

London Borough of Islington

**Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024**

Minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Sub Committee C held at Committee Room 4, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 10 December 2024 at 7.45 pm.

**Present:**      **Councillors:**      Bashir Ibrahim, Clare Jeapes and Heather Staff.

**Councillor Heather Staff in the Chair**

**130      INTRODUCTIONS AND PROCEDURE (Item A1)**

Councillor Heather Staff welcomed everyone to the meeting and officers and members introduced themselves. The procedure for the conduct of the meeting was outlined.

**131      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)**

Apologies were received from Councillors Weekes, Croft and Shaikh.

**132      DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)**

Councillor Staff substituted for Councillor Weekes, Councillor Jeapes substituted for Councillor Shaikh and Councillor Ibrahim substituted for Councillor Croft.

**133      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)**

There were no declarations of interest.

**134      ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)**

The order of business would be Item B4, B1, B2 and B3.

**135      MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)**

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2024 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

**136      GRILLSHACK STEAKHOUSE AND COCKTAIL BAR, 67 UPPER STREET, N1 ONY - PREMISES LICENCE VARIATION (Item B1)**

The licensing officer reported that conditions proposed by the police and noise team had been agreed. It would be sensible to remove the current conditions 5 and 7 which were existing under the original magistrate's licence. The police and licensing authority representation remained.

The police reported that this application was outside framework hours and they were not able to condition to cover a business operation outside these hours. The conditions offered would satisfy framework hours only. The Licensing Authority stated that no additional conditions or details of how they would operate outside these hours had been offered by the applicant. The applicant had stated it was a restaurant and bar. Policy hours would be up until midnight on Fridays and Saturdays.

## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

In response to questions, it was noted that no conditions had been initially offered by the applicant until discussions had taken place with the police. Police would support framework hours, but any extension of hours would need to be properly managed. The applicant had operated under a series of TENs but that would be a different prospect to a permanent extension of hours.

The applicant's representative stated that this application was to extend hours for late night refreshment and the sale of alcohol. They had met with the police and agreed a number of conditions. 70 Upper Street had a number of conditions, and this premises operated to similar hours proposed. There had been no specific links to the premises of crime and disorder. The operator had been running similar businesses for twenty years and knew the area very well. He had operated a business at the same site.

In response to questions, it was noted that temporary event notices had been applied for with one operating the previous weekend which was for two parties. Patrons could leave by cab. It was noted that since Covid, business had decreased with many local businesses closing. The additional hours requested would help to pay staff, rent and rates. The business was quiet Monday to Wednesday but busier over the weekend. There would be no external promoted events, and this would be conditioned. A condition regarding door supervisors was proposed by risk assessment. The sale of alcohol was ancillary, and this was not a bar. There were 120 covers for food in a good location and this was not a walk-in bar. Patrons would have to buy food until 2.30 am as this was a restaurant. There would be staff/security on the door and 16 CCTV cameras. Waste collections were made from the rear of the premises. It was noted that the licensee had proposed a condition stating that waste collections could be from 8am to 8pm but had agreed to a noise team condition for collections up until 11pm. They stated that they were concerned about noise late at night. The licensees' representative stated that there had been no history of incidents linked with the premises and the police conditions had been accepted. This was not an alcohol led business. They had no dispersal policy but would be happy to draft one. They would be willing to work with the authority with conditions. He stated that businesses had been struggling after Covid.

In summary, the Licensing Authority stated that the premises could not be compared with neighbouring premises as the other businesses were clubs and late-night bars. They had accepted the police conditions but had not explained how they would operate in a cumulative impact area. There was capacity for 120 people, and they would need to have systems in place to deal with people in the late-night economy. The revised plan of the premises had not been submitted and it was expected that alcohol would be ancillary to food. The police stated that this was considered to be a restaurant and they were unable to condition to late night hours. It would be unusual for a restaurant to have security. They did not consider that the hours should be extended.

The applicant stated that the plan of the bar was the same as it was in 2012. The premises was a restaurant and was not a nightclub. There was a proven history of promoting the licensing objectives, measures were in place and they would be happy to share the dispersal policy. They had requested less hours than neighbours and it was a reasonable application. There were notices on display in the premises.

