

Public Document Pack

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 12 JUNE 2024

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Sinan Boztas, Sabri Ozaydin, Jim Steven, and Mahym Bedekova (Chair).

OFFICERS: Ellie Green (Licensing Team Manager), Victor Ktorakis (Senior Environmental Health Officer), Paul Wilkins (Streetworks Manager), Dina Boodhun (Legal Adviser for Churchfields application), Tayo Hassan (Legal Adviser for +355 Café application), and Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

Also Attending: Police Representatives (Leon Christodoulou, Andy Underwood and Lisa Panthelitsa), local residents (Alevi application: Other Parties (OPs): 1, 3 and 4; +355 application: OP38), Gulay Dalkilic (British Alevi Federation representative), Dilek Incedal (Chair of British Alevi Federation), Muslum Dalkilic (Co-chair of British Alevi Federation), Olgan Gunduz (Solicitor representing British Alevi Federation), an officer observing, Cara Gazmend (Premises Licence Holder (PLH) and Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) of +355 Cafe), Noel Samaroo (agent representing NTAD Consultants Ltd), Wysif Alhani (Barrister representing Cara Gazmend), and press.

1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

Members **AGREED** that Cllr Boztas would Chair the Churchfields application.

2 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Cllr Sinan Boztas would be unable to attend the hearing for the +355 Coffee Bar & Lounge application, and so would be substituted by Cllr Mahym Bedekova, who would Chair this item.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Sabri Ozaydin declared that he was a member of the Alevi faith, but not a member of the British Alevi Federation. It would be declared when the decision was being conveyed that Cllr Ozaydin was also a consultant to one of the vendors who would be at the 2024 British Alevi Federation summer festival. Cllr Ozaydin would abstain from the decision on the Churchfields Recreation Ground application.

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

1. The introduction by Ellie Green, Principal Licensing Officer, including:
 - a. The sub-committee were to consider a variation application for the British Alevi Federation at Churchfields Recreation Ground, Great Cambridge Road, London, N9 9LE.
 - b. There was no DPS, as the existing licence did not permit the sale of alcohol and the variation application did not seek to add this activity.
 - c. The variation sought to add outdoor live and recorded music, performance of dance and anything of a similar description between 1pm and 7pm for a Saturday and Sunday two-day event annually. The opening hours sought for this two-day event were between 10am and 10pm.
 - d. The Alevi had held outdoor events previously in the summer months of recent years, these events were reported to have caused noise nuisances and some unlicensed activity had been witnessed by council officers, specifically in the summer of 2022.
 - e. A new licence application for the premises was submitted in December 2023, which originally sought outdoor events to be included as part of the same licence, but following mediation with the Licensing Authority, the outdoor activities were removed from that application. That new application went to a hearing in February 2024, in light of outstanding representations from the Licensing Authority and local residents. The application was granted with full hours and modified conditions and was in regards to the event hall.
 - f. This variation application was submitted in April and had attracted objecting representations from the council's traffic and transport team, the Licensing Authority, the Police and six local residents. One ward councillor had submitted a representation in support of the application.
 - g. Through the representations, there was a pattern that the Alevi needed to include more details in the event management plan, including a traffic management plan.
 - h. The Alevi had provided a response which was available in the main and supplementary reports. However, some outstanding concerns remained, therefore the representations from all parties remained in place.
 - i. Conditions had been sought by the Licensing Authority, as per Annex 10, but the Alevi had not indicated agreement to them.
 - j. The committee could if minded to impose additional conditions not yet mentioned in any representation.
 - k. The Alevi were required to submit an amended plan to reflect the true layout of the licence area, and include the 200 car parking spaces on site as mentioned by the Alevi in recent meetings. The plan of the licensed area was a legal requirement and formed part of the licence authorisation, so must be accurate for the licence to be used. Mr Gunduz circulated an updated plan to Members at the meeting.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- I. Those in attendance were introduced, the proposed order in which verbal representations would be heard was outlined, and the amount of time parties would have to speak was detailed.
2. In response, the following comments and questions were received:
 - a. Cllr Ozaydin asked that Ms Green let speakers know 50 seconds in advance of their time elapsing, as opposed to 30 seconds, to give them the opportunity to adequately sum up. Ms Green highlighted that there would be an opportunity for speakers to sum up at the end, but would give 50 seconds notice before each party's time was up.
 - b. Mr Gunduz asked for a copy of annex 10. The legal adviser directed him to page 106 of the main agenda.
 - c. The Chair highlighted that there was a second hearing for another application set to take place after this one, and that speakers would only be allowed their 5 minutes in which to make their representations.
3. Mr Gunduz, Solicitor representing the British Alevi Federation, made the following statement:
 - a. In relation to the consultation which took place in January, prior to the hearing for the indoor event application, the withdrawal of outdoor events had been discussed on the basis of this application, and not with a view to removing it.
 - b. The variation application sought one outdoor two-day summer festival event per annum. Outdoor live and recorded music, performance of dance and anything of a similar description was sought between 1pm and 7pm, and opening hours on Saturday and Sunday between 10am and 10pm.
 - c. The sale/provision of alcohol was not sought thus a DPS was not required.
4. In response, the following comments and questions were received:
 - a. Mr Ktorakis queried whether the Alevi were willing to accept any of the proposed conditions 32-71 set out in Annex 10. Mr Gunduz responded that some of the conditions were repetitive in the sense that they were based on the application, for example condition 32 that the outdoor event is only permitted to take place on two consecutive days (Saturday and Sunday). Ms Green explained that the times, days and conditions stipulated the scope of what was and wasn't permitted and were part of the template for a licence. On condition 34, Mr Gunduz questioned the need/ reasoning for point q, an extreme weather plan. Mr Ktorakis replied that in the event of extreme weather such as lightning or heatwave, there would need to be a plan for managing the event safely. Mr Gunduz advised that his clients had instructed him that it would not be ready for the coming weekend event, for which there was not expected to be extreme weather, but this would be put in place

