

From: Aleslicensing [
Sent: 25 September 2019 12:36
To: Business Licence <business.licence@brent.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: New Premises Licence - Fudam, 238A Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 4QL - 17186

FUDAM, Dear Vanesha,

I am grateful for the two representations from residents that you have forwarded to me. Please could you confirm if there have been any other representations from the ones agreed with Public Safety and the Police.

As no name or address has been provided for either resident I am unable to contact them to allay their fears and try to negotiate an agreement.

Please could you pass on my contact details to them and explain that I am more than happy to speak with them on the telephone, by email, or have a meeting at the restaurant. Hopefully this will show them that the premises is a restaurant and not an off licence and as such it is very unlikely to cause any problems.

Of particular concern is the allegation that the public notice is incorrectly worded. I would like to point out that the actual wording is the same as per the pdf on Brent's website, similarly with the wording for the newspaper advert.

<https://www.brent.gov.uk/business/licences/get-a-licence/premises-licence-adverts/>

With regard to the representations, and taking into account that most residents whilst being well intentioned and passionate, have little or no working knowledge of the licensing act 2003, and the legal procedure. I make the following observations as a response to their comments:

1. There is no actual evidence in either of the reps to support any of the allegations made that these premises would fail to promote the licensing objectives. Comments like the one made in rep 1 "We do not want to see a fatality on our road" are merely sensational, add no evidential weight and are not related to the premises application.
2. It is irrelevant that a previous application was refused as the legislation, guidance, and Brent's own licensing policy require that every application is treated as a new application and must be judged on its own merits.
3. Rep 1 is mostly irrelevant. The majority of the rep is concerned with the resident making a complaint that the council is generally letting residents down, and also failing to prevent anyone from applying for a premises licence.
4. If there has previously been any issue with Brent trading standards. Then this must be dealt with by the specific legislation that trading standards are empowered with. This may not be relevant to any decision a licensing authority or licensing sub committee can make under the Licensing Act 2003.
5. Rep 1 complains that this application if granted would exacerbate the issues of street drinking, Paan/gudhka spitting, rough sleepers, urinating in public, and furthermore all of this this would adversely impact on One Tree Hill. This is blatantly incorrect, there is no evidence or likelihood of this happening to support the claims, and more importantly the resident has failed to observe that the application is for a restaurant and not an off licence. They will not be selling alcohol to street drinkers and anyone who fails to meet meet an acceptable standard of dress and conduct, will not be permitted inside the premises.
6. I am sure that there must be a significant number of law abiding citizens who live in Fudam. It is a somewhat absurd link that using this name for the restaurant would be a draw for anyone who hails from Fudam, is a street drinkers, Paan/gudhka spitter, or general cause of anti social behaviour

Regards,

Mark

Mark Altman - ALES Licensing

From: Licensing [mailto:aleslicensing@mail.com]

Sent: 26 September 2019 14:48

To: Business Licence <business.licence@brent.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: New Premises Licence - Fudam, 238A Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 4QL - 17186

Good afternoon vanesha,

I appreciate why the reps have been accepted and my comments were based on the premises being a restaurant. They will not be operating as an off licence and if it assists the residents and the authority, I can offer up a condition that only allows off sales only to persons who have consumed a meal at the premises, or to persons ordering a substantial takeaway meal in person at the premises (this will not include delivery of alcohol) For example this would allow anyone who has ordered a bottle of wine with their meal to take away the unfinished bottle of wine which will be suitably sealed, or for someone who has eaten a meal to purchase a bottle of wine to take away after their meal. This condition would prevent the premises from becoming an off licence and more significantly completely reduce the possibility of street drinkers obtaining alcohol from the premises.

Regards,

Mark