

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE LICENSING SUB COMMITTEE B

WEDNESDAY 28 JUNE 2023

THE LIVESTREAM OF THE MEETING CAN BE VIEWED HERE:

<https://youtube.com/live/ZjnvGcz7mEI>

**Councillors Present:** Cllr Gilbert Smyth in the Chair  
Cllr Midnight Ross and Cllr Joe Walker

**Officers in Attendance:** Amanda Nauth, Licensing Lawyer  
Suba Sriramana, Principal Licensing Officer (acting)  
Gareth Sykes, Governance Officer

**Also in Attendance:** Cllr Christopher Kennedy (Observing)  
Cllr Yvonne Maxwell (Observing)

**Item 6 Application for a Premises License: Heart of Hackney, 255 Mare Street, London, E8 3NS**

Applicant

Shaun Murkett, Agent for the applicant  
Aziz Ozdemir, applicant

Other persons

C1: Filipe Fonseca  
C2: Melinda Thompson  
C5: Ed Burgess  
C8: Matteo Izzi

**Item 7 Application for a variation to a Premises Licence: The Doner Store, 468 Kingsland Road, Hackney, London, E8 4AE**

Applicant

Mahir Kilic, Agent for the applicant  
Berke Ozer, Applicant

Responsible Authorities

Police: Police Constable Neal Hunwick  
Licensing: Channing Reverie (Hackney Council)

**1 Election of Chair**

1.1 Cllr Gilbert Smyth was elected as the Committee Chair.

**2 Apologies for Absence**

2.1 There were no apologies for absence.

**3 Declarations of Interest - Members to declare as appropriate**

3.1 In the interest of openness and transparency, in relation to agenda item 6 Heart of Hackney. Cllr Smyth advised that he had used the Turkish restaurant next to the Heart of Hackney.

**4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

4.1 None.

**5 Licensing Sub-Committee Hearing Procedure**

5.1 The meeting participants noted the hearing procedure.

**6 Application for a Premises License: Heart of Hackney, 255 Mare Street, London, E8 3NS**

6.1 The Licensing Sub-Committee heard from Hackney Council's Principal Licensing Officer (Acting), the agent for the applicant, the applicant and various other persons speaking in objection. The application was for a premises licence to allow authorisation for the provision of regulated entertainment and sale of alcohol on Monday to Sunday. Prior to the meeting the Responsible Authorities (Environmental Enforcement, Environmental Protection and the Police had withdrawn their submissions after the applicant had accepted their conditions. The Licensing Authority had no representation for the application. The other persons had made representations on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance and the protection of children from harm.

6.2 During the course of the meeting there was a discussion where a number of points were raised including the following:

- In response to a query regarding the playing of music on the premises, the agent for the applicant replied that no music would be played in the garden. Members noted that the garden would be closed after 6:00pm;
- The Other persons welcomed the news that the applicant had agreed a number of conditions with the Police and the Council's Environmental Enforcement and Protection teams. However, some of the other persons disputed an ascertain that the site had always been a traditional family pub. They stressed that going forward the pub must be at the heart of the community;
- Replying to a question from one of the Sub-Committee members, the agent for the applicant responded that his client understood local residents' concerns about the garden and its proximity to their homes.

The applicant had been in discussion with the Police and a number of conditions had been agreed relating to both the exterior and interior;