### **RESOLVED**

That the application for a premises licence variation in respect of Grillshack Steakhouse and Cocktail Bar, 67 Upper Street, N1 0NY be refused.

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

The Sub-Committee listened to all the evidence and submissions and read all the material. The Sub-Committee reached the decision having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003, as amended, and its regulations, the National Guidance and the Council's Licensing Policy.

The Sub-Committee took into consideration Licensing Policies 2 & 3. The premises fall within the Upper Street and Angel cumulative impact area. Licensing policy 3 creates a rebuttable presumption that applications for the grant or variation of premises licences which are likely to add to the existing cumulative impact will normally be refused following the receipt of representations, unless the applicant can demonstrate in the operating schedule that there will be no negative cumulative impact on one or more of the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee noted that the applicant sought to vary the premise licence and the current licence.

The Sub-Committee considered the representations made by the responsible authorities.

The Sub-Committee noted that the Police were concerned that the initial application did not include the previous police recommendation for updated safeguarding conditions and that the premises licence enjoyed the grant of longer than framework hours for late night refreshment and the sale by retail of alcohol. It was noted that the licence holder accepted the Police's initial representations for conditions suitable for crime & disorder considerations, but the licence holder would consider if they wished to amend the application hours. It was noted that the licence holder was happy to amend the conditions to cover police recommendations but sought to keep the extended hours applied for. The Sub-Committee heard and noted that the application did not propose to amend any of the licence conditions already in place despite the Police noting that the extant conditions [Appendix 2 condition 5 and 7] appeared contrary to the current operation and may require amending. The Sub-Committee heard that the reason the Police had not withdrawn their representation was that with the operating hours being out of framework, there was a presumption which needed to be rebutted that this will adversely impact Crime and Disorder in the area.

The Sub-Committee noted and heard that the Licensing Authority's concerns referred to Public Nuisance and Prevention of Crime and Disorder. It was further noted that the Licensing Authority's concern was that the licensing hours sought would be significantly later than the current hours on the licence and beyond the recommended hours in the Licensing Policy. Further, it was noted that the Licensing Authority were concerned that no further additional conditions were offered in order for the Sub-Committee to be satisfied that the additional later hours would not adversely affect the cumulative impact policy and promote the licensing objectives.

The Sub-Committee noted the three representations from local residents who were not in attendance. It noted, that the first representation from the resident highlighted that the hours applied for were contrary to the Licensing Policy. It is noted that the second representation objected on the grounds of increasing noise and anti-social behaviour in the immediate area. It is noted that the third representation supported the application and the representative had proposed for the Applicant to apply for a late licence so that they could run cultural events, including live music as it would fit in with the premises and their latin menu.

The Sub-Committee noted and heard representations from the Applicant. The Sub-Committee noted from the Applicants unsigned witness statement that the Applicant has

## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

been a licence holder on Upper Street for 20 years and that he has experienced difficulties with the food and leisure industry post COVID-19. It was noted that the applicant accepted the proposed conditions by the Police.

It was noted that the Applicant's legal representatives were going to make a request relating to conditions 5 and 7 of the current licence. The Sub-Committee noted that the submissions subsequently heard from the Applicant on this point that they would continue to sell or supply alcohol to persons taking table meals as ancillary to the meal. No detailed submissions were put forward relating to how the rest of current condition 5 will be adhered to, given the extended hours and to current licence condition 7.

The Sub-Committee further noted that the Applicant was happy to consider similar conditions as listed to the neighbouring businesses and that they would operate as a restaurant and cocktail bar and not a nightclub. The Sub-Committee in making further inquiries (and noting the applicant's 20-year record on Upper Street) on this point highlighted that it is for the Applicant to satisfy the Sub-Committee of the conditions that it would be reasonable for their premises to operate as a restaurant and cocktail bar as opposed to providing comparable neighbouring businesses conditions that are not the same as the Applicants.

It was noted that the Applicant had represented at the time of his witness statement dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2024 that there were no resident representations despite the two representations against the variation having been received and dated 14<sup>th</sup> November 2024.

