

Public Document Pack

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH 2016

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT (Chair) Chris Bond, George Savva MBE and Peter Fallart

ABSENT

OFFICERS: Ellie Green (Principal Licensing Officer), Charlotte Palmer (Licensing Enforcement Officer), PC Gary Marsh (Metropolitan Police Licensing Officer), Antonia Makanjuola (Legal Services Representative), Jane Creer (Democratic Services)

Also Attending: Interested Parties re Item 3 (Trent Park) x 4
Found Series Limited representatives x 4
Barrister for Metropolitan Police Service and PC Martyn Fisher
Counsel, Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises
Supervisor for Bar Taps
Barrister and Premises Licence Holder for Oncu Food Centre
Silverpoint Food Centre representatives x 2

462

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

463

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

464

**TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTERS ROAD, EN4 0PS (REPORT NO. 214) -
10:00 - 11:30**

465

**BAR TAPS, 29 SILVER STREET, ENFIELD, EN1 3EF (REPORT NO. 215) -
11:30 - 13:00**

466

**ONCU FOOD CENTRE, 418-426 HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON, N9 8AA
(REPORT NO. 216) - 14:00 - 14:40**

467

**SILVERPOINT FOOD CENTRE, 76-82 FORE STREET, LONDON, N18 2FF
(REPORT NO. 217) - 14:40 - 15:20**

468

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 16 MARCH 2016**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT (Chair) Chris Bond, George Savva MBE and Peter Fallart

ABSENT

OFFICERS: Ellie Green (Principal Licensing Officer), Charlotte Palmer (Licensing Enforcement Officer), PC Gary Marsh (Metropolitan Police Licensing Officer), Antonia Mankanjuola (Legal Services Representative), Jane Creer (Democratic Services)

Also Attending: Interested Parties re Item 3 (Trent Park) x 4
Found Series Limited representatives x 4
Barrister for Metropolitan Police Service and PC Martyn Fisher
Counsel, Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises Supervisor for Bar Taps
Barrister and Premises Licence Holder for Oncu Food Centre
Silverpoint Food Centre representatives x 2

462**WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Bond as Chair welcomed all those present and explained the order of the meeting.

Councillor Fallart replaced Councillor Vince on the panel due to illness.

463**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

NOTED that Councillor Bond declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 4 on the agenda (Bar Taps) as there was correspondence in the agenda papers from people that he knew.

464**TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTERS ROAD, EN4 0PS (REPORT NO. 214) -
10:00 - 11:30**

RECEIVED the application made by Found Series Limited for a new Premises Licence for Trent Park, Cockfosters Road, EN4 0PS.

NOTED

1. The introductory statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

- a. This was a time limited new premises licence application by Found Series Limited for an event on Saturday 6 and Sunday 7 August 2016.
 - b. The application sought supply of alcohol and regulated entertainment from 11:00 until 22:00 latest on Saturday and 21:00 latest on Sunday.
 - c. The application was not seeking late night refreshment.
 - d. A similar application was granted in 2015 for a one day event.
 - e. 19 representations had been received from interested parties: 18 against and one in support of the application. The representations were set out in full in the report and the supplementary report. Video footage was also available from [REDACTED] which could be shown at Members' request.
 - f. The representations were based on all four licensing objectives.
 - g. The applicant had met with local residents, and had supplied documentation in support of the application included in the supplementary report.
 - h. The meeting between the applicant and local residents took place on the evening of 14 March. On the evening of 15 March a list of suggested conditions which had been drafted as a result of the discussions at that meeting was submitted to the Licensing Authority. The residents asked that the conditions should be applied if the Panel was minded to grant the application, but the residents were not withdrawing their representations.
 - i. Present at today's hearing were three representatives of Found Series Limited and Counsel, and three spokespeople on behalf of the interested parties.
2. The introductory statement of [REDACTED] interested party, including:
- a. He was the chairman of Chalk Lane Area Residents Association (CLARA), had been a resident of Games Road for the past 35 years; and regularly walked dogs in Trent Park.
 - b. The locality covered by CLARA was the first area to be impacted by any large departure from events at Trent Park, and had been particularly affected by the previous event in 2015. The applicants were the same people who put on the previous event, which from the residents' point of view was an absolute failure of control.
 - c. The applicant had shown splendid planning for inside Trent Park, but did not take sufficient responsibility for customers when they were outside the gates.
 - d. Such large numbers of people took a lot of time to guide and manoeuvre, and the real experts in that type of control were the police, but it had not been made clear whether the Metropolitan Police Service would be in attendance at the event.
 - e. Difficulties arose when large numbers of people came out of Trent Park and entered a residential area. Plans to close off various exits to local roads did not seem feasible, especially routes to the Cock Inn. Last year, that pub became an assembly point for attendees and taxis, which resulted in Chalk Lane / Games Road becoming utterly congested with traffic.
 - f. Last year the applicants had created a 10,000 person mass and in this application were seeking an increase to 12,500 people, who would all be

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

put out onto the neighbourhood. He was not sure that the applicants realised the magnitude of what was being presented.

g. The behaviour of the concert-goers last year had been appalling. Residents had witnessed offensive events and had felt menaced and frightened by the large volume of excited people. He understood that a different management agency would be employed in 2016, but questioned whether that would be enough, and highlighted that this event was over two days. The applicant had not demonstrated that they could organise a one day event successfully. Residents should not have to put up with this embargo on their peaceful movements.

h. He asked on behalf of CLARA and the local residents of Cockfosters that this application be refused for both days.

3. [REDACTED] responded to questions, including:
 - a. Councillor Savva highlighted that the police had not objected to the application and queried the responsibility of the applicant for issues outside the park. [REDACTED] questioned the extent and level at which police approval had been sought and on what basis approval was given. He asserted this was an enormous number of people in a residential area and the event organisers felt no responsibility and were creating a situation for alarm by the residents.
 - b. In response to Councillor Savva's query whether the applicant's previous experience would lead to measures to alleviate difficulties faced last year, [REDACTED] stressed the need for practical measures and that he had seen no such matters. The applicant was responsible for creating a crowd and had to take responsibility.
 - c. Councillor Fallart highlighted the traffic management plan provided by the applicant and asked why it was felt that road closures would not work. [REDACTED] considered that crowds released from the park would go straight for the only pub in the area and that closing off Chalk Lane would be a very difficult task, especially with amateur stewards who did not have police powers.
4. The introductory statement of [REDACTED], interested party, including:
 - a. He was a resident of Fairgreen East, which was a hotspot where noise was likely to be an issue, and he had concerns about noise management.
 - b. The event organisers had been unable to comply with the noise management procedure they offered in 2015, for example the sound testing the day before did not take place. The organisers were aware of the sensitive areas yet inadequate monitoring took place during the festival. Six readings were taken over an 11 hour period, which was one per 1.7 hours.
 - c. The organisers did not have a robust complaints process. The telephone number provided did not work during the majority of the event. There were five complaints received which were about noise from known sensitive areas, but none of the complainants were visited and the reason given was the traffic conditions though all were within a five minute walk of

