

Cllr Coleman Ben: H&F <Ben.Coleman@lbhf.gov.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 3:09 PM

To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection to Application Ref. 2023/01489/LAPR, 82 North End Road W14 9ES

Having heard from constituents, I would like to object to this application to extend delivery hours to 3am and 4am. This will increase the noise and ASB problems for my constituents who live in residential roads in the local delivery area.

Regards

Ben Coleman

Deputy Leader of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham

Councillor for Lillie ward

From: [REDACTED]

Subject: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER REPRESENTATION

Date: October 19, 2023 at 10:58:03 AM GMT+1

To: Lorna McKenna <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: Lbhf Licensing Email <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER deadline 25 October 2023

We are very concerned about another application to stay open until 4am.

--There is no tube from this area after about 12 midnight. I'll obtain the official schedule for the hearing.

--The pub across closes at 23:00, 01:00pm on Fri and Sat according to Google Maps.

Other eateries close from 21:30!The pub and tube are the biggest draw at this largely vehicular intersection which is overly crowded throughout the day and evening until Heathrow traffic ceases-- around 23:00/23:30.

--This then means that the hours are being applied for mainly for delivery. Delivery causes immense nuisance at any time, but especially late at night and into the small hours, let alone until 3am or 4am. Fulham is being run over by delivery companies pushing for 24-hours. Fulham is residents. Residents need sleep.

Delivery is therefore nuisance-creating of the highest order; noise nuisance, emissions nuisance, anti-social behaviour of gangs of riders/drivers of delivery scooters/vehicles and public safety issues in our residential roads with L-plated drivers and any delivery drivers zooming through roads the wrong way, the correct way, on pavements, you name it, they know how to deliver as quickly as possible.

Fulham is being taken over by this new Delivery Economy and we residents request the Licensing Subcommittee to find ways to curtail this nuisance as residents need some sleep in this big city of cities, in our residential roads. Our only chance to sleep is between 23:00 and 04:30. Why?

I quote from the LHR website:

"At Heathrow we do not have any scheduled departures between 22:50 - 06:00 or scheduled arrivals between 22:55 - 04:40.

This means that there are no scheduled flights after 22:55 and before 04:40.

Heathrow also has a voluntary ban in place that prevents flights scheduled between 04:30 - 06:00 from landing before 04:30."

We reserve our right to comment further.

We ask the Committee to reject this application.

Tx.

██████████ for Barclay Road Conservation Area Neighbourhood Watch (Barclay Road Residents)

██████████

Comments were submitted at 24/10/2023 4:34 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Proposal: Licensing Act - Premises Licence

Case Officer: Ms Lorna McKenna

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Residents Group

Stance: Customer objects to the Licensing Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 24/10/2023 4:34 PM We strongly object to this license application requesting opening hours until 3am on Sunday to Thursday and 04.00am Friday's and Saturday's. This premises is already trading way outside of a Take-Away Business Framework Hours (until 23.00). From their application its clear that they are gearing this specifically for late night take away delivery service - which they already offer until 1am with the likes of Uber Eats, Just Eats etc. The NER and its many residential side streets is populated by hardworking professionals, families with young children and older people that require a full night's sleep - the noise of scooters, and the noise at point of delivery (talking with customers, ringing doorbells, opening and closing doors etc), is amplified ten-fold during crucial sleeping hours and will negatively impact resident's ability to sleep.

To sanction such late-night hours would condemn residents to noise and nuisance and commercial activity via dispatch/delivery motorbike riders well beyond normal business hours and well into the essential time for sleep for young and old alike. It also poses a real risk of exacerbating crime and disorder. This section of This area of NER in particular has a high crime rate as shown MET Police UK data statistics.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED] n Behalf of Seagrave Road Residents Association

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 2:57 PM
To: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>
Subject: Chicken Cottage (2023/01489/LAPR)

2023/01489/LAPR
Chicken Cottage, 82 North End Road, London W14 9ES
Deadline: 20th October 2023
Current licence: 2023/00770/LAPR

Please find attached my representation regarding the above licensing application. I am writing as a local resident. My address is [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this representation. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

2023/01489/LAPR

Chicken Cottage, 82 North End Road, London W14 9ES

Deadline: 20th October 2023

Current licence: 2023/00770/LAPR

[REDACTED]

Introduction

1. I am writing to you to object to the above licensing application. I am a nearby resident and am therefore very familiar with the business in question.
2. In my representation, I will refer repeatedly to the LBHF "Statement of Licensing Policy 2022-2027". For brevity, I will shorten this to "the SLP".
3. I encourage the Licensing Committee to reject this application on the following statutory grounds.
 - a. The prevention of public nuisance
 - b. The prevention of crime and disorder
 - c. Promotion of public safety

4. My letter of objection will cover these points in more detail below. In doing this, I will highlight other significant issues including the cumulative impact of late-night takeaway opening and delivery is having on local residents.
5. Key objections include the following. However, my representation should be read in full as it provides additional objections and evidence to justify these points.
 - a. The hours requested (and currently granted) are excessive for a restaurant in a residential area – and are beyond the guidelines in the SLP. The proposed hours will exacerbate problems with noise, nuisance, crime and disorder. No adequate reason is given to justify opening hours beyond the guidelines in the SLP.
 - b. The location of the takeaway – on a Red Route and close (20m) from a dangerous junction – means that it can't provide safe parking for delivery riders and customers.
 - c. The high concentration of fast-food delivery services (both operating in this area and passing through it) has a substantial cumulative impact on this high-density residential area.
 - d. In practice, fast-food takeaways have no control over the conduct of external delivery riders (Uber Eats, Deliveroo, etc). Any conditions that the Licensing Committee adds to control rider noise, parking, behaviour, etc. are useless as the applicant can't enforce them on the riders. As a result, it is impossible to prevent public nuisance to local residents.
6. In their application form, the applicant lists many conditions which they feel could be removed. As a local resident, I also object to these changes and provide my reasons below.

General Points

7. Chicken Cottage is a fast-food takeaway at the top of North End Road, adjacent to the junction with Talgarth Road. It is situated inside the Red Route restrictions for Talgarth Road (which extend past its front door). In addition, North End Road is a priority bus route.
8. The pavement outside Chicken Cottage is often thick with grease from the refuse from Chicken Cottage. A disused phone box directly outside (now a cash machine) has become a site for fly-posting. Both are visible in the photos below. These have an adverse effect on the local neighbourhood.
9. The takeaway is directly opposite the Famous Three Kings pub. This is a very large venue which operates as a sports bar, specialising in screening live TV events. As a result, it routinely hosts large crowds and late-night events (including frequent TENS).
10. The takeaway is in a high-density residential area and has several stories of residential properties directly above. This is also visible in the photos below.
11. There have been multiple complaints to the Licensing department about Chicken Cottage, pointing out that it has been operating in breach of its existing allowed hours.