It was further noted that the applicant in seeking to address the concerns regarding the cumulative impact assessment, proposed conditions that would deal with the prevention of Public Nuisance including Noise Control, Customer Dispersal and Waste and Delivery Management. When further enquiries were put to the applicant regarding Waste and Delivery Management, it transpired that the hours proposed were the ones not in fact being implemented as the Applicant would seek to rely on the Local Authority collection services and the hours they had agreed with the Council's Noise Service.

The Sub-Committee made further enquiries in relation to the recent TENs and were advised that they took place without any complaints or issues. Further details on what procedures were in place and what specifically the events were not discerned in order to satisfy the Sub-Committee that the licensing objectives were preserved and adhered to.

Further details in relation to the plans of the premises to address how the cocktail bar and restaurant would operate in line with current and proposed conditions were not provided so the Sub-Committee could not be satisfied that the proposed conditions could be implemented accordingly so as to further the Licensing Objectives.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the hours sought were not within the hours specified in licensing policy 6.

Regarding Licence Policy 3, the Sub-Committee concluded that the applicant did not comprehensively demonstrate why a varied licence would not add to the cumulative impact and that the possible exceptions to the Angel and Upper Street Cumulative Impact Policy were not relied on and were not applicable in the application received.

The Sub-Committee were therefore satisfied that the grant of the application would undermine the Licensing Objectives. In so doing the Sub-Committee relied on the guidance provided in *R (on application of Hope and Glory Public House Ltd) v City of Westminster Magistrates' Court and Other (2011) EWCA Civ 312*. Whereby it was illustrated that the

licensed premises, and the activities that took place in those premises, exist in a dynamic environment and should not be looked at entirely in isolation. The Sub-Committee was satisfied that the lack of detail including specific detail on noise mitigation in relation to the live events that recently took place and would be proposed to take place over extended hours did not contribute to the promotion of the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety and the prevention of public nuisance. This was further compounded by the confusion relating to the Waste Collection mentioned above.

Further, in refusing to grant the application, the Sub-Committee relied on the guidance provided in *R (on application of Daniel Thwaites plc) vs Wirral Magistrates Court and Others 2008 EWHC 838 (Admin)*. This case highlighted that Responsible Authorities were experts in their fields, and that weight should be attached to their representations. Further it illustrates that the purpose of the Act is to prevent problems from happening and the Responsible Authorities representation allow the Sub-Committee to contextualise the information and make a decision on well informed common sense. The Police's representation led the Sub-Committee to come to such a decision. Specifically, their representation that the extant conditions [ Appendix 2 condition 5 and 7] appeared contrary to the current operation. That they may require amending was not taken on board by the applicant and therefore applying well informed common sense, the prospect of extending the operating hours would lead to extending what the Police viewed as a current operation contrary to the extant conditions. Thereby, applying the same common sense, would not lead to the promotion of the prevention of Crime and Disorder, public safety and the prevention of public nuisance.

Further, in refusing to grant the application, the Sub-Committee noted that the Licensing Authority's representation and that the Applicant sought to address the Authority's concerns at paragraph 21 of his unsigned witness statement. However, the Sub-Committee was not satisfied that they had been presented with enough information such as, up to date plans of the premises, in order to determine the feasibility of the proposed conditions along with the continuation of the extant conditions the Applicant wished to keep. As such, in applying the approach in *Thwaites*, the Sub-Committee was satisfied that the common sense determination was that there was not enough specific information on this front so it could not be satisfied that granting the extended hours would lead to the promotion of the prevention of Crime and Disorder, public safety and prevention of public nuisance.

137

**GO MEZZA, 680 HOLLOWAY ROAD, N19 3NP - NEW PREMISES LICENCE (Item B2)**

The licensing officer reported that the hours had been amended following consultation with the police. The police representation had therefore been withdrawn. There were three outstanding residential representations.