- Committee members noted that no loud speakers would be installed on site;
- Replying to a question from the Committee members, the agent for the applicant responded that Council Officers had submitted a noise report and that the maximum number of people in the garden would be limited to 20 persons. The agent for the applicant added he was not sure what else his client could do to be more accommodating in addressing local residents' concerns;
- In a response to a question from the other persons, the agent for the applicant replied that it would be too expensive to re-brand the pub. It was noted if the application was to be granted the pub would not open immediately;
- Replying to a question from the Sub-Committee about how the pub would be family-orientated, the agent for the applicant responded by citing examples such as a child's menu and arrangements had been made with the restaurant next door to sell pizzas;
- Responding to a question from the other persons, the agent for the applicant replied that while it was recognised that some neighbours were working from home it might not be practicable to close the garden earlier than 6:00pm to reduce the noise coming from that area. Some patrons with their children during the summer may wish to example sit in the garden before 6:00pm;
- Responding to a question from the other persons, the agent for the applicant replied that his client was trying to please everyone by initiating a number of positive changes and agreeing to several tight conditions;
- Responding to a comment from the Council's legal officer, the agent for the applicant replied that his client could look at holding regular meetings with local residents;
- Replying to a question from a Sub-Committee member on the garden and the number of smokers, the agent for the applicant responded that the garden was a non-smoking area. The smoking area at the front of the premises would accommodate six to eight people maximum. This area would be tightly conditioned. In light of this development condition 20 in the published application report would be amended accordingly to reflect this change. Members noted there would be no barbeques in the garden;
- Responding to a question from a Sub-Committee member about how the applicant would respond to concerns over anti-social behaviour, the agent for the applicant replied that the premises would be tightly conditioned, as agreed with the Police, and it was noted that a female Security Industry Authority (SIA) would also be employed;
- Replying to a question from a member of the Sub-Committee, the applicant confirmed that he did not have any connection to the previous owner. They said they would ensure that what had happened in the past would not happen again;
- In response to a question from a Committee member on what training staff would undertake in the pub, the applicant replied that the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) would run the day to day running of the premises. The staff that were employed would be experienced and well trained;

- Responding to concerns raised by the other persons about the freeholder. The premises previously had had a problematic history of which the freeholder had been associated. The Police suggested a condition wherein the freeholder would not be allowed on the premises. Members noted that the DPS would have a tight brief;
- Sub-Committee members noted that if the application was granted a dispersal policy would be produced in the first week of operation;
- Replying to a question from other persons about a potential conflict of interest between the freeholder and the owner of the premises, the agent for the applicant responded that there was no conflict of interest;
- Other persons expressed their disappointment that the DPS was not present at the Licensing Sub-Committee meeting;
- In his closing remarks, the agent for the applicant reiterated how his client had agreed to a number of stringent conditions with the Police and the Council's Environmental Health and Protection teams. The use of the garden would be limited to 20 people maximum and a review of the running of the premises would occur after three months. As previously mentioned, if the application was granted the premises would not open immediately as his client initiated a number of changes to the premises;
- In their closing remarks the other persons reiterated their concerns about the premises and the application. They were mindful of the site and its problematic history particularly in relation to the garden and its close proximity to their properties. They hoped that with a new owner the premises could be turned around and it was suggested that during the week the garden should only be open for a specific number of days;
- The Sub-Committee took into account that the local residents were pleased to hear that the garden hours would be restricted and that's on due to the noise;
- The Sub-Committee noted that the Police were content as well as all the Responsible Authorities were content with the conditions that were agreed by the applicant.

### **The decision**

The Licensing sub-committee in considering this decision from the information presented to it within the report and at the hearing today has determined that having regard to the promotion of all the licensing objectives:

- The prevention of crime and disorder;
- Public safety;
- Prevention of public nuisance;
- The protection of children from harm;

The application for a premises licence has been approved in accordance with the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and the conditions set out in paragraph 8.1 of the report, with the following amendments agreed with the Applicant :-

- Condition 19 shall be amended as follows:

“The garden area shall close and cease to be used from 18:00 each day. The tables and chairs in the outside area shall be rendered unusable after that time”.

- Condition 20 shall be amended as follows:

After 21:00 no more than 6 smokers will be permitted at the front of the premises at any one time.