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

Trent Park and were places that should have been visited for sound monitoring.

d. A draft plan by the applicant stated that the same principles as last year would be adhered to, although they did not work.

e. The papers suggested that a noise management consultant was yet to be appointed though residents were told at the recent meeting they were in place, and they were told of an intention to use new technical equipment. Organisers had told residents they "hope this will be successful" ie. it was not a proven solution.

f. Last year had showed that for all the promises from the organisers, the noise had been intolerable. There was no guarantee that new revisions would be successful. He would suggest that the organisers should rather have applied for a one day event to build their credibility. If this application was granted and the noise management was ineffective, residents would have two days of unacceptable and intolerable noise. He urged the sub-committee to refuse this application.

g. There were no questions from any party to [REDACTED]

5. The introductory statement of [REDACTED], interested party, including:
- a. He was chairman of Friends of Trent Country Park and wished to draw attention to concerns within the park.
 - b. All the issues were raised last year and a high level of reassurance was given and 182 marshals were offered, but as had been reported problems had occurred. The problems had been written up in the email response on behalf of the Parks Service on 14/08/15 from Matthew Watts.
 - c. The country park and its accesses had not been designed for commercial uses. The gear for the event had to be moved through the Cockfosters gate rather than via Snakes Lane, but this was also an inappropriate entrance.
 - d. The setting up and taking down of this event took several days and meant that the public were essentially debarred access to the park for about a week.
 - e. There were concerns that event-goers would stay overnight in the park and could not be prevented. Any move for that practice to seep in would be strongly resented.
 - f. Last year during the event the Go Ape course had to close as participants would not be able to hear the safety instructions over the noise and revenue was lost. The café also lost all its business that day. The net revenue gained by the Council was therefore questioned, and that it was at the expense of residents and park users.
 - g. Police had suggested that they would not be in attendance unless their presence was paid for in advance.
 - h. Marshals were inadequate. Putting marshals at the entrance to local roads was no match to determined people and parkers.
 - i. He urged the panel to take these concerns seriously and to reject the application, and not to set a precedent for major events in Trent Park.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

6. In response to a question from Councillor Savva, Ellie Green confirmed that sleeping overnight in Trent Park was not permitted, and that this did not form part of the application and was not sought by the applicant.
7. The statement by Counsel on behalf of the applicant, including:
 - a. For background information, she advised that the team behind Found Series Limited had over 50 years' experience in running events, from clubs, street, and outdoor festivals. In 2015 they ran four events in four different London boroughs. They had worked successfully with LB Hackney for four years to put on an event in Haggerston Park with no complaints. In Haringey, an event was organised the last two years in Finsbury Park, and there were no egress problems despite it being held at the same time as an Arsenal home football match. The company had carefully built up its reputation and was known not just for its music but also its success in organising events.
 - b. This application was considered a modest one: on Saturday the music would stop by 22:30 and on Sunday by 21:30. Sale of alcohol would end 15 minutes before the music stopped. The organisers would then have 45 minutes to remove all people from the site.
 - c. The event would be for over 18's only. All alcohol would have to be purchased: there would be none free and none allowed to be brought into the site.
 - d. No-one would be able to sleep in the park. There would be a sweep of the site and there would be 24 hour security with dogs.
 - e. The two days of the event would not overlap. They were two separately promoted events. If people wished to attend both they had to buy separate tickets, but it was more likely they would be different people each day.
 - f. The majority of the event-goers would be in the 30 to 50 age group as the genres of music were from the 1980s and 1990s. They would not bring with them the problems associated with younger music festivals.
 - g. The site in Trent Park was in the area known as the showground. The rest of the park would not be closed off to the public but would be open as usual.
 - h. It was intended that most attendees would arrive via Cockfosters tube station and be funnelled into the park quickly.
 - i. The organisers had been working very closely with the Council to ensure careful planning and minimum disruption.
 - j. Last year's event had been considered successful: the only arrest made was at the search point in respect of drugs. Inside the site there had been no incidents at all and people who attended were very positive about the event. Organisers had not been aware of problems with local residents until recently.
 - k. There had been problems relating to accessibility of mobile numbers provided to residents during the 2015 event, but that would be dealt with this year by providing a landline number for the site office and all staff to have radios, and all complaints would be logged.
 - l. At the meeting on Monday evening, the residents and the applicant discussed issues in detail and at length. This had been very useful and the

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

organisers had picked up practical tips and solutions, such as using a park entrance nearer the station.

m. The organisers took on board that they had wider responsibilities and would do what they could to minimise disruption to local residents. There would be many improvements from the 2015 event.

n. The police had not made any representations in this case, but the organisers were working closely with police including at superintendent level and with a specialist event planning team which had been involved in the Olympic Games. All recommendations made by the police had been adopted and incorporated. They would be happy to include a condition in respect of police sign off of event policies.

o. There would be 200 SIA registered security staff at the event and in the area, all wearing hi-viz vests and with the supervisors visible in a differently coloured vest.

p. There would be extensive CCTV, particularly covering the entrance, exit and search lanes.

q. Attendees would be thoroughly searched. They would be made to empty their pockets and be patted down and wanded. There would also be a very obvious police presence at the entrance with dogs, along with Trading Standards officers, to deal with people trying to bring in legal highs, drugs and paraphernalia. A list of prohibited items would be printed on the tickets and on posters on display at the entrance. There would be staff trained to identify what the paraphernalia included, and these would be confiscated and reported to police. There would be 50% more search lanes than last year and all would be covered by manually operated CCTV. There would also be undercover police on site, and British Transport Police would assist in crowd management at the station. Found Series Limited would be paying for police resources.

r. In respect of public safety, the applicant had been working closely with the Council, police and responsible authorities. Site capacity had been discussed and numbers were concluded as safe. Clickers would be used to track the number of people on site. The width of exits would be expanded, safe areas would be provided, there would be plenty of sanitary facilities, and sufficient lighting. Additionally this year a temporary traffic order would be in place along Cockfosters Road which would be part closed at agreed times.

