



London Borough of Brent
347 – 359 High Road
Wembley
Middlesex
HA9 6BZ

Our ref: RJT/LHK/97100-689-7
Your ref: Estelle Lendore
Date: 30th March 2012
E-Mail: rjt@gosschalks.co.uk
Direct Fax: 0870 600 5958

Dear Madam

re: **William Hill, 141-143 Kilburn High Road**
Application for review



We write further to your recent email correspondence with Richard Taylor at this office and thank you for forwarding copies of the representations received. We also thank you for confirming that this application is likely to be listed before the licensing committee sitting in May.

William Hill Organization Limited has instructed Philip Kolvin QC to represent the company's interests at the hearing. Mr Kolvin's availability is limited and we would be grateful therefore, if you could liaise with us with regard to the hearing date in order that we may ensure the date fixed is convenient to him.

In the meantime, we respectfully submit that the application for review is defective.

The Gambling Act 2005 (Premises Licences)(Review)Regulations 2007 (as amended) require at regulation 4 that a person making a review application must give a notice to the person who holds the premises licence. That notice is prescribed within schedule 2 to those regulations and according to regulation 4(3) the notice "must in particular specify the period of 28 days starting on the relevant date as the period during which representations about the application may be made to the licensing authority by ..."

The applicant for review forwarded a notice in the prescribed form to our client. We attach a copy of the notice received by our client on 14th February. The notice is defective as the applicant for review indicates that representations about the review may be made "during the period of 28 consecutive days beginning on 10/02/201..."

The applicant for review then also fails to insert a date being the last date for representations.

As this is prescribed information which, according to the regulations must be given, the notice is defective.

Furthermore, we respectfully submit that the licensing authority has failed to comply with regulation 5. We are unaware as to whether or not the licensing authority has complied with paragraph 5(1)(a) by publishing notice of the application either in a local newspaper or on the website but we are aware that regulation 5(1)(b) has not been complied with. This regulation requires that a notice is displayed as near as reasonably practicable to the premises to which the application relates where it can be conveniently read by members of the public. That notice must be displayed for a period of no less than 28 days.

Our clients have been checking for notices since the review application was received and we are instructed that no notices have been displayed.

In all of the circumstances, we respectfully submit that the application is defective. We look forward to receiving details of what steps are proposed to remedy these breaches.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully



GOSSCHALKS

Cc Horatio Chance, London Borough of Brent Solicitor,
Brent Council
Health Safety & Licensing
Brent House
349 - 357 High Road





GOSSCHALKS
SOLICITORS



Horatio Chance, London Borough of Brent
Brent Council
Health Safety and Licensing
Brent House
349-357 High Road
Wembley HA9 6BZ

Our ref: RJT/LHK
Your ref:
Date: AS PER ATTACHED
E-Mail: rjt@gosschalks.co.uk
Direct Fax: 0870 600 5958

Dear Sir/Madam

WITH COMPLIMENTS

Please see attached letter for your information

Yours faithfully

GOSSCHALKS

Queens Gardens, Hull, HU1 3DZ **T** 01482 324252 **F** 0870 600 5984 **E** info@gosschalks.co.uk **W** www.gosschalks.co.uk **DX** 11902 - Hull

Partners: Simon Lunt, Bruce Raper, Ian Lanch, Richard Llewellyn, Neil Johnson, Clare Johnson, Roy Taylor, Robert Thomson, Jonathan Beharrell, Nigel Beckwith, Zoë Carmichael, Nicholas Dean, Mark Teal, Stephen Walker, Andrew Mallory, Robert Hastie, Richard Taylor, Andrew Johnson, Jonathan Peet, James Phinn, Justin Graves, Matthew Fletcher, Andrew Tarbutt, Ted Flanagan, Kate Groves, Craig Beetham, Stephen Dillon, Ashlie Prescott, Chris Groves, Paul Plaxton, Nicola Barrass, James Houston, Victoria Quinn, Andrew Bell, Charlotte Chilcott, Caroline Neadley

Associate - Julia Williams

Partnership Secretary - Martin Haldenby

This firm is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority under number 61213

Lexcel
Practice Management Standard
Law Society Accredited



London Borough of Brent
347 – 359 High Road
Wembley
Middlesex
HA9 6BZ

Our ref: RJT/LHK/97100-689-7
Your ref: Estelle Lendore
Date: 30th March 2012
E-Mail: rjt@gosschalks.co.uk
Direct Fax: 0870 600 5958

Dear Madam

re: **William Hill, 141-143 Kilburn High Road**
Application for review

We write further to your recent email correspondence with Richard Taylor at this office and thank you for forwarding copies of the representations received. We also thank you for confirming that this application is likely to be listed before the licensing committee sitting in May.

William Hill Organization Limited has instructed Philip Kolvin QC to represent the company's interests at the hearing. Mr Kolvin's availability is limited and we would be grateful therefore, if you could liaise with us with regard to the hearing date in order that we may ensure the date fixed is convenient to him.

In the meantime, we respectfully submit that the application for review is defective.

The Gambling Act 2005 (Premises Licences)(Review)Regulations 2007 (as amended) require at regulation 4 that a person making a review application must give a notice to the person who holds the premises licence. That notice is prescribed within schedule 2 to those regulations and according to regulation 4(3) the notice "must in particular specify the period of 28 days starting on the relevant date as the period during which representations about the application may be made to the licensing authority by ..."

The applicant for review forwarded a notice in the prescribed form to our client. We attach a copy of the notice received by our client on 14th February. The notice is defective as the applicant for review indicates that representations about the review may be made "during the period of 28 consecutive days beginning on 10/02/201..."

The applicant for review then also fails to insert a date being the last date for representations.

As this is prescribed information which, according to the regulations must be given, the notice is defective.

Furthermore, we respectfully submit that the licensing authority has failed to comply with regulation 5. We are unaware as to whether or not the licensing authority has complied with paragraph 5(1)(a) by publishing notice of the application either in a local newspaper or on the website but we are aware that regulation 5(1)(b) has not been complied with. This regulation requires that a notice is displayed as near as reasonably practicable to the premises to which the application relates where it can be conveniently read by members of the public. That notice must be displayed for a period of no less than 28 days.

Our clients have been checking for notices since the review application was received and we are instructed that no notices have been displayed.

In all of the circumstances, we respectfully submit that the application is defective. We look forward to receiving details of what steps are proposed to remedy these breaches.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully



GOSSCHALKS

Cc Horatio Chance, London Borough of Brent Solicitor,
Brent Council
Health Safety & Licensing
Brent House
349 - 357 High Road

