the prevention of crime and disorder, police records disclosed a number of the incidents connected with the premises over a relatively short period of time. This included a serious assault in which the victim allegedly lost consciousness, reports of theft connected with the events at the premises, stolen bank cards that were then used fraudulently, information relating to use of prohibited drugs and intelligence received from staff expressing concerns regarding management practices and the handling of the incidents.
- Some information suggested that serious incidents occurring within the premises had not been managed appropriately and had not escalated to senior management or the Police when they should have been.
- Although offences were alleged to have occurred, the concern was apparent failure of the management to recognise, response to and properly deal with incidents.
- Effective management was one of the cornerstones of the Licensing Act. Where management systems failed, the licensing objectives were placed at risk.
- In terms of public safety, on 18 May 2026, a compliance inspection was carried out which identified a number of licensing failures, including the absence of a door supervisor, risk assessment and the absence of alcohol sales training records. These failures resulted in a written warning issued to the designated premises supervisor (DPS) at that time, concerning alleged offenses under the Licensing Act.
- Further concerns related to obstructed emergency exits, medical staff missing from the premises, failures by staff to escalate incidents and wider shortcomings in event safety.
- Some matters had been addressed following Police intervention, the concern was that fundamental controls should already had been in place.
- Compliance should not depend upon regulatory intervention before basic licensing responsibilities were fulfilled.
- In relation to public nuisance, the Police fully supported the evidence presented by the Noise Team.
- There was documented history of complaints relating to amplified music and noise breaking out from the premises.
- The service of an abatement notice coupled with continuing complaints from the local residents demonstrated that previous attempts to resolve the issue had not been achieved.
- Good management should protect residents from nuisance just as effectively as it protected patrons from crime or unsafe conditions.
- When all of the evidence was viewed collectively rather than in isolation, a clear picture began to emerge of repeated crime related incidents, compliance failures, public safety

concerns, ongoing nuisance, issues and information suggesting weaknesses in management oversight.

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

- There had been no issues since the new management team had stated at the premises. The use of the outside areas had ceased and there was no music from the outside area and the bulk of complaints were from the use of that area.
- No complaints were ever submitted regarding the use of the inside area of the premises. Noise team worked until 02:00. The premises had a license until 06:00. If some hours were removed, it would be possible to monitor it more closely.

In response to questions, PC Costache informed the Sub-Committee that:

- CCTV recordings should be provided immediately to the Police upon request. There had been an improvement with the new management as before there had been an incident of grievous bodily harm (GBH) and Police had not been called.
- After the new management took over, a sexual offence was reported to the Police. This was an improvement where SIA staff had detained the alleged perpetrator.
- In relation to CCTV, she had spoken with the DPS and he admitted that the premises had some 'blind spots'. CCTV was not covering the dancefloor where the incident had occurred. As the CCTV was not comprehensive, this was a breach of licence. Footage was also not given immediately to officers.
- One incident of GBH had happened on 10 May 2026. This was under the previous management. In the early hours of the morning, two suspects punched a victim on the head, causing him to break out and fall to the floor. Premises staff did not call the Police, but called the Ambulance. The victim called the Police whilst at the hospital.
- Another incident involved a sexual assault on a woman. This happened on 5 July 2026 at 04:34 on Sunday morning. Police attended at 04:44. The call was made by a manager at the premises. SIA staff detained the suspect, who was subsequently arrested by police. CCTV covered the location. However, it was not directly viewable on the scene of the incident. The manager admitted the CCTV had several blind spots, including the dance floor area. The premises needed new cameras. Currently, it had about 30 cameras and it needed about 50 to cover the blind spots.
- CCTV at the premises was not fit for purpose.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer clarified that the licence was for the ground floor, the fifth floor and the roof terrace. However, the fifth floor and the roof terrace were not to be used and subject to planning processes.

Presentation by the licence holder

Mr Luke Elford, Mr Spencer Wyatt and Mr William Wintour representing the licence holder, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- A review application such as this was a rare occurrence for a licensing solicitor. A review application where the causes of the issues had been identified and dealt with did not come around often.

