

Decision Notice

APPLICATION FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENSE AT RED CARPET RESTAURANT AND BAR, 99 WEST GREE ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15- HEARING- 10TH AUGUST 2026

The Licensing Sub-Committee has carefully considered the application for a premises licence together with:

The Licensing Act 2003;
The Council's Statement of Licensing Policy;
The Secretary of State's Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003;
The application and supporting documentation;
The representations made by the applicant;
The representations made by the responsible authorities; and
The oral submissions made at the hearing.

Having considered all the evidence before it, the Sub-Committee has decided to REFUSE the application.

Reasons for the Decision

In reaching its decision, the Sub-Committee attached significant weight to the representations of the Noise and Nuisance Service and the documented history of non-compliance at the premises.

The Sub-Committee noted the evidence that:

A warning letter had been issued to the applicant following concerns that licensable activities were being carried on without the benefit of the required authorisation. Subsequent visits by Council officers found evidence of alcohol sales taking place without a premises licence.

Further inspections identified additional evidence consistent with unauthorised alcohol sales.

Three Temporary Event Notices associated with the premises had subsequently been refused due to concerns arising from the compliance history of the premises.

The Sub-Committee accepted that more recent inspections indicated that the applicant had ceased selling alcohol and had implemented a "bring your own alcohol" policy. The Sub-Committee also acknowledged the applicant's efforts to install CCTV and her willingness to accept a number of proposed licence conditions. In particular, it was noted that the applicant had agreed to the conditions proposed by the Police.

However, whilst these recent positive steps were noted, they were insufficient to overcome the Sub-Committee's concerns.

The Sub-Committee's concerns were significantly informed by the applicant's responses during the hearing. Having heard directly from the applicant, the Sub-Committee was not satisfied that she had demonstrated a sufficient understanding of the responsibilities that accompany the grant of a premises licence.

In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that:

The Applicant demonstrated a limited understanding of key licensing concepts and conditions that she had agreed to comply with. She failed to demonstrate that she understood the meaning of the conditions she had even agreed to or even how to implement them.

The Applicant was unable to demonstrate a clear understanding of the measures required to promote all of the licensing objectives, including the prevention of public nuisance, public safety and the protection of children from harm.

The Applicant appeared unfamiliar with policies and procedures that would be required for the safe and lawful operation of licensed premises.

Although the Applicant stated she had undertaken personal licence training, her answers during the hearing did not reassure the Sub-Committee that the content of that training had been properly understood or could be effectively applied in practice.

The Applicant confirmed that she currently operated the premises alone and had no staff.

The Applicant's responses to questions about her own "bring your own alcohol" policy and subsequent customer pressure for her to buy alcohol from across the road & her inability to demonstrate that she could refuse such requests, further concerned the sub-committee.

The applicant's evidence regarding the support she received in the management of the premises and in preparing the application lacked clarity.

The applicant acknowledged that another person had completed the application form with her assistance and the Sub-Committee was left with concerns regarding her understanding of the contents of the application and the operational arrangements proposed.

The Sub-Committee was particularly concerned that the applicant did not provide credible or sufficiently detailed explanations as to how she would manage licensed activities, ensure compliance with licence conditions, promote the licensing objectives, or respond to incidents arising at the premises.

The Sub-Committee carefully considered whether the grant of the licence, subject to conditions, would be an appropriate and proportionate response. However, it concluded that conditions alone could not adequately address its concerns. The issue was not simply the content of the proposed conditions, but whether the applicant had demonstrated the knowledge, understanding and management capability necessary to implement and maintain them.

The Sub-Committee found that the applicant had failed to satisfy it that she could operate the premises in a manner consistent with the promotion of the licensing objectives.

In particular, the Sub-Committee considered that the grant of the licence would undermine

the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance objectives.

Whilst the Sub-Committee acknowledged the applicant's difficult personal circumstances, her desire to develop her business, and the positive steps recently taken towards compliance, these factors could not outweigh the concerns arising from the previous history of non-compliance and the lack of confidence demonstrated during the hearing regarding her ability to uphold the licensing objectives.

Accordingly, the Sub-Committee determined that refusal of the application was both appropriate and proportionate.

Informative

Whilst the Sub-Committee has refused the application, Members recognise that the applicant has recently taken steps towards compliance and may wish to make a further application in the future.

The Sub-Committee would encourage the applicant to obtain further independent advice and training before submitting any future application. In particular, the applicant should seek to develop a fuller understanding of:

The four licensing objectives;
The responsibilities of a premises licence holder and designated premises supervisor;
Challenge 25 and age-verification procedures;
Incident, refusals and complaints recording;
Public nuisance prevention measures;
Staff training and management procedures; and
The operation of licensed premises in accordance with the Licensing Act 2003.

The applicant may find it helpful to review the licensing guidance available on the London Borough of Haringey's website, including information relating to premises licences and the responsibilities of licence holders. Haringey Council's guidance explains the licensing objectives and the expectations placed upon operators of licensed premises.

The applicant may also wish to obtain advice from:

Haringey Council's Licensing Team;
An accredited licensing training provider offering Award for Personal Licence Holders (APLH) and licensing compliance training;
A suitably qualified licensing consultant or solicitor; or
A recognised trade body operating within the licensed hospitality sector.

The Sub-Committee would encourage the applicant, before making any future application, to ensure that she has a clear operational management plan, understands

all licence conditions proposed, and can demonstrate how the licensing objectives will be actively promoted at the premises.

Right of Appeal

The applicant may appeal this decision to the Magistrates' Court within 21 days of being notified of the decision.