And the following condition to be added to the premises licence :

- The applicant shall appoint an acoustic consultant registered with the IOA to conduct a music noise survey on the main premises ceiling and the flats immediately above the premises within three months of the opening of the premises with recommendations on suitable mitigation for any excessive music noise from the premises. The agreed acceptable music sound levels to be then set on the sound limiter and calibrated to the satisfaction of the Environmental Protection Team.
- The contact details of the duty manager and the Designated Premises Supervisor to be on display where it can be easily read from the exterior of the premises.
- Refuse/Recycling of bottles are permitted to be placed in the external receptacles or in areas outside the premises between 09:00 and 17:00 each day.
- No barbecues shall be permitted in the garden area.
- The Freehold owner, Mr Ali Abaci shall be excluded from the premises and shall not undertake any activities related to the management of the business. This shall include but shall not be limited to any directorship, shareholding, direct employment, employment as a contractor, advisor or supplier
- The maximum of 20 persons shall be permitted in the garden at any one time.
- No smokers shall be permitted in the garden area.
- The Premises Licence Holder shall submit a written Dispersal Policy to be approved by the Licensing Authority and the Police. The approved Dispersal Policy shall be implemented at the premises. All staff shall be briefed on this Dispersal Policy. A copy of the policy shall be kept on the premises and shall be produced to a Police officer or other authorised officer upon request.
- The Premises Licence Holder shall organise and publicise a meeting for local residents to discuss the operation of the premises and address any issues at least every 3 months. The frequency of meetings may be varied by agreement between the Premises Licence Holder and local residents.

### **Reasons for the decision**

The Licensing Sub-committee approved the application for a premises licence with amended hours for use of the garden area, and additional conditions for on-sales of alcohol at the premises.

The Sub-committee took into account that the Applicant had agreed in advance to conditions with the Responsible Authorities (Metropolitan Police Service (“the Police”), Environmental Protection Team, and the Environmental Enforcement Team) who

subsequently withdrew their objections to the application. It was noted that the Licensing Authority raised no objections.

The Sub-committee also took into consideration objections raised by 10 Other Persons (local residents) to the application, in a residential area, on the grounds of the four licensing objectives, and the impact the premises will have on the local residents and families that live close to the premises.

The Sub-committee took into consideration the Planning Authority's representation that the Applicant needed to ensure they had the necessary Planning Permission in place to operate the premises.

The Sub-committee heard from local residents that there was a lack of resident consultation prior to the meeting which the local residents were concerned about and how the Applicant will work with local residents going forward.

The Sub-committee heard local residents expressed their concerns that the Applicant may not be able to address their concerns due to his lack of experience as a manager of a pub.

The Sub-committee heard from residents that lived in the area for a number of years who confirmed that the noise does get amplified in the beer garden and there were little shields from the noise to prevent the impact on local residents. The Sub-committee heard from a number of the neighbours that they respect peace and quiet, and they do not want to be disturbed with noise. The Sub-committee heard that the Applicant had agreed to no smokers in the garden and the smokers will be at the front of the premises.

The Sub-committee took into account representations from the local residents who have previously experienced use of the premises to be very noisy from 21:00 and in the middle of the night. The Sub-committee heard when the premises closed the local residents found that 90% of the noise issues and antisocial behaviour issues disappeared, and they felt that by reopening the premises all of these issues would reoccur.

The Sub-committee heard from local residents that the area was now more of a commercial and sports pub with long hours and it was not family orientated, the building amplified the noise and also traps smoke which were ongoing problems. The Sub-committee noted that local residents would welcome a traditional family pub as it would make the community more united and the local residents would have something to support and be proud of. However they are concerned about how the premises would operate in reality.

The Sub-committee heard from local residents that following the two incidents in the 10 year period, the concerns are that the premises will repeat how it operated previously and the reputation that followed it. The Sub-committee heard that the local residents felt that the Applicant does not appear to have presented a premise that will be new. It appears to be like the previous premises that promoted heavy drinking and attracting the wrong crowds which led to antisocial behaviour in the area. The Sub-committee noted that the local residents were concerned about the negative impact the premises would have on the residential area.