s. There would be mitigation against noise, including fencing, noise limiters, monitoring by an independent company, and an acoustic consultant on site. Following the event last year, staff were more knowledgeable and would focus on sensitive areas and the most affected residential roads. Video footage would be recorded. A lot of thought had been put into noise levels, but on the day the conditions and wind direction would also have an effect. It was impossible to plan for everything, but she confirmed there would be a landline to bring any issues quickly to the attention of the event organisers. The final policy would also be shared with residents.

t. A new traffic management company would be used this year. It was accepted there were problems with the company used in 2015 and Found

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

Series Ltd had felt let down. The new company was recommended by the Council and had a proven track record.

u. There would be a robust dispersal policy in place. A 'soft close' system would see some tents closing by 20:30. Not all visitors would leave at the same time. By 22:00, 40% of visitors had left last year. It was not expected that people would loiter on site. They were an older crowd and people often wanted to leave early to avoid tube and road congestion. There was an after party in central London which would also draw people away. Use of the SIA security staff would also assist: after 19:00 30 of them would be working on egress from the site, increasing by another 30 staff after 20:30. A funnel system would slow people down and assist with egress from the site. Both security and traffic management staff would be working from 09:00 to 02:00. A dedicated taxi pick-up site would be agreed.

v. To take up additional concerns of residents, at least another two meetings would be held, and everyone was encouraged to attend and be proactive. There would also be a de-briefing session after the event. To avoid a repeat of unacceptable issues from 2015, there would be more toilets and strategic placing on the route to the station. A meeting would be held with the Cock Inn managers and a security presence provided if acceptable to them. There would also be a robust waste policy.

w. She believed that Found Series Limited had dealt with all main concerns and demonstrated how the licensing objectives would be promoted. A considerable amount of time and money was being put into the organisation of this event, which could be held successfully. This was not a company which put profit before residents. They had heeded the warnings and improved their services. They welcomed regular meetings with residents.

8. The applicants and representative responded to questions including:
- a. In response to Councillor Fallart's queries, it was clarified that the intention and policies were to ensure that people exited quickly via Cockfosters tube station or taxi and did not loiter. The event would be coming to a close by 22:00 on Saturday and 21:00 on Sunday. A meeting would be held with the local pub to work out a sustainable policy.
 - b. In response to queries from Councillor Bond, it was advised that the applicant was working closely with Transport for London (TfL) and Cockfosters station in respect of trains and tube line operation and the aim was that everyone would have left via train by 23:00 latest, in advance of the last train time. The after party would also pull people away as it was quite a distance from the site, at the Ministry of Sound club.
 - c. ██████████ asked for clarification that the organisers had not been aware of the residents' concerns. It was advised that at the meeting this week the organisers had learned a greater level of detail, and had become aware of the different resident bodies, and would have agreed meetings with them sooner if they had known of their existence. A letter drop to local residents had not generated a high response level. The applicant was now aware of the sensitive areas and there would be pertinent conditions to any licence. There would be additional independent sound consultants, and additional

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

Environmental Health staff had been requested. A new sound system should prevent as much sound leakage from the site. Organisers felt they could guarantee that residents would not be disturbed.

d. In response to further queries from [REDACTED], the organisers confirmed they were confident in the plans for the event and had learned from the 2015 experience. A key change had been the removal of the traffic management company to take responsibility for the biggest impact on the local area. The new company this year had managed a previous event successfully and prevented an impact on the area. There would also be more proper licensed security and more police on site and at the entrance. That everyone would be in radio communication would be a condition to any licence.

e. In response to [REDACTED] further queries regarding loud music and disturbance particularly by low frequency sound, it was advised that an independent sound company had helped with design and speaker positioning and layout of the stage and tents to minimise all frequencies of sound and to minimise the impact of bass frequencies. There would also be shorter scheduled hours on Sunday. There would be independent monitoring of sound during the event and those staff would be in radio contact with organisers and be able to bring attention to any breaches of the limits.

9. The closing statement of the interested parties including:
 - a. [REDACTED] stated that concern remained about the impact of the event on the local area, especially when attendees left the park and distributed themselves over the area and around the Cock Inn, as there was such chaos in 2015. It was difficult to believe that the same people could be confident that they were going to deal with an increased number of people and over two days. This was considered far too much for the neighbourhood to have to put up with. He sought refusal of the entire application, or at least that the Sunday event be refused.
 - b. [REDACTED] noted the information provided by the organisers in respect of improvements planned, but was not confident that these would work. He remained concerned that residents would have to endure problems for two days and that this was unacceptable.
10. The closing statement on behalf of the applicant that they had provided detailed plans and that they felt the event would make a positive contribution to the community. They considered the proposed conditions would be sufficient and that all licensing objectives would be promoted.
11. The summary statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. Having heard all the representations, it was for the sub-committee to take such steps as appropriate for promotion of the licensing objectives.
 - b. Members' attention was directed to specific guidance and policies, especially in respect of time limited licences.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

RESOLVED that

1. In accordance with the principles of Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

The Panel retired, with the legal representative and committee administrator, to consider the application further and then the meeting reconvened in public.

2. The Chairman made the following statement:

"The Panel read and listened to all the evidence given both for and against the application. The Licensing Sub-Committee (LSC) noted that there were no objections from the Police and also noted that the applicants and the objectors had already met and produced a rough draft of additional conditions which formed the basis of an agreement as to the conditions that would be put in place for the event. The LSC was persuaded by the additional safeguards relating to public safety, noise and traffic management, involvement of the Police which the applicants had proposed to ensure that the event ran smoothly. Accordingly the LSC agreed to all the conditions stipulated in the report plus the merger of these with the tabled conditions proposed by the applicants to the Chalk Lane Area Residents Association."

3. The Licensing Sub-Committee resolved that the application be granted in full as follows:

The premises licence to be valid between Saturday 6 and Sunday 7 August 2016.

(i) Hours the premises are open to the public: from 11:00 to 22:30 Saturday and from 11:00 to 21:30 Sunday.

(ii) Supply of alcohol (on supplies only): from 11:00 to 21:45 Saturday and from 11:00 to 20:45 Sunday.

(iii) Live music, recorded music and performance of dance: from 11:00 to 22:00 Saturday and from 11:00 to 21:00 Sunday.

