

Ms Lisa Weaver
Democratic services Officer
Committee Clerk
Brent Council
Brent Town Hall
Forty Lane
Wembley
Middlesex HA9 6HD

26th November 2012

Dear Ms Weaver

Re: Premises Licence Application- Costcutter (Formerly The Lush), 9-10 Heather Park Drive, Wembley, Middlesex HA0 1SL

We note from the Council's website that a Hearing into the above matter is to take place on 5 December 2012. As persons who have submitted a representation against the grant of a premises licence to the named applicant on the form, we wish to be present at the Hearing and put forward our case to the Panel.

We note from the Licensing Officer's Report, which is to be presented to the Committee Members, that it is very brief, but more importantly, under the heading "Background", it does not cover the true history of these premises. In particular, as we have stated in our earlier letter of 19 October 2012, the irresponsible way in which the applicant ran the previous establishment of a Restaurant and Bar (The Lush) from the same premises and his abuse of the 4 licensing objects. I note on Page 19 of the current application form under the heading "General" the applicant's agent has stated:

"In line with the government guidance we will manage the premises in line with the four licensing objectives and all relevant legislation".

As mentioned above, given the past attitude of Mr Parag Patel, we find it almost laughable. It is purely put in the form to give his application some creditability.

We have also drawn attention, in our earlier letter of Representation, to the two applications regarding Review of Premises Licence instigated by Metropolitan Police. One of these was dealt in July 2010 after a Hearing before the Panel and the other review, of 8th August 2012, is still pending. If it has not been withdrawn then the matter is still alive and we would like to know if the same would be revoked.

We find it bewildering that the Metropolitan Police has objected to the current application only on the grounds which are in no way related on the suitability of the applicant to be granted an off licence This having failed to successfully run an on licence. These two licences are inter-linked and one would have expected more opposition from the police on grounds other than those mentioned in their Representation.












In light of the above, we recommend that this letter is placed before the Panel together with the following documents:

1. Police application dated 6th May 2011 to Review the Premises Licence under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003.
2. Police application dated 8th August 2012 to Review the Premises Licence under section 51 of the Licensing Act 2003.
3. The decision/s of the Licensing Committees into the above.
4. Any other papers associated with the licensing of any premises from this address.

Should the Police make an appearance at the Hearing then we suggest that the Panel investigate why they are not pursuing the matter into the second Hearing. Having already established that the applicant has failed on account of all 4 licensing objective for the premises under his care, why do the police feel that he will now prove to be worthy of running the off-licence successfully?

For ease of reference, I am attaching herewith some of the papers mentioned above. No doubt you will now place all the other relevant papers before the Committee and inform us that this has been done.

Yours faithfully

Address of Property	Name	Signature	Date
 Heather Park Drive			27/11/12
 Heather Park Drive			27/11/12
 Heather Park Drive			27/11/12
 A Lyon Park			
 Ave 