The Prevention of Noise and Nuisance

12. Allowing Chicken Cottage to open late (particularly on Friday and at weekends) will dramatically increase the noise levels in the area as it will attract cars, motorbikes, scooters and groups of people to the locality. The extension being requested by the applicant is excessive (too long and over too many days) and will cause substantial disruption to local residents. It is inappropriate – particularly in a high-density residential area – for the current application to treat 03:00 or 04:00 as normal opening hours. We particularly object to this application treating Sunday as a suitable night for extended late-night activity as this noise would disrupt residents and their children who need to be at work and school on Mondays.
13. The SLP (pages 21-22) indicates that takeaways are “not considered appropriate” in a residential area and suggests a closing time of **00:30 on Friday/Saturday** and **23:30 on Sunday** for a takeaway in a mixed-use area. We feel that it would be inappropriate for the applicant to be granted an extension beyond these guidelines – and would need to be justified by the Licensing Committee in their decision letter, particularly if it grants the extremely late opening requested by the applicant (or a compromise which still exceeds these SLP guidelines).
14. The proximity to the Famous Three Kings pub (and the size of that venue) also needs to be taken into consideration in setting the opening hours for Chicken Cottage otherwise it will attract large intoxicated late-night crowds. This “symbiotic” relationship between the Famous Three Kings and Chicken Cottage is well established as the takeaway will regularly arrange TENs which match those of the pub – and say in its TENs application that it is “requesting to trade late due to local events and customer base”. If the opening hours of Chicken Cottage exceed those of the Three Kings, there is a severe risk of noise and nuisance to local residents as large intoxicated crowds will leave the pub at closing time and migrate to Chicken Cottage as the only open shop/takeaway nearby.
15. Because of the close relationship between the takeaway and the pub, this antisocial behaviour is also likely to occur before the closing time of the Famous Three Kings. Customers from the pub cross the road to use the takeaway and they share a similar clientele in a similar state of intoxication. The pub has security inside and at the door to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour. Although the proposed licensing conditions for the takeaway contain some relating to CCTV and security, these are not strict enough to prevent noise, nuisance and criminal activity. Any criminal or antisocial behaviour from the pub is just “exported” to the Chicken Cottage, where security is far more lax.
16. Delivery riders form another source of noise, nuisance and antisocial behaviour. Although the overall number of delivery orders has grown, the number of riders has risen even more quickly and these riders are now competing more aggressively for orders. It is now common to see scores of delivery riders parked outside (or near to) takeaway restaurants so that they can be the first in line when an order comes in (the delivery matching software seems to prioritise riders who can collect the quickest which favours those loitering outside). These communities of waiting riders seem to develop their own social scene based on shared language, background, or circumstances. I am concerned that extending the late-night opening will lead to this premises becoming one of these “congregation spots” which will cause a substantial late-night disruption to local residents living above nearby. As stated elsewhere, Chicken Cottage is with Red Route restrictions – and this means that riders will congregate in/on this Red Route or in neighbouring residential streets if they want to avoid these restrictions.

17. The applicant states in their application letter (under “Prevention of public nuisance”) that they will ensure that vehicles will turn off their engines and lights and minimise noise when outside the shop. However, at the Fresh Pizza hearing (2022/01970/LAPR), the applicants in that case said that, in practice, they have no control over the delivery riders – the riders operate on a self-employed basis and are therefore not employed by the delivery company or the takeaway. As a result, these applicant’s reassurances – and any similar conditions that the Committee places on the premises licence – are unenforceable by the licensee and therefore worthless.
18. I note that this “Prevention of public nuisance” section says that the applicant will “ensure that the immediate area is a clean and welcoming place”. This is clearly contradicted by the grease-stained pavements which are regularly found outside this premises.
19. This section also mentions litter patrols in the immediate area. However, this ignores their existing Condition 37 which specifies a much wider area. I regard Condition 37 as it is currently worded to be inadequate as it just specifies litter collections along Talgarth Road. For a start, this ignores litter on North End Road (both north and south of the Talgarth Road junction) – and only requires the collection to be done once per day (at a time that is hard to monitor/enforce). In addition, it is unlikely that customers will be consuming food as they walk these main roads – they are more likely to sit, stand or park in the local residential streets and dispose of their rubbish there (either in the street or a garden). As a result, Condition 37 should define a more appropriate area – perhaps listing all local streets north/south of the junction or requiring all residential streets within a certain area or radius are checked each day.
20. The following image, taken from the Chicken Cottage site shows the catchment area for this branch, which is extremely large – stretching as far as Chiswick, White City, Wandsworth and Hyde Park. The prospective number of deliveries in this catchment area is likely to be very high and this will cause a substantial disruption to local LBHF residents (both in the vicinity of Chicken Cottage and along its delivery routes. This catchment area contains many other fast-food takeaways and overlaps substantially with another Chicken Cottage franchise – so is already well-served for delivery services. There is therefore no need to extend the opening hours for the current applicant – particularly as this would breach the guidelines in the SLP and result in a large quantity of late-night delivery traffic in a residential area, which would be parking in a Red Route restriction at a dangerous junction.
21. Although Chicken Cottage is in a high-density residential neighbourhood, many of these premises are HMOs or other accommodation with high turnover of occupants. The residents are less likely to recognise licensing breaches or make a licensing complaint. As a result, the Licensing Committee should not treat the absence of previous complaints as a sign that the premises have been operating correctly or have not already caused noise, disturbance or crime.



Prevention of Crime and Disorder

22. The connection between fast-food takeaways and crime/anti-social behaviour is well established. They act as a magnet which attracts crime to the local area. The recent drug arrests at a premises adjacent to Pizza Pronto (250m from Chicken Cottage) stands as clear example of this.
23. Over recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in the levels of graffiti in the local area, particularly along Talgarth Road (towards Earls Court) and underground tracks (towards Barons Court and Hammersmith) – both adjacent to Chicken Cottage.
24. In assessing this issue of crime and disorder, the Licensing committee should also consider the conduct of the business in question. The SLP (page 9) says that LBHF wants to “improve the local business community by enforcing against those businesses that don’t operate well, are breaking the law and do not contribute to making the borough safe and orderly”. I believe that this aim is undermined if the applicant is granted a licence which would allow extended opening hours.
25. Page 39 of the SLP says that the Licensing Authority should consider: “xvi. The history of previous nuisance complaints proved against the premises, particularly where statutory notices have been served on the present licence holder”. Likewise, Annex 4 of the SLP (page 52) indicates that one of the grounds for reviewing an existing premises licence is “frequently operating outside permitted hours”. It is my understanding that the Licensing department has received multiple complaints within the past year about the premises being open beyond its permitted hours.
26. My comment above about antisocial behaviour from the Famous Three Kings pub being “exported” to the takeaway also applies to criminal activity. For instance, the Famous Three

Kings (like most pubs) has a zero-tolerance attitude to drug dealing on its premises, so it can more easily take place offsite at the Chicken Cottage takeaway.

