

From: Kelcher, Councillor Matt
Sent: 10 January 2024 13:44
To: Legister, Linda; Business Licence
Cc: Chan, Councillor Jumbo; Patel, Councillor Mili
Subject: Palm Island Lounge Licence application: 30411

On behalf of the Harlesden and Kensal Green Councillors, I wish to object to the above application for a Premises Licence on the grounds that the application is incomplete and somewhat ambiguous with regard to three out of four the licensing objectives. Namely, preventing crime and disorder, public safety and preventing public nuisance.

Preventing crime and disorder:

There does not appear to be an 'anti-social behaviour strategy' contained within the application. For example, there is no mention of how incidents will be logged. There is no detail regarding how many SIA security guards will be employed (as a higher risk area, Eventbrite advises one SIA for every 10 patrons). The Applicant has not submitted any information to show that independent security advice has been sought. There is no dispersal strategy.

This isolated venue is primarily in a residential area with a retail offering. Despite it being located within the Town Centre, there is no other night-time economy within the parade of retail shops. Should a license be granted, it will likely lead to a rise in anti-social behaviour, parking issues and contraventions. There is a significantly reduced policing team and as such, the resources required to manage issues arising from this night club will be greatly stretched. It is not described as family venue and as such, an increase in crime and disorder is likely.

The applicant has failed to meet this objective.

Public Safety:

It is stated that the venue will hold between 60-80 patrons. However, this number seems too large for such a small venue. There was mention of all patrons being directed to their seats. Where is the seating plan? What is the provision for serving those seated in the external/ garden area? How many will be seated to the rear extension and how many in the garden? Will patrons be seated in the garden area? Will patrons be allowed to stand in the venue?

What is the fire procedure? Where is the fire risk assessment? Have the FRA approved any evacuation plans or risk assessment. Policy D12 of the London Plan states the need for fire safety information. This is an obligation required of all businesses. This has not been provided by the applicant.

There is mention of no smoking or drinking to the outside of the property. It is unclear whether this pertains to both the front and rear of the property. If a fire breaks out to the rear, what is the evacuation process? Photographs of the internal areas of the property have not been provided which renders it difficult to see how some of the objectives will be met.

The applicant has failed to meet the objective for ensuring public safety.

Preventing Public Nuisance:

Are there speakers in the rear of the property (extension)? Is the structure sound-proofed? Will the Glass doors to the rear of the property be open at all times? The venue has a history of noise pollution issues due to the level the music was played at. The Applicant has failed to address those concerns.

The Applicant's Planning application No. 23/2664 dated 08/08/23 had conditions attached. In Brent Council's notice, condition number 4 suggested that the external seating area has been restricted between the hours of 9am and 8pm. The plans do not show clear delineation of the licensable area. It cannot be determined from the application what the licensable area is or how the restriction would be managed. There is mention of 'noise permitted levels between 11pm and 7am. This shows no regard for the condition attached as mentioned in the planning notice.

Protecting children from harm:

It is worth mentioning that the Applicant has stated that children are not permitted in the venue. However, the Applicant has suggested this is a calm restaurant/ lounge: a restaurant that does not welcome families. Is this a bar or a restaurant?

Summary

The application appears incomplete or at the very least ambiguous. There are no clear strategies or details that suggest the licensing objectives can be met. The question as to whether the Applicant has sufficient experience in this field arises again. Brent Council requires a designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) to have successfully completed an accredited qualification (as per the five mentioned on the website). There does not appear to be any evidence that the Applicant holds an accredited personal license. A very complex neighbourhood, Harlesden would benefit from a person who can show clear evidence that they can meet the objectives. The applicant once again fails to undertake due diligence. This is a lazy application that has not covered any of the grounds in any detail. The lack of detail is astonishing and more importantly, concerning. The Applicant had an opportunity to address the concerns raised on a previous application, however, has failed to do so. This is especially important due to the lack of experience of the applicant.

On the basis of all the points raised above, the applicant does not appear to have met the objectives required by Brent Council's licensing committee.

Best wishes,

Matt

Cllr Matt Kelcher
Labour Councillor for Kensal Green Ward
Chair, Planning Committee