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- for future events. On condition 37, Mr Gunduz expressed that if the wording reflected that capacity would not exceed 7,000, this was accepted. Mr Ktorakis conveyed that the spirit of what had been discussed was that 7,000 was likely too many people to manage safely, and that the number needed to be revised to a more manageable level. Mr Gunduz said that following their SAG meeting they had increased their security measures, and so were inclined to have a capacity limit not exceeding 7,000. Mr Ktorakis indicated that the Licensing Authority were not willing to agree this. On condition 38, allowing for pre-sold tickets only, Mr Gunduz explained that tickets could not always be sold solely online and there would be some door entry at the event. On condition 44, Mr Gunduz conveyed that at present the Alevi were using an SIA company to deal with this aspect, but for future events could have a traffic management company responsible, if required, by traffic and transport based on the risk assessments. Mr Wilkins advised that a traffic management company would be needed as it was a legal requirement that the direction of moving traffic be carried out by an authorised accredited traffic operative or CSAS officer. He added that the A10 was managed by TFL, and it would likely be a requirement from them to determine what they wanted on the network. Mr Ktorakis expressed that the Licensing Authority representations had been made in writing a long time ago, and the Alevi had plenty of time to engage on these proposed conditions. Mr Gunduz responded that this point was highlighted at the SAG meeting, and they were trying to understand if this condition could apply only if required by the authority, following submission of the risk assessment, and if deemed so, then a traffic management company would be appointed. Ms Green pointed out that the condition 44 said a traffic management company shall be employed where required, so already reflected what the Alevi sought. Mr Ktorakis added that the traffic and transport management plan formed part of condition 34, so if accepting this, condition 44 should be accepted by default. Mr Gunduz felt the wording should read, if required, following submission of the event management plan. Ms Green highlighted that the condition did not ask for an event management plan to be submitted each year; the requirement was that the Alevi had an event management plan. Mr Gunduz would take instruction from his clients on condition 44. Mr Gunduz expressed that condition 45 being read in conjunction with condition 38 was not accepted. Mr Gunduz confirmed that conditions 32-36, 39-44, and 46-71 were all accepted, and some of them were already in place; conditions 37, 38 and 45 were not agreed. Mr Gunduz sought clarity as to whether these conditions applied only to outdoor events, or indoor also. Mr Ktorakis confirmed that they were for outdoor events only.
- b. Mr Ktorakis expressed that the Alevi had been advised that the Licensing Authority were of the opinion that the noise management plan was not suitable. It set a noise limit at 65 decibels at the nearest noise sensitive receptacle, which was equivalent to the level of someone speaking, which would not be achievable. The Alevi had also

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

been asked to provide evidence that a number had been given to residents which they could call if they had noise complaints, and this was stipulated in the event management plan and condition 63, but no information had been received as to whether or how this had been done. Mr Gunduz replied that if/when the license application was approved, they would circulate a ready prepared leaflet with all of the details for residents to contact. Mr Ktorakis conveyed that the Alevi had been asked to provide a copy so that the Licensing Authority could see it, which had not been done. Gulay Dalkilic said that they had used a leafletting system previously, and were replicating this. The leaflet would go out with an onsite mobile number and email address; there would also be an invite for local residents, some information as to what would be going on during the day and a free ticket to attend. Cllr Ozaydin asked if it would be possible for an Alevi representative to email a copy of the leaflet to the Licensing Authority now so that they could see it. Gulay Dalkilic would see if this could be done. Mr Gunduz made the point that if they were agreeing to circulate what was required, then this was a sufficient response. Mr Ktorakis enquired why it hadn't been submitted prior to the meeting, as the Licensing Authority had been asking for this for a while, and it didn't fill them with much confidence that such things still hadn't been provided. He added that the information regarding the council's contact number had been provided to the Alevi should residents wish to contact the Local Authority, if they weren't getting joy when contacting the Alevi, and this information should also be provided on the leaflet. Mr Gunduz suggested that a draft template of the leaflet be circulated and approved by Environmental Health following the meeting, and this would address the point. An other party stated that within the conditions there was a requirement that notification of the event be provided to residents by the Alevi from 6 weeks prior to the event.

- c. Mr Ktorakis explained that the Licensing Authority had made comments and recommendations on the Alevi's noise management plan, but these had not been taken into account in the latest version of this document. Specifically, there were no low frequency levels specified in the noise management plan despite being requested, and the monitoring locations had not been specified. Gulay Dalkilic responded that the locations where there had been issues previously would be where the checks would take place, namely on the border of Churchfield Recreation Ground, as well as outside locations on the roads going outward to Edmonton Green and across the road from Bury Street. Mr Ktorakis conveyed that specific locations would need to be gone back to and retested, and these were not detailed in the noise management plan. He added that condition 35 which the Alevi had agreed to stated that they would adhere to what was set out in the event management plan, including the noise management plan, but this was not fit for purpose, and an amended version of the security plan had not been provided. No consideration had been taken with regards to the sound pressure level; 65 decibels at the nearest noise sensitive

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

receptacle was not attainable, but formed part of the plan the Alevi were agreeing to comply with, meaning they would have to reduce the volume of the music. Mr Gunduz replied that the sound engineer report was detailed and took account of all relevant factors; the 65-decibel limit had been checked by acoustic engineers and they confirmed this. Mr Ktorakis expressed that the Alevi had been informed that this level was not realistic and would result in them being required to have a very quiet festival. Gulay Dalkilic said that experts had told them that this was the right figure. Mr Gunduz added that the illustration Mr Ktorakis gave of the noise level, of him speaking into the phone was not an accurate reflection, as the distance at the festival to resident's properties would be over a much larger area. Mr Ktorakis clarified that the expected noise level in the closest neighbouring resident property was to be at speech level, but it would be near impossible for the festival to achieve this, as the music and speech would spill out.

- d. Mr Ktorakis conveyed that the most recently submitted security plan had not been updated, and still said there would be 25 SIAs and 25 volunteers, and the documentation for this formed part of condition 35. Mr Gunduz advised that the correct number of SIAs was 47. Mr Ktorakis responded that the plan did not reflect this; the plan was binding as part of the condition, and 25 SIAs and 25 volunteers could not be agreed to. Alevi representatives would check to see if the updated plan had been circulated, as there may have been an email attachment error, in which case they apologised, but 47 SIAs was the correct figure. The Chair asked how many volunteers would be attending. Gulay Dalkilic replied that there would be 82 volunteers. The Chair enquired whether there had been any written confirmation of the change in number of SIAs and volunteers. Mr Ktorakis expressed that the Alevi had mentioned in the SAG meeting that they would look at increasing the number. Representatives from the Police questioned whether Annex 11 reflected the updated plan, as it still referred to 25 SIAs and volunteers. Ms Green conveyed that the change in SIA and volunteer numbers had been mentioned in the Alevi's written representation, but the security plan had not been amended, despite forming a condition which needed to be complied with. Mr Gunduz directed the committee's attention to page 16 and 17 of the supplementary report which outlined details of the revised numbers following advice provided at the SAG meeting by TFL and the Police. He quoted, 'accordingly, it is submitted that the Alevi Federation have, on recommendation from the Police, authorised 47 SIA's to be employed on site – for each day of the two-day festival'. Mr Ktorakis pointed out that this was not reflected in the security plan which was a condition. Mr Gunduz responded that there may have been an email attachment issue, but there was an updated plan which they had had sight of, and based their legal representation on. Mr Ktorakis asked if they would be able to send this amended plan to the Licensing Authority now, so that they could have a look at it. Alevi representatives would try to do this. The Chair wished to clarify that there was an

