

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2024**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Doug Taylor (Chair), Sinan Boztas, and Jim Steven.

**OFFICERS:** Ellie Green (Licensing Team Manager), Victor Ktorakis (Senior Environmental Health Officer), Dina Boodhun (Legal Adviser), and Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

**Also Attending:** Cllr Mahym Bedekova (Haselbury Ward Councillor), Cllr George Savva (Haselbury Ward Councillor), Gulay Dalkilic (British Alevi Federation representative), Muslum Dalkilic (Chair of British Alevi Federation), Olgan Gunduz (Solicitor representing British Alevi Federation), OP10 (Spokesperson representing Haselbury residents), an officer observing, and 2 opposing parties.

**1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR**

Members **AGREED** that Cllr Taylor would Chair the meeting.

**2 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Sabri Ozaydin, who was substituted by Cllr Doug Taylor.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest received regarding any item on the agenda.

**4 CHURCHFIELDS RECREATION GROUND, GREAT CAMBRIDGE ROAD, LONDON, N9 9LE**

On 28 December 2023, an application was made for a new Premises Licence at Churchfields Recreation Ground, Great Cambridge Road, LONDON, N9 9LE, by British Alevi Federation.

**NOTED:**

1. The introduction by Ellie Green, Licensing Team Manager, including:
  - a. The sub-committee were to consider a new premises licence application at Churchfields Recreation Ground, Great Cambridge Road, LONDON, N9 9LE, submitted by the British Alevi Federation.

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- b. There was no proposed designated premises supervisor (DPS), as there was no sale of alcohol being sought in the application.
- c. The Alevi had held various outdoor events during summer periods for a number of years, and recently indoor events had taken place in the new event hall via a temporary event notice application.
- d. The outdoor events had cause noise nuisance and some unlicensed activity had been witnessed, specifically in the summer of 2022.
- e. The application originally sought outdoor events to be included in the licence but following mediation with the Licensing Authority, the outdoor activities had been removed from the application.
- f. Conditions had been agreed, namely in relation to traffic management and CCTV with the Police, and as these had been agreed, the Police's representation had been withdrawn.
- g. The Licensing Authority had also made representations, seeking a number of conditions. All but four of these conditions had been agreed, and only these four remaining conditions should form the basis for discussion and consideration at the hearing, though additional conditions could be added if the committee should wish to do so. These conditions are outlined in the report packs.
- h. The new application had drawn representations from fifteen local residents objecting to the application, mostly that the licence be refused in its entirety based on the prevention of public nuisance licensing objectives. The application had also drawn two supporting representations from the Ward Councillors present.
- i. Churchfields is located off the busy A10, and the grounds are surrounded predominately by residential properties.
- j. The application sought an unlimited licence, meaning there would be no end date, with a capacity of 350 people, for indoor events only. Opening hours sought were 8am to 11pm, with indoor sporting events 10am to 9pm, and live and recorded music and performance of dance midday to 11pm daily.
- k. The Alevi had provided updated plans and policies to support their application and a written response to the representations, including discussion on the outstanding conditions, which are available in the report packs.
- l. OP10, had been nominated spokesperson by a number of opposing parties (OPs), namely OPs 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 14 and 15, two of whom were present.
- m. Those in attendance were introduced, and the order of representations and amount of time parties would have to speak was outlined.

2. Mr Olgan Gunduz, Solicitor representing British Alevi Federation, made the following statement:

- a. He said that he would not repeat the written submission and instead directed members of the sub-committee to where in the report packs these written representations, previously made by Alevi, were available.

## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- b. It was highlighted that through consultations, outdoor events had been withdrawn from this application, which was now limited to indoor events only. He added that there was no sale of alcohol sought in the application.
  - c. Of the four outstanding conditions, Mr Gunduz expressed that following discussions prior to the meeting/hearing, the condition regarding the wording of 'adult entertainment' on the licence, Alevi, in principle, no longer objected to. It was explained that Alevi did not like the wording of 'adult entertainment', but Ellie Green had explained that this was the default wording applied to licences including other religious centre, and thus, in principle, they no longer had an objection to this. Additionally on the condition regarding children under the age of 16 always being accompanied after 9pm, in principle, Alevi also now agreed to this.
  - d. This left two contentious provisions, one being that despite outdoor events being withdrawn, and the application limited to indoors only, they could not understand the legal/practical reason why the number of events should be limited to only fifteen per year. They felt this to be a serious restriction on the practices of the community, and that one event a month plus three extras for special occasions appeared the only logic for this limit. He added that the Licensing Act states there must be good valid reason for limiting the number of events. He thought it to be a trial-and-error approach, and emphasised that the licensing team had no power to increase the number of events they could hold, but instead Alevi would have to create a new application, starting the process from scratch, which he felt was unfair and impractical. He highlighted that if the application were granted, the Licensing Act allowed for the Local Authority, residents, or other parties to seek a consultation and review of the licence, if they felt there were issues.
  - e. The Chair allowed Mr Gunduz to continue speaking beyond his 5-minute limit, and said he would allow the same for other parties making representations.
  - f. The merits of having the Alevi centre at this location in the community were highlighted, and Mr Gunduz made clear how helpful his client had been during the Covid pandemic; that this demonstrated that they were on the side of local people, and it was not in their interest to cause a nuisance/ disruptions.
3. In response, the following comments and questions were received:
- a. The Chair asked what Alevi's traffic management policy plan at the site would be. Mr Gunduz responded that this was an area his client had been working on, and had employed outside professionals to help with. He added that they were working on another application for a large outdoor annual festival, thus appreciated the traffic concerns, but would focus on what fell within the scope of the application being discussed. Mr Gunduz conveyed that car parking facilities were available on site, that of the 350 attendees permitted by this application, the front car

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

park provided 35-36 spaces, and more spaces were located along the barrier which brought the total to 100. He said that there would likely be around 40 cars per event, which the car parking facilities more than accommodated for. The width of the access to the site was described as a potential problem which would be managed through specially trained staff in high visibility jackets directing cars in and out on event days. Cars coming in would be given priority so as to avoid traffic issues on the A10. Alevi were said to take the issue of traffic seriously, and had many volunteers at the community centre who would help contribute to ensure that it was effectively managed at all events.

- b. Victor Ktorakis queried how Alevi would manage the number of people at events so as to ensure that the capacity of 350 was not exceeded. Mr Gunduz replied that there would be counting on door entry, with a one in one out policy. Officer suggestions for ticketed/ guest listed events would be adopted as policy at events where deemed practical, but Alevi did not want this as a condition on the licence as they did not want to be limited/ restricted by this. Gulay Dalkilic clarified that they were a religious organisation, and they would not for example want to be ticketing at the centre in the event that somebody passed away as this would not be appropriate. Ellie Green expressed that such an instance would not involve licensable activity. Mr Gunduz agreed that worship and prayer were not covered by the Licensing Act and was a practice that could take place as frequently as was desired thus did not form part of the scope of the application. He added that there may still be events where tickets/guest lists were not possible, and that in these instances there would be a strict door supervisor counting people in and out of the premises, and a clicker system for instance would serve to control capacity. The limited car parking capacity would also assist in managing this naturally and once the capacity figure had been reached, there would be a no entry policy for non-ticketed events.
- c. Victor Ktorakis enquired whether Alevi would be willing to accept a condition that a door supervisor be employed. Mr Gunduz advised that they would not have a problem with this in principle, but that they would not be able to employ a door supervisor from a private company, as this would be too expensive, and was not in keeping with the charitable nature of the organisation. The DPS who would have been proposed, had they been required to have one as part of the application, had a personal licence and looked after licensed premises in other boroughs, thus his extensive knowledge and experience would help to ensure door supervision was done correctly. Mr Gunduz added that an SIA door supervisor would not be needed as they would not be dealing with the usual issues associated with pubs and bars, given there would be no alcohol and guests were not expected to get into altercations or be involved in crime and disorder. Ellie Green expressed that one of the mandatory requirements for licence conditions relating to door supervision, necessitated that such door supervisors be licensed/ SIA registered. Mr Gunduz replied that somebody would obtain this

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

necessary qualification, and in the meantime an external SIA door supervisor would be employed.