The Sub-committee heard representations from the Applicant's Agent that the premises is a traditional family pub. There will be no live music or dancing. The new operator has no involvement with the previous licence holder of the premises. The Applicant is the leaseholder and the previous licence holder is the freeholder of the premises. The Sub-committee heard that the Applicant had agreed conditions with the Responsible Authorities and the Police were happy with the site plans for the premises. The Sub-committee heard that there will be new CCTV, new security and the Police will be monitoring the operation of the premises and the performance of the Designated Premises Supervisor very closely.

The Sub-committee took into consideration that the Applicant had agreed to the garden being closed from 18:00 each day. The Sub-committee noted the Applicant had made plans to carry out improvements to the premises if the licence is granted such as a play area and other children's activities being provided to create a more family friendly premises. The Sub-committee heard that the Applicant was making plans about a family menu that they will be offering.

The Sub-committee heard from the Applicant that they have no involvement with the previous licence holder and that they will make sure they have good security inside and outside the premises. The Sub-committee noted that the Applicant had worked in a pub previously. However they have not managed a pub. The Sub-committee heard from the Applicant that they will ensure that there is no smoking on the premises. The Sub-committee noted that the Applicant was not planning to open the premises straight away, and that they intended to employ experienced staff first.

The Sub-committee heard from the Applicant's agent that there is a gym now under the premises, causing a great deal of plant noise and it was not noise coming from the actual premises. The Applicant's agent confirmed that the Police will monitor the Designated Premises Supervisor closely, and if they are not operating correctly the Police will refer the matter back to the Licensing Authority.

The Sub-committee heard from the Applicant's Agent that they would be prepared to meet with the Responsible Authorities and local residents within one week of opening to try and work with them to resolve any issues.

The Sub-committee took into consideration the representations made by the Applicant, the Licensing Authority and the Other Persons (local residents), and the Sub-committee felt that with the additional conditions, and the Applicant's willingness to work with local residents to overcome any issues, that the Applicant will be able to operate responsibly. The Sub-committee was satisfied that the garden closing at 18:00 each day would prevent noise nuisance and any impact on local residents.

The Sub-committee takes antisocial behaviour seriously, and will not want the previous experiences to be repeated. The Sub-committee hopes that the necessary security will be in place to prevent any antisocial behaviour.

The Sub-committee felt that the premises needed rebranding in order to make progress in the future and move away from the past incidents. The Sub-committee took into consideration that the local residents did not have confidence that the new premises would operate well.

The Sub-committee felt the premises needed to demonstrate and reassure both the Responsible Authorities and local residents that this is a new start for this premises.

In addition, the Applicant needs to demonstrate that they have listened to the local residents, and they will try to resolve any issues at the premises to prevent noise nuisance, antisocial behaviour and any other impact on the local residents who live within close proximity to the premises and the garden.

The Sub-committee took into consideration the concerns raised by the local residents and satisfied themselves that the conditions applied will allay the fears of the local residents. The safeguards and quarterly meetings and other measures offered by the Applicant made the Sub-committee feel confident that the Applicant will take the concerns raised by local residents seriously.

The Sub-committee felt that the main issues were management and lack of experience of the Applicant to operate a premises such as this. The Sub-committee felt that the Applicant demonstrated that they were open, accommodating and prepared to comply with the conditions and amendments proposed in the meeting. The Sub-committee considered the nuisance experienced by local residents previously and they welcome the changes and the conditions that the Applicant has agreed to.

The Sub-committee took into account that the Environmental Protection Team suggested that there should be no more than 20 people at any time and that a noise report should be carried out to resolve any potential noise issues that will arise from use of the rear garden.

The Sub-committee took into account that the local residents did not want the recycling of bottles to be carried out late at night. The Sub-committee were pleased that the Applicant agreed to the bottles being recycled from 09:00 onwards during the day at more reasonable times to prevent a disturbance.