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

updated plan, which had not been received by the Licensing Authority, but the updated numbers had been provided in an email. Ms Green said they had received the amended numbers in a written representation but not an updated security plan with 47 SIAs. Representatives from the Police added that as the plan had not been amended, this was not yet part of the condition. The Chair asked for confirmation that 47 SIAs would be in attendance. Mr Gunduz confirmed this to be the case, and explained that their representation also dealt with questions from the Police and Environment Team as to the qualifications of the SIA officers, which was also part of the plan. He apologised that an updated plan had not been provided in advance, but assured those present that an amended plan had been produced; their legal representation had been based on the revised version, and they would happily circulate it as soon as they could. The Chair expressed that it would have been helpful to have received the updated plan prior to the meeting to Mr Gunduz apologised again on behalf of his clients.

- e. Mr Ktorakis enquired where specifically the event had been advertised. Gulay Dalkilic responded that it had been advertised on social media, namely Facebook and Instagram. Mr Gunduz added that the British Alevi Federation had 18 associations across the country and many attendees had been directed through these. An other party made the point that they did not use social media, and having tried to google the event to find out more information, all they could find was a flyer in Turkish and there was no translation. Gulay Dalkilic said this had been rectified and there was now an English translation also. Mr Gunduz would present the translated flyers to the committee. The updated security plan, with amendments on page 2 to the SIA and volunteer numbers was emailed to the Licensing Authority at this point.
- f. Police representatives highlighted their concerns with the Alevi's traffic management plan, particularly the lack of appropriate training for those who would be directing traffic. Additionally, the lack of a weather plan, given the potential for quick flooding which would prevent cars being able to access the site. Furthermore, they asked how the small number of staff would search the 7,000 attendees as had been described in the Alevi's security plan, and what staff would do with any non-compliant items that they found. Gulay Dalkilic replied that anything which was confiscated would be put away in a locked box, and any dangerous items handed to police. There would be five people searching at each of the two pedestrian entry points, who would be able to search everyone as they came in, as not everyone would arrive at the same time.
- g. Ms Green confirmed the updated security plan had been received and described staff levels of one per every 150 attendees, resulting in a team of 47 SIA security staff and over 80 stewards, which was correct based on a capacity of 7,000. Mr Ktorakis pointed out that the purple guide advised one staff for every 100 attendees. Gulay Dalkilic responded that it was a family event and there would be no alcohol on

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

site. Police representatives questioned if an updated plan for the day had been provided. Ms Green confirmed this formed part of the amended security plan which had been emailed across.

- h. Police representatives queried the lack of a traffic management plan and adequate traffic management training of staff for this year's event. The safety issue of people parking on the highway in previous years was raised. Gulay Dalkilic conveyed that they had provided some additional information relating to traffic management in their representations. She expressed that at the last of the events in 2022, TFL had cordoned off parking on the highway. Mr Wilkins said that it was the council's Traffic team who had done this. Gulay Dalkilic added that stewards and SIAs had and would again patrol the A10 and local roads ensuring that no inappropriate parking took place. She said there were no issues at the last event, and they had communicated to attendees that there was no parking available. Mr Gunduz explained that at their last outdoor event in 2022, there were over 1,000 cars on site, and this time the number had been limited to 200. Police representatives felt that this only meant more attendees would try to park in the local area. Mr Gunduz said this was a speculative assumption, and in their advertisement of the event, they had categorically told attendees not to drive to the event.
- i. Police representatives made clear that there was not sufficient public transport infrastructure to accommodate 7,000 people attending and leaving the event. Gulay Dalkilic expressed that the same could apply to Tottenham Hotspur events. Mr Gunduz expressed that his client's Federation were fully supportive of public transportation, and environmental/green policies generally, and had asked attendees not to drive to the event. He explained that most attendees would be pedestrians arriving on foot, from local areas or from bus and train stations. The same concerns raised they felt applied to the Pink concert being held at Tottenham Stadium the same weekend which had sold a capacity of 65,000 tickets each day. This event did not appear to have a public transport issue, and by comparison the Alevi event had just 7,000 people attending, so there would not be an issue.
- j. Mr Wilkins described concerns due to a lack of details in understanding the Alevi's transport plan, and what methods/links attendees would use. He explained that SIA stewards were not lawfully entitled to direct traffic, and instead accredited traffic or CSAS officers, were required. Mr Gunduz replied that attendees would use a variety of transport methods and links to reach and leave the event. Mr Wilkins expressed that in a similar way to the Alevi's previous events in 2022, a proportion of attendees would inevitably arrive by car. Vehicles entering the site via the A10 would have to queue up on the inside lane whilst staff directed and checked them in, which would cause a tailback into residential roads, such as the Bury Street junction and Harrow Drive, which were critical for emergency vehicles. There had been no contingency plan as to how excess vehicles would be managed to prevent issues. Mr Gunduz responded that this was a licensing rather

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

than a planning application, the application was for a two-day event, rather than day to day, and measures had been taken by his client to significantly reduce the number of cars attending to 200. This was further controlled, by 100 of these spaces being allocated to prebooked/reserved disabled parking, and these attendees had been invited to arrive early. SIAs would check vehicle registrations once they were onsite and would issue them with a coloured pass/card and then show them to their designated parking area. Comments from the SAG meeting regarding the access from the A10 being too narrow to allow for two-way traffic was being addressed by having only one entry way, with no drop offs permitted. Stewards and signs/notices would inform attendees that no parking would be allowed on the highway. Mr Wilkins emphasised that TFL would need to approve those signs, as there were regulations/legislation regarding their design, and no feedback had been received to suggest TFL had seen or approved them. He added that there was a safety risk in that cars that didn't want to be in the queue that would form in the inside lane of the A10 would try and move out into the fast lane. There would also be a nuisance caused to residential streets, and how cars would be dispersed was not known. Mr Gunduz expressed that the risk factors were eliminated by the fact that the site on a daily basis provided 96 car parking spaces, and a further 104 spaces were being provided. Mr Wilkins conveyed that there was potential for far more than 200 cars to turn up, and there was no contingency plan in place for this. Mr Gunduz made clear that the A10 was always going to have problems, and the goal of the plan was management of the site not the A10. Police representatives said the focus was management of the event, and a queue would form in the inside lane where cars were being directed at the site which cars that weren't part of the event would then try and move out of, into the fast lane which could cause an accident.

