

From:

Sent: 21 September 2026 11:35

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

Subject: Re: FORMAL REPRESENTATION AGAINST THE APPLICATION TO VARY
PREMISES LICENCE NO. 31765

Dear Licensing Authority,

Re: Premises Licence No. 31765 – Zebu Butcher's, 38 Sapcote Trading Unit, Dollis Hill, NW10 2DJ

Further Relevant Representation – Request for Refusal of the Proposed Variation

I write further to the applicant's response to my representation and respectfully ask the Licensing Authority to take the following matters into account when determining this application.

I would first like to clarify that **my restaurant is now under new management/direction**. I therefore respectfully submit that I should not be held responsible for incidents, complaints, alleged breaches or regulatory matters which may have occurred **before I took over the management and operation of the premises**.

Since taking over the restaurant, **I am not aware of any incidents, breaches or enforcement matters relating to my management of the premises**. I have sought to operate responsibly and to maintain a constructive relationship with Brent Council, the Licensing Authority, the police and other relevant authorities.

If any historical matter concerning my premises is relied upon in determining the present application, I respectfully request that the Licensing Authority establish the date of the matter, who was responsible for the premises at that time, whether any breach was actually established, whether enforcement action was taken, and whether that historical matter has any evidential relevance to the premises as it is currently operated under my management.

I respectfully ask that the present application therefore be assessed on the basis of the **current management, current operation and current evidence**, rather than attributing historical matters predating my management to me or to the way in which I currently operate the restaurant.

My representation is made in relation to the four statutory licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003, namely:

1. the prevention of crime and disorder;
2. public safety;

3. the prevention of public nuisance; and
4. the protection of children from harm.

The Licensing Authority is required to carry out its licensing functions with a view to promoting these objectives.

1. The proposed external area and alcohol service

A particularly important issue is the proposed use of the private car park as an external customer area, including the proposed consumption of alcohol.

My understanding is that **my own premises licence does not authorise me to use the outside/car-park area for the service of alcohol**, and I therefore ask the Licensing Authority to clarify the legal and licensing basis upon which the proposed external alcohol area for Zebu is being considered.

I am not asking the Licensing Authority to determine this application based on commercial competition. My concern is one of **consistent application of the Licensing Act 2003 and public safety**.

If two directly facing premises are operating in the same physical environment, with customers and vehicles using the same surrounding area, the Licensing Authority should carefully consider whether the proposed external drinking area creates additional risks and whether those risks can realistically be controlled.

2. Public safety – the car park is not a conventional pedestrian terrace

The proposed outside area is a **vehicle car park within a trading/industrial environment**, rather than a purpose-built pedestrianised restaurant terrace.

This is particularly concerning because vehicles use the area and, especially at weekends, vehicles can travel through the area at significant speed.

Introducing customers who may be consuming alcohol into an area where vehicles are manoeuvring creates an obvious need for proper separation between pedestrians and vehicles.

The applicant refers to cones and staff supervision. However, I respectfully submit that general assurances are not sufficient by themselves.

Before granting the variation, I ask the Licensing Authority to require clear evidence addressing, amongst other matters:

- the exact dimensions and boundaries of the proposed external customer area;
- the maximum number of customers permitted outside;
- how pedestrians will be physically separated from moving vehicles;

- how vehicles entering and leaving the car park will be controlled;
- how deliveries and loading/unloading will be managed while customers are outside;
- how emergency vehicle access will be maintained;
- how children, elderly persons and persons with reduced mobility will be protected;
- what level of staff supervision will be provided and during which hours;
- what will happen when customers consume alcohol outside and vehicles are simultaneously moving through the area.

The current proposal should therefore not be treated simply as an ordinary outdoor seating area.

The statutory guidance recognises public safety as one of the licensing objectives and makes clear that licensing authorities must consider the particular circumstances of the premises and the activities proposed.

3. Risk of incidents involving customers from the neighbouring premises

I also wish to clarify an important practical concern.

The applicant states that incidents or behaviour associated with the neighbouring premises should not be attributed to Zebu. I agree that one premises should not automatically be held responsible for another premises' conduct.

However, that is not the point I am making.

The two premises are directly opposite one another and their customers will be using the same surrounding physical environment.

If an altercation occurs in or immediately around Zebu involving persons who have also attended the neighbouring premises, the Licensing Authority should consider how the incident would be managed and how responsibility would be established.

For example, if customers move between the two premises, or if an argument begins at one premises and continues into the shared external environment, this can create a real issue of **crime and disorder and public safety**, regardless of which business originally served the individuals involved.