- They apologised to the review applicant, the interested parties and to councillors, but could not apologise for undermining the licensing objectives because they had not done so.
- The blame rested on an operator who was no longer part of the premises.
- They understood the negative impact that a poorly run licensed premises could have. Mr Wintour lived about 200 yards from the premises and he had himself experienced the problems that the premises had caused.
- Making a review application took time and effort, time completing forms, gathering evidence and support.
- They regretted not becoming involved in the premises 12 to 18 months ago. If they had done so, it would be unlikely for the application to have been submitted.
- The documentation submitted contained a letter and a suggestion to conditions that may be imposed if the Sub-Committee agreed that the root cause of the issues at the premises had been established and dealt with.
- Establishing the cause or causes of problems in response to a review application was important.
- The Sub-Committee must direct any remedial attention to any causes and do no more than what was appropriate and proportionate. Some of the suggestions that had been made, for example, reducing the hours of operation to suit the Noise team's working pattern were not appropriate and proportionate suggestions. The Sub-Committee was invited to reject these.
- Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour became involved with the premises when it became apparent to the owners of the building that the previous operators were operating in a way that was causing significant distress and nuisance to those nearby. They had over 50 years of venue and event management experience.
- It was disappointing to hear that the CCTV system at the premises was not adequate. The premises had been operating with the CCTV system the licence holder inherited. If more CCTV was required, more CCTV could be added. They were happy to work with the Police on the issue.
- Positive steps were being taking in terms of making the Police aware of upcoming events and also letting them know how the previous weekend had gone and maintaining regular contact.
- Mr Wintour was focused on community and regeneration. He had realised a long time ago that premises like The Archives only worked when they could host more than just music events.
- At another premises, Mr Wintour worked tirelessly to make progress and turn its reputation around. His community spirit in terms of the use of the premises was already taking place. The main room of the premises was being used for a charity telethon by a Jewish charity raising money for sick and disabled children.
- On screens throughout the premises, it was displayed that the premises had raised over £1.2 million in donations.
- A collaborative approach had been taken regarding the review application to safeguard the premises' future.
- They would suggest modifying the licence by adding appropriate and proportionate conditions. These were available to be seen on the agenda papers.

In response to questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- On the evidence the premises was being significantly mismanaged by the previous operator. This all had taken place prior to Mr Wintour and Mr Wyatt becoming involved at the beginning of June 2026.

At this point in the proceedings, the Licensing Officer stated that the initial licence applied for in 2021 was under the name of Full Steam Trading Limited and that name had continued to be the premises licence holder to date. One individual was the director of that company initially, before Mr Joe Berger took over in September 2022. He remained the director of Full Steam Trading Limited since that time. Mr Wyatt and Mr Fouad were subsequently added as directors since the review application was submitted. Full Steam Trading was the company that had held the premises licence from the start of the premises up to present time.

In response to further questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The company had the same name, but it was the same only by name.
- Mr Spencer was appointed as a director of the company and Mr Elford was on the Companies House website as of 3 June 2026. Mr. Winter, whose actual name was Hussein Ahmed Fouad, was appointed on 8 June 2026.
- Mr Berger was terminated as a director on the 29 June 2026. He was no longer a director and was never involved with the day-to-day management of the business.
- The actual people that were running this premises previously probably would have been the person who was appointed as DPS.
- The new DPS was Mr Wyatt.
- Neither Mr Wyatt nor Mr Wintour had any involvement with the premises previously before June 2026.
- The previous directors and owners had completely exited the business. There was no involvement with them either in the day-to-day running or non-executive directorships or any sort of attachment to Full Steam Trading Limited. They were not on Companies House. They were not persons with significant control. They had no more involvement with the premises.

In response to a question, the Licensing Officer stated that Mr Berger had subsequently removed himself from being a director there as of June 2026. Full Steam Trading was headed by Mr. Fouad and Mr. Wyatt.

In response to more questions, Mr Elford, Mr Wyatt and Mr Wintour informed the Sub-Committee that:

- They had inherited the paperwork from the previous ownership and it was under revision. There had been events taking place at the premises and the external area had been in use for smokers and for people to sit outside. However, there had been no music in the outside area or external regulated entertainment.
- They would be revising the noise management plan and once it had been fully revised, it would be resubmitted to officers.
- At present, the CCTV was managed by the office itself. It managed the whole CCTV system throughout the building. Unfortunately, one night when an incident occured, there was no one in the CCTV office.
- Page 92 of the agenda papers stated that the external seating area designated on the plan would be cleared by patrons no later than 23:00.
- A new noise management plans were being done. Mr Wyatt was currently going through all of the documents that had been inherited such as noise management plans, security management plans, venue management plans, right to work and other documents. It was an ongoing piece of work. One that he was going to give particular attention to was

the noise management plan for the premises. They were happy to liaise with any of the parties at this meeting on the plan. However, it would reflect no regulated entertainment outside.