Conditions:

Conditions 1 to 16 as per Annex 7, which are not disputed, merged with the conditions tabled at the meeting, which were based on discussions between the applicant and interested parties; and an additional

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

condition to ensure that there should be no ticket sales at the event on either day.

465

BAR TAPS, 29 SILVER STREET, ENFIELD, EN1 3EF (REPORT NO. 215) - 11:30 - 13:00

RECEIVED the application made by the Metropolitan Police Service for a summary review of the Premises Licence held by Mr Michael Fallon at the premises known as and situated at Bar Taps, 29 Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3EF.

NOTED

1. The Chair declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item as there was correspondence in the agenda papers from people that he knew.
2. The introductory statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. This was a summary review brought by the Metropolitan Police Service based on the licensing objectives of prevention of crime and disorder and public safety.
 - b. The background to the review application was set out on page 126 and related to a glassing incident on 21/02/16. On 24/02/16 the Licensing Sub-Committee met to consider the necessity of taking interim steps and deemed it necessary to modify conditions of the licence. On 26/02/16 the Premises Licence Holder (PLH) made representations against the interim steps. On 01/03/16 a meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee took place to consider whether the interim steps were appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives, and determined that it was appropriate to modify some of the conditions of the interim steps, and the decision had immediate effect.
 - c. The Police had submitted further information to support the review, in Annex 07 to the supplementary agenda pack.
 - d. The final position of the review application was set out in paragraph 3 of the supplementary report. The Police, supported by the Licensing Authority, sought a terminal hour to close of 01:30 Friday, Saturday and all days preceding bank holidays, and all licensable activities to cease at 01:00.
 - e. Proposed conditions were set out on page 81 onwards. A number of the conditions sought had been agreed by the PLH, and representations would focus on those still being discussed which included the terminal hour and times for licensable activities, last entry time, and conditions relating to a Club ID scan, plastic bottles, times and numbers of door supervisors, the pub's capacity, and an additional condition being proposed by the PLH.
 - f. Mr Fallon, the PLH, had made representations against the review application attached as Annex 08 in the supplementary agenda pack.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

3. The introductory statement of Mr Charles Streeton, Francis Taylor Building, Barrister on behalf of the Metropolitan Police, including:
 - a. This review arose principally from the incident on 21/02/16 when a customer was glassed in the face and the Police were called by the Ambulance Service but not by Bar Taps.
 - b. Despite the history of violence at the venue, Police were not seeking revocation of the licence, but modest and reasonable conditions to prevent incidents of this nature.
 - c. He confirmed that Police sought a terminal hour of 01:30 latest and last entry of 23:00. They wished to see an ID scanner, no glasses in the premises, greater door supervisor presence, and a maximum capacity of 150. The PLH's proposed condition in respect of use of a breathalyser was welcomed.
 - d. There had been a series of incidents at the premises since the new PLH took over. On 02/10/15 there had been a fight. In the same month on 29/10/15 there had been a headbutting. On 08/11/15 there was a fight at the entrance. On 19/12/15 there was an incident where windows of a car were smashed. On 21/02/16 an individual was struck in the face with a glass.
 - e. CCTV footage was shown of the incident on 21/02/16 to give a flavour of what it was like inside the premises and how an incident of violence was dealt with. PC Fisher provided commentary on specific individuals and actions, noting that the person who threw the glass was not visible on camera. The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS), Philip Maiden, also provided commentary on the staff members included in the footage.
 - f. Police considered that there had been a pattern of incidents at the premises, and that the premises were not being properly run. In his letter of 13/11/15, the DPS had stated that advice about calling Police as soon as an incident began had been taken on board and would be added to their procedure, yet on 21/02/16 the Police were not called by Bar Taps. The majority of the incidents had taken place at a late hour and on Friday or Saturday nights.
 - g. The Police wanted to make sure these sort of incidents did not happen in future. They considered that closing half an hour earlier would make a big difference in encouraging earlier dispersal and reducing violence. A last entry time of 23:00 would make it impossible for customers moving from other pubs already drunk to use it for a late night binge. An ID scanner would put off trouble-makers as they could easily be traced, and would be of assistance to the Police. All drinks could be decanted into plastic containers and that was a moderate proposal to reduce danger. An increase in door supervisors would improve security coverage throughout the bar. There would also be less likelihood of incidents starting if the density in the bar was slightly lower. A capacity of 150 would also give a better staff / customer ratio. It would be preferable if the bar was run under normal business principles rather than a late night, after closing, vertical drinking and dancing venue.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

4. Metropolitan Police representatives responded to questions, including:
 - a. In response to councillors' queries, it was confirmed that Police wished plastic containers to apply for all products.
 - b. In response to queries about breathalysers, it was advised that they would assist in giving an indication of the intoxication of those waiting to enter the bar.
 - c. In response to queries in relation to introduction of an ID scanner, it was advised that one was used very successfully at Club Azure. Patrons knew to bring valid ID. In conjunction with CCTV, ID scan provided evidence in respect of any sort of crime. It was reported that in Romford town centre all the main venues used an ID scan, and Police ideally wished to see them installed in all of Enfield Town's main venues within the next 24 months, with linkage and sharing of data.
 - d. In response to further queries about comparison of this premises to others in Enfield Town, the Police considered Bar Taps the number one crime attractor in Enfield Town.
 - e. PC Fisher advised that a funded trial with breathalysers had been run and that feedback was awaited, but it appeared to be a good indicator and of help to reduce arguments between door staff and customers at the entrance. It was one of many useful tools which door supervisors could use. He gave credit to Bar Taps for agreeing to purchase their own breathalyser, but it could have been done previously.
 - f. In response to questions from Counsel on behalf of Bar Taps, PC Fisher confirmed that the incident on 21/11/15 related to a lawful ejection. In the case on 19/12/15, there was criminal damage outside over an hour after individuals had been ejected, but Police would still argue that these were incidents associated with the venue.
 - g. In response to Bar Taps having sent notification to local venues, including a description of the male offender, PC Fisher stated that this had not been mentioned to him at any other hearing.
 - h. In respect of breathalysers, PC Fisher agreed that these were a useful tool and that there was no evidence that Bar Taps had refused to purchase their own. He had sent details of some products to give an indication of cost, but could not recommend specific products. Police also supported Bar Taps use of radios voluntarily linked to other venues.

5. The introductory statement of Charlotte Palmer, Licensing Enforcement Officer, on behalf of the Licensing Authority including:
 - a. The Licensing Authority was concerned by the number of incidents at the premises, and that in the recent incident, staff had not called the Police and had cleaned up a crime scene.
 - b. Council records showed complaints received from four different properties where residents were affected by noise from the venue. An earlier last entry time, increased security, and reduced hours would help reduce the disturbance.
 - c. People had run away after incidents and their identities had not be discovered. An ID scan could assist with this.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

- d. Glass had been used as a weapon at the venue, and a condition relating to polycarbonates was supported.
 - e. The Licensing Authority supported this review application from the Police and the proposed strengthened conditions on the licence.
6. Charlotte Palmer responded to questions, including:
- a. In response to points about other licensed premises operating nearby, she confirmed that complaints had been made from residential premises above this particular parade and that complainants had stated that noise was coming from this premises.
 - b. Charlotte Palmer confirmed that the last noise observations at the venue took place on 11/09/15 when there was noise from people in the smoking area and the queue outside the bar. There had been no complaints since November and since the door staff company had changed.
7. The statement by Ms Nikita McNeill, Counsel on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder (PLH), including:
- a. It was highlighted that this was the first review at the premises in 12 years, and that the PLH and DPS had been willing to engage throughout.
 - b. It was noted that 21 Temporary Event Notices had been granted to the premises over Christmas. Not all had been used and there had been proactive discussions with Licensing officers.
 - c. The Police claim of a stream of incidents was not borne out, with four incidents in 2014, three in 2015 in which the bar was at fault, and one in 2016. To jump from the incident in February to a summary review was a very big step and not in line with an incremental approach normally taken.
 - d. The Police submitted that proposed modifications to conditions were modest, but these proposals would have business-ending consequences for Bar Taps.
 - e. The premises would like to have the opportunity for its proposals to bed in, accepting that if there were problems, there were possibilities of further reviews.
 - f. Most business came to the premises later on. A change in last entry time from 00:00 to 23:00 would result in a loss of most customers. They accepted that they were a late night bar, but did not accept that all customers arrived drunk and disorderly.
 - g. Any changes to conditions should be targeted and proportionate. The conditions sought in this review would target every customer and would not be proportionate. It should be noted that the incidents in November 2015 took place at times when the bar would still open and serving. On 19/12/15 the people involved had already been ejected over an hour earlier. Proposed conditions would not target the incidents highlighted, but would prevent their customers using the bar as normal.
 - h. The proposed breathalyser condition would be more targeted and would be a tool for an objective means of dealing with concerns about customers in the queue and in the bar and when they should be turned away.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

- i. A condition requiring an ID scanner was not considered proportionate and this pub should not be singled out in the local community. If it was a goal that all main venues should have ID scanners that decision should be made at a policy level. It was also not considered workable if only customers after 21:00 were scanned. There would however be improvements in CCTV, which was a proportionate and targeted response.
 - j. It was not accepted that four door supervisors would have dealt better with the recent incident: the positioning rather than the number of door staff was most important, and the PLH was willing to distribute the staff differently if Police recommended. Two door supervisors from 21:00 to 23:00 would be a significant presence as there were very few customers during that period. Three door supervisors after 23:00 in addition to the 12 members of staff would be sufficient.
 - k. The capacity had always been stated as 175 maximum. On certain occasions, the staff felt it appropriate to accept no more than 150 people, such as during an event or televised football match, and were able to manage that appropriately.
 - l. It was accepted that plastic drinking containers could be used after 21:00, but there was not sufficient evidence to warrant it appropriate that wine should not be provided in glass bottles.
 - m. Notwithstanding any licence conditions, nobody wanted drunk patrons in the bar: they were disruptive and did not buy more drinks.
 - n. The conditions proposed by Bar Taps would promote the licensing objectives, without penalising the venue.
8. The representatives of Bar Taps responded to questions including:
- a. In response to Councillor Savva's queries about conditions sufficient to prevent future incidents, it was advised that Bar Taps was still regarded as a safe venue. It was noted that incidents in October / November followed shortly after two other licensed premises had closed in the area following review and possibly some negativity spilled into other venues. Trouble makers had been barred. The incidents were all isolated and not linked. There were no issues with gangs. The venue had learned from incidents and there were now more experienced door staff. Radios had been changed to be compatible with those used by other premises in Enfield Town and allowed very quick contact. A search wand had been purchased. The sort of people who wanted to commit crime were being deterred. The breathalyser was a targeted way to prevent those already drunk coming into the venue in the first place. There was also improved CCTV. There were regular meetings with Police licensing officers and the Police had the DPS's mobile number. It was felt that Bar Taps was doing enough to prevent incidents and wanted to be able to use judgement at times, such as cutting down the capacity if larger groups came into the venue. The bar had got through Christmas with no incidents. The conditions proposed by Bar Taps would assist without shackling them.
 - b. In response to queries from Councillor Fallart regarding the long narrow premises and control of customers, it was advised that the staff kept an eye out for difficulties and were able to control things quite well. If the

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

venue was feeling congested, more customers would not be permitted to enter until it thinned out. The numbers coming in were all counted.

c. In response to the Police Barrister's questions regarding incidents mentioned, it was maintained that Bar Taps was not dissimilar from other licensed premises in Enfield Town. It was highlighted that despite incidents recorded, the Police and Licensing Authority were satisfied enough to grant extended licensed hours over Christmas, and there had been no incidents during the festive period.

d. Bar Taps had not put in place all recommendations in the letter from the Police dated 10/11/15, but advised that almost all requests were met and that there had been 105 days between the last incident in 2015 and the recent incident in February, so the measures put in place had worked. Having seen the CCTV footage, it was questioned what more could have been done and what measures could have made a difference.

e. In response to queries regarding the breathalyser and that it had not been proposed at the interim steps hearing, it was advised that it was considered a good tool to provide an indication of the intoxication level of someone who had been drinking. It was not intended to be used on every customer but to be discrete and targeted. Bar Taps also used the Challenge 25 policy and could ask to see ID if they wanted to know who people were without needing to ID scan everyone. It was further confirmed that the breathalyser gave red, amber and green readings, and door staff made professional judgements. If Bar Taps was required to have an ID scan they would be the only pub with it. The venues with such a scan were those with a night club weekend trade, unlike Bar Taps seven day a week 12-15 hour trade. It was advised that the pubs in Enfield Town had the same clientele and acted like a community, sharing information between themselves via WhatsApp and Facebook and they knew their clients well.

f. In response to queries regarding use of plastic containers, the change of drinking vessels had been managed and glass removed after the recent incident, while noting that many items could be turned into a weapon. Removal of glass bottles had been resisted because no-one had been hit with a bottle.

g. In response to queries regarding Police not being called by the venue at the time of the recent incident, it was advised that staff's first priority had been to seek medical attention for the person who was injured. The individual who committed the crime had left and could not be restrained. When the situation had been described to the Ambulance Service they had contacted the Police but instructed Bar Taps staff to stay on the phone in respect of the medical attention for the victim. No-one saw the glass being thrown as the incident happened so quickly. There was no fight. The door supervisor had asked someone to leave and they were complying.

