

Application for a New Premises Licence under Licensing Act 2003 for New River Sports & Fitness, (Main Site), White Hart Lane, Wood Green, London N22 5QW
29 June 2026

The Licensing Sub Committee carefully considered the application for a new premises licence for **New River Sports & Fitness, (Main Site), White Hart Lane, Wood Green, London N22 5QW** by **London Borough of Haringey Active Wellbeing and Leisure Service (the Council)**. In considering the application, the Committee took account of the Application, Haringey's Statement of Licensing Policy, the Licensing Act 2003, the Licensing Act 2003 Guidance, the report pack ("pack") and two additional packs and the Applicant's and Objectors' representations.

After discussions with the Responsible Authorities, at the hearing the Applicant sought a licence for the following licensable activities and hours:

Hours sought:

Regulated Entertainment: Live Music

Friday 19:00 to 21:30 hours

Saturday 17:00 to 20:30 hours

Sunday 16:00 to 19:30 hours

Recorded Music

Monday to Friday 09:00 to 21:30 hours

Saturday 09:00 to 20:30 hours

Sunday 09:00 to 19:30 hours

Late Night Refreshment:

Friday 11:00 to 21:30 hours

Saturday 11:00 to 20:30 hours

Sale of Alcohol

Monday to Friday 11:00 to 21:30 hours

Saturday 11:00 to 20:30 hours

Sunday 11:00 to 19:30 hours

Supply of alcohol ON the premises.

Hours open to Public

Monday to Friday 07:30 to 22:00 hours

Saturday 09:00 to 21:00 hours

Sunday 09:00 to 20:00 hours

Having carefully considered the application and heard from all the parties, the Sub-Committee decided to **refuse** the application

PARTIES

The Applicant Council was represented by Laura Crouch, Head of Active Wellbeing in the Council's Environment & Resident Experience Directorate; and called Craig Bellringer, Noise Nuisance and Licensing Enforcement Team Leader as a witness. Tunde Williams, Leisure Centres Area Manager also attended but took no active part.

The Responsible Authorities (Police, and Council Noise Team) did not attend as objectors.

Local Councillors. **Cllr Lucia das Neves (Woodside Ward)** attended and spoke objecting to the application.

Resident Objectors speaking:

Liz Edmunds)

Robert Goate)
Kate Steward)
Robin Alcott
Mark Garner
Mary Connolly
Sarah Gornall

Members of Woodside Matters

Background

New River Sports & Fitness (Main Site) is a council-operated leisure centre on White Hart Lane, Wood Green, London N22 5QW, open to the public all year round (save for a closure over the Christmas to New Year period). The site extends across approximately 40 acres and includes a stadium with seating for approximately 1,000 spectators and a floodlit 3G stadium pitch, together with a number of other buildings, including leased buildings for other organisations, changing rooms, a café/bar and function space within the stadium complex. While there are no residential premises immediately alongside the stadium, there are such premises around 200m away from the centre of the stadium to the North, West and South.

The venue has held a premises licence since December 2015. A copy of that licence in its current form appears in the pack at **p387-399**. The panel observes that that licence is for longer hours than currently applied for. It is not currently operated because the Designated Premises Supervisor is no longer employed by the Council.

Prior to the hearing the panel had read the pack together with the additional papers provided.

Application

The Licensing Officer introduced the application as set out in the report forming part of the hearing pack.

Representations – in Support

The Applicant (Laura Crouch) introduced the application. She stressed that the Council did not intend to change the existing use of the centre. She emphasised that the reason for the application was to allow the Council to exert stronger control over events held at the Centre; rather than allow hirers to hold events for which they were responsible as Licensee, the Council would be Licensee and set the terms on which hirers would operate. What is intended is that in addition to business as usual for the Centre, including events for up to 500 people, it would allow for events with up to 2,000 attendance on five days per year, during the summer months, she clarified in response to questioning that that did not mean 5 events (potentially multi-day). She proposed giving 28 days' notice of large events, and various mitigations.

The Centre has bought a portable noise meter, and during events officers would patrol the boundary with a view to keeping the noise level below 75dB. Again, the Centre proposed a dedicated mobile number to which complaints could be directed.

She thanked the local residents for their engagement and, in response to questions, proposed further forms of engagement, including setting up community meetings, including local Councillors.

She also referred to the mitigations mentioned in the response to objections at **pp403-406** in the pack.