- d. Victor Ktorakis asked, in instances where excess numbers of people had turned up to an event, how they would go about managing them, to ensure capacity was not exceeded and those excess individuals left. Mr Gunduz responded that once the capacity had been hit, any further people wishing to attend the event would be refused access outright, and any individuals waiting outside would be asked to leave by the SIA trained door supervisor. Alevi would inform door staff not to let anyone in once capacity had been reached, and this would be communicated to attendees. Victor Ktorakis conveyed that it would be for Alevi to put policies and procedures in place for the SIA door supervisors to follow, that they would need to have a security plan in place, and that it may not be enough to have just one SIA supervisor in some instances. Mr Gunduz said that SIA door supervisors would enforce their rules and expectations from a licensing and security point of view. He reiterated that their organisation was different in nature to a drinking establishment. Mr Gunduz explained that there would be a queuing system; counting would take place at the door, and if they reached capacity, no further entry would be permitted, with any extra people asked to leave. He said their one in one out policy would not be like at pubs and bars, and there would be no waiting outside once the attendee limit was reached. Gulay Dalkilic added that at their recent event just before Christmas, a council officer had attended to check it, and could confirm that eight SIAs were in attendance. She said that there would not necessarily be eight SIAs at every event, but there would be more than one person on the door who was SIA registered, and they would plan for events where they expected the full 350 people capacity.
- e. Victor Ktorakis queried whether Alevi would accept a condition regarding having a security policy in place, which would be signed by the SIAs working at events, and enquired why a guest list would not be a suitable solution. Mr Gunduz advised that guest lists and ticketing would not be enforceable/ workable at all events and was therefore not a condition they could accept, as they did not want to be restricted by a condition; but they would use these approaches in the case of events where they were practical. He added that Alevi had several policies, that seeking advice on a security policy would not be difficult and they therefore did not object to having a policy conditioned.
- f. Victor Ktorakis asked if Alevi would be willing to accept a condition that events are risk assessed in advance, to determine whether they should be a ticketed or guest list event, and or how many SIA door supervisors would be required. Mr Gunduz responded that they had no problem with this, that once they had assessed the event, if practical, they would apply ticketing, and if not, they would state in their logbook the reasons for this. The Chair clarified that there could be categories, which individual events could be assessed against to determine, what security plan and form of admittance would be needed/ should be used.

## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

Mr Gunduz suggested the wording could be something to the effect of the: licence holder shall carry out a risk assessment to determine whether or not an event is going to be ticketed, or if a guest list is possible, and if not must insert in their logbook why not. Victor Ktorakis added that this should include wording to the effect of: and to determine the number of SIAs needed for the event; and this would form part of the conditioned security plan/ policy. Ellie Green would find some model condition wording.

- g. OP10 queried how traffic would be sufficiently managed. Mr Gunduz replied that the A10 was a busy dual carriage way and traffic was an important concern which they took seriously. He explained that there was a sufficient number of parking spaces on the premises to accommodate the expected capacity and that cars coming in from the A10 would be given priority. It was expressed that the risk management condition would allow them to better understand the potential issues and attendance prior to events and put plans/ policies in place to mitigate the impacts. They could make announcements to members of the community encouraging that they use public transport or carpool so as to reduce the risk of traffic issues. Mr Gunduz conveyed that problems accessing the premises only occurred when cars were trying to leave the premises, and they would mitigate this by having staff managing cars entering and leaving the site and giving priority to those arriving. Gulay Dalkilic added that they were contacting Edmonton County School with regards to using their new road to access the area and renting parking spaces. Additionally, they were looking at adding fencing with plastic sheeting to the grass area between the premises and residential properties as a means of reducing noise and dust. Furthermore, there were said to be recent discussions about moving parking spaces in front of the nursery and scout hut back towards the fencing, which would widen the access point, making it easier for cars to enter and leave the site, and eliminate the bottleneck. It was emphasised that their plan to give priority to incoming cars had been used at previous events and worked effectively.
- h. OP10 raised the traffic issues which had occurred at events at the premises during previous summers. He highlighted that any traffic backup at the site would cause serious issues on the A10, pointed out the amount of speeding that occurred, believed the estimate of 40 cars was not accurate, and enquired how this would be managed. Mr Gunduz advised that they had highlighted some of the efforts they would make to reduce the issues, like giving priority to cars entering the site and widening the access point. He said that they could not guarantee that there would be no issues on the road, and emphasised that there were broader problems with traffic in the area and on the A10. The historic instance of traffic issues regarding to Alevi related to the summer festival in 2022 which was an outdoor event, and thus not comparable/ relevant to this application. He expressed that some of the issues raised and the research they would conduct, would feed into their future application for the annual festival. Mr Gunduz highlighted

## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

that no traffic or highways objections had been received when the application was made, he reiterated that they would manage the problems effectively, that for this indoor event only application the traffic issues were not a major concern, but would be considered in their future application. Cllr Bedekova thanked residents for highlighting these issues and welcomed the work that the Alevi Federation were doing to try and find solutions to the issues. She suggested Churchill Primary School parking spaces as another potential solution, and offered to help Alevi with this to resolve potential traffic concerns.

- i. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:03am to allow those in attendance a short comfort break. The meeting resumed at 11:09am.
- j. One of the OPs present asked on what grounds it would be determined whether an event was to be ticketed, how this would be communicated, and could a list of potential events be produced. Mr Gunduz responded that they would risk assess events and manage them effectively. He added that there could potentially be a monthly newsletter published to the centre's mailing list, highlighting the upcoming events once they were known. Another of the OPs enquired whether it would be possible to display upcoming events on a notice board at the premises, Mr Gunduz replied that this would be a possibility. Ellie Green queried whether it would be possible to display the information regarding upcoming events on the group's website. Mr Gunduz advised that the British Alevi Federation did have a website, but did not have in-house IT, and so making changes/ adding information on a regular basis would incur a cost to them, but Gulay Dalkilic said that this was something they would look at. Mr Gunduz believed that the mailing list would prove the most practical approach, encouraged members of the public to join the mailing list, and highlighted the good work his clients did in the community, including clearing up rubbish which had been left at the premises by others.
- k. One of the OPs present queried, given the event hall had been described as a temporary building, whether there were plans to build a larger building. Mr Gunduz responded that there was no intention to build a larger building and clarified that the event hall was a temporary structure.
- l. One of the OPs present enquired whether there were plans to put in proper parking facilities, or if they would continue using the grass at the premises. Gulay Dalkilic replied that at present cars were parked 10-15 meters away from houses, in line with the building. She added that they constantly re-grassed the site, and were looking at adding fencing with plastic sheeting to reduce noise and dust to residents. It was explained that photos on the website showing cars parked close to residential properties were probably old and needing updating; that trees had been planted, and an arts hub and fencing added since these were taken.
- m. One of the OPs present queried whether pedestrian and cycle access would be encouraged. Gulay Dalkilic advised that there were walkways and pathways for pedestrians and cyclists to access the premises, and

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

they would do their best to encourage their attendees to use these methods of transport. She highlighted that at their summer event in 2022, they had sent communications on social media asking that people walk or use public transport to attend the event, and would continue to do this in the future.

- n. One of the OPs present asked whether there would be a designated smoking area at the premises, and if there was, where this would be located. Gulay Dalkilic responded that it was on the far side of the building facing the allotments and was partially covered. It was said there were cameras located here and staff would be around to reduce the chance of noise issues. She added that even on days when there were not events, people who had nothing to do with the centre attended the site/ park, and they had a caretaker who went round and dispersed people if there were noise issues.

4. Victor Ktorakis, Senior Environmental Health Officer, made the following statement:

- a. As with any application, it was important to consider the history of the premises. Since June 2018 the council had received 63 complaints regarding noise from the site, the majority of which were received between May and July 2022.
- b. On 7 August 2018 council officers witnessed a statutory noise nuisance and as a result served a fixed penalty notice on Mrs Koroglu and Mr Erbil, both of whom were trustees for the British Alevi Federation at the time.
- c. In the summer of 2022, there were a number of outdoor events held at the site without the British Alevi Federation applying for a temporary event notice. Alevi believed that the Community Premises Exemption applied, however, this was only for events with a capacity not exceeding 500, which was not the case at these events. Once the Licensing Team became aware that the events were taking place with a capacity above 500, and several noise complaints received by residents, officer advice was provided to the British Alevi Federation about how to meet their licensing requirements for further events on the site. This advice was sadly ignored, as several events followed where the capacity far exceeded 500 people. These included the Albanian Community Concert which still went ahead despite being refused by the Licensing Authority. Council officers attended the event and witnessed a capacity in excess of 500 people with ticket sales having reached 1,300 people, massively over what they were entitled to; unauthorised sales of alcohol were also being made at the premises at this event.
- d. In September 2022 the Licensing Enforcement Team conducted an investigation in relation to offences under the Licensing Act, the outcome of that investigation resulted in the British Alevi Federation signing a simple caution for a number of offences. This included, on 19 and 26 June 2022 the British Alevi Federation carried out unauthorised



#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

licensable activities, namely live and recorded music for a capacity over 500 people, the capacity actually being 2000 people at that event. Additionally on 26 June 2022 the British Alevi Federation carried out unauthorised licensable activities in the form of the sale of alcohol. Officers also witnessed a breach of the noise abatement notice on 19 and 26 June 2022, for which fixed penalty notices for each breach were served on the aforementioned trustees. Advice had been given to the British Alevi Federation that if events over 500 people were expected, they would need to apply for a licence which they were now in the process of doing.