The Sub-committee heard from the local residents that they needed reassurance that noise checks were being carried out, and that a noise report would be done to address the noise impact on local residents.

The Sub-committee and local residents were disappointed that the DPS did not attend the hearing to listen to the concerns of local residents and the issues arising that they will be dealing with.

The Sub-committee were not convinced that the Freeholder will not have any involvement in the premises. The Sub-committee felt it was necessary to have a condition to prevent the Freeholder of the building who previously operated the premises, when the incidents occurred, and the premises licence was revoked, to be excluded from operating the premises.

The Sub-committee felt that the conditions in place would allow the Applicant to go some way to operating responsibly. The conditions will enable a review to be carried out to ensure problems from the past will not occur. The proposed safeguards in place gave the Sub-committee confidence that the premises will be under tighter controls.

Having taken all of the above factors into consideration, the Licensing Sub-committee was satisfied that the application could be approved without the licensing objectives being undermined.



## **Public Informative**

1. The Premises Licence Holder is encouraged to work with and to engage in meaningful dialogue with the local residents to resolve any issues relating to noise or other nuisance from the premises, and for the Premises Licence holder to play their part in reducing any impacts of noise emanating from the premises, particularly during the evening and late at night.
2. The Premises Licence holder is encouraged to continue working with the Environmental Protection Team to reduce noise nuisance, and prevent any nuisance or negative impact in the area.
3. The Premises Licence Holder is advised as part of the rigorous monitoring and checking process that the recruitment of staff are to be well trained and to undertake the required training: Wave training, training for vulnerable persons and other training offered by the Council's Hackney Nights portal.
4. The Premises Licence Holder is reminded of the need to operate the premises according to any current licensing conditions on the premises licence, any planning permission requirements and consents relating to the use class, conditions and hours that the premises will operate under.
5. It also should be noted for the public record that the local Planning Authority should draw no inference or be bound by this decision with regard to any future planning Application which may be made.

## **Your right to appeal**

**If you are aggrieved by any term, condition or restriction attached to this decision, you have the right to appeal to the Thames Magistrates Court, 58 Bow Road, London E3 4DJ within 21 days of the date you receive this written decision.**

### **7 Application for a variation to a Premises Licence: The Doner Store, 468 Kingsland Road, Hackney, London, E8 4AE**

- 7.1 The Licensing Sub-Committee heard from Hackney Council's Principal Licensing Officer (Acting), the agent for the applicant and the Responsible Authorities (the Police and Licensing). The application was to vary a premises licence to extend late night refreshment until 02:30 am on Thursday to Saturday. The premises was in the Dalston Special Policy Area (SPA) area. The Police had made a representation on the grounds of the prevention of crime and disorder and the prevention of public nuisance whilst the Licensing Authority had made representation on the grounds of prevention of public nuisance.
- 7.2 During the course of the discussion the agent for the applicant raised a query regarding the current status of the Dalston SPA. It was understood that a review of the Statement of Licensing Policy and Cumulative Impact Assessment was currently underway which included a re-assessment of the status of the SPAs. The agent for the applicant explained that they had submitted an application on the basis that the SPA was not currently active. Committee members in discussion took the view that it was unclear as to the current status of the SPA

and that clarification should be sought from the Licensing Service. It was understood that the Licensing Policy would be considered at the July 2023 Council meeting.

- 7.3 In light of the uncertainty over the current status of the SPA in relation to the review of the licensing policy and its impact on the application Sub-Committee members agreed to adjourn the hearing. The application would be resubmitted for consideration and decision at a future Licensing Sub-Committee meeting.

## **8 Temporary Event Notices - Standing Item**

- 8.1 None.

### **END OF THE MEETING**

**Duration of the meeting: 7.00pm - 9.06pm**

Cllr Gilbert Smyth  
Chair of the Licensing Sub-Committee

Contact:  
Gareth Sykes  
Governance Officer  
Email: [governance@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:governance@hackney.gov.uk)

DRAFT