- They had already made structural changes which were planned to be implemented straight away which would deter any activities to be held after 21:00 in the garden area. The premises was currently licensed to 23:00, but this was to change to 21:00 regardless of the activity. There were two sections. One was at the front of the rear of the building. It was utilised for a smoking area during licensed events internally.
- The outdoor area would be closed from 21:00.
- The premises was not planning to host any activities outside until the summer of 2027. Until then, extensive changes were going to be made in the garden.
- The external area of the premises was not suitable to host anything after 21:00. It was too close to residents and the licence holder had to take common courtesy into account when making decisions.

To summarise, Mr. Bellringer stated that due to the level of complaints that received for the outside area, the conditions that proposed in the additional papers were needed to reduce the disturbance that was likely to occur. In recent times, with the new management, there had been positive outcomes and obviously he would like that relationship to continue with the new management in place.

To summarise, PC Costache stated that the Police were not seeking to hold the current DPS responsible for matters that occurred before their appointment. However, the Sub-Committee was entitled to consider what had occurred during their stewardship of the premises. During that period, an allegation of sexual assault had arisen. When Police sought CCTV footage to investigate the allegation, management advised that the system did not cover the relevant area. This was difficult to reconcile with the requirement for a comprehensive CCTV system. The absence of coverage in an area where such a serious allegation could arise raised concerns not only regarding compliance with licence conditions but also regarding the robustness of the current management arrangements and their ability to promote the licensing objectives. She acknowledged the premises had submitted suggested conditions. However, an operating schedule was only effective if followed by the premises. Therefore, the Police supported the review application and respectfully invited members to consider the full range of powers available under the Licensing Act 2003. She invited members to determine which outcome was best and appropriate and proportionate to secure the promotion of the licensing objectives. She supported the reduction of hours and the CCTV issue needed to be addressed.

To summarise, Mr Elford stated that there was no evidence to support reducing operating hours. The evidence was that outside events had caused issues and outside events had been ceased. The Sub-Committee was invited to put in place a condition that prevented outside regulated entertainment taking place. The premises would shut the outside area at 21:00. A range of other conditions that addressed the issues that brought forward the review application which had been agreed by other parties. The premises did not pretend that there was not work to do at the premises. The new licence holders had inherited a difficult premises and were doing their best to improve matters. The process was underway. It was continuing at a pace it would be ensured that everything that took place promoted the licensing objectives.

Adjournment and Decision

At 8:55pm, the Sub-Committee withdrew from the meeting together with the Legal adviser and clerk to deliberate in private. The Sub-Committee had heard and considered representations

from all those who spoke. Legal advice was given to the Sub-Committee on the options open to them and the need for any decision to be proportionate.

The Sub-Committee decided to grant the review application impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence.

RESOLVED: To grant the review application impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence.

Decision notice

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for the review of a Premises Licence at: **THE ARCHIVES, UNIT 10, HIGH CROSS CENTRE, FOUNTAYNE ROAD TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15 4QN (SOUTH TOTTENHAM)**

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 Human Rights Act, The Environmental Protection Act 1990 part III The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005, Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 the report pack, and the applicant's and objector's representations.

Having carefully considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the grant the review application, impose conditions and amendments and modify the premises licence and remove the use of the Roof Top Terrace from the licence and use of the outdoor court yard for a period of 3 months subject to the conditions below:

Ground Floor (internal)
Monday to Sunday
Sale of Alcohol 1000 to 0600
Provision of Regulated Entertainment 1000 to 0600
Late Night Refreshment 2300 to 0500

5th Floor (internal)
Monday to Sunday
Sale of Alcohol 1000 to 0200
Provision of Regulated Entertainment 1000 to 0200
Late Night Refreshment 2300 to 0230

The opening hours of the premises:
Monday to Sunday 0800 to 0630

CONDITIONS:
The Committee requires the Respondent to adhere to the Conditions proposed by the Respondent at pages 16-17 of the additional papers of the Committee papers in addition to Robust CCTV, Noise Management, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals or minors and Incident Management policies
The conditions are as follows:

1. There shall be no outdoor regulated entertainment.

2. The premises shall have in place a Noise Management and Dispersal Policy which will be made readily available to any statutory authority upon request.