A local resident reported that she objected to this licence based on two licensing objectives, the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder. There had been noise disturbance from the extractor fan for many years, both before and after the current applicant had started trading. She had texted a previous owner when there was a problem, and they would switch off the fan and staff would leave. When he had left the business, co-operation ceased, and a Section 18 had been served on the premises but then the business had closed. There was a period of silence during this time but when the new owner opened the premises the noise began again. When speaking to the owner he had been dismissive and asked the resident to deal directly with the landlord. Her partner had also spoken to the applicant. The Council had witnessed this nuisance and confirmed a section 18 noise abatement notice. This was breached in July and a fixed penalty notice had been issued. The landlord stated that a hood would be placed over the fan. This work had been carried out; the noise level had improved slightly but persisted. The fan was switched off at 11pm

## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

and she had come to terms with the noise, but she struggled with sleep with the current hours of operation. An officer had attended from the anti-social behaviour team and had said that this could potentially be a statutory noise nuisance in the warmer months. Other neighbours were also unhappy about the noise. Regarding crime and disorder, she stated that they lived on a quiet street and patrons were drug taking and dealing outside.

In response to questions, the resident stated that the issue persisted even when there had been a good relationship with the occupier. A statutory notice had been served but then the occupiers had left the premises so there had been no engagement around solutions. Following a further notice a hood had been put over the extractor fan but still the problem continued. The solution was a technical issue.

The applicant stated that the premises had been closed for a year and he had taken over in April 2023. He had met the resident before he had commenced trading. Residents in the flats had complained and he hired an acoustic engineer. Two fans had been reduced to one. They closed the premises at 10.45 to allow for the extraction to end at 11pm. The engineer had suggested an acoustic housing and once work was completed the immediate neighbours were ok with the noise levels. They had carried out all possible work to the extractor. All local businesses were closing and businesses needed to trade when there was high demand. His premises were on Holloway Road had nothing to do with drug dealing. He had been informed that issues needed to be reported to the landlord which is the reason why he referred the resident to them. He wanted to work with neighbours. He was unable to continue cooking without extraction on. They did not have any issues with his other sites. The business was mainly delivery, but they had four seats in the premises.

In response to questions, it was noted that there were no noise issues from a visit the previous evening. Work had been carried out, but they would not know how much of a problem it was until the summer. He had removed one extractor fan; the duct had been insulated, the hood installed and the flats above had no noise issues since January. The business was mainly take-away and delivery. They did not sell alcohol and had no intention to do so. There had been no complaints about the drivers. The hours requested were within framework hours. The extractor had silencers fitted and was the same as extractor fans used at other sites. He considered that the issue was that the premises had been closed and so the area had been very quiet for a long period. The delivery drivers left straight away. If drivers misbehaved they could be blocked.

In summary, the resident stated that she was only 10 metres away from the fan and higher up so she could hear it more. They had problems on the road when people had been inebriated. People had been standing in front of the business. She was not asking for the business to close, but the fan needed to be permanently fixed as it was very concerning.

The applicant said that he wanted to co-exist with residents. The premises were on a busy road. He hoped to satisfy the noise issue and was happy to do more to do so.

### **RESOLVED**

- 1) That the application for a new premises licence, in respect of Go Mezza, 680 Holloway Road, N19 3NP be granted to allow:-
  - a) The provision of late-night refreshment, Sundays to Thursdays from 11pm to midnight and Fridays and Saturdays from 11pm until 1am.
  - b) The premises to be open to the public, Sunday to Thursday from 10am to midnight and on Fridays and Saturdays from 10am until 1am.

## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

- 2) That conditions outlined in appendix 3 and detailed on pages 88 to 90 of the agenda be applied to the licence.

### Note of the Sub-Committee

The Sub-Committee advised that both parties keep in contact with the noise team.

### REASONS FOR DECISION

The Sub-Committee listened to all the evidence and submissions and read all the material. The Sub-Committee reached the decision having given consideration to the Licensing Act 2003, as amended, and its regulations, the national guidance and the Council's Licensing Policy.

The Sub-Committee took into consideration Licensing Policies 2 & 3. The premises fall within the Holloway and Finsbury Park cumulative impact area. Licensing policy 3 creates a rebuttable presumption that applications for the grant or variation of premises licences which are likely to add to the existing cumulative impact will normally be refused following the receipt of representations, unless the applicant can demonstrate in the operating schedule that there will be no negative cumulative impact on one or more of the licensing objectives.

Three local resident objections had been received. There had been no representations made by the responsible authorities.

The Sub-Committee noted that the hours sought were within the hours specified in licensing policy 6.