9. The summary statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:

a. Having heard all the representations, it was for the sub-committee to take such steps as appropriate for promotion of the licensing objectives and make its determination on the review.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

- b. Members' attention was directed to specific guidance and policies, as set out in paragraph 5 of the officers' report.
 - c. The sub-committee may be minded to stipulate that should the Premises Licence Holder appeal the decision, the interim steps as per the Decision Notice dated 1 March 2016 must be complied with until the appeal is heard.
10. There was an adjournment of the meeting to provide a lunch break.
11. The closing statement of Mr Charles Streeton, on behalf of the Metropolitan Police, including:
- a. This premises did not have a good reputation. There had been a change in the clientele demographics, with behaviour changing for the worse.
 - b. The venue had been at fault for three incidents in the last year and one in the first quarter of this year. This suggested a serious problem which had emerged towards the end of 2015.
 - c. The Police proposed steps to be taken, including making contact when there was an inkling of trouble. The PLH had not taken all the steps suggested and did not engage with Police when the recent problem occurred. This incident could have been avoided. The venue had been given more than one 'second chance' to improve.
 - d. A suite of measures was needed. Use of a breathalyser was an easy way to solve arguments, but was not sufficiently enforceable as a condition and could not prevent the nature of this incident.
 - e. The operative hour should be reduced by 30 minutes as that would make incidents late at night less likely.
 - f. The time of last entry should be reduced by one hour to dissuade inebriated clients from using it as a bolt hole at the end of an evening.
 - g. There should be an ID scanner. This would not be unfair, given that the venue had comparable drinking habits to venues using ID scan which did not have problems of this nature, and the hope that soon there would be use of ID scan across all main Enfield Town venues.
 - h. The capacity should be reduced from 175 to 150 people. This was a narrow premises and the recent incident was to some extent sparked by customers jostling and lack of space.
 - i. There should be no glass bottles. They were as dangerous as a drinking glass and could be used as an offensive weapon. Both beer and wine could be served in plastic containers.
 - j. There should be more door staff. If there had been one more at the time of the recent incident it would have been easier for him to have remained in place.
 - k. The proposed conditions were entirely necessary and proportionate.
 - l. The premises did not put Police suggestions into practice before, and to prevent another incident they asked that proposed conditions were now imposed. The LSC should also make it clear that the interim steps should remain in force in case the conditions were appealed.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

12. The Licensing Enforcement Officer confirmed that the Licensing Authority supported the views of the Police and the proposed conditions.
13. The closing statement by Counsel on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder (PLH), including:
 - a. It was not accepted that the evidence supported the submission that this was the most dangerous pub in Enfield.
 - b. Three incidents in 2015 did not amount to the assertion of a 'stream of violent offences'. In one instance the person had been lawfully ejected. The second case was after Bar Taps closing hours.
 - c. It was not accepted the venue did not have a good reputation. Communications had been good. The pub had been a feature in Enfield Town for 12 years without review.
 - d. The proposed conditions requested were not warranted, targeted or proportionate. They would not have prevented any of the incidents relied upon by the Police, all of which took place in licensed hours agreed by the Police.
 - e. The effect of bringing forward the last entry time would be to prevent the majority of people who visited the venue to be admitted. That was not a proportionate measure. In law and policy terms, late night venues could be run safely and be an important part of a local economy.
 - f. The incidents were not linked and there were no consistent failings. The Police advised that they were not called in time. A reduction in operating hours would not address the failings they allege.
 - g. The concerns did not necessitate the review of the licence, and it would not be appropriate to impose the conditions as requested as there was not enough evidence from the Police to warrant them.

RESOLVED that

1. In accordance with the principles of Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

The Panel retired, with the legal representative and committee administrator, to consider the application further and then the meeting reconvened in public.

2. The Chairman made the following statement:

"After reading all the submissions and listening to all parties concerned, with these amendments to the licence we are happy that the licensing objectives will be met. The LSC was persuaded by the representations of Bar Taps that some of the steps proposed by the Police would not prevent the unfortunate incidents the Police had relied on in their evidence. The LSC noted that some of the incidents occurred outside

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

the premises and were beyond the control of Bar Taps. The LSC was not persuaded that Bar Taps was a bad establishment from a licensing perspective and the evidence showed that Bar Taps had historically shown a willingness to work with the Police to ensure that the licensing objectives are being promoted. Bar Taps had been willing to co-operate with the Police by accepting some of the interim steps proposed by the Police such as reducing capacity during busy hours to 150 instead of 175. Further conditions have been added in respect of use of breathalysers at the venue, as proposed in the Premises Licence Holder statements in Annex 9 of the report.”

3. The Licensing Sub-Committee resolved it appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives to modify the conditions of the licence; as follows:

Conditions (in accordance with Annex 10 of the LSC Supplementary Report):

(i) Conditions 1 to 17, which are not disputed

(ii) Modifications:

Proposed conditions 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 30 agreed.

Condition 20 – delete all text after “from 21:00 hours”.

Condition 25 – change 23:00 to 00:00.

Condition 27 – change 20:00 to 21:00.

Condition 31 – change 20:00 to 21:00.

(iii) Additional conditions:

Breathalysers shall be used to test customers to assist door supervisors in assessing whether customers shall be permitted entry. Customers with a red reading shall be refused entry.

Records shall be kept of the time and date for all breathalyser tests administered, and of any issues discovered. These records shall be kept for 12 months. Records must be made available to an authorised officer of the Council or Police, upon request.

A prominent, clear and legible notice shall be displayed at the entrance to the premises advising of the alcohol screening test.

Appeal:

Should the premises licence holder appeal this decision, the interim steps as per the Decision Notice dated 1 March 2016 must be complied with until the appeal is heard.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

**ONCU FOOD CENTRE, 418-426 HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON, N9 8AA
(REPORT NO. 216) - 14:00 - 14:40**

RECEIVED the application made by Mr Ugur Tekagac for a variation of the Premises Licence at the premises known as and situated at Oncu Food Centre, 418-426 Hertford Road, London, N9 8AA.