I therefore ask the Licensing Authority to consider whether the applicant has provided adequate arrangements for:

- preventing disorder;
- identifying and dealing with intoxicated customers;

- refusing further alcohol where appropriate;
- dealing with confrontational behaviour;
- recording incidents;
- contacting the police where necessary;
- supervising customers leaving the premises;
- preventing disputes from developing in the external area.

These are practical licensing considerations and should not be dismissed simply because another premises is independently operated.

4. The proximity of the two premises is relevant to the assessment

I am not asking the Licensing Authority to impose responsibility on Zebu for the independent operation of another business.

However, the physical proximity of the premises is relevant when assessing the **actual environment in which the proposed licence would operate**.

The applicant proposes:

- outdoor customer use;
- outdoor consumption of alcohol;
- recorded music;
- live music;
- alcohol sales until midnight; and
- opening to the public until 00:30.

These activities have the potential to increase the number of people outside, the length of time customers remain in the area and the level of pedestrian and vehicle interaction.

The Licensing Authority should therefore consider the combined effect of these matters rather than considering each proposal in isolation.

5. Public nuisance and noise

The applicant characterises my concerns regarding noise as speculative.

I respectfully disagree.

My concerns relate directly to the activities actually proposed in the application, including:

- live music until 00:00;

- recorded music until 00:00;
- recorded music in the external area;
- outdoor consumption of alcohol;
- alcohol sales until 00:00; and
- customer activity continuing until 00:30.

These are not hypothetical activities. They are elements of the variation being sought.

The current Section 182 guidance recognises that public nuisance can include adverse effects on the environment and amenity of people living and working in the area. It also specifically identifies measures that may be appropriate for controlling noise from licensed premises and external areas.

Accordingly, the Licensing Authority should consider the cumulative effect of music, customers, alcohol, vehicle movements, arrivals, departures and late-night activity.

6. Live music and the surrounding environment

I recognise that the applicant is not responsible for the independent operation of the neighbouring premises.

Nevertheless, where two premises are directly facing each other, the existence of activity from the neighbouring premises can be relevant to understanding the **existing acoustic and operational environment**.

My objection is therefore not that the neighbouring premises' conduct should automatically be attributed to Zebu.

Rather, the question is whether adding further live music, recorded music, outdoor activity and late-night customer movement at Zebu would increase the overall level of disturbance in this particular location.

That assessment should be based on evidence and the actual characteristics of the site.

7. Children and vulnerable members of the public

The applicant refers to the premises being family-oriented and to parents supervising their children.

Parental supervision does not remove the responsibility to consider the physical safety of the premises.

The proposed external area would place customers, potentially including children, in an environment where vehicles can manoeuvre.

The Licensing Authority should therefore consider whether the proposed layout and management arrangements adequately protect children and other vulnerable members of the public from foreseeable physical risks.

8. Conditions should not be assumed to solve every risk

I note the applicant's repeated suggestion that any concerns could simply be dealt with by conditions.

I respectfully ask the Licensing Authority not to assume that conditions will necessarily provide an adequate remedy.

Conditions must be **clear, enforceable, practical and capable of promoting the licensing objectives**.

If the fundamental problem is the interaction between an alcohol-consuming external area and moving vehicles, for example, a general condition requiring staff to "supervise" the area may not adequately remove the underlying risk.

The Authority should first determine whether the proposed variation itself is appropriate having regard to the licensing objectives.

9. Planning and licensing

I acknowledge that planning and licensing are separate regulatory regimes.

I am not asking the Licensing Authority to determine a planning application through the licensing process.

However, the physical use of the premises, the proposed external area, customer capacity, access arrangements and the actual layout of the site are relevant factual matters when considering public safety and public nuisance.

I therefore ask that the Authority ensure that the proposed licensed activities are clearly understood and that there is no uncertainty regarding the lawful use and physical arrangement of the external area.

10. Cumulative effect of the proposed variation

The applicant asks that each element be considered separately.

I respectfully submit that this would not provide a complete assessment of the licensing objectives.

The Licensing Authority should consider the **combined effect** of:

- an external customer area;
- outdoor alcohol consumption;

- alcohol sales until 00:00;
- live music until 00:00;
- recorded music until 00:00;
- outdoor recorded music;
- opening to customers until 00:30;
- increased pedestrian activity;
- increased vehicle interaction; and
- the close proximity of another licensed premises.

Brent's current Licensