

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, February 3, 2024 2:09 PM

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

Subject: Re: Attendance to Licensing Sub Committee - Chicken Cottage, 82 North End Road London W14 9ES

Thank you for your email. Please find attached my additional representation regarding this licencing hearing for Chicken Cottage to be held next Wednesday (7/2/24).

As indicated in my previous email, I will be attending the hearing.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

2023/01489/LAPR

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

Current licence: 2023/00770/LAPR

Additional Representation

[REDACTED]

I am writing to submit an additional representation regarding the application to extend the licence hours of Chicken Cottage.

The agenda pack includes representations from the Licencing department, Police, Noise and Nuisance team, local councillors, and a substantial number of local residents – all of which oppose the application. I therefore believe that this application should be rejected in its entirety.

Licencing team has noted (pages 48 to 51) that there have repeated breaches of the applicant's licencing conditions and documented these breaches through a series of test purchases and observations. These breaches have occurred even after the licencing department have made numerous attempts to engage constructively with the applicant to remind them of their licencing responsibilities and have issued formal warnings.

This raises serious concerns about the conduct of these premises in the future and the trust that can be placed in the reassurances given by the applicant in the course of this Licencing hearing. On page 51, the Licencing department indicates that they expect that there will be further licencing breaches by the applicant in the future. Given this, it is clearly inappropriate for the licencing hours to be extended. Indeed, I would argue that there is a strong argument the licencing hours of this premises

to be reduced until the applicant can demonstrate a consistent pattern of compliance with their licencing conditions.

The representation from the Police also notes (pages 52 to 53) that this is an area with high levels of anti-social behaviour and criminal activity. They also highlight a fight which occurred at the applicant's premises and resulted in the attendance of both the Police and Ambulance services. This incident occurred at a time outside of the licenced hours for the premises, when it should have been closed – clearly demonstrating both a serious breach of the existing licencing conditions. It also demonstrates an inability/unwillingness by the applicant to control anti-social conduct on their premises, which resulted to it escalating to in a fight among several customers (the information provided suggests that there were more than two people were involved).

As a local resident, I am very concerned that this incident did not, on its own, trigger a licencing review (to remove or reduce the current extended hours) – as it clearly demonstrates the repeated breaches of licencing conditions at this premises and its role as a focus for anti-social behaviour in the area, particularly late at night. In considering the risk of future anti-social behaviour at this premises, the Licencing committee should take into consideration its location opposite a very large sports pub.

The pictures on page 60 to 65 indicate clearly the quantity and behaviour of delivery riders collecting from this premises and the way in which they park in an anti-social way on the pavement (as the premises is in a red route area). It is worth highlighting that these pictures were taken at 1:25 AM and so are well past the guidelines in the SLP as summarised on page 8 of the documents provided (I would regard this as a residential area for the purposes of the SLP).

As a local resident, I would like to point out that this is level of delivery rider traffic is typical at peak hours. I would also like to highlight this is just one restaurant in the local area which accepts delivery orders and so represents just a fraction of the delivery traffic passing collecting from and passing through this residential area. This clearly raises issues regarding the cumulative impact that fast food collection/delivery is having on the local area.

As I discuss in points 51 and 52 of my original representation, the applicant appears to have knowingly ignored many of the conditions in his existing licence (including ones relating to public safety) and is seeking in his current application to have these removed. I believe that removing these conditions would be wholly inappropriate from a safety/licencing point of view – particularly as the applicant has failed to engage constructively with the licencing department to bring an end to their licencing breaches.

Ideally, I would like to see a reduction in the licenced hours of this premises until it can demonstrate a pattern of good behaviour. Failing this, I would like to see the current application refused in its entirety and the existing licencing conditions enforced more rigorously, rather than removed (I do not believe that relaxing these conditions would improve the applicant's compliance regarding opening hours).

If there are continued licencing breaches at this premises and further anti-social behaviour (both by customers and by delivery riders), this should trigger a review of their licence. A premises should not be able to commit repeated breaches of its licencing conditions without consequence as this renders the entire licencing process meaningless.

Given the previous licencing breeches and antisocial behaviour laid out in the documentation pack for the licencing meeting, I would also encourage the police and Licencing department to review

future TENs applications by this premises with a more critical eye and reject those which are excessive or would have an adverse effect on this residential area.