27. I note that the measures suggested by the applicant in the “Protection of children” section focus purely on protecting their own premises from damage. Their stated “challenge” policy does not refuse service – it merely limits underage customers to take-out service only. This protects the Chicken Cottage from antisocial behaviour but “exports” the problem to the local streets as these customers will have nowhere else to consume their takeaways (or dispose of their litter).

Road Safety

28. Chicken Cottage is 20m from the junction of North End Road and Talgarth Road. Talgarth Road is a Red Route with no stopping at any time. This Red Route restriction extends around 50m to the north and south of this junction. Chicken Cottage is therefore covered by these Red Route restrictions on parking and stopping. This is clearly visible in the pictures provided.
29. The North End Road/Talgarth Road junction is an accident blackspot. There have been several serious accidents at this junction over recent years involving pedestrians and cyclists, some of these fatal. Congestion at this junction has led to drivers using other residential streets as a “rat run” – leading to a similar serious accident on Charleville Road involving a cyclist and a truck. It has also led to drivers and riders performing illegal manoeuvres to avoid congestion – queue jumping, illegal turns and U-turns, taking shortcuts over the pavement and against traffic, etc.
30. Chicken Cottage is clearly within on a Red Route (and within Red Route restrictions) and is less than 20m from this dangerous junction. Because of this, there is no safe and legal place for delivery riders and customers at Chicken Cottage to park outside the takeaway.
31. The only alternative parking (outside of the Red Route restriction) is on nearby residential streets. No adequate offstreet parking exists so if delivery riders and customers park elsewhere, rather than outside Chicken Cottage, this will cause disturbance to local residents.
32. The Licencing Committee cannot ignore the Red Route in the reviewing the current application. Although Red Routes are enforced by TfL, the police and traffic wardens, it has a responsibility to not grant licences where this would encourage illegal (or anti-social) parking or compromise road safety. While not noted in the decision letter, the issue of Red Routes was a path of questioning which was following by the Licensing Committee during the hearing for 2022/01970/LAPR.
33. The North End Road/Talgarth Road junction has a number of turning restrictions (e.g. no right turn from North End Road northbound, a separately controlled filter from Talgarth Road eastbound). Delivery riders are more likely than other road users to ignore these restrictions and compromise their own safety and that of others – for instance, by doing illegal turns/U-turns or jumping to the head of the Talgarth Road filter.
34. On a related matter, delivery riders are also a risk to pedestrians. Delivery riders on electric bikes often use the pavement, and ride at high speed with little care or consideration for the safety of pedestrians. In my experience, delivery companies are uncooperative when there is a complaint – the delivery rider is self-employed and the delivery company cannot/will not help to identify a rider who has had a “hit and run” collision with pedestrian. This is one reason why restrict takeaways to electric vehicles only is an ineffective measure – it reduces

the localised noise disturbance from the vehicles (but not from their riders), but increases the risk to pedestrians.

Precedent

35. Regarding “precedents”, I feel that the Licensing Committee should not take the opening hours of other nearby fast-food takeaways into account when considering the current application. Given the concentration of fast-food takeaways in the local area, I am concerned that granting these extended hours would create a precedent and that other establishments in the area would want to follow suit. This approach (using “precedent”) does not create a “level playing field” – but instead leads to a “race to the bottom” as each takeaway will request longer and longer late-night extensions. This is detrimental to local residents in the long term. This is why the Licensing Committee should refuse applications on the basis that they are “just a bit later” than other nearby takeaways. This causes a “drift” towards ever later opening hours. The guidelines in the SLP should always take precedent – and opening hours in residential/mixed-use areas which are excess of these guidelines should only be granted rarely and with a clear explanation of what special circumstances allow this exception.
36. The use of local precedents also leads to an over-concentration of late-night delivery services in certain areas: once one fast-food outlet in an area has late-night opening, all of the others apply for the same – whereas another area can avoid it completely if they don’t grant the first late-night license. This allows some residential areas to be blighted by late-night takeaways while other wards flourish. To avoid this inequality, the Licensing Committee should consider decisions across the whole of LBHF, not just the immediate vicinity or the local ward – and if similar extended hours (03:00 or 04:00) have been refused in other residential areas in the Borough as they have been regarded as excessive (or denied on other grounds), they should not be allowed here.
37. While these late-night opening hours may be allowable in areas designated as city centre areas (e.g. Hammersmith Broadway), this should not create a precedent that allows similar opening hours in mixed-use or residential areas. There must be a clear distinction, in terms of late-night opening hours, between mixed-use/residential areas and city centre areas – and the opening hours in the residential areas should not be allowed to “drift” incrementally so that they end up matching those of the formally designated city centre zones.
38. In addition, the formally defined city centres zones also have extra resources (policing, CCTV, etc) allocated to them to prevent crime and disorder – the mixed-use/residential areas do not have these. It is therefore inappropriate for the mixed-use/residential areas to “drift” towards similar opening hours as the city centres without giving them the same protections. This “exports” antisocial behaviour from city centres areas to the residential areas as the latter have less protection.

Cumulative Impact

39. I would like to also highlight the cumulative impact of fast-food takeaways in this area (particularly in terms of public nuisance and crime and disorder) – and would encourage the Licensing Committee to take this into consideration when considering my representation and rejecting the current application.

40. The SLP lists (on page 8) “a sustainable, well-run licensed sector” as one of its three key themes. However, I feel that this sustainability can be undermined (at a local/street level) if there is an overemphasis on one type of business (particularly fast-food takeaways/deliveries).
41. This area close to Chicken Cottage (around the North End Road/Talgarth Road junction) is a high-density residential area, but has an extremely high concentration of fast-food takeaways offering late-night service or late-night delivery. A quick survey includes the following (incomplete) list:
 - a. Six pizza takeaways (Fresh Pizza, Pizza Pronto, Domino’s, Venice Pizzeria, Maurizio Barca, and Casa Bardotti)
 - b. Two fried chicken takeaways (Chicken Cottage and Chicken Shack)
 - c. Three kebab takeaways (Rihan Valley, Best Mangal, Best Mangal 1996)
42. Other local businesses add to the number of delivery riders collecting from this vicinity. These include:
 - a. Several local “mini” supermarkets. The Sainsbury’s Local at North End Crescent does a very large volume of delivery trade and it is rare to be in the shop without a delivery order being assembled/collected at the same time. Other mini supermarkets also provide delivery orders.
 - b. A Gorillas distribution hub in Challoner Crescent with parking for 13 motorcycles.
 - c. A glance at Google Maps suggests there are also delivery business being operated out of purely residential properties. For instance, it shows a 24-hour pharmacy delivery service and a 24-hour wine/alcohol delivery service based in Matheson Road.
43. Delivery traffic passing through this area also adds to the cumulative impact. The North End Road and Talgarth Road junction will, for example, handle all of the delivery traffic for the following common routes:
 - a. Orders served in Hammersmith and beyond, heading east or south (e.g. to Earls Court, Chelsea, Fulham, etc.)
 - b. Orders served in Fulham Broadway or North End Road and heading north.
 - c. Orders from Earls Court and beyond, heading west (e.g. to Hammersmith, etc).
 - d. Orders served in Shepherd’s Bush etc and heading south.
44. Some of this delivery traffic will use residential streets or pavements. For instance:
 - a. A rider going from Hammersmith to Earls Court may use Edith Road and other residential streets as a shortcut, rather than the main roads.
 - b. Mopeds will ride over the pavement at the end of the Edith Villas cul de sac to get to Talgarth Road in order to avoid the red light at the junction.
 - c. Electric cycles will ride on the pavement along Talgarth Road between North End Road and Warwick Road.
45. Conditions placed by the Licensing Committee to limit the disruption of delivery riders are ineffective and, in some cases, counterproductive. For instance, if deliveries are restricted to electric bikes, these are more likely to ride on the pavement at high speed and cause a danger to pedestrians.
46. The cumulative effect of these takeaways (and the late-night “delivery economy” as a whole) is having a detrimental effect on this residential neighbourhood. The foreword to the SLP mentions (page 3) creating a “a diverse, vibrant and safe night-time economy” night-time economy and goes on to say “[w]e want to make H&F an even more attractive place to live, work and visit; so that restaurants, cafes, bars and other licensed hospitality premises can profit”. On page 4, it says “[w]e believe the policy strikes a balance between providing an

environment within which responsible business operators can succeed and contribute towards a vibrant business and thriving night-time economy in a sustainable way - promoting economic growth whilst protecting residential amenity”.

47. Having a residential area with an excessively high concentration of delivery-focused fast-food takeaways seems incompatible with this aim of promoting a diverse and sustainable hospitality sector (a varied mix of thriving local businesses). It likewise seems incompatible with the aim of protecting residential amenities or nurturing local communities.
48. To ensure a vibrant and sustainable local environment, the Licensing Committee needs to consider the mix of restaurants in an area (particularly the number of delivery-oriented fast-food takeaways in relation to the number of sit-down restaurants), not just the number of restaurants compared to other types of business.
49. It is the sit-down restaurants which contribute most to creating a vibrant local community (and to local employment), but these can be “squeezed out” of a neighbourhood by fast-food takeaways. The pandemic had a great impact on the hospitality sector, but it affected these sit-down restaurants the most – fast-food takeaways and delivery services thrived. As a result, it is these sit-down restaurants which now need the most support.
50. If a takeaway claims that it can only survive by taking late-night delivery orders, then this is an indication that the area is already over-saturated with similar takeaway businesses. The Licensing Committee should not extend their hours simply to support an otherwise unsustainable business – this does not contribute to “business resilience” or an overall “robust and thriving cultural and leisure sector” (SLP page 7).

Removal of existing conditions

51. In their application form, the applicant lists many conditions which they feel could be removed (this information is in the PDF version, not on the website). I see no justification for removing these existing conditions.
 - a) As a general observation, it appears that the applicant is objecting to all fire safety requirements, which seems reckless given that they are operating a restaurant (which, by definition, will deal with open flames and hot oil) and which is open to the public for up to 17 hours per day.
 - b) Many of these conditions (e.g. providing toilet facilities for customers) appear to be in their current licence. If the applicant is not already satisfying these conditions, they have operating in breach of their licence.
 - c) There seems no logic to removing conditions which have been agreed to in the current licence and (presumably) have been complied with. Having agreed to the conditions before, it seems untenable for the applicant to now argue that they are unreasonable or impossible to comply with – while at the same time arguing for an additional extension.
 - d) This question (in the application form) asks about conditions which “could be removed as a consequence of the proposed variation you are seeking”. As the applicant seems only to be seeking a variation to extend the licensed opening hours, this does not seem to provide any justification for removing/relaxing the existing conditions. The application does not make any variation in operation which renders an existing condition redundant or superfluous – and as a result, the Licensing

Committed should therefore refuse on this basis any change to the existing conditions. The extended hours being sought, if anything, should require tighter conditions, fuller compliance, and closer monitoring.

- e) If the applicant feels that their existing measures are adequate to satisfy certain requirements (e.g. Condition 25), then they should discuss this the Licensing department and see if they agree – it is not a reason to remove the condition.

52. Regarding the removal of specific conditions:

- a) Condition 4. It seems routine practice for staff to be identifiable as such, including at fast food restaurants. It is not intrusive or inappropriate and seems a necessary step to operate a well-run business. Without this condition, requiring Council-approved name badges, staff cannot be distinguished from customers or delivery riders. This would render other conditions more difficult to monitor and enforce.
- b) Condition 5: Again, this is routine practice and not intrusive. This is also another reason why staff need to be identifiable with name badges.
- c) Condition 7: It does not seem unreasonable for a restaurant that wants to open for 17 hours per day to provide a public toilet. Omitting this condition, would lead to public urination (from delivery riders and customers), particularly if additional late-night opening is allowed. As this condition forms part of the existing licence, I would question why it hasn't already been complied with.
- d) Condition 8: Providing disabled facilities is now the norm. This condition therefore does not seem unreasonable, particularly as sanitary facilities for the able-bodied are provided (condition 7).
- e) Conditions 11-17: While these fire-related conditions may fall within the area of expertise of LFB, it is useful to retain them as part of the licensing conditions. There is certainly no harm in retaining this dual responsibility as this would enable these conditions to be jointly monitored by the Licensing department and form part of their routine inspection (particularly in the event of a breach of other conditions). This provides an additional safety net for the public. It is unclear whether LFB proactively monitor compliance.
- f) Conditions 18/19: If the applicant regards these as "common sense", it is unclear why they should want them to be removed. As a premises open to the public, I feel that it is essential that the licence has conditions to ensure the safety of the public.
- g) Conditions 25 and 30-32: It is unclear why the applicant objects to these entirely reasonable fire-related safety measures. The provision of emergency lighting, particularly of the exits, seems to be an essential safety measure.
- h) Conditions 26/27: This is required to ensure electrical safety. It is unclear how the business can operate without already having this type of safety inspection and electrical certification. This causes safety concerns in other areas, particularly fire prevention and control.
- i) Conditions 33/34: It is unclear how the applicant can provide suitable escape lighting to satisfy Condition 35 (and others) without the batteries listed here. This condition should therefore be retained to ensure that the escape lighting remains in working order. The applicant does not object to Condition 35.
- j) Condition 39: This requirement must remain. Being near a busy road does not allow local business to make as much noise as they want.
- k) Condition 41: I see no reason to remove this condition. It provides a safety net in case modifications/repairs are made without planning permission.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Licensing Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided

Comments were submitted at 19/10/2023 7:46 AM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Proposal: Licensing Act - Premises Licence

Case Officer: Ms Lorna McKenna

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email:

Address: [REDACTED]

l)

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Licensing Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 19/10/2023 7:46 AM Non-vital deliveries at anti-social times are simply not necessary. The harm which they cause is not only at the point of collection but also at the point of delivery.. At the point of collection, there is the noise of motor bikes arriving, doors opening and shutting, inevitable conversation, motor bikes starting, and driving off. At the point of delivery there is the noise of motor bikes arriving, doorbells being rung, conversation on Entryphone, doors opening and shutting, motor bikes starting, and driving off. This inevitably disturbs the sleep of neighbouring residents, including children who deserve the protection of the licencing authority.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 8:47 PM
To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>
Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>; Barclay Residents Subject: Deadline Oct 20 2023/01489/LAPR: Chicken Cottage: 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

If I am unable to attend the hearing, I appoint my neighbour [REDACTED] or her representative to represent me or take my five minutes at the hearing.

Lorna,

I am strongly against this application for any extended hours under Prevention of Nuisance, Prevention of Crime, and Public Safety, currently they are open til 1am and they wish to extend to 3am sun to thurs and 4am friday and Saturday. The application is also to change the opening hour from 10.30 to 10am, resulting in noise, pollution, litter and disturbance across Fulham during these hours, often at least one hour after closing.

I strongly object to this, having witnessed the considerable noise and nuisance of other delivery outlets on the same street. They keep residents awake late at night, for example, I have witnessed Morley's Chicken on the North End Road still with several people (presumably staff) inside it, over one hour after the supposed closing time.

This causes traffic on the street and noise when the people leave the premises. Indeed, if the business is open til 4am on a weekend then it is not inconceivable that antisocial behaviour could occur well past 4.30am, as patrons finish up their food outside the joint. The importance of sleep to our wellbeing cannot be stressed enough. Additionally, as LBHF is already the Borough with the highest level of noise pollution, this will only make matters worse.

Furthermore, I have witnessed delivery drivers fighting each other, stealing parcels, leering at young women, driving the wrong way down the one way street, urinating in front gardens and littering on the streets where they wait (see Haldane Road for reference).

There is already a plethora of chicken shops in Fulham, to the detriment of its residents. they provide very little benefit to the nighttime economy, and only cause harm and distress to the borough's council tax paying residents.

Lastly, the Talgarth Road area is not suitable for such late night activity given there is no room for delivery bikes causing a severe issue of public safety especially with regard to traffic.

Based on the above, I ask the Licensing Committee to please reject this application.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Licensing Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 19/10/2023 11:50 PM from [REDACTED].

Application Summary

Address: 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Proposal: Licensing Act - Premises Licence

Case Officer: Ms Lorna McKenna

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

Email:

Address: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Licensing Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 19/10/2023 11:50 PM This application is yet another outrageous attempt by a local business to operate between the hours of 12 midnight to 06:00 at the detriment of locals getting a good night's sleep. The establishment cannot

prove the business case for the increase in hours and cannot define their customer base. In reality, they are most likely serving those who are drunk and high on drugs that would need to eat chicken at these early morning hours so this would perpetuate noise, anti-social behaviour and nuisance for Fulham. I fully object to this application and would look to the council that it does not meet the 4 licensing objectives to warrant the proposed increase in hours.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Licensing Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 19/10/2023 2:56 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address: 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Proposal: Licensing Act - Premises Licence

Case Officer: Ms Lorna McKenna

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Licensing Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 19/10/2023 2:56 PM I strongly object to the proposed new opening times for Chicken Cottage. This area of Fulham is primarily a residential area and these extended opening hours will lead to noise nuisance not just from the increased footfall but the delivery riders coming and going. A huge number of people have Ring doorbells so they can see who is at their door but they are very loud and intrusive. Late night opening will also attract people who will probably have been late night drinking and we know from other premises on the North End Road that this attracts anti social behaviour, drug dealing and increased crime levels. We know from existing "venues" that open late that there is also an increase in unsavoury behaviour - customers and delivery drivers urinating and defecating in people's gardens.
There seems to be a constant pressure to open these premises later

with very little thought put in to how this might affect the local residents

Dear Sir/Madam,

Licensing Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 22/10/2023 1:33 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	82 North End Road London W14 9ES
Proposal:	Licensing Act - Premises Licence
Case Officer:	Ms Lorna McKenna

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	
Address:	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	Neighbour
------------	-----------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Licensing Application
---------	-----------------------------------------------

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 22/10/2023 1:33 PM As a neighbour having lived in [REDACTED] and also have commercial premises within the area and a proud resident of the [REDACTED], I object to this late night license on the grounds stated below.

1. Delivery Drivers Accumulating at the Junction: The presence of a significant number of delivery drivers at the junction of Barons Court Road and North End Road can lead to congestion and blockage of traffic. This can not only inconvenience residents but also affect the overall safety and flow of vehicles in the area. It's important to address how the late-night license might impact this situation and what measures will be in place to mitigate it.

2. Delivery Drivers Accumulating at the Junction: The presence of a significant number of delivery drivers at the junction of Barons Court Road and North End Road can lead to congestion and blockage of traffic. This can not only inconvenience residents but also affect the overall safety and flow of vehicles in the area. It's important to address how the late-night license might impact this situation and what measures will be in place to mitigate it.

3. Traffic Flow onto A4 Cromwell Road: It's crucial to ensure that any activities associated with the late-night license do not impede the flow of traffic onto the A4 Cromwell Road. The existence of a double red line outside the premises suggests that the traffic regulations should be strictly enforced. Any adverse effects on traffic flow should be considered in the decision-making process.