- k. There was a short rest break at 11:21am, and the meeting resumed at 11:27am.
- l. Mr Wilkins reiterated his concerns, which included: the amount of people who could attend, the lack of contingency plans for if excess cars arrived, the need for TFL to agree the signage that would be used on their network to eliminate potential risks, the nuisance caused to residential roads, and lack of details in the plan. Police representatives expressed that there had been no analysis provided as to how the 7,000 attendees would get to and from the event each day, and did not believe public transport had the capacity to accommodate this. There would be no trains running at Edmonton Green the weekend of this year's event. The comparison to Tottenham Hotspur which had a very well planned 5 transport hub strategy was said not to be fair. It was described that there were maybe 3 bus routes to the site, and each bus at full capacity could take about 90 people, thus 7,000 people could not be moved in this way. The venue and its residential surroundings were described as not suitable for an event of that size. The purple guidance booklet had not been followed, as it advised not to use SIAs to manage

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

traffic; and further fundamental event planning had been missed. Mr Gunduz replied that this was the fourth festival they would be having at the site; they previously applied for TENS licences and had numbers exceeding 7,000, and there were no incidents, thus the site was suitable. The coming event had a reduced number of just 200 cars attending, compared to 1,000 previously. There were 28 SIA officers at the last event, compared to 47 who would be in attendance this time. The initial budget for this was almost doubled, thus his clients were taking account of and dealing with concerns to ensure the festival was safe. The purple guide was general and not legally binding, each event had to be tailored to its circumstances, and their event plan was fit for purpose, as it was a daytime family festival event, not an evening rave. A strategy had been circulated regarding entering and leaving the premises. Mr Wilkins said there was a lack of detail and contingency plan. Ms Green clarified that 4 outdoor Alevi festivals had taken place at the site previously, which had been applied for through TENS, some of which had been covered by one temporary event notice, which allowed for a maximum capacity of 499 people. On one occasion only, 5 TENS had been applied for one event, as had been referred to in annex 1 from the previous hearing on 14 February.

- m. An other party said they had contacted TFL regarding the event and they were said not to be aware of it. They conveyed that statutory notices would need to have been put in the local paper and signage put up for the festival to take place. Mr Wilkins advised that the Alevi would need to get permission to put signs on the A10 and these would need to be compliant with the law, but there was no statutory notice needed as the road was not being closed.
- n. An other party queried an aspect of the original licence, in that the licence was issued for an event hall, but the planning permission was for a sports facility. A section 35 notice had been issued regarding building regulations, and if this was not compliant, how could a variation to the application be granted. The Chair replied that this was a planning consideration which the Licensing sub-committee could not deal with. An other party pointed out that this section 35 notice relating to fire exit and construction issues formed part of the Licensing Authorities representation. Mr Ktorakis clarified that the building could not be used as part of the outdoor event. Mr Gunduz added that the issue was raised at the SAG meeting where the planning officer was present, and raised no comment on the issue.
- o. An other party asked whether proposed condition 38, that outdoor events shall be entry with pre-purchased tickets only had been agreed to by the Alevi. Mr Gunduz clarified that this condition had not been accepted. The other party expressed that this would mean the Alevi did not know exactly how many people would be turning up. Mr Gunduz responded that they did have an idea, that they sold tickets in advance, and for those who did not have the opportunity/access to purchase tickets online or over the telephone, there would be an option to buy tickets at the door, which was common practice for festivals in the

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

country, and there should be no exception for them. An other party enquired if people would be turned away once capacity was reached. Mr Gunduz confirmed that once capacity was reached, any further people seeking admittance would be turned away. Gulay Dalkilic added that for pre-purchased tickets, attendees had been informed there was no parking and encouraged to walk or take public transport. TFL had been contacted with regards to the event and were part of the SAG meeting, and clarification with them as to the signage would be done if/when the application was approved. Free and pay non-street parking options within walking distance would also be communicated to attendees if/when the application was granted.

- p. An other party highlighted that at the event in 2022 where 5 TENs had been applied for, the numbers were not controlled, hence raised concerns that the same would occur again in the future. Issuing tickets on the day meant there was no way of knowing how many more people might show up, which compounded the issues, and how these people would be dispersed had not been planned. An other party felt the preparation/management of the event was amateurish, and if the event were to go ahead there would be two days in which local people could be informed in advance. The stage had already been built and tickets sold, which undermined the council's authority. Gulay Dalkilic said that the stage was a cost to the Alevi Federation.
- q. Mr Ktorakis asked how many tickets had been sold so far. Mr Gunduz replied that just over 3,000 had been sold in total so far over the 2-day event.

5. The Chair offered the officer representing Transport the opportunity to make a representation. Mr Wilkins replied that he had nothing further to add.

6. The Chair offered the Licensing Authority the opportunity to make a representation. Mr Ktorakis responded that he had nothing new to add at this stage.

7. Police representatives, made the following statement:

- a. There were concerns regarding the volume of people resulting in anti-social behaviour. How this would be managed should have been detailed in the Alevi's event management plan as a means of reassuring local residents that, for instance pavements would not be blocked.