- e. The main condition still up for debate regarded no more than 15 indoor events taking place/ being provided in the year, where regulated entertainment takes place. Local residents were said to have expressed concerns with the frequency at which even indoor events could take place. The Local Authority were aware of the issues which arose in 2022, which largely occurred due to a lack of control at the events in general, such as noise nuisance and traffic management. Until the premises had established itself and operated without substantial complaints and or officer concerns for a period of at least a year, the Local Authority do not believe the premises should be permitted the potential to operate every day of the year. An alternative number of events had not been proposed by the applicant.
- f. Officer observations in 2022 resulted in capacities exceeding attendance by a significant number, despite council advice being provided. On 19 June 2022 attendance reached 2000 people when the maximum should have been 500, and this was similar on 26 June 2022. Unauthorised sales of alcohol had taken place on the site at an event where the attendance should have been 500 people, but instead reached 1300. This demonstrated that the British Alevi Federation were not able to control the number of people at their events, or the licensable activities taking place on their premises, and because of these breaches they had signed a caution.
- g. The Licensing Authority lack confidence in the applicant's ability to control and confirm the number of attendees on site, and until such a time that the applicant can show compliance with the attendance capacity numbers, the Licensing Authority maintain their position with regards to this licensing condition.

5. In response, the following comments and questions were received:

- a. The Chair asked whether all of the breaches referred to related to outdoor events. Victor Ktorakis confirmed this to be the case.
- b. Mr Gunduz queried whether one of the breaches referred to, which resulted in the British Alevi Federation signing a caution, was the Albanian concert, on 26 June 2022. Victor Ktorakis responded that he believed it was.
- c. Cllr Savva enquired whether the events in June 2022, taking place soon after the Covid pandemic and lockdowns, when people would

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

want to go out and meet each other, was a mitigating consideration for the breach. Victor Ktorakis replied that it was a clear breach regardless of the scenario, that it was for the licence holder to control the capacity, which they were unable to do, and they would not allow or want to see breaches following a potential future pandemic. Victor added that despite this being an event for the Albanian community, it was still the British Alevi Federation's site, and they were responsible for it. He expressed that the premises was large and could accommodate more than the capacity.

- d. The Chair asked why any restriction on the number of events that the Alevi Federation could hold would be a problem. Mr Gunduz advised that they could not measure on which days certain events may need to take place, and they wanted to be able to respond to the needs of the community. He expressed that 365 events in a year was never realistically going to happen and questioned the purpose of having a numerical number of events, as they did not want to be limited in this respect. It was highlighted that all of the previous issues referred to related to outdoor events, and that this application, through consultation had been reduced to indoor events only. Mr Gunduz believed that his clients should not need to prove that they could effectively manage indoor events, thus should not be restricted. There were mechanisms in place whereby if there were issues in the future, the public and Licensing Authority could bring about a review of the licence. The external event referred to was a leased event to an outside community, and as a matter of policy, they no longer leased their premises to any external community, and would only be running their own events at the site. This step, along with withdrawing the outdoor events, showed effective management in ensuring that past issues were not repeated. He reassured those present that all indoor events going forward would be properly managed and have a restricted capacity. Mr Gunduz conveyed that condition 18 was outstanding as well as condition 4. Victor Ktorakis said that this was subject to agreeing the conditions with regards to door supervisors, a security plan and risk assessments. Mr Gunduz clarified, this being the case, that condition 4 regarding the number of events, was the only outstanding/ contentious condition remaining.
- e. One of the OPs present questioned whether the Alevi Federation would still be able to use the community event exemption to hold outdoor events for under 500 people. Gulay Dalkilic responded that this application did not seek any outdoor events, that their intention was not to repeat 2022 where they had a month of several events, but instead have one weekend where residents would know the event date, but this was subject to the future licence application being granted. Mr Gunduz expressed that they had no plans to use this exemption alongside this current application in the immediate future, and that future events would respond to the needs of the community and would be consulted on/ shared.

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- f. One of the OPs present enquired if there were further statutory noise nuisance breaches. Victor Ktorakis replied that they had been issued with fixed penalty notices on two separate occasions, on 19 and 26 June 2022.
- g. OP10 asked what consultations had taken place regarding the licence application. Mr Gunduz advised that there was a consultation on the application when it included both indoor and outdoor events, which ran from the end of December 2023 and ended on 25 January 2024. Since this time, a consultation had taken place between the applicant and council officers which discussed the issues and resulted in outdoor events being removed from the application; an further application for the outdoor annual festival would be submitted in the future.
- h. OP10 raised a public consultation regarding the purpose of the event hall which took place in 2022, which received a large number of signatures and comments. The Chair explained that this consultation referred to a planning application, and was therefore not relevant to this application.