4. Residential Flats Above the Premises: The presence of several residential flats above the premises at 82 North End Road is a valid concern. Late-night activities, such as noise and disturbances, can have a significant impact on the quality of life for these residents.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, October 22, 2023 7:35 PM
To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>; Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER Resident Objection

2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER deadline 25 October 2023

Dear Lorna

Please accept this email as my written OBJECTION to the above application where the Applicant runs a takeaway/sandwich shop. I am and have been for 23 years a resident at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

My principal concerns are:

1. This is yet another application for late night opening hours, in this case, to 3 or 4 am. Between my house and the Application Site there are 21 takeaways (including Chicken Cottage) and 11 other retail sites on the NER that use delivery/dispatch riders as a means of sale/service offering and a primary way to secure business. So 32 sites in total. Delivery riders leaving the Application Site can be on my road [REDACTED] (quicker if they speed). All the roads off the NER are, [REDACTED], 100% residential roads, and the Statement of Licensing Policy (SLP) requires special regard to be given to the proximity to residential roads. As residents we witness daily from 6 am through to late at night (when all ambient noise has gone) the constant noise and nuisance that residents have imposed upon them. At any one time anything from 10 – 30+ delivery bikes are on our road. None of these are electric. They are noisy, highly revved, dirty, often idling polluting bikes. The road is used as a huge cut through route to Dawes, Lille, Munster, Fulham Palace, Fulham, Kings roads and many others. It is regularly the case that I can stand outside my house and watch as 3-4 bikes process at intervals along the entire length of our road like flights backed into Heathrow! Riders rarely stay under the speed limit and are in 99% of cases L-plate drivers. They don't look when pulling out, they turn into and out of roads on the wrong side of the road and at speed, they don't stop and wait or signal, they force issues by driving aggressively, process dangerously quickly down the middle of the NER when traffic is at a standstill in both lanes, they hoot each other when they see their mates whether at 6 am or 11pm or later waking up our children and family members who are trying to sleep. They get angry with drivers who don't give them what they think they are "entitled" to (they are after all incentivised to deliver food as quickly as possible). They block/fill residents parking bays (for which residents must register and pay (paying more for non-electric vehicles) – they don't), they race along roads and play roulette as they try to process at speed through slim spaces on double - parked roads. They believe that they don't have to stop at zebra crossings and that none of the rules of the road apply to them. They litter, urinate, and play music when they are

waiting for jobs. They make threatening and abusive comments to young girls and women walking home (██████████ do not feel safe near them). They are not considerate neighbours who live on the street or are visiting friends on the road – they have no reason to be respectful and take advantage of this. Overrun by huge numbers our road has become their "office", the place where they carry on a commercial activity on the door step of residential homes. Sleep is broken every night. It is well evidenced that children perform significantly less well at school without proper sleep and as adults we all know that sleep deprivation impacts our work, productivity, our mental health, personalities, and all aspects of our personal, social and other relationships. Residents have had cars scratched and delivery bicycle riders regularly ride on the pavements on our road and on the NER. Think how different this would be if all delivery/dispatch motorbikes were required to be electric bikes, they had to register and pay a fee like residents (thereby helping to minimise the rogue riders and sift out those who don't take the rules seriously), and if they could only reapply to register to operate in LBHF if, after six months, they had to also converted their L plate into a full license? This application makes it clear that the extended opening hour will facilitate the delivery part of their takeaway business and this will impact residents adversely for the reasons given above. Please take into account the sheer **impact** that licensing 32 retail sites all dependant on delivery/despatch, will have on residents during the critical and sensitive hours when sleep (a necessity) is critical as opposed to the luxury of one person on a road having a pizza delivered;

2. The very real occurrence and threat of **crime and disorder** taking place in and around late-night activity and where the delivery bike riders gather. Sadly, we witness large amounts of drug sales in the immediate vicinity. The NER is widely classified as a crime hotspot. Let's be honest the Police are under resourced and not available to patrol our streets and protect residents. Late night hours mean places stay open later, create meeting places for the good and the bad, create a space and opportunity late at night when the Police cannot actively patrol the vicinity during the current opening hours. Late night hours just create more hours in which all the evidence is that greater drug and crime activity will take place in our vicinity. Sadly too many of us have had to clear up vomit from outside our houses, wash away the smell of urine, witness fights on our roads, been abused and threatened by dealers and others when they are asked to move on or turn down the volume on their car's stereo sound systems. The environment, if permitted, of late-night food establishments just provides the cover for this type of activity;
3. For the reasons referred to above the situation described above impacts and threatens the **prevention of harm to children** in a real way – both in the spectre of increased crime and constant inescapable noise well beyond their bedtime. Not everyone can/has the option to move their children to the back bedroom in their house or flat to mitigate the noise;
4. I am deeply concerned by the fact that the application evidences a total lack of regard, awareness, or consideration by the Applicant to any of the key licensing objectives applied to their site, the reality of what the community outside their front door experiences and with no reference to or assessment of the impact that late hours will have on/ the position of residents. Of the 42 offered "conditions" none make any meaningful or enforceable attempt to address the real issues. We are told that they will display their prices (condition 6), that staff will be easily identifiable (4), they will have fire extinguishers (9), boards won't block points of access (23), they will have lighting (24), they will charge a storage battery (33), and ventilators will be kept clean (38) – aren't all these taken as read as basic requirements hardly worthy of mention? Does the Applicant believe that these address any of the issues that are posed by late night hours? We all know that notices (38) are entirely useless and

that the Applicant has not control of what happens outside/off the site. Is this lip service being paid to the real requirements of the SLP?

5. I believe that six similar applications for late hours (in no particular order, Swimming Pig, Selekt Chicken, Papa John's 1 and 2, Morleys and Gillans) have been made since mid-late 2022 and all have been rejected by the Licensing Committee (LC). Whilst the Committee is not bound by any previous decision, I cannot see any feature of this Application that distinguishes it in any way from the requests for late night hours that, in all these cases, were rejected. Therefore, I would ask the Committee to consistently apply the approach taken by earlier recent committees in reaching a finding on this Application. If the Applicant does not withdraw this application, then I will refer the Committee to the detail of one or two of these decisions at any hearing;
6. I note that larger takeaway providers on the NER (McDonalds, KFC, Nandos) are not permitted the late hours that this Applicant is seeing; and
7. If the Applicant adds to, varies, changes or in any way supplements their submission prior to the hearing then I reserve the right to make further representations. Please ask the Applicant
8. Please reject the application as it breaches at least three of the four licensing objectives.

Thank you.

██████████

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2023 12:47 PM

To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: Ref: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 North End Road, Resident Objection

Dear Lorna

Ref: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 North End Road, **Resident Objection**

I am writing on behalf of Vanston Place Management Company, who look after the interests of the residents of Dungannon House, a block of 42 residential apartments fronting onto Vanston Place.

In our building we have babies, toddlers, school children and adults right through the the elderly, around 100 in total. Plus good few dogs and cats. A mixed group of residents, happy to live in a vibrant area like this, but we all do need our sleep. In particular we have 12 flats with 24 bedrooms along the front of the building. Residents of these flats are already disturbed late into the night from those exiting the Wolf Pack and most notably Simmonds. However after that the general noise in the area lessens and it is quiet. We do not need this to be broken by delivery scooters zapping back and forth in front of our building. We know they will do this as Vanston Place is an illegal cut through from the NER to Fulham Broadway, saving them time, by missing several sets of traffic lights and a roundabout. (Picture of signage attached).