3. Unless and until there is a cited Noise Management and Dispersal Policy agreed to and approved by the licensing authority in writing use of the outdoor courtyard space is suspended.

4. Once the Noise Management and Dispersal Policy is approved and in place the outdoor court yard space will be cleared of patrons by no later than 21.00.

5. There shall be no use of the Roof Top Terrace and any refence to it is removed from the licence.
6.

(a) The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system as per the minimum requirements of the Haringey Police Licensing Team.

(b) All entry and exit points will be covered enabling frontal identification of every person entering in any light condition.

(c) The CCTV system shall continually record whilst the premises is open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises and will include the external area immediately outside the premises entrance.

(d) All recordings shall be stored for a minimum period of 31 days with date and time stamping.

(e) Viewing of recordings shall be made available immediately upon the request of Police or authorised officer throughout the entire 31-day period.

5. A staff member from the premises who is conversant with the operation of the CCTV system shall be on the premises at all times when the premises is open. This staff member must be able to provide a Police or authorised council officer copies of recent CCTV images or data with the absolute minimum of delay when requested.

6. Management must ensure that patrons do not obstruct the public highway in any manner whilst outside the premises.

7. No noise generated on the premises, or by its associated plant or equipment, shall emanate from the premises nor vibration be transmitted through the structure of the premises which gives rise to a nuisance.

8. Loudspeakers shall not be located in the entrance and exit of the premises or outside the building.

9. The Premises shall be kept in a clean and tidy condition and waste management shall be dealt with effectively and expeditiously to ensure no nuisance or annoyance is caused to any owner or occupiers of neighbouring properties.
10. The Premises Licence Holder shall maintain a hotline number for all events taking place at the Premises.

11. The hotline number shall be provided to the Licensing Authority and displayed on any social media or communications regarding events.

12. The Premises Licence Holder shall keep a log (which may be electronic) of all calls received by the hotline number, including the name of the caller (if given) and a brief

description of the issue. The log shall be kept at the Premises and made available to Responsible Authority Officers on request.

13. The Premises Licence Holder shall maintain a hotline email address for all events taking place at the Premises.

14. The hotline email address shall be provided to the Licensing Authority and displayed on any social media or communications regarding events.

15. The Premises Licence Holder shall keep a log (which may be electronic) of all emails received by the hotline email address, including the name of the sender (if given) and a brief description of the issue. The log shall be kept at the Premises and made available to Responsible Authority Officers on request.

16. Both the hotline number and email address shall be monitored for the duration of any event by a competent person appointed by the Premises Licence Holder.

17. The logs for both the hotline number and hotline email address shall be kept for a period of 12 months from the date of call or email before they may be discarded.

18. The Premises Licence Holder will arrange regular residents' meetings (which may take place online) to discuss the operation of the Premises. For the remainder of 2026, residents' meetings shall be held once per calendar month beginning in July 2026.

19. The Premises Licence Holder shall advertise the date and time of the residents' meetings by:
a. Affixing an A4 notice at the main entrance to the Premises from the public highway
b. Providing a copy of that notice to the Licensing Authority by email
c. Providing a copy of that notice to any person who has provided the Premises Licence Holder with their email address for that purpose.

20. The date and time of the residents' meetings shall be advertised at least 7 days before the meetings are due to take place.

21. The Premises Licence Holder shall produce a note (which may be AI generated) of each residents' meeting and a copy of that note shall be served on:
a. The Licensing Authority by email
b. Any person who has provided the Premises Licence Holder with their email address for that purpose
within 10 working days of the residents' meeting having taken place.
Copies of these notes (which may be electronic) shall be kept at the Premises and made available on request to Responsible Authority Officers.

22. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme.
(a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and responsible alcohol sales and a record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer.
(b) Relevant material shall be displayed at the premises.

(a) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office.