8. In response the following comments and questions were received:

- a. Mr Wilkins returned to the point of traffic orders to clarify that there was a cycle lane directly outside the entrance to the site, which should TFL want suspending to accommodate the footfall, would need a traffic order, but this was a matter for TFL not the council.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- b. Cllr Bedekova, present as supporting party for this application, enquired whether any traffic control officers would be in or could attend the area, to make sure residents driveways were not blocked etc. Mr Wilkins confirmed that traffic wardens would patrol the area to ticket anyone who was parked illegally. Mr Gunduz added the Alevi had 82 stewards who would be patrolling residential roads with walkie talkies to deal with any issues that arose. Mr Ktorakis queried how many of these 82 stewards would be patrolling residential streets. Gulay Dalkilic clarified that roughly between 15 and 20 of the stewards would be patrolling the residential streets going out towards Edmonton Green and across Bury Street. An other party questioned what radius this would cover, as people may just go further afield to park, creating a knock-on effect for residents in other streets. Gulay Dalkilic replied that anyone who was moved on would be directed to local parking, rather than being asked to move on from where they were to another street.
- c. Cllr Bedekova asked whether there would be stewards managing car parking at the overflow at Churchfield Primary School. Gulay Dalkilic confirmed that there would be security and stewards covering entry, exit and parking aspects at the location. Mr Gunduz added that Churchfield Primary School had not been advertised as part of the allocation, and so represented part of their contingency plan. A map would be provided to those attendees who were directed to park here.
- d. An other party enquired when the clear up would take place. Gulay Dalkilic said that this would be done daily, on Saturday night removing waste which had accumulated from the site that day; the same again on Sunday, and then Monday for anything left over. The other party sought confirmation that any glass bottles and the like would be cleared before the school reopened. Gulay Dalkilic confirmed this to be the case, the event area itself was fenced off, and the bulk of the clear up would have been done by Sunday, and they wouldn't expect anything to be left in addition to what would normally be there.

9. The other parties, made the following statements:

- a. One of the other parties expressed that they were disabled, and people had previously parked outside their property in their personally permitted space that they pay for, which caused inconvenience. They asked whether the Local Authority had given permission for Churchfields Primary parking to be used, as they were unsure whether it was grant maintained or an academy. Gulay Dalkilic responded that it had been booked through the Ivy Trust website who looked after the site. The other party conveyed that residents felt put out by this, as cars coming down Latymer Road would not be good for neighbours. They added that in recent years there had been two deaths on the A10, and the queuing of traffic in the inside lane could cause an accident. The other party felt the undermining of authority for the Alevi to have sold tickets before permission was granted was a disgrace, and thought it would look bad if the sub-committee approved the

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

application. Mr Gunduz replied that the tickets were fully refundable, and asked the other party to show regard to the sub-committee. The Chair said that if the other party carried on in the way they were they would be kindly asked to leave.

- b. An other party queried whether written authority had been received from the council that a non-sporting event could be held on the fields, as this was a term of the lease. Mr Gunduz responded that this was a private landlord and tenant matter governed by the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954, through which it could be raised. He added that it was a civil matter, and an issue for the Procurement team at the council, who were aware of the event, and not for the Licensing sub-committee. Ms Green clarified that the Licensing Authority would have had to accept the application without carrying out those checks beforehand.

10. Cllr Bedekova was advised by Ms Green that she would have 1 minute and 15 seconds to give a verbal representation, and made the following statement:

- a. Enfield was home to a variety of diverse communities. These communities often held festival events in the summer period, which brought people together and allowed young people to learn about different cultures. Since the Alevi Federation took over the site it had become a cleaner and safer space. The community also helped to support people during Covid-19 lockdowns and provided educational courses and events. She hoped all voices would be considered to make the events safe, support and benefit all.

11. The following closing summaries/ points were made:

- a. Ms Green outlined the options available to Members of the sub-committee to make, and directed them to the relevant guidance. She highlighted that conditions would apply to the licence with immediate effect when licensable activity was taking place and the first event had been advertised for the coming weekend.
- b. Mr Ktorakis expressed that the Licensing Authority had not received a full responses from the Alevi Federation to previous requests for information and queries. A capacity of 7,000 people was a significant number to control access and egress without the appropriate parking and a traffic management plan, as well as being situated on the A10. The noise impact on residents was likely to be high and the noise management plan unlikely to be effective in controlling the noise level. Since 2018, 63 noise complaints had been received regarding the premises, for which noise abatement notices were served and breached, with fixed penalty notices having been issued and a simple caution signed for capacity and outdoor music. In the absence of the requested information, not being satisfied with the plans, and no

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- agreement to conditions 37, 38 and 45, the Licensing Authority's concerns with the application remain as does their objection.
- c. Police representatives pointed out that whilst Mr Gunduz was correct in that the purple guidance was not statutory, if there were to be an inquiry, it would be used as best practice for event planning, and was a relevant document that should be considered by event planners.
 - d. An other party asked how the Licensing sub-committee could make a decision when the applicant had not agreed to some of the conditions, and would not be able to apply with others such as condition 33, to give 3 months' notice of the event. Ms Green clarified that the licence would apply each year, the two-day event could take place in any one-year period, hence she had highlighted that conditions would come into effect immediately. In the event the licence was granted a condition for 3-month notice would be in breach were the event held this weekend as notice had not been given. Mr Gunduz conveyed that in their original application made in December 2023, notice of the summer festival was given, and it was discussed at the last hearing in February that there would be a summer festival. There was no case law as to what constituted notice, he did not believe this would constitute a breach, and at the request of local residents there was neighbourhood consultation in April, which also notified them of the event. Ms Green brought the committees attention to page 66 which gave a summary of this meeting, and asked how it was advertised. Mr Gunduz replied that leaflets were put through residents' doors in advance of the meeting. An other party said they had not received a leaflet. An other party enquired if the application were agreed, going forwards, would the Alevi have to give notice 3 months in advance every year. The Chair confirmed this to be the case. An other party questioned the conditions which the Alevi had not accepted. Ms Green clarified that even though the Alevi had not accepted all of the proposed conditions, the Licensing sub-committee could still apply the conditions, they may modify conditions, or add new conditions. Mr Gunduz proposed a recital, that for the forthcoming festival due regard had been given to the conditions and they had been complied with; including notice of the event, and reiterated that conditions would be applied to all future events. An other party highlighted that the Alevi had agreed at the last hearing to put up notices at the site of upcoming events so that people walking past could see events. Gulay Dalkilic said that the notice board which had been ordered had not yet arrived. Mr Gunduz added that advertising had been done on social media, and further notification would go to residents if/when the application was granted. An other party suggested events be advertised in the local paper also.
 - e. Mr Wilkins asked that the committee consider adding a condition that the applicant engage a traffic management company and put signs on the A10 to keep the junctions moving safely.
 - f. Cllr Bedekova asked if the Alevi Federation volunteers could trim Salmons Brook. Gulay Dalkilic responded that they were happy to do

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

this, but were unsure with regards to the nature aspect. The Chair said this was not a licensing consideration.