6. OP10, spokesperson representing Haselbury residents, made the following statement:

- a. The initial representations made by Haselbury residents OP1-15 were made when the application was for both indoor and outdoor events. Some of the OPs were only informed of the removal of outdoor events from the application around the closure of the consultation. The representations made were therefore relevant based on their previous experiences of Alevi events, and the information in the original application. The OPs representations should be given full consideration by the Licensing sub-committee.
- b. Whilst residents understood the importance of fostering community engagement and cultural events, past events had a detrimental impact on the wellbeing and quality of life of residents in the surrounding area.
- c. Residents had a variety of concerns regarding the application, and these objections were based on the four licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003. Residents had raised concerns that individuals leaving Alevi events in the past had committed antisocial behaviour, namely not leaving events quietly, urinating in residents' gardens, and parking across residents' drives.
- d. Alevi events had attracted large numbers of attendees resulting in an increase in traffic, congestion, and parking issues in the area.
- e. The Alevi had been unable to control the number of people attending events in the past, and there was no evidence to suggest that this would be any different in the future were the application granted.
- f. Past events had generated an extremely high level of noise resulting in a public nuisance and statutory noise nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, and as confirmed by at least two officers who had visited a resident's premises on one of the event days.

## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- g. Due to their past experiences, Haselbury residents had no confidence that Alevi would adhere to the terms of the licence, as they had not demonstrated they could do this at previous events. Residents had concerns over the lack of event management, noise, the control of numbers and local parking by attendees. Alevi had shown unwillingness to control the level of noise emanating from events, and appeared unconcerned or unwilling to take into account the complaints and effects on residents, which it was believed would continue to be the case in the future.
- h. Alevi officials and representatives were said to have shown disregard towards Enfield Council employees, specifically members of the Environmental Team who had attended the site on event days.
- i. Residents therefore urged the Licensing sub-committee to reject this application for the reasons outlined.

7. In response, the following comments and questions were received:

- a. Mr Gunduz asked what had been meant by some of the OPs only being notified of the application around the closure of the consultation period. Ellie Green clarified that those who had submitted representations on the application had been contacted following the amendment to the application to remove outdoor events, to see if their representations remained, which all residents confirmed they did.
- b. Mr Gunduz sought clarity that residents had been given the opportunity to comment on the application, and that on knowing the outdoor event aspect of the application had been withdrawn, residents' positions were unchanged. O10 responded that the representations had been made on past experiences, particularly the lack of management of past events, hence the Licensing Authority were of the position that the number of events should be limited until it had been demonstrated that they could manage events effectively. OP10 added that he did not feel Alevi appreciated how their events had affected local residents. He described how he had witnessed officers visiting his premises, following a complaint regarding the noise from one of Alevi's events, being treated badly over the phone by an Alevi representative when trying to investigate and resolve the issue. Mr Gunduz expressed that he felt OP10 had gone beyond providing clarification on the point he had raised, and instead made another representation. The Chair conveyed that he had given both sides latitude in order to allow for all the issues to be heard.
- c. Victor Ktorakis queried whether there was a number of events which residents would be happy for the British Alevi Federation to hold per year. Residents/ OPs present said they had not considered this question.

8. Cllr George Savva and Cllr Mahym Bedekova, Haselbury Ward Councillors, made the following statements:

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- a. Cllr Savva highlighted and thanked the British Alevi Federation for all the valuable work they do in the community.
- b. Cllr Bedekova expressed that she believed the application should be supported in order to promote the licensing objectives, particularly regarding the prevention of crime and disorder, prevention of public nuisance, public safety and protection of children from harm.
- c. Cllr Bedekova conveyed that as a resident and ward councillor she had previously witnessed on many occasions anti-social behaviour on the site before the British Alevi Federation had moved in. She added that when she was elected in 2018, she raised this issue in a CAPE meeting with Police, but the issue persisted until the Alevi Federation moved in.
- d. Cllr Bedekova highlighted that this application was for indoor events only, meaning the previous issues regarding noise/ music at their outdoor events would not be repeated.
- e. Cllr Bedekova said that she had been told by many residents how pleased they were that as a result of the Alevi community centre, the area felt safer and cleaner. She added that there had been a reduction in crime, and that access to the green area on site was a positive benefit for residents.
- f. Cllr Bedekova raised how the British Alevi Federation provided a variety of educational courses to local residents, which helped to keep young people off the streets, and they had done a great deal of work to support the local community during Covid-19 lockdowns. She added that following the earthquake in Turkey, the Alevi Federation had done lots to help support local people.