REASONS:

The committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by all the supporters of the application and the owners and operators of the Premises and the Metropolitan Police.
It was noted that the main area of concern for the Applicant was the prevention of public nuisance objectives being impacted by the noise emanating from the outdoor court yard space and roof top terrace. Given the number of noise complaints associated with the premises the Committee feels strongly that use of the roof top space should be removed from the licence and before any use of the outdoor court yard space can be considered the owners and operators must prove that they can put in place plans to manage the noise and dispersal in relation to the indoor space.
The Committee, whilst noting the numerous noise complaints received by Haringey before the current owners and operators took over, firmly believes that the conditions referred to above will serve to alleviate the worries and concerns raised by the owners and occupiers of neighbouring property.
It should also be noted that the above conditions are legally enforceable and breaching any of them can lead to a review of your premises licence/a prosecution under section 136 of the Licencing Act 2003. The potential sanctions are significant ie 6 months in prison and / or an unlimited fine.
The representative for the owners and operators made reference to Section 177A of the Licensing Act 2003 however this venue has a 1000 plus capacity far in excess of the 'no more than 500 persons' referred to in section 177A subsection 2 (1 C) therefore the Committee did not deem it relevant for the purpose of the current application.
In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application to review with the above conditions balanced the interests of the Applicant, the Respondent, local residents and the licencing objectives.

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.

7. APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT THOMPSON'S BEER SHOP, 26 VERYAN COURT, PARK ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON N8 8JR (CROUCH END)

Presentation by the Licensing Officer

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

- The applicant sought the ability to provide the sale of alcohol Monday to Wednesday from 13:00 to 22:00, Thursday 13:00 to 23:00, Friday and Saturday 12:00 until 23:00 and Sunday from 13:00 to 20:00 for the supply of alcohol for consumption on and off the premises.
- Should the licence be granted, the premises would be able to benefit from the automatic right to be able to provide regulated entertainment
- The application had received representations from the Police and the Noise team, but these representations had been withdrawn.
- There were resident representations and a petition submitted from local residents.
- Section 1.4 of the report should be disregarded by the Sub-Committee.

- The premises was situated in a terrace of residential properties with retail units underneath. The applicant described the business as an independent beer shop and tap room specialising in the sale of craft beer, real ale, cider and related products for consumption both on and off premises.
- The applicant had offered not to do outdoor seating as part of the application.

Presentation by the applicant

Mr Alex Holbourn, applicant, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He wished to thank the residents who had taken the time to submit representations.
- He understood why issues had been raised and he hoped to reassure residents and the Sub-Committee that the application promoted the licensing objectives.
- The business was intended to be a positive addition to the area.
- He had lived locally in Crouch End for almost 15 years and opening Thompson's Beer Shop was not simply a business opportunity for him. It was something he wanted to create for the community in which he lived.
- He would be running the shop himself
- He did not wish to create an environment that caused nuisance to neighbours or changed the character of the area.
- The business would be, first and foremost, a specialist independent craft beer shop. Alongside the retail side of the business, patrons would be able to enjoy a carefully selected range of beers and other drinks on the premises.
- His intention was always for the premises to be somewhere quiet, relaxed and welcoming where people could enjoy a good beer in a calm environment.
- The premises was not intended to operate as a pub or a venue focused on late night drinking.
- The premises itself was a very small with space with only a handful of seats. There was no capacity for large groups or a lively drinking atmosphere.
- He wanted the business to become part of the local community. He intended to work with other independent local businesses wherever he could. This could be through collaborations, supporting artists, events, or encouraging people to visit independent shops and restaurants that made the area already special.
- He wanted to add something different to the local high street and make a positive contribution to the community.
- Many of the concerns that had been raised related directly to the four licensing objectives. The prevention of public nuisance, prevention of crime, and disorder, public safety, and the prevention of children from harm.
- He understood the concerns and had worked with the responsible authorities throughout this process. To address the concerns directly, he had agreed to the conditions put forward by the responsible authorities.
- There would be no outdoor seating. Patrons would not be congregating outside the premises. Any recorded music would only ever be low-level background music for customers inside the premises. These were measures specifically intended to minimise any risk of public nuisance.
- He would actively manage the area immediately outside the premises.
- Patrons would not be permitted to take drinks outside and he did not intend the frontage to become a smoking area. If patrons wished to smoke, they would be asked to leave their drinks inside and move away from the front of the premises. If anyone started gathering outside, staff would politely move them move them on.
- He wanted to be a good neighbour and intended to manage the premises accordingly.