The Council's witness **Mr Bellringer**, the Noise Nuisance and Licensing Enforcement Team Leader, gave evidence of measured noise levels and the effect on those levels of activity at the centre. He had measured at the boundary of a house at Wolves Lane's junction Woodside Road, 243m from the centre of the Centre pitch. The

measured average sound pressure level (LAEQ) was 66dB; background noise (LA90) was 44dB. He calculated that a speaker at 90dB (at 1m) in the centre of the Centre pitch would add attenuate to 33dB at the property boundary; which would add 0.3dB to the noise levels there.

Representations - Responsible Authorities

Mr Bellringer (as Noise Team Leader) had initially objected to the licence on public nuisance grounds and proposed conditions (**p80** in the pack) to mitigate that. The Centre accepted those conditions

The Police had objected, but proposed revised timings and additional conditions promoting all 4 licensing objectives (**pp74-76** of the pack); they withdrew their objections on the Council accepting both the timings and the proposed conditions.

A draft Operating Schedule setting out the consolidated timings and conditions proposed by the Responsible Authorities and accepted by the Council appears in the papers at **pp409-413**.

Representations – objectors

Over one hundred complaints had been received from residents; seven residents and a ward Councillor (Cllr das Neves) spoke against the application. The objectors lived from around 200 metres away from the Centre to 0.4 miles.

Several common themes developed as the representations were made, summarised below.

The Centre gave rise to very significant nuisance, in terms of noise, even as currently operated. The low frequency bass noise was a particular concern, and the measured noise levels in their view did not reflect the particular effects of bass noise; two residents pointed out the annual reggae festival as a particular offender. Objectors gave evidence of not being able to hold conversations not only outside in their gardens, but those residing closer had the same problem inside behind double-glazing. The existence of a planning condition forbidding any noise from the operation of the Centre being audible inside surrounding homes was referred to.

Together with this, residents did not consider that the record of complaints mentioned within the Report was complete, on the basis that many reports were direct to the Centre and not recorded by the Noise Team. They also noted that even when action was taken by turning down the volume in response to a direct complaint, the noise level was often restored later in the day.

The Council had confirmed that on-site parking was limited to 148 spaces. Objectors pointed out that this was wholly insufficient for an event of 2,000 people, particularly given that the centre was poorly served by public transport. The effect would be that those attending would park in the surrounding streets. This would create a nuisance in itself; and those returning to their cars after the events would add to the nuisance. Increased traffic and parking in the residential areas would affect public safety.

One resident questioned the times applied for; it wasn't clear why a community sports centre required a licence to sell alcohol at 11am on a weekday.

Over all of this, there was little trust from the residents that any of the promises made would be kept or that conditions offered would be complied with. The Council's enforcement teams could not effectively enforce compliance because the Council could not prosecute itself; although the possibility of enforcement via the Monitoring Officer was explained.

They had seen little change from historic problems with Ms Crouch's arrival in post. They observed that while the suggestions made in the Council's response to their objections were welcome so far as they went, they didn't go far enough and they'd

have expected more engagement from the Council prior to the application to establish and address their concerns.

Decision

The Panel carefully considered the representations made, alongside the documents. They noted and shared the residents' concerns in relation to public nuisance and public safety arising from the noise and parking issues. They recognised that the history of non-compliance with the planning condition, while not directly a licensing matter, supported the resident's concerns as to whether management at the Centre would comply with licensing conditions.

There was insufficient specificity in many of the promises made; while the Council had included a relatively high-level Event Management Plan in the Application, and a Noise Management Plan in the second distribution of papers for the meeting, other written plans or policies that one would have expected were not provided. No plan was provided for dealing with parking for the larger events (to prevent nuisance and ensure safety); and the Panel noted that the proposed licence conditions include a condition that the Council provide on-site parking for those attending events at the centre so that there would be "minimal effects on residents for parking".

They noted the Council's evidenced lack of engagement with the local community as to the running of the Centre and its plans for larger events, and the lack of community trust resulting from this and from the Centre's track record to date.

Generally, the Panel had regard both to the nuisance arising from the Centre and the community's lack of trust and was itself not confident that the Council had demonstrated that it would comply with the conditions proposed so as to promote the licensing objectives of prevention of public nuisance and of ensuring public safety. The Panel therefore decided to refuse the Application.

This page is intentionally left blank