- g. Mr Gunduz expressed that numerous consultations, meetings and engagements had taken place, and the Alevi had taken steps to employ additional staff to address safety and nuisance concerns. The application had been discussed with local residents and the relevant authorities since January and they had taken every step to ensure the licensing objectives were complied with. He added that there was support for the community event, the Alevi Federation had a history at the site, they were a family-based centre that provided education and cultural services, and did not harbour anti-social behaviour. Concerns regarding the festival had been taken onboard and addressed as demonstrated, and the conditions which had been accepted allowed the relevant authorities to engage with the federation to raise any issues, and they could bring about a review of the licence. The committee were invited to look favourably on the application.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting at 12:27, 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 13:36.

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

- (i) Licensing Hours and Activities:

<i>Licensable Activity</i>	<i>Times confirmed by Licensing Sub-Committee:</i>
Opening hours (Event Hall)	Same as existing: 08:00 – 23:00 daily
Opening hours (Outdoor event)	10am to 10pm Saturday and Sunday
Indoor Sporting Events (Event Hall)	Same as existing: 10:00 – 21:00 daily
Live Music (indoors) Recorded Music (indoors) Performance of dance (indoors)	Same as existing: 12:00 – 23:00 daily
Live Music (outdoors) Recorded Music (outdoors) Performance of dance (outdoors) Anything of a similar description (outdoors)	1pm to 7pm Saturday and Sunday

- (ii) Conditions:

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

In accordance with Annex 10, Conditions 32 to 36, 39 to 44, 46 to 71 are applied. (Conditions 1 to 31 are not affected by this variation application and remain in place.)

Condition 37 is confirmed as:

The maximum number of persons on the premises at any one time shall not exceed 7,000. This capacity includes staff, stall holders and performers.

Condition 61 is amended to:

With effect from 17 June 2024, the licence holder shall notify neighbouring residents in writing of the proposed event weekend six weeks before the event and must provide a telephone number should there be a complaint during the event. The residential streets must include (but are not exclusive) are: Latymer Road, Harrow Drive, Rugby Avenue, Winchester Road, Lancing Gardens, Malvern Terrace, Stowe Gardens, Marlborough Road, St Joan's Road, St Ann's Road, Church Lane, Cyprus Road, Streamside Close, Cedars Court, Bury Street West, Sayersbury Way, Bury Street, Chichester Road, (houses along the) A10, Glastonbury Road, Darley Road, Church Street.

Condition 69 is amended to:

- (a) A Waste Management Plan shall be prepared and implemented for each event, which shall include the collection of litter in the immediate local vicinity.
- (b) Clearance of the site and any associated sites shall be completed at the end of each event day.

New condition added:

The premises licence holder shall engage with a Traffic Management Company and have signs placed along the highway to manage traffic lawfully on event days.

The Chair made the following statement:

"I would like to 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.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

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.

It should be noted that Cllr Ozaydin has declared being a consultant for one of the vendors who would be at the event this week.”

Mr Gunduz asked that condition 33 also be amended to apply from 17 June, to which the Licensing sub-committee agreed.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting following the completion of item 4 at 13:40, the meeting resumed at 14:38 for item 5.

5 +355 COFFEE BAR & LOUNGE 738 GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 3RE

Mr Samaroo conveyed that the applicant was present, but in light of some of the implications made by residents in their written representations that they felt threatened by him, the applicant wanted to check that his presence wouldn't make anyone feel threatened before entering the chamber/ joining the meeting. Cllr Bedekova, now chairing this item/application after Cllr Boztas' departure, felt he should attend and checked with those present that they would be comfortable for the applicant to join the meeting, and he was invited to do so.

1. The introduction by Ellie Green, Licensing Team Manager, including:

- a. The sub-committee were to consider a new premises licence application for the premises now known as +355 Coffee Bar & Lounge, at 738 Green Lanes, London, N21 3RE.
- b. The premises was within the Winchmore Hill parade, and was close to a number of residential properties, which were located above the commercial parade, as well as in nearby residential streets.
- c. The application sought to sell alcohol on site between 10am and 10:30pm daily, with a closing time of 11:00pm. Section 1.3 of the report provided an indication as to the licensable times for nearby similar premises.
- d. The Licensing Authority had initially provided a representation, namely seeking conditions, which had since been agreed in full by Mr Gazmend, so the Licensing Authority had withdrawn their representation. The list of agreed conditions between the two parties were provided in Annex 3. The Police did not submit a representation to the application. The Licensing team received 53 objections from other parties, namely local residents. This was a high volume of representations for this type of application typically; the objections could be seen in annex 2 and were based on all four licensing objectives.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- e. The objections included: the hours sought were too late for a coffee shop to have an alcohol licence; customers loiter on the pavement outside and block the path for pedestrians, and existing activity at the premises had raised concerns, including alleged unlicensed activity taking place inside. Additionally, objections were raised on the grounds that the premises did not have the appropriate planning permission to operate so that its primary function was the sale of alcohol, and the issuing of the licence would effectively breach planning permission. Some residents also did not believe that the conditions agreed between the applicant and Licensing Authority were sufficient to address their concerns.
- f. Section 5 of the report provided the position of the planning status for this premises, namely permitting a restaurant and café, but would not permit it to operate as a bar or pub type premises, where alcohol sales is the primary focus. However, it was made clear that planning and licensing regimes are totally separate, and each have their own enforcement powers to address any non-compliance. Both permissions would need to be in place for the premises to trade lawfully, one regime did not supersede the other, but there is no requirement for one permission to be sought before the other.
- g. The premises was permitted to be open and trading as long as unlicensed activity was not taking place, such as the sale of alcohol, but the premises could operate by selling soft drinks and food between 8am and 11pm. If open after 11pm, a licence for late night refreshment would be needed. Conditions relating to the premises only become effective if/when the licence is issued.
- h. The applicant had submitted written representation, but this was received after the permitted deadline and so could not be accepted. The Licensing sub-committee were reminded that they were to give equal weight to any written and verbal representations.
- i. Those in attendance were introduced, the proposed order in which verbal representations would be heard was outlined, and the amount of time parties would have to speak was detailed.