- In relation to the rear of the building, the outdoor area at the back of the premises would not be used by patrons at any time. It was not intended to be a customer space and there would be no drinking, seating or gatherings there. Residents used that area and children played there. He hoped this provided reassurance in relation to both public safety and the protection of children from harm.
- In relation to the feedback around earlier closing times, he accepted these, but would ask the Sub-Committee to allow the terminal hour for the sale of alcohol on Friday and Saturday to be 22:00, with last orders taken at 21:30. This reflected the agreement reached with the Police who considered the application and were satisfied these timings were appropriate subject to the agreed conditions. He hoped this reassured the prevention of crime and disorder objective.
- The application was being considered by all of the responsible authorities. Police, the Noise and Nuisance team and the London Fire Brigade had all agreed the licence could be granted provided the agreed conditions were followed.
- If, after operating successfully and demonstrating that the business was well managed, he wished to introduce a very small amount of seasonal outdoor seating with restricted hours. This would be a separate application so it could considered on its own merits.
- He would ask the Sub-Committee to reconsider the proposed condition prohibiting vertical drinking. Whilst he understood its intention, he did not believe it was practical or proportionate as he could not reasonably control whether a person briefly stood with a drink. His commitment was to ensure the premises did not operate as a noisy or a bar-like drinking venue and he therefore asked the Sub-Committee not to impose the condition.
- The premises was not a chain or an investment property. It was his business and he would be running it day to-day. His reputation, his livelihood and his relationship with the local community were tied to the business. It would not make sense for him to create problems for the people he hoped would become his customers.
- He wanted Thompson Beer Shop to become known as a quiet, welcoming, independent beer shop that added something positive to the local area.
- If concerns were ever raised, he would engage openly with residents and the Council to resolve them quickly.
- He hoped he had demonstrated that the application promoted each of the four licensing objectives and he asked the Sub-Committee to grant the application subject to the agreed conditions.

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

- There were no independent craft beer shops in Crouch End.
- The premises would be a dedicated craft beer shop with three fridges, a few craft beers on draft. It would have a few seats. There was nothing like this in Crouch End.
- He did not anticipate the maximum capacity of the premises to exceed more than 10 at any one time.
- He would be happy for a telephone number or an e-mail address to be shared with residents if they had any concerns and he would be happy to have this as a condition on the licence.

Presentation by interested parties

Ms Helen D’Ambrosio, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Residents were concerned that the area had a residential building. There were 18 flats. The only place that had patrons coming in to consume food and smoothies was a cafe

which closed at 16:00. Residents were worried about having drunk people on their doorstep.
- There were already young people who could be seen outside front doors who smoked and threw cigarette butts outside. They also drank alcohol and left cans in the area.
- In the afternoon, there were lots of noisy school children who ran around the area. Having people drinking outside would expose children to the premises and its activities.
- In relation to noise, it was unclear how loud the music is going to be until a business opened up.
- There was a big difference regarding how well the premises operated with the new management as there had been an improvement. However, before there was loud music played at the premises. The premises now had a different clientele including families. The music level was not too high.
- The applicant was willing to work with residents and listen to concerns.

In response to questions, Ms D'Ambrosio informed the Sub-Committee that:

- The new agreements including a terminal hour of 22:00 on Friday and Saturday would address most of her concerns as long as there was not any disorderly behaviour on outside the flats in the pavement or a mess left afterwards. Various shops tended to clean the front of their shops because they did not want it to be messy.
- She did not want to have anybody drinking in the outside area.
- Residents were worried about having people drinking on the in the premises and in the outside area. Off licences did not actually offer consumption of alcohol inside the premises. Patrons brought the alcohol and took it away. No music was played either.

To summarise, Ms D'Ambrosio felt that the applicant had presented well and appeared to want to work with residents.

To summarise, Mr Holbourn stated that he hoped a case that makes it reassuring that it.

Adjournment and Decision

Later, at 8:55pm, the Sub-Committee withdrew from the meeting together with the Legal adviser and clerk to deliberate in private. The Sub-Committee had heard and considered representations from all those who spoke. Legal advice was given to the Sub-Committee on the options open to them and the need for any decision to be proportionate.

The Sub-Committee decided to grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

RESOLVED: To grant the application subject to conditions and amendments.

Decision Notice

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a Premises License at, Application for a New Premises Licence at Thompson's Beer Shop, 26 Veryan Court, Park Road, Hornsey, London N8 8JR.