The Sub-Committee heard evidence from the resident who confirmed that they experienced noise nuisance with the extractor fan. A section 18 Abatement Notice was served on the previous owner. A hood was placed over the extractor fan. The resident confirmed that the noise could be a statutory noise nuisance in the summer months as confirmed today following a visit from the Noise Team. The resident said that they don't know what will be required as a solution as it was a technical question. They further noted that they were concerned that the business would be open until 1am with the debilitating noise of the fan.

The applicant said that they took over the property in April 2023 and admitted to a Fixed Penalty Notice being issued as a result of not turning off the extractor fan at 11pm. The applicant said that he learnt from this to turn off the fan at 10:45pm so that there was no noise from it at 11pm following a period of cooling.

The applicant further stated that from September – December 2023, a lot of work had been carried out to install the hood around the premises. The residents with the representations were those who lived behind the building. They had done all they could to abate the nuisance. The applicant confirmed that 85% of the delivery drivers they used were uber eats orders and they had a protocol with them regarding parking and reporting any unsatisfactory conduct which would allay any concerns relating nuisance. The applicant confirmed that they disconnected one of the extraction fans and placed a silencer on the operating fan.

The Sub-Committee noted and were concerned that the applicant and the resident's relationship had experienced tension due to the issue of the extractor fan. As such, the Sub-Committee saw fit to note that the parties should stay in contact with the local authorities Noise Team to ensure that the extractor fan noise remained below the levels of a statutory nuisance.

## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

The Sub-Committee concluded that the granting of the licence with the agreed conditions would promote the licensing objectives. The Sub-Committee noted that the hours sought were within the hours specified in licensing policy 5 and 6. The Sub-Committee was satisfied that the operating schedule demonstrated high standards of management and that the proposed use, with the extensive conditions agreed, meant that the premises would not add to the cumulative impact.

The Sub-Committee was satisfied that granting the premises licence was proportionate and appropriate to the promotion of the licensing objectives.

**138**     **SHAHS HALAL FOOD, 255 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N4 2DD - NEW PREMISES LICENCE (Item B3)**

**RESOLVED** that this item be deferred to a future meeting as the applicant was not in attendance.

**139**     **CERU, 9-13 COWCROSS STREET, EC1M 6DR - NEW PREMISES LICENCE (Item B4)**

The licensing officer reported that conditions detailed in Appendix 3 had been agreed. There was one resident present at the meeting.

The local resident spoke against the application. She stated that, although she had always supported regeneration, there had been an increase in the late night openings of nightclubs and bars. Cowcross Yard was a dark yard where some people gathered. There was loud music and aggressive behaviour. She did not see anything in the application regarding safety and avoiding public nuisance. There was a risk that people would gather in the yard and patrons from the premises would flood out onto the street. The entrance into Cowcross Yard was not lit and she considered that patrons would continue onto after parties with shouting and loud music. She considered that CCTV and lighting at the rear of the premises would help avoid issues. She also asked that delivery vehicles turn their van engines off on the Cowcross Yard side.

In response to questions, it was noted that there had not been much interaction with the applicant as there had been scaffolding outside the property. There had been squatters in the premises and basement parties had been held so residents were concerned. The music from Fabric was loud. Patrons sat in the seated area. Community policing would help the situation.

The applicant's representative stated that they wanted to make the area better and invested in the restaurant. CCTV and lighting at the rear was agreed, although they had some concerns regarding other residents' thoughts regarding the lighting. He stated that the majority of issues related to Fabric. This was a restaurant and alcohol was ancillary. The amendments made by the police and noise team were agreed. He considered that the presence of a restaurant would act as a deterrent. This was a local restaurant which would not attract a young crowd. There were robust conditions on CCTV, signage, refuse collection and deliveries and a direct telephone number was offered. The restaurant was small with 59 covers and sat below framework hours on Fridays and Saturdays. The applicant stated that his two other premises had residents living above and they had become part of the neighbourhood. They would light up the area as much as they were able. Deliveries were made by their own staff and not by third parties. Deliveries took place between 8.30am and 11am. For refuse collections they used Islington Council. The restaurants attracted nearly two thirds of women to their restaurants and mainly 40-65 year olds. They were sensitive to their neighbours.



## Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024

In response to questions, they assessed their patrons demographics through their online booking system and when they visited their restaurants. They set ourselves out as a female friendly brand. He had been at South Kensington for 8 years and Queensway for nearly three. They were concerned about female safety, not only for patrons but also for staff. They did not take bookings after 9 or 9.30pm. They staggered bookings so dispersal was also staggered. We encouraged customers to have a full meal and would not wish customers to just drink at tables. In response to a question about New Years Eve, the application for this date was formally withdrawn.

In summary, the resident wished for prevention and considered that another restaurant would further aggravate the situation. She would want the CCTV and lighting at the rear.

The applicant's representative confirmed that the suggested conditions regarding the CCTV and lighting was agreed. The police and noise team conditions were accepted and these were outlined to prevent public nuisance.

### **RESOLVED**

- 1) That the application for a new premises licence in respect of Ceru, 9-13 Cowcross Street, EC1M 6D be granted to allow:-
  - a) The sale of alcohol on and off the premises from 10am until 11pm Sunday to Thursday and Friday and Saturday from 10am to 11.30pm;
  - b) Late night refreshment from 11pm until 11.30pm
  - c) Until 11.30pm on Sundays immediately before Bank Holiday Mondays.
  - d) Opening hours from 9am until 11.30pm Sunday to Thursday and from 9am until midnight Friday and Saturday.
- 2) Conditions detailed on pages 155 to 158 of the agenda shall be applied to the licence with the following additions:-
  - That CCTV be placed at the rear of the premises before and after hours.
  - Lighting be installed at the rear but the type of lighting be determined upon consultation with the Executive Member of Community Safety for consideration.

### **REASONS FOR DECISION**

The resident confirmed that she had been a resident of Clerkenwell for 30 years and that there has been a rise in late openings and pubs. She stated that Cowcross Yard has been increasingly a dark yard. Her concern was about prevention than objection. The resident didn't see anything regarding safety or avoiding nuisance. There was nothing to prevent people gathering on Cowcross Yard before and after hours.

The Committee asked about the residents' experience locally with the business as well as whether there are any interactions with the business. The resident confirmed that the previous businesses led to illegal raves being held at the premises.

The applicant agreed that they were concerned about the surrounding areas. The lighting and the CCTV points could be agreed. For clarity, they would be happy to have CCTV to the rear. The lighting could be on permanently if the neighbours were happy with that.

## **Licensing Sub Committee C - 10 December 2024**

The majority of the objection related to the nightclub Fabric and how the restaurant would operate. Noting that the premises must operate as a restaurant and alcohol was ancillary. They confirmed that the conditions agreed by the Met and Noise were agreed.

The Applicant stated that the customers that would attend were local and this would serve as a deterrent for the nuisance occurring currently, such as public urination.

The restaurant was confirmed to have 59 covers. The back would have wheelchair access. The deliveries would take place between 8:30 – 11:30am. 62% of clients were women. The insights were gleaned from online booking systems and being physically in the restaurant.

Following enquiries on dispersal policies, the applicant confirmed that they staggered bookings so that people arrived and left at different times and that they did not want the later opening hours on New Year's Eve.

The Sub-Committee having listened to all the evidence and submissions and read all the material. The Sub-Committee reached the decision having considered the Licensing Act 2003, as amended, and its regulations, the Home Office revised guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 and the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy.

The Sub-Committee took into consideration Licensing Policies 2 & 3. The premises fall within the Clerkenwell cumulative impact area. Licensing policy 3 creates a rebuttable presumption that applications for the grant or variation of premises licences which are likely to add to the existing cumulative impact will normally be refused following the receipt of representations, unless the applicant can demonstrate in the operating schedule that there will be no negative cumulative impact on one or more of the licensing objectives.

The Committee noted that the applicant adopted conditions suggested by the Police and Islington Council's Environmental Health Officer in relation to their Operating Schedule.

The Sub-Committee noted that the hours sought were within the hours specified in Licensing Policy 6.

The Sub-Committee concluded that the granting of the licence with the agreed conditions would promote the licensing objectives. The Sub-Committee noted that the hours sought were within the hours specified in licensing policy 5 and 6.

The Sub-Committee was satisfied that granting the premises licence was proportionate and appropriate to the promotion of the licensing objectives

The meeting ended at 10.45pm

**CHAIR**