The majority of all scooter delivery drivers in our area appear to be Leanners, is there anything the Council can do to insist upon tests being taken. So the drivers that do zoom around H&F are fully conversant with the Highway Code.

Our building is 10 years old and has been built to current building regulations so is highly insulated, and we therefore need to open windows day and night. For example this summer my flat reached 30C before breakfast. Open windows are essential, so it will be impossible for us to blank out the noise from scooters. Sleep is already hard to come by in Fulham as the planes start so early, but please allow us some time when this streets remain quiet. It is a human right to be allowed sleep.

Their current license allowing them to stay open until 1pm (2pm Friday and Saturdays) is late enough. The benefit of extended hours to the local community is completely out weighed by the noise and nuisance caused by creating a night kitchen and serviced by delivery drivers. All the residential roads off the NER are quiet at that time of the morning and delivery drivers on scooters arriving, ringing doorbells, hellos/goodbyes etc will wake people up and disturb sleep.

As to crime and disorder, the general increase in the 'deliveries by scooters' is proving taxing for our building as we have a recessed area in front of our garage, and almost on a daily basis we find people have urinated and sometimes defecated here. Although we have CCTV this doesn't seem to stop

them. Although hard to prove it does appear that more often than not, the culprits are delivery drivers, who presumably have no where else to relieve themselves. Which brings me onto my final point.

We are also very troubled by the request to remove some of the License conditions already in existence. In particular condition 7 relating to keeping loos clean and in working order with hand basins available. Why on earth would any respectable eating establishment want to remove this, surely it something that is a 'given' when starting a restaurant. This condition should never be removed from any restaurant. In fact we cannot see any reason why all the conditions should not remain in place.

We respectfully request that the current variations to the license be rejected on the grounds of **noise and nuisance** and also **crime and disorder**.

[REDACTED]

For and on behalf of

Vanston Place Management Company

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

PS>. Please could I have confirmation of receipt of this email



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2023 6:57 AM

To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER deadline 25 October 2023

Re: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER deadline 25 October 2023

Dear Lorna McKeena,

Please accept this email as my written OBJECTION to the above application where the Applicant runs a takeaway/sandwich shop, fully opposing to the late hours to the premises licenses application.

I represent Samuel Lewis Trust (SLT) Residential social housing estate where 270 flats house general social need families and supported housing for elderly and disabled. A large number of whom are vulnerable and isolated residents, and the majority include families with children. There are many, Anti-social behavioural problems with safeguarding and mental health aspects on this estate.

I live near Fulham Broadway, off North End Road, and am disturbed and fear the increasing noise and nuisance, crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour from those who frequent the local establishments. Living nearby to Fulham Broadway bus stops and Fulham tube station, revellers are attracted to this area, once the establishments, particularly on North End Road, are closed where there are many issues of anti-social behaviour late at night such as vomiting, urinating, fighting, noise.

The delivery scooters also collate in Fulham Broadway, and on Samuel Lewis Trust, are dangerous, noisy, pollutive and the drivers fight, argue, urinate and are abusive to particularly to women and girls.

I have video evidence and Police report of a driver urinating on SLT estate while a man pushing a young child in a pram is passing by and he can clearly be seen exposing himself. CAD 2991/28Jul23. This behaviour clearly impacts and threatens the protection of harm to children.

All these issues cause me disturbed sleep and make me feel unsafe. The estate of Samuel Lewis Trust is known locally for not having CCTV, it has many blind-spots and escape routes through blocks. Myself and my neighbours have issues with non-residents breaking into our communal gardens to congregate to drink, smoke weed and take drugs, and to urinate, defecate and vomit.

H&F councillors including Ben Coleman are fully aware of these long-term (last 15 years), ongoing issues experienced on Samuel Lewis Trust estate as he worked for many years with the residents and local agencies such as LETs team, Police, Walham Grove Neighbourhood Panel and Southern Housing Association.

SLT is situated just off Vanston Place and Fulham Broadway, and is a high density entertainment area services by 9 bus routes (2 are night buses) and London tube, with many pubs, clubs and restaurants in the local vicinity as well as Chelsea Football ground, Eel Brook Common and a local cinema and many shops, takeaways and restaurants.

This area is situated with close proximity to the travel links, and its residents are disproportionately affected by anti-social behaviour, especially from drunk, loud and rowdy revellers who frequent the area to urinate and vomit and congregate to travel, especially in the early hours, and also suffer from ASB delivery scooter drivers who also urinate and fight and have threatening behaviours on Vanston Place.

For the above reasons and that the Framework for town centres clearly states 11pm cut off time, I do not agree with the extended hours of this license, as this will further increase the ASB, crime disorder, noise and nuisance from the patrons and delivery drivers in our area.

Should this establishment's licensing hours be extended these issues will increase and exacerbate what we are already experiencing and will continue into the early morning hours.

If I am unable to attend the licensing hearing for this application, I ask [REDACTED] or his Representative to represent me, and anyone I may be representing, should other neighbours ask me to represent them.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 5:45 PM
To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>
Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>
Subject: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NRE Resident Objection

Dear Lorna

Ref: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER Resident Objection

Please accept this email as my written OBJECTION to the above application where the Applicant runs a takeaway/sandwich shop. I am writing in my capacity as Secretary of the Fulham Island Resident's Association (FIRA), and also as the owner of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

If I am unable to attend the hearing (date to be notified), I appoint [REDACTED] or her representative to use my five minutes.

My concerns are written under the headings of three of the four licensing objectives.

1. Prevention of crime and disorder

I am sure you are aware that the police have designated the NER as a "hotspot" for anti-social behaviour and disorder. Adding another takeaway, open until the early hours, when even the tubes have stopped running, can only add to the issue of public safety, in terms of people congregating on the pavements, and the potential for disorderly drunk customers. The police are under-resourced at the best of times – more potential for crime and disorder will only exacerbate their ability to police our streets safely.

2. Prevention of nuisance

The wards of Walham Green, Lillie Road and West Kensington consist of residential roads, all leading off the semi-residential / semi-commercial North End Road (NER).

As residents of Fulham, we are becoming increasingly concerned with the increase in the number of take-aways situated on the NER, and the noise nuisance this causes.

Not only in terms of the delivery drivers themselves, who seem to totally disregard road safety, cutting in front of cars, not signalling etc., and who are a clear danger to other road users and pedestrians, but the noise their (mostly L-plated) scooters make, especially during the quiet hours of the night, when residents are sleeping.