NOTED

1. The introductory statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. This was an application for variation of the premises licence.
 - b. A licence had been held since November 2013 which permitted 24 hour opening, with sale of alcohol 08:00 to 00:00 daily.
 - c. The application sought sale of alcohol and opening 24 hours every day.
 - d. The current licence had not been subject to review.
 - e. Representations against the application had been made by the Metropolitan Police and the Licensing Authority on the grounds of prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance, and protection of children from harm.
 - f. The premises was located in the Edmonton Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) Area. Therefore the CIP policy applied to this application. The application included licensable activities outside the CIP core hours and therefore there was a presumption against grant that is implicit in a CIP.
 - g. It was for the applicant to demonstrate to the LSC's satisfaction why they considered the application should be an exception to the CIP policy.
 - h. A revised operating schedule had been received with two amendments today, but due to the short notice this was not accepted by the Police.
 - i. The Premises Licence Holder (PLH), Mr Ugur Tekagac, was present, represented by Mr Duncan Craig, Barrister.

2. The statement of Charlotte Palmer, Licensing Enforcement Officer, on behalf of the Licensing Authority, including:
 - a. The premises was located at the end of a parade of shops on the corner of Tramway Avenue, which was a residential street. There were also residential properties opposite and in nearby side streets. This was a quieter part of Hertford Road and local residents had recently complained about noise nuisance from people visiting the premises and delivery vans obstructing the road.
 - b. There was concern that if this application was granted, a greater number of customers would be attracted to the shop and there would be noise from larger numbers of people in the early hours when ambient noise levels were lower.
 - c. The premises was located in a CIP Area, indicating that the locality was already an area of concern in respect of anti-social behaviour and public nuisance. The CIP policy applied to any new and variation applications.
 - d. There was no information provided in the documents to justify why the application should be an exception to the CIP policy. A revised operating

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

schedule had been submitted this morning, and had been read by officers, but the Licensing Authority still wished to object to the application.

e. The premises had been visited by Licensing Enforcement officers following complaints and five breaches of licensing conditions were discovered. A warning letter was sent in relation to the breaches and after hour sale.

f. Even if the CIP did not exist, the Licensing Authority would still object to the application due the recent complaints, breaches and after hours sale, which also led to a lack of confidence in those running the premises.

3. Charlotte Palmer responded to questions including:
 - a. In response to queries from the applicant's representative, she confirmed that there had been no representations from the public. She confirmed that there was one after hours sale at 00:14.
 - b. In response to queries regarding nearby licensed premises, she confirmed that there were two nearby premises with 24 hour licences but that these licences were issued prior to the introduction of the CIP. She was not aware of any complaints or reviews in respect of those premises without checking the database

4. The statement by PC Gary Marsh on behalf of the Metropolitan Police including:
 - a. The Police representation was set out in Annex 4 of the report.
 - b. The CIP Area was designated further to a large amount of evidence submitted. Since the CIP had been in place there had not been a lot of crime and disorder, and that had been put down to the CIP being successful.

5. In response to questions from the applicant's representative, PC Marsh advised that no database check had been made on the two nearby premises with 24 hour licences as the hearing did not concern those, and that he was not aware that either of those premises employed any door staff.

6. The statement on behalf of the applicant, represented by Mr Duncan Craig, Citadel Chambers, including:
 - a. This application was for extension of hours at the licensed premises.
 - b. The premises had been licensed a little under a year ago.
 - c. The licence currently operated until 00:00 which was within the core hours of the CIP. This application sought a 24 hour licence for off sales.
 - d. An operating schedule had initially been submitted, but this had recently been fleshed out, with apologies for some duplication within the document.
 - e. This morning he had taken further instructions from his client following a conference at the premises. They sought to include a revised operating schedule into the application, but that had not been acceptable to the Police at this stage. He therefore read out an additional proposed condition 'That a registered SIA member of door staff be present at the premises

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

and all times from 00:00 to 08:00 when licensable activities are taking place'. This door supervisor would be required to wear a high visibility jacket and a badge.

f. It was understood that the premises needed to demonstrate evidence of how it would promote the licensing objectives and that it would not have a negative impact.

g. The premises currently traded 24 hours a day. It was a busy shop. If they provided an SIA registered door staff member to tackle public nuisance, customers would leave quickly and any potential issues of crime and disorder would be dealt with. This was offered as a condition on the licence. This would have a positive impact in relation to all customers not just those purchasing alcohol, and prevent any crime and disorder.

h. The premises currently employed around 15 staff and employed local people. The PLH Mr Tekagac wished to address the hearing. He had also bought the premises next door and wanted to open a restaurant. This showed his commitment to the local area and economy.

i. Concerns had been raised about noise nuisance, but it was noted there were no representations from the public, even though the application had been advertised. So the concerns of the Licensing Authority were not shared by residents.

j. Each application should be considered on its own merits, and he emphasized the proposed positive steps and verbal undertaking given by the applicant.

k. Mr Tekagac spoke to add that he had been running the shop for two years and had expanded to become 24 hour trade. He was struggling to pay the business rates. If this application was granted, that would help him pay his bills. He would employ more staff to work in the premises and put an SIA registered door supervisor in place and that would help the Police, and he would be happy to do anything required.

7. The applicant and representative responded to questions including:
 - a. In response to the Chair's queries in relation to the purchase of the next door property, the applicant advised that was a separate business, with a different income: one was a supermarket and one a restaurant. He had held the freehold for some time.
 - b. In response to a query by Charlotte Palmer, it was confirmed that the same applicant had also submitted an application for another Oncu Food Centre at another double shop. It was advised that was a different supermarket and the business rates were not as high as here.
 - c. Charlotte Palmer asked about plans and costs for the door staff. The applicant advised that he would use the best staff for the job. He had not worked out the finance in detail but an estimate was around £100 per day. He did not have a company in mind, but would search out a proficient local company. When customers buying groceries late at night had found that they could not also purchase alcohol they frequently abandoned all their shopping and left the premises and sales were lost.
 - d. Charlotte Palmer asked about actions taken following the after hours sale. Mr Tekagac advised that Licensing Enforcement officers had visited

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

the premises and had provided advice. Curtains were closed in the fridge at 00:00 to cover alcohol and a sign displayed. Staff had been trained not to sell alcohol after 00:00.

