

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

At a hearing of **LICENSING PANEL C** held on **THURSDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER, 2025** at 7.00 pm, which was held remotely via Microsoft Teams.

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL PRESENT

Councillors Jonathan Simpson (Chair) and Matthew Kirk

MEMBERS OF THE PANEL ABSENT

Councillors Nina De Ayala Parker

ALSO PRESENT

Councillors Awale Olad.

The minutes should be read in conjunction with the agenda for the hearing. They are subject to approval and signature at the next hearing of Licensing Panel C and any corrections approved at that hearing will be recorded in those minutes.

MINUTES

1. GUIDANCE ON REMOTE MEETINGS HELD UNDER THE LICENSING ACT 2003 AND ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

RESOLVED –

THAT the guidance on remote meetings be noted.

2. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor Nina de Ayala Parker.

It was noted that the Panel was still quorate with 2 members in attendance.

3. DECLARATIONS BY MEMBERS OF STATUTORY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS, COMPULSORY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND VOLUNTARY REGISTERABLE NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS IN MATTERS ON THIS AGENDA

There were none.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Webcasting of the Meeting

The Chair announced the following: "I would like to remind everyone that this meeting is being broadcast live by the Council and is recorded and later made available on the website. If you are addressing the meeting, you are deemed to be consenting to having your contributions recorded and broadcast."

The Chair also announced that a supplementary agenda had been published on Tuesday 25th November containing:

- Further supporting information provided by the applicant- Environmental Health Responsible Authority, including a link to Video evidence.
- Additional information from Camden's Senior Area Monitoring Officer – Environmental Services Team.
- A description of restricted evidence received from the applicant– describing staff members dressed in the premises uniform approaching a car.

The video evidence had been circulated and viewed prior to the hearing – so there was no need to view again during the hearing.

5. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DECIDES TO TAKE AS URGENT

There were none.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED –

THAT the minutes for the meeting on 24 July 2025 be agreed and signed as an accurate record.

7. LEBANESE GRILL EXPRESS, 84 LEATHER LANE, LONDON EC1N 7TT

Consideration was given to a report of the Executive Director Investment, Place and Opportunity detailing an application to review a premises licence under Section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003.

Steven Dormer, Licensing Officer, summarised the report explaining that the premise was licensed for late night refreshment Monday to Sunday 23.00 to 01.00. The application to review the licence had been lodged by Environmental Health Noise and Pollution Team Responsible Authority, with 55 other representations received in

support of the application to review the licence, including from the Police, Licensing Authority, local ward Councillors resident associations and residents. These representations were on pages 102-369 of the main agenda. The applicant and those supporting the application to review the Licence believed that the licensing objective, the prevention of public nuisance was not being upheld, even after extensive engagement with the premises licence holder and management of the venue.

The Licensing Officer informed the hearing that the applicant had submitted evidence of what they had witnessed at the venue including noise and odour emitting from the extractor and pipe system at the venue which had served as public nuisance and triggered the review of the licence.

There were 4 representations as well as a signed petition objecting to the application to review the premises licence and were in support of the venue these could be found on pages 370 to 432 of the main agenda.

It was noted that the prevention of public nuisance licensing objective was engaged by the application, the type of venue engaged was supply of hot food and drink after 23.00.

Mr Lee Perella, applicant (Environmental Health - Noise and Pollution Team) Responsible Authority accompanied by James Preston Environmental Health Officer, outlined the case for review which could be found on pages 64 – 101 of the main agenda. The main points raised were

- The premises had caused serious and long-standing problems with numerous complaints from residents, ward Councillors, Police and multiple Council departments about the poor maintenance of the premises extractor system, litter, anti-social behaviour of its customers resulting in public nuisance.
- First abatement notice served in June 2025; breaches continued into October and November 2025.
- The business had been slow to respond and often ignored deadlines.
- Concluded that there was no confidence in the premises as it had failed to uphold licensing objectives and recommended revocation.

The following information was provided by Lee Perella in response to questions:

- There had been complaints about the premises every year since 2022. There had been lots of complaints this current year, 2025.
- Residents had tried to engage with the premises.
- Environmental Health had issued 4 abatement notices this year, there had been 2 breaches which had meant that the premises had failed to comply with the notices that had been served.
- Environmental Health were discussing with the legal department about next steps to take issues forward.

- The Licence holder instructed a legal representative in November 2025 who raised the issue of conditions but there was no concrete offer and it was very minimal contact from the premises licence holder. It was all very late notice.

Nicola Watson Health and Safety Team Responsible Authority summarised her representation which could be found on pages 141 – 143 of the main agenda and highlighted that the premises extraction system was inadequate and required major improvement, noting that compliance from the premises had been very difficult to achieve and supported the review application

Marcio Rodrigues Area Monitoring Health and Responsible Authority referred to his representation which could be found on pages 149-160 of the main agenda and indicated that he stood by his statement and supported the application to revoke the licence.

Peter Agbley Licensing Responsible Authority summarised his representation which could be found on pages 108-112 of the main agenda and highlighted that they had tried to work with the business for two years, but problems kept getting worse. He informed the Panel that it was the responsibility of all premises licence holders such as late-night venues to manage and mitigate the impact of their activities on residents and the wider community and it was expected that proactive steps would be taken to minimise noise nuisance and disturbance arising from their operations, particularly where residential properties were located nearby. The Panel was informed that with this premises it was the largest volume of support for the review from Council departments, Councillors and residents they had seen and he therefore supported revocation of the licence.

The following information was provided by Peter Agbley in response to questions:

He had been aware of a recent attempt, 2 days ago by the Barrister representing the Premises Licence holder to mediate the review. However there had been numerous attempts in the past at engaging with the premises and its management but there had been non engagement and it was difficult to determine whether this had changed.

PC Christopher Malone Police Responsible Authority summarised his representation which could be found on pages 102-107 of the main agenda and highlighted that the premises attracted large, loud late-night crowds. He reported anti-social behaviour, fights, fireworks, and drug-related incidents near the premises and said that the premises staff could not control behaviour outside. He supported the revocation of the premises Licence because he was of the view that conditions would not solve the problem.

Tom Parkes Air Quality Environmental Health Team Responsible Authority summarised his representation which could be found on pages 177-179 of the main agenda and highlighted that there had been complaints from residents of smoke and odour from Lebanese Grill entering their homes which had raised health concerns

from residents. The Air Quality Team had raised the issue of pollution from the premises which could affect public health via correspondence but no response had been received from the premises. They therefore also supported revoking the licence.

Councillor Awale Olad, Holborn and Covent Garden speaking as Ward Councillor and local resident summarised his representation which could be found on pages 180-181 of the main agenda. He described and highlighted issues of serious anti-social behaviour arising from the premises and their customers. Nuisance to residents unable to sleep from fireworks being fired in the street. Ongoing fear and distress to the community. Years of failed attempts to work with the business as the premises had ignored repeated attempts to improve and the serious harm caused to the community. He said all three ward Councillors wanted the premises licence revoked.

The following information was provided by Councillor Olad in response to questions:

- Attempts at engaging with the premises and its management had occurred on a number of occasions, although it had been a friendly relationship there had been no progress or improvement on the issues raised. The conclusion was that the premises needed to lose its licence.

Kerry Dyus Interested Party on behalf of some residents summarised her representation which could be found on pages 216-220 of the main agenda and described life living close to Lebanese Grill as “a living nightmare” highlighting the issues of constant smoke, odour, litter, anti-social behaviour and noise, affected residents on Hatton Garden as well as Leather Lane. Noting in particular that in summer if she were to open the windows in her property the smoke pervades her whole flat leading to long term health concerns. She also queried whether the signed petition form and preprinted letters were genuine highlighting that they did not hold the same weight as heartfelt submissions by local residents remarking that 5 postcodes on the prewritten letters were not local postcodes.

Melanie Tew Interested Party on behalf of Bourne Estate Tenants and Residents Association summarised her representation which could be found on pages 182-185 of the main agenda and described situations where customers of Lebanese Grill used estate facilities, the presence of drug paraphernalia in playgrounds and elderly residents living in fear. Cars racing up and down using Leather Lane as a racetrack.

David Kaner Interested Party on behalf of Holborn Covent Garden Safer Neighbourhood Panel summarised his representation which could be found on pages 186-188 of the main agenda and described two issues relating to the premises. The issue with the fumes and odour emanating from the premises which he said could be addressed by physical changes and appropriate conditions. The other issue related to anti-social behaviour and the premises attracting problematic activity at night which in his view felt that the premises could not do much about and supported revocation of the premises licence.

Mr David Wolfe interested party objecting to the review application summarised his representation which could be found on pages 370-372 of the main agenda. He commented that as a local resident and customer he would like to see the business continue as a successful business. He and a lot of other people enjoyed the food the premises produced. He had encouraged the employment of a fume extraction company to clean the extraction equipment on the premises which occurred in recent weeks. He also commented that the previous person the premises licence holder had employed to advise on licensing issues had not done a good job in advising the premises licence holder. He was of the view and confident that with the employment of better advisers and a condition requiring an SIA operative the situation with the premises would improve and advocated allowing the premises additional time to resolve the issues rather than revoking the licence.

The following information was provided by David Wolfe in response to questions:

- The premises licence holder had made modifications to the existing chimney or replaced components.
- There had not been any discussion with the premises licence holder about the requirement for planning permission for the extract system.