The drivers generate noise whilst they congregate waiting for take-aways to deliver; noise as they speed away and noise when they deliver.

My particular road – [REDACTED], despite being partly pedestrianised and despite a prominent notice stating “no through route to Fulham Road” (see attached photo) is regularly used as a cut through, to avoid the traffic lights on the corner of Dawes Road and NER and also the roundabout between NER and Fulham Road. The noise of the scooters at night is an issue.

We residents have a “window” of quiet for sleeping, which would be considerably jeopardised with delivery drivers on the roads up until 4am. Sleep deprivation, which is well documented in Fulham, is a big issue for residents and any increase in noise generation will only have the potential to worsen the situation.

3. Public Safety

The applicant’s premises are very close to the junction of NER and the Cromwell Road, a major North / South route through London.

This is a very busy junction, with two lanes of traffic generally queuing alongside the premises, either to go straight on, on the NER or turning left onto the Cromwell Road.

The delivery drivers at other take-away venues in the area all park outside the premises, waiting to collect deliveries (sometimes illegally).

The NER (B317) has double yellow lines along its’ northern length, including outside the applicants’ premises. If the delivery drivers congregate outside the applicant’s premises, this will cause a public safety issue for other road users, as well as being illegal on double yellow lines.

General Observations:

1.The “overview” on Google maps states that they are open until 3.00am seven nights a week, when their current licence states opening hours of Monday to Thursday until 1.00am and Saturdays and Sundays until 2.00am. In addition, they state a daily opening hour of 09.30am and not 10.30am, as their current licence 2023/00770/LAPR states.

Is this in breach of their current licence? (Screenshot attached)

2. Their application states that “The licensee will also use this variation to update the



16:34 26%

Chicken Cottage

OVERVIEW MENU REVIEWS PHOTOS

82 North End Rd, London W14 9ES

Wednesday	09:30–03:00
Thursday	09:30–03:00
Friday	09:30–03:00
Saturday	09:30–03:00
Sunday	09:30–03:00
Monday	09:30–03:00
Tuesday	09:30–03:00

Confirmed by this business 6 weeks ago

[Suggest new hours](#)

<https://chickencottage.com/chicken-cott...>

£1–10 per person
Reported by 30 people

[Suggest an edit](#)

Call Save Share

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 9:21 PM

To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: Ref: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 NER Resident Objection for 3am/4am delivery of chicken.

Please accept this email as my written OBJECTION to the above application where the Applicant runs a takeaway/sandwich shop. I am and have been for almost 2 years a resident at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. If I am unable to attend the hearing (date not yet available), I now appoint my neighbour [REDACTED] or his representative to use my five minutes.

My concerns are written under the headings of the four licensing objectives. Our road is now a one way from North End Road; a positive Development but The Delivery Economy guys are Rat-Running, driving even in the wrong direction! We need sleep, not noisy deliveries. 3am and 4am are not necessary in residential Fulham. The Committee must find ways to protect residents from a relentless surge of emissions nuisance and noise nuisance during sleeping hours.

1. Prevention of crime and disorder

There have been several incidents of crime in the area including drug activity as well as reckless driving causing significant and expensive damage to many cars.

2. Prevention of nuisance

We need to safe guard our families and prevent the nuisance being caused by late night food and drink establishments causing issues such as urination in our foot gardens and leaving trash all over our gardens on Walham Grove.

3. Upholding public safety

We need our borough kept safe and further late night food and drink establishments jeopardise this

4. Prevention of children from harm

Both drunken customers from fast food establishments as well as delivery drivers have been seen to harass our young teenagers on the street. More late night licenses will create more problems in this regard

For these reasons and the further reasons set out by other residents, I ask the H&F Licensing Sub-Committee to reject the application.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 10:22 PM
To: Licensing HF: H&F <licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] >
Subject: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Dear Adrian and Lorna,

Ref: 2023/01489/LAPR Chicken Cottage 82 North End Road London W14 9ES Resident Objection

Please accept this email as my written objection to the above application for a local fast food premises. I am and have been for 26 years a resident at Fulham SW6, at [REDACTED] for 22 years until the end of August 2023 and now at [REDACTED]

If I am unable to attend the hearing (date not yet available), I now appoint my neighbour [REDACTED] or his representative to use my five minutes.

This business owner wishes to apply for longer hours from 1am Sunday to Thursday to 3am on these days, and from 2am on Friday and Saturday to be extended to 4am.

I cannot see having delivery drivers riding around West Kensington and Fulham to these later times is conducive at all to residents being able to sleep. These delivery drivers are a nuisance, the noise generated by the vehicles and by the drivers hanging around outside premises on side streets very much disturbs residents and their children. The majority of the deliveries will be made down residential side streets as they can't be avoided, and the drivers won't be obeying the 20mph speed limit in the early hours of the morning when traffic is lighter than usual.

As well as the deliveries being the opposite of the prevention of nuisance, upholding public safety and prevention of children from harm from a noise and speed perspective - they also contribute significantly to the pollution in the borough. These additional journeys aren't usually made on foot, by pedal cycle or by e-bike but usually by noisy and belching scooters and motor bikes. The emissions from these deliveries are harmful to residents, and haven't been considered by the council. This is not protecting children and residents from harm. Why is the council bothering to install LTNs and CANs when the volume of deliveries by scooters is increasing exponentially in the borough?

Lastly, as a resident and someone who has many years of experience serving on ward panels I know the last thing residents need is more people hanging around on the streets at 4am. Almost all the side streets are affected by anti-social behaviour and low level crime such as drug dealing. We are fed up at witnessing people urinating in the streets, the litter and the ubiquitous nox cylinders in the

gutters, drug dealing and the associated violence. Some delivery drivers in this area also deliver drugs, I myself have seen a deal happen a few yards away from me and followed the delivery driver back to the premises. I can't say this applies to all delivery drivers but having fast food and other items delivered to 4am is unlikely to discourage drug taking and heavy drinking in our area.

For these reasons and the further reasons set out by other residents, I ask the H&F Licensing Sub-Committee to reject the application.

Lastly, there seems to be a flood of business owners applying for longer hours through licensing applications, which are frequently to the detriment of residents. I don't see longer hours at fast food joints, shisha bars, cafes serving alcohol as contributing to a night time economy in a positive way. As they usually involve deliveries, they will lead to more noise, pollution, litter, anti-social behaviour and crime - as well as leading to more unhealthy eating and drinking habits in the borough. Surely the ability to eat fast food and drink alcohol almost 24 hours a day isn't a good thing. Please could these comments and the feedback of other residents be brought to the attention of the Administration and councillors, and be incorporated into the LBHF Licensing Policy? It will save residents having to spend time submitting objections to these unpopular and badly thought out applications.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]