#### 9. In response, the following comments and questions were received:

- a. One of the OPs present highlighted the noise pollution that had been experienced by residents. Cllr Savva responded that this application was for indoor events only, and the complaints/ representations made regarded previous outdoor events, which would be relevant to the further/ future application for the outdoor annual festival. He reiterated the good work the Alevi Federation had done in the area, including maintaining the green space at the site.
- b. One of the OPs present thanked the Alevi Federation for the good work they did in the community, expressed that they believed it would be better to limit the number of events initially and see how it went, and questioned whether a new application would need to be submitted to increase the number of events. Ellie Green advised that if the application were granted in part, subject to a condition that the number of events be restricted to 15, then after for instance the proposed 1-year period, the Alevi Federation would have to submit a full variation application. Mr Gunduz queried whether the open/ transparent publication/ notification of events, as a record of the number of events which had taken place without restriction, which the Council and members of the public could look over and bring back for a review at

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

committee if there were issues was the better option. The OP replied that the thought that Alevi would be able to hold an event every day without a numerical number to limit this would cause them concern, and they had to base their judgement on what had happened in the past. Mr Gunduz reemphasised that these issues regarded outdoor events, and this new application was indoor events only.

- c. Cllr Steven queried whether the British Alevi Federation currently had an outdoor events licence. Mr Gunduz responded that they did not, that events like the Albanian Community Concert had been held with a temporary events notice, but due to the issues of such events, the decision had been taken not to rent the outside area of the premises to any group in the future. He added that these issues were caused by a different community to theirs, that they had not allowed the Albanian group to provide alcohol, but this had been ignored, and that their application sought no supply of alcohol at events.

#### 10. The following closing summaries/ points were made:

- a. Ellie Green outlined the options available to Members of the committee to make, and directed them to the relevant guidance.
- b. Victor Ktorakis expressed that having read and listened to the British Alevi Federation's representations, the Licensing Authority were not minded to change their position on condition 25 regarding the number of events. The Licensing Authority were minded to change their position on condition 28 regarding ticketed events/ guest lists, subject to Alevi agreeing to alternative provisions. The first of these being that the premises shall have a written security crowd management and dispersal policy, which all staff will be fully trained in, with training being logged/ records kept, and made available to the Police and Licensing Authority upon request, and kept for one year. Additionally, the premises licence holder will undertake suitable and sufficient risk assessments prior to all licensable events to identify if the event will need to be ticket only and if SIA door supervisors are required, this must be document and made available to the Police and Licensing Authority on request, and kept for a year. The duties of the door supervisor will include the supervision of persons entering and leaving the premises, to ensure that this is achieved without causing a nuisance. All door supervisors shall be easily identifiable by wearing high visibility jackets. Furthermore, a log must be kept indicating the date and times door supervisors sign in and out for duty, and must include clear details as to door supervisors' names, SIA badge numbers, employer, and the duties that they are employed to carry out at that particular event. The log must be kept for at least 6 months and made available to the Police and Licensing Authority upon request.
- c. OP10 conveyed that residents appreciated the good work that the British Alevi Federation did, but past events had caused problems for local people, with noise and traffic issues being the most prevalent. He added that he hoped future events would see changes, with residents

#### LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

not affected like they were in the past. OP10 felt that indoor only events would help to restrict the noise, but supported the Licensing Authority's condition to limit the number of events to 15, until such time the Alevi could prove that they were capable of effectively managing events.

- d. Cllr Bedekova said that from her experience, when the Licensing sub-committee had given licence holders the opportunity to learn from past mistakes they had. She reemphasised the good work Alevi did in the community, that the issues of the past referred to outdoor events, and this application was for indoor events only, and thus supported the application, but did feel sorry for residents for what they had endured in the past.
- e. Mr Gunduz expressed that the application emanated from consultations which had taken place with the Licensing Authority. Previously temporary event notices had been utilised for outdoor events which had resulted in some issues. The Licensing Team advised that the applicant submit a license application, and said they would not be issuing further temporary event notices to the licence holder for outdoor events. He conveyed that the problems with previous outdoor events were addressed by the reduction in scope of this application to indoor events only. Mr Gunduz highlighted the good work that his clients did in the community and reiterated that the supply of alcohol was not sought in the application. He emphasised that the Alevi Federation worked with children and thus had high regard for the opinions of the locals and responsible authorities, hence they had agreed to the condition that post 9:00pm all children would be accompanied. Mr Gunduz expressed that given the good management steps demonstrated, the sub-committee should grant the application. With regards to the proposed alternative provisions to ticketed events, his clients accepted these, and this illustrated their willingness to work with the Local Authority to make the application as good as it could be for all. On the issue of the condition relating to limiting the number of events to 15, this was strongly opposed for the reasons which had been outlined, namely that they couldn't and should not be made to fix number of events they had, particularly given the nature of the Alevi Federation. He said that his clients did not want to be punished for past outdoor events, as these were not relevant to this, but the future outdoor annual festival application, and there had been good management decisions/ steps taken in the preparation of the application. Mr Gunduz highlighted that Alevi were trying to work with local residents, for instance by agreeing to provide notice of their upcoming events where possible. He raised an instance of an enforcement from 16 December 2023, available in the report packs, relating to a temporary events notice which officers had categorically marked no noise. This he said provided assurance that noise was not expected from indoor events, and thus the sub-committee should disregard the issues raised regarding outdoor events. Mr Gunduz explained that a limiting numerical figure of events was not about negotiation, but instead the practice and regulated activity of the group, and any mistakes made by the applicant would

## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

allow for the right to review the licence, which they took seriously. He added that it should be a case of innocent until proven guilty, that there had been no indoor event breaches, and so Alevi should be given the chance to prove their indoor events would be managed effectively. All complaints regarding outdoor events would be addressed in their next application for the annual festival, which they would have a consultation for, thus this application should be granted.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting at 12:32, while the committee went away to deliberate. The Panel retired with the legal adviser and committee administrator to consider the application further, and then the meeting reconvened in public at 13:38.

The Licensing Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** that the application be **GRANTED IN PART** as follows:

### Licensing Hours and Activities:

Activity	Proposed Times by Applicant	Times Confirmed by LSC
Opening hours	08:00 – 23:00 daily	08:00 – 23:00 daily
Indoor Sporting Events	10:00 – 21:00 daily	10:00 – 21:00 daily
Live Music (indoors) Recorded Music (indoors) Performance of dance (indoors)	12:00 – 23:00 daily	12:00 – 23:00 daily

### Conditions

- (i) Conditions 1 to 24, 26 and 27 (in accordance with Annex 6, from page 122 of the report pack).
- (ii) The premises shall have a written security, crowd management and dispersal policy. All staff shall be fully trained in the policy. The training shall be logged, and records kept. These records shall be made available to the Police and/or Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year.
- (iii) The premises licence holder will undertake a suitable and sufficient risk assessment prior to all licensable events to identify if the premises will need to be a ticket only event and if SIA door supervisors are required. The risk assessment must be documented and made available to the Police and/or Local Authority upon request and shall be kept for at least one year.



## LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024

- (iv) The duties of the door supervisors will include the supervision of persons entering and leaving the premises to ensure that this is achieved without causing a nuisance.
- (v) All door supervisors shall be easily identifiable by wearing high visibility jackets.
- (vi) A log must be kept indicating the date and times door supervisors sign in and out for duty and must include clearly printed details of each door supervisor's name, SIA licence number, employer, and the duty they are employed to carry out on any particular event. This log must be kept for at least six months and must be made available to Police or Local Authority officers on request.

The Chair made the following statement:

“I thank all participants for their oral and written representations. The Licensing Sub-Committee (LSC) considered all submissions and representations and carefully considered all the evidence.

In making its decision, the LSC took into account the promotion of the four licensing objectives:

- Prevention of crime and disorder;
- Public safety;
- Prevention of public nuisance;
- Protection of children from harm.

The LSC also had regard for the Council Policy Statement and Statutory Guidance.

Having heard all representations, the LSC took steps for the promotion of the licensing objectives by granting the application in part, subject to mandatory conditions plus the conditions outlined above.”

The Chair added that on condition 25 regarding the number of events, the committee had spent a long time considering the issues, but decided not to accept the Licensing Authority's proposed restriction. He made the point that had this been an entirely new application from a new licence holder for events, they would not have considered restricting the number of events, but instead give the applicant the opportunity to prove themselves, with mechanisms for review available. The Chair conveyed that the committee recognised the history of complaints from residents, but hoped the changes and conditions would mean the applicant could deliver what they had promised, and the Licensing Authority should ensure if there were breaches, that the licence be reviewed. On the issue of smoking, the Chair expressed that the sub-committee were not minded to specifically condition this, but asked that the designated smoking area be properly supervised and not create any nuisance. The Chair asked that any ability to prevent Alevi event

**LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.2.2024**

attendees parking across residents' driveways, for instance through supervision, would be appropriate. He asked for better communications, and that if issues did arise, there ought to be a number that residents could reach, which Alevi could respond to and address the problems.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and contributions and the meeting ended at 13:44.