Mr Matt Lewin, barrister speaking on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder, addressed the Panel providing the following information:

- Acknowledged that mistakes had been made but argued revocation was not needed and that focus should be on the current position.
- The purpose of the review was not to punish the Licence holder for mistakes that had been made but looking ahead based on what had gone wrong and what the appropriate response was to make sure it does not happen again.
- While mistakes had been made matters were now in hand.
- The main reason for review was the extraction system, none of the secondary issues justified revocation of the licence.
- The premises was in Central London where it was inevitable that there would be noise.
- It was a popular family business serving a diverse community
- The premises had recent management changes with nephew Zak Khan taking over responsibility.
- Planning issues were not relevant to licensing.
- Street-level behavior described was beyond the premises control.
- Most complaints were about extractor issues, which had now been fixed. Recent extraction system overhaul (£1,000+ investment)

He stated that recent improvements had been made which included the cleaning of the extractor system and replacing of the silencer. There were plans for further upgrades and regular maintenance. He proposed a number of new conditions including:

- SIA door supervisor on Thursday–Saturday nights (11 pm–1 am).
- Mandatory litter patrols.
- Better CCTV and a single point of contact.
- Mandatory litter patrols
- Commercial waste bin provision
- Designated management contact
- Noise expert assessment

Requested for a final chance to prove improvements.

In response to questions Mr Lewin provided the following information:

- The hours offered for the SIA condition were for licensable hours 11.00pm - 1.00am but this could be kept under review.
- Until recently the advice provided to the premises licence holder had not been very constructive which had not helped the situation and increased friction with local residents.
- There had been changes behind the scenes at the business which should serve to improve relations with residents.
- There was working CCTV and it was available to the Responsible Authorities.
- Steps had already been made to improve the situation with the cleaning of the extractor system and there was evidence to show that this had made a meaningful difference.
- There was proof of the record of works which could be sent by email.
- There had been no structural changes to the building apart from the replacement of a silencer which did not require separate building control approval.
- There was no objection to accepting Camden's model conditions to apply to the licence.
- The litter patrols that had gone out at 1.00am had concentrated on Leather Lane.
- There was acceptance that there had been engagement with the local ward Councillor but the licence holder did not accept anything else.
- The premises licence holder was of the view that 1 SIA operative was sufficient which was the standard ratio for a premises with no licence to sell alcohol over a short period of time.
- The premises Licence Holder would not object to a condition requiring the SIA wearing body worn camera as this was a normal requirement.

The applicant, Environmental Health Responsible Authority, Licencing Authority and Police Responsible Authorities provided closing remarks stating that they had no confidence in the premises licence holder or the premises management as the issues highlighted had lasted for years. The condition proposing use of one SIA operative was not sufficient to control dispersal and other issues occurring with the premises, therefore the recommendation remained to revoke the premises licence.

Mr Wolfe Interested party objecting to the application to revoke the Licence advocated for further dialogue with the Premises Licence Holder which would secure the benefits the establishment provided to the area.

Matt Lewin on behalf of the Premises Licence Holder in his closing remarks said that the Panel should consider the position of the premises as of today as improvements were now in place and revocation of the premises licence would be disproportionate.

Deliberation and Reasons

Panel Members confirmed that they had been able to follow and understand the submissions and discussions in relation to the application for review of a premises licence in respect of the Lebanese Grill.

In deliberation, the Panel noted the representations made by the applicant, Police, Licensing, Health and Safety, Air Quality, Area Monitoring Responsible Authorities, Interested Parties including the ward Councillor and the information provided by the Licence Holders Legal representative.

The Panel then considered all the options available to them and whether to:

- a) Allow the licence to continue operating as before.
- b) Modify the conditions of the licence.
- c) To suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months.
- d) To revoke the licence.

Panel Members considered the strong evidence provided by the Responsible Authorities and Interested Parties of long-term and serious nuisance from ongoing smoke, noise, and anti-social behaviour and the serious impact this had on residents' daily lives.

The Panel noted in particular, the message across multiple council departments, residents and the local ward Councillor about the consistent pattern of total non-cooperation from the premises and the loss of confidence in the business. This was due to repeated non-engagement and broken promises and while significant weight was attached to the efforts of David Wolfe interested party in attempting to find peace in the local community the late action only before the hearing was too little too late, recent changes appeared commercially driven rather than genuine commitment to community relations. There had been very limited evidence of real improvement.

The Panel considered conditions but given the repeated non-engagement and broken promises from the premises management felt that conditions would not fix the problems.

The Panel unanimously decided to revoke the late-night refreshment license for Lebanese Grill Express, effective immediately due to:

- Consistent pattern of non-compliance over 2-3 years

- Total disdain for local community concerns
- Lack of confidence in future compliance with conditions
- Sustained public nuisance affecting multiple residential areas
- Removing late-night trading was the only reliable way to reduce nuisance
- Recent improvements were deemed "too little, too late"
- Commercial motivation was behind last-minute engagement efforts

The Panel acknowledged that if genuine change occurred, a new license application could be considered in future.

Given all the reasons above and having deliberated on all evidence available to them, the Panel was of the view and agreed that the licence should be revoked.

Therefore, it was

RESOLVED –

- THAT the premises licence in respect of Lebanese Grill be revoked pursuant to Section 53 of the Licensing Act 2003.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

There was none.

The hearing ended at 9.03 pm.

CHAIR

Contact Officer: Sola Odusina

Telephone No: 020 7974 8543

E-Mail: licensing.committee@camden.gov.uk

MINUTES END