e. Charlotte Palmer asked about how often Mr Tekagac was on the premises. He advised that he was there almost every day 08:00 to 23:00 / 00:00 and that this was a family business. He advised that his brother would be managing the other supermarket and that his father would be managing the restaurant. If this application was granted, his cousin would apply for a personal licence so that he could work at the shop and a licence holder would be there at all times that licensable activities were carried out. This was also offered as a condition to the licence.

f. PC Marsh asked about research regarding risks and the local area and what actions would be taken. The applicant advised he had not spoken to other business operators as they were rival businesses, but he would do his best to keep the residential area quiet. He had used SIA registered door staff at a previous business in Canterbury and councillors had said it was a good idea and there had been no problems. He would have door staff in place from 00:00 to 08:00.

g. PC Marsh noted that conditions offered today had not been included in the operating schedule submitted, and that the applicant had not made contact with him at all, even after the representation, and he asked about the responsibilities of the proposed door staff. It was advised that they would be based in the premises and they would prevent alcohol sales to anyone who was drunk, and in a situation such as a fight they could get in touch with the Police and constrain people until the Police arrived.

8. The summary statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. The premises was in a CIP Area and unless the applicant had demonstrated to the LSC's satisfaction that the application should be an exception to the policy, it would be subject to the presumption against grant that is implicit in a CIP.
 - b. Members' attention was drawn to relevant policy and guidance set out in paragraph 6 of the officers' report.
9. The closing statement of Charlotte Palmer, Licensing Enforcement Officer, to confirm that even if the CIP did not exist, the Licensing Authority would object to a 24 hour licence being granted.
10. The closing statement of the Metropolitan Police in support of the Licensing Authority. The Police agreed with the CIP when it was put in place. Granting such an application may re-introduce problems which had been sought to get rid of.
11. The closing statement on behalf of the applicant, including:
 - a. He suggested that the LSC may grant the application with reduced hours. It was advised that SIA registered door staff would be available for whatever period the LSC granted.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

- b. The premises operated 24 hours a day currently, and there had been no representations from the public against this application.
- c. He highlighted the matters included in the operating schedule and further actions offered at the hearing, which would further promote the licensing objectives.

RESOLVED that

1. In accordance with the principles of Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

The Panel retired, with the legal representative and committee administrator, to consider the application further and then the meeting reconvened in public.

2. The Chairman made the following statement:

"Having considered all the written and oral representations and listened attentively to all parties at the hearing, the LSC determined that refusing the application is the appropriate measure for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

The view of the panel was that the evidence submitted did not warrant the variation of the premises licence in a Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) Area. The LSC was not persuaded by the Applicant's argument that he had financial difficulties which would be alleviated by the licence being varied as evidence was disclosed that he had recently purchased the premises next door. The Applicant was unable to show how employing an SIA licensed guard during the early hours of the morning would assist in preventing any problems occurring in and around his store. Nothing in his or his legal representative's argument persuaded the LSC that an exception to the CIP Area was warranted in this case."

3. The Licensing Sub-Committee resolved that the application be refused.

467

**SILVERPOINT FOOD CENTRE, 76-82 FORE STREET, LONDON, N18 2FF
(REPORT NO. 217) - 14:40 - 15:20**

RECEIVED the application made by Mr Haydar Aslan for a new Premises Licence at the premises known as and situated at Silverpoint Food Centre, 76-82 Fore Street, London, N18 2FF.

NOTED

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

1. The introductory statement of Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. This application was for a new premises licence for the premises known in the Licensing Authority records as Silverpoint Food Centre.
 - b. The premises had not previously held a licence. The premises had previously been a chemists, a butchers and a discount shop.
 - c. The application sought 24 hour opening and supply of alcohol 08:00 to 23:00 daily.
 - d. The premises was located in the Edmonton Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP) Area, but the times applied for fell within the core hours permitted by the CIP.
 - e. The application was considered by the responsible authorities. The Police and the Licensing Authority had accepted the times applied for and offered further conditions which had been agreed by the applicant. Consequently the representations against the application had been duly withdrawn.
 - f. Representations had been made against the application by one local resident, set out in Annex 3 of the report. The grounds of representation included the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder licensing objectives. The interested party, Mr Basim Jafar, had been notified of this hearing, but was not able to attend today.
 - g. The Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was present at the hearing, with a licensing consultant representative.

2. The statement of Mr Graham Hopkins, GT Licensing Consultants, on behalf of Silverpoint Food Centre, including:
 - a. The premises was run as a convenience store on the ground floor of a new building.
 - b. The Licensing Authority and the Police concerns had been met and appropriate conditions would be included on the licence.
 - c. The applicant also wished to offer two further conditions to promote the licensing objectives. Firstly, a contact telephone number would be placed in the window to enable problems to be reported. Secondly, the shop staff would use CCTV to keep the frontage outside of the shop checked and move on anyone loitering there.
 - d. The operators were fully aware of their responsibilities. They would record any incidents in a book.
 - e. With respect to the interested party, incidents reported in the representation took place within a residential block and would seem to be a matter for the management company. It was noted that some residents of the block were already customers of the shop.
 - f. It was confirmed that waste would be disposed of appropriately.
 - g. The shop did not wish to sell alcohol at any later hours.
 - h. The applicant had experience in working in licensed premises and held a personal licence.

RESOLVED that

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016

1. In accordance with the principles of Section 100(a) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for this item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

The Panel retired, with the legal representative and committee administrator, to consider the application further and then the meeting reconvened in public.

2. The Chairman made the following statement:

“Having read and heard all evidence submitted, and consideration of the objector’s views, the LSC was not persuaded that the operation of the shop will exacerbate the concerns about public nuisance and crime and disorder raised by the objector. Accordingly the licence is granted with the added condition that the phone number of the premises be displayed on the exterior of the shop.”

3. The Licensing Sub-Committee resolved that the application be granted in full as follows:

(i) Hours the premises are open to the public: 24 hours daily.

(ii) Supply of alcohol (off supply): 08:00 to 23:00 daily.

Conditions (in accordance with Annex 04 of the LSC report):

(i) Conditions 1 to 11, which are not disputed;

(ii) AND

- A phone number shall be clearly displayed on the shop window for residents to call with any concerns / complaints. Details of any resident’s complaints should be recorded in the Incident Book together with the outcome.
- Two staff shall monitor the frontage immediately outside the premises on an ongoing basis both by CCTV and physically and politely ask any people loitering outside to move away.

468

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RECEIVED the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 24 February 2016.

AGREED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 24 February 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 16.3.2016