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 objector's representations in

particular the withdrawn objections of the Metropolitan Police, the London Fire Brigade and Haringeys Noise and Nuisance Team

Having considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Committee decided to **GRANT** the application subject to the conditions and amendments below:

Regulated Entertainment: Recorded Music
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 21:30 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 22:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 19:30 hours
Sale of Alcohol
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 21:30 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 22:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 20:00 hours
Supply of alcohol **ON** and **OFF** the premises.
Hours open to Public
Monday to Wednesday 13:00 to 22:00 hours
Thursday 13:00 to 23:00 hours
Friday to Saturday 12:00 to 23:00 hours
Sunday 13:00 to 20:00 hours

CONDITIONS:

The Committee requires the Applicant to adhere to most of the conditions proposed by the Metropolitan Police at page 139-142 of the Committee papers, relating to Robust CCTV, Dispersal, Staff Training particularly in relation to the prevention of sale of alcohol to intoxicated individuals or minors and Incident Management policies and in addition to a condition that litter will be dealt with so that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from litter. However it should be noted that there is no restriction on vertical drinking.

The conditions are as follows:

1. CCTV shall be installed, operated, and maintained, to function all times that the premises is open for licensable activities. Said CCTV will comply with the following criteria:
(a) The premises will ensure that the system is checked on a regular basis to ensure that the system is working properly and that the date and time are correct.
(b) There will be a camera on the entrance to the premises, to capture a clear image of anyone entering.
(c) The system will provide coverage of the interior of the premises accessible to the public:
(d) The system will record in real time and recordings will be date and time stamped:
(e) At all times during operating hours, there will be at least 1 member of staff on the premises who can operate the system sufficiently to allow Police or authorised Council officers to view footage on request.
(f) Recordings will be kept for a minimum of 31 days and downloaded footage will be provided to the police or other authorised officers on request (subject to the Data Protection Act 2018) within 24 hours of any request.
(g) Signage stating that CCTV is in operation will be clearly and prominently displayed at the premises.
An incident and refusal log [whether kept in written or electronic form] shall be kept at the premises, and made available on request to the police or an authorised officer, which will record:
(a) Any and all allegations of crime or disorder reported at the venue

(b) Any and all complaints received by any party
(c) Any faults in the CCTV system
(d) Any visit by a relevant authority or emergency service
(e) Any refused sales of alcohol
(f) Any and all ejections of patrons
All staff involved in the sale of alcohol shall receive induction and refresher training (every 12 months) relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence.
All training relating to the sale of alcohol and the times and conditions of the premises licence shall be documented and records kept at the premises. These records shall be made available to the Police and/or Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year from the date of the last entry.

2. All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
Suitable beverages other than alcohol (including drinking water) shall be available for consumption.
The maximum number of people on the premises at any one time shall not exceed the capacity limit.
All emergency exits shall be always kept free from obstruction.
The premises license holder shall ensure that the area immediately outside the premises is kept clean and free from smoking-related litter at all material times to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority.

3. The premises will not sell alcohol to any person or on the behalf of any person, who appears to be drunk.
A personal licence holder is to be present on the premises and supervise the sale of alcohol, or a trained member of staff nominated in writing by the DPS shall always be on duty throughout the permitted hours for the sale of alcohol and when the premises are open to the public.
Prominent, clear and legible notices shall be displayed at all public exits from the premises requesting customers respect the needs of residents and leave the premises area quietly. These notices shall be positioned at eye level and in a location where those leaving the premises can read them.
All refuse and bottles shall be disposed of in bins quietly so as not to disturb neighbours or residents.

4. The premises will operate the 'Challenge 25' proof of age scheme.
(a) All staff will be fully trained in its operation and responsible alcohol sales and a record of this be kept on site and made available to police or an authorised officer.
(b) Relevant material shall be displayed at the premises.

(b) Only suitable forms of photographic identification, such as passport or UK driving licence, or a holographic marked PASS scheme cards, will be accepted and any other ID approved by the Home Office.

5. Means of direct contact via telephone/email to be provided to local residents.

6. Periodic meetings with local residents to be arranged to address any concerns raised.

7. There shall be no use of the rear yard area of the premises or the area directly in front of the premises for the consumption of alcohol.

REASONS:

The Committee gave serious consideration to the submissions by the Applicant and to the concerns raised by the objector(s). Whilst sympathetic to the objector(s) it was noted that the

Applicant addressed all the concerns raised robustly and had sought to agree conditions with the Metropolitan Police in advance of the Hearing.

In particular the Committee took into account that the Applicant agreed to reduce his trading hours and to confirm that any application re outdoor space would be made separately. He further agreed to provide contact details so that residents might contact him directly with any concerns/complaints re his business.

In light of the above, it was deemed that a grant of the application with the above conditions balanced the interest of the applicant, the residents and the licencing objectives.

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.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

CHAIR: Councillor Nick da Costa

Signed by Chair ……..

Date ……