2. Mr Samaroo, representing Mr Gazmend, made the following statement:

- a. The application was for a licence to sell alcohol until 10:30pm. The premises is primarily a café bar that would open during the day serving coffee shop style food and drinks until 11:00pm.
- b. A considerable volume of residents had raised concerns with regards to the application which the applicant had taken seriously. They felt OP1 had been the trigger, with most of the other objectors having similar concerns. There appeared to be an undertone with regards ethnicity and male dominated premises, which came as a surprise, given Enfield was a very diverse borough. The applicant's representatives had spoken to Ms Green, as some of the objections were seen as vexatious and they did not believe they should have been allowed, but were included anyway.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- c. Some of the accusations, that the premises had breached conditions, were unfounded/unsubstantiated and untrue. OP1 had suggested that they happened to be passing the premises when the shutters were three quarters of the way down and could see lots of men in the premises drinking, smoking and gambling; but the only men in the premises at the time were builders, and they were not doing such things when they were working.
- d. The application had a very robust operating schedule, which had been gone through with the Police and the Licensing Authority, hence they were not objecting to the application.
- e. The applicant wanted to be part of the community, and wished to assure residents that they were all welcome. The premises was not aiming to attract mono-ethnic men standing on the pavement disturbing women walking by.
- f. There were concerns from Enfield residents that parts of the borough had lots of cafes which created issues, but there was nothing to suggest that Mr Gazmend would run a premises that would not be welcoming to the local community or cause issues.
- g. The committee were invited to look at the application on its own merits, and there was nothing to suggest the café run by Mr Gazmend, who had done a very good job and spent a lot of money making the premises look nice, would be anything but an asset to the area. It was felt that there were too many assumptions as to what the premises would be like.

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

- a. The Chair asked if the applicant had followed advice to check the planning permission. Mr Samaroo responded that if this were an application for a pub, bar or virtual drinking establishment, the applicant would have had to submit an application, but as it was a café for seated customers only, there was no requirement to apply for a change of use. The Chair queried why then officers had recommended the applicant check if they required planning permission. Mr Samaroo replied that he did not know why an officer had advised this, but that this was a licensing hearing and if planning had any concerns, they would have submitted a representation. He added that he had spoken to his planning agent who had advised him that under the application they were submitting, there was no need to change the planning use. Ms Green clarified that operating as a coffee bar did not require a change of use, but if time showed that primary sales were alcohol, then they would need to submit a change of use planning application to a bar, but it had been indicated that this would not be the intention. Cllr Ozaydin enquired how this could be monitored. Ms Green conveyed that planning could check this by asking for invoices and sales and making observations as to what the premises was being primarily used for.

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- b. The Chair questioned whether the applicant was planning to play any music at the premises. Mr Samaroo advised that there were no plans for the applicant to have any regulated entertainment. He pointed out that up until 11pm, the provision of background music was deregulated anyway, so under the current legislation they could do this if they wanted to. The applicant was mindful of nearby residents and the provision of music above background level wasn't something they wanted to do. Ms Green clarified that background music was not a licensable activity, this was music which did not require raising your voice to be heard. There was a default/ automatic entitlement with a licence that permitted the on-sale of alcohol to provide regulated entertainment between 8am and 11pm, but the applicant had expressed that this was not part of their business model.
- c. The Chair queried whether any residents had approached the applicant directly with regards to their objections. Mr Samaroo responded that nobody had come to the applicant with their concerns. He described that Mr Gazmend would have liked to have spoken with some of the residents. The applicant did not know who the residents that had objected were. The Chair clarified that it was Licensing Authority policy not to provide any details regarding the identity of residents who had submitted representations.
- d. Cllr Ozaydin enquired whether there was a designated smoking area at the premises. Mr Samaroo replied that one of the concerns raised in the objections related to mono-ethnic men standing on the curb and blocking the pavement, so the applicant had located the smoking area at the back of the premises. There had been a day when two tables and chairs had been put outside the front of the premises, but upon notification from the Licensing Authority that these were not permitted, they were instantly removed, and had not been put back out there since. A pavement licence had not been applied for yet, as they felt it would be wrong to do so until after the committee were minded to grant this licence. Mr Samaroo had spoken to Mr Gazmend who had indicated that when that time came, he would only want 8 chairs outside the front of the premises. The Chair asked whether the applicant had received any advice regarding the use of tables and chairs on the pavement. Mr Samaroo advised that he had not, that as soon as the applicant was notified that they weren't allowed they were removed and not put back. The applicant had seen tables and chairs outside other premises on the street and assumed he would be able to add some too, and didn't know a licence was needed. The applicant wanted to comply with the rules and work with all interested parties.
- e. Ms Green asked to see where on the plan the smoking area was located. The Chair followed up by querying how many people they would allow to use the area at a time. Mr Samaroo responded that a table and 3 chairs had been placed at the rear of the premises next to the parking area where smoking would be permitted, but that no food or drink would be served for people smoking there. Ms Green clarified that as it was likely private land, an application would not be needed,

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

- but enquired how this area was accessed. Mr Samaroo replied that it was accessed by going straight through the premises, down some steps, passed the toilets, and out the back door, on the left next to the parking area. Ms Green advised that the committee may want to add a condition that the plan be updated to show the smoking area. Mr Samaroo added that were the licence to be granted, they would speak to the Licensing Authority about putting a small designated smoking area at the front of premises and restricting it to 3 or 4 people whilst awaiting the application for a pavement licence. Ms Green highlighted that were a pavement licence applied for, then smoking at the tables and chairs in front of the premises would not be permitted. She added that one of the conditions which had been agreed was that there would be no more than 5 people outside the front of the premises and queried whether the applicant was offering to reduce this to 3. Mr Samaroo said that a designated smoking area would then be needed; it was a small premises, so 4 people maximum seemed sufficient. Ms Green advised that the committee may wish to reword condition 13 on page 211 to consider this. It was noted that this condition also prevented drinks being taken to the designated area when smoking.
- f. The Chair enquired whether the shutters were located at the front or back. Mr Samaroo conveyed that there were security shutters at the front of the premises.
 - g. Ms Green asked if the windows at the front of the premises were frosted or clear. Mr Samaroo expressed that when the shutters were up there was clear glass, and the premises could be seen into.
 - h. The council's legal adviser asked if it would be helpful to the committee for Ms Green to establish the licensable times for nearby similar premises. Ms Green advised that these were located on page 112.
 - i. The Chair questioned whether there had been any history of complaints of similar issues at nearby premises. Ms Green said there was potentially some noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour at venues open later than what was being sought in this application. She added that alcohol sales at similar nearby premises started as early as 8am and others went on until midnight, and some had longer periods than what was being sought by the application. Coffee Break was described as perhaps the most similar like for like for premises and served alcohol from 11am until 10:30pm.
 - j. Cllr Steven asked if there had been any representation made by the Police. Ms Green responded that had not been, the comment they had provided, detailed in the report read "we have nothing of any significance from a crime and disorder perspective therefore we have no reps". They were aware of the concerns and had undertaken their own observations and did not feel a need to make a representation. Mr Samaroo added that he consulted with the Police prior to the application, who advised they would be happier if the application stayed within the core hours, as Mr Gazmend was a relatively new operator to this type of business, and they wanted to see how things went. The agent had initially spoken to the Police about staying open

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

later on Fridays and Saturdays, and it was recommended to keep to 10:30pm, and see if the applicant could prove he could run the business well, hence they had not objected, as any concerns had been dealt with in advance. The council's legal adviser explained that the committee had no confirmation of this. Ms Green described that the premises was not within a communitive impact policy area, so the core hours did not apply, and those hours were 8am until midnight.

- k. The Chair enquired how the applicant would deal with drunk customers so as to avoid anti-social behaviour taking place at the premises. Mr Samaroo said that under the Licencing Act, the premises was not allowed to sell to drunk people and anyone who was drunk would not be allowed on the premises. It was not the type of place a drunk person would go to as they could only drink sitting down. Mr Gazmend added that he did not want to attract people who would cause trouble to his business, and he wanted to operate for a long time. If somebody was drunk, they would not be sold any alcohol and asked to leave if they were causing issues. He did not want his premises to generate excess noise and did not expect there to be issues.
- l. The Chair asked if staff at the premises were trained. Mr Gazmend replied that he was at the premises almost every day, and his staff were very good. Mr Samaroo added that he had suggested that to the applicant that he was an authorised trainer, and did a level 1 course which covered responsible alcohol retailing and if the licence were granted, he would be happy to provide this training to the staff, it be recorded in a training book and refresher training done every 3-6 months.
- m. The Chair asked if the smoking area at the back of the premises was covered by CCTV. Ms Green clarified that consumption was not a licensable activity, but the smoking area could cause a nuisance, and it could be conditioned that it is added to the plan. Mr Samaroo expressed that the table at the back of the premises for smoking was covered by a CCTV camera, but this was not a permanent solution to what the applicant wanted to achieve. If the licence were granted, they would look to have a small, designated smoking area at the front of the premises which was also monitored by CCTV, and with the glass front there would be lots of natural surveillance.
- n. The Chair questioned why the smoking area had not been included in the plan. Mr Samaroo explained that when the plan was submitted the smoking area didn't exist, the premises had only been open three weeks or so, and the smoking area was created in response to residents' comments and to give the builders somewhere to smoke out of sight; it was not a permanent solution. Ms Green advised that this could be reflected in additional conditions and the updated plan be resubmitted.
- o. The Chair asked how the applicant would communicate with the community and if they would provide their contact information somewhere so that residents could get in contact with him if they had any issues. Mr Samaroo said that one of the proposed conditions was

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

for the applicant to make their number available to local residents. He may choose to do this by posting his business card through local residents' doors, he could also put his contact information in the window of the premises.

4. The other party was offered the opportunity to make a representation and ask questions, but they had nothing they wished to add.

5. The following closing summaries/points were made:

- a. Ms Green outlined the options available to Members of the sub-committee to make, and directed them to the relevant guidance.
- b. Mr Samaroo expressed that the hours sought by the application were within the core hours of Enfield's Licensing policy. The premises was not a vertical drinking establishments, customers must be seated to be served alcohol. The premises was primarily a café. Mr Gazmend had taken very seriously the objections of residents and had looked at ways of ensuring he and his business were part of the community. As mentioned, additional training would be provided for staff in dealing with alcohol sales etc. The Enfield licensing policy had been carefully looked at when submitting the application, so that conditions were precise, enforceable and tailored to create a robust operating schedule, so residents need not be concerned. The contact information for the manager would be provided and engagement with the Licensing Authority would continue. It would be important for Mr Gazmend to attend the local CAPE meeting to understand what was going on in the area. They hoped the committee would grant to application based on its own merits, given the robust conditions which addressed concerns, no representation from authorities, and nothing to substantiate complaints relating to noise and anti-social behaviour.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting at 15:32, 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 16:07.

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

Licensing Hours and Activities:

Licensable Activity	LSC Confirmed Times:
Open	10am to 11pm (daily)
Supply of Alcohol (on supply only)	10am to 10:30pm (daily)

Conditions in accordance with Annex 3:

Conditions 1 (b)-(i), 2 to 12, 14 to 20, and amended conditions as follows:

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE - 12.6.2024

Amended Condition 1(a): The premises shall install and maintain a comprehensive CCTV system covering both the interior and exterior of the premises, including the rear designated smoking area, and shall be installed to current Metropolitan Police/Home Office standards and shall continually record whilst the premises are open for licensable activities and during all times when customers remain on the premises.

Amended Condition 13: There shall be no more than 3 persons using the outside of the back of the premises, designated for the purpose of a smoking area, within the operating hours. This area shall be adequately supervised to control the number and behaviour of patrons so as to not cause noise nuisance or anti-social behaviour. Notices shall be displayed in the area specifying the terms of its use and asking patrons to respect the needs of local residents and to use the area quietly. No alcoholic drinks or glass containers shall be taken into any smoking area at any time.

The Chair made the following statement:

“After considering the papers and evidence provided to the Licensing Sub-Committee and having listened carefully from the Applicant and reading the objections of the residents which is contained within the Agenda, the Licensing Sub-Committee have reached a decision.

The Licensing Sub-Committee was particularly mindful that +355 Coffee Bar is located in close proximity to a residential area but having taken into account the Licensing Objectives, and provisions to mitigate the risk, the Licensing Sub-Committee were persuaded that the application can be granted following the Applicants agreement to modify the conditions as proposed by the Licensing Authority (as set out above).

The Applicant shall also submit an amended plan to the Licensing Team, which incorporates the designated smoking area to the rear of the premises.”

The Chair thanked everyone for their time and contributions and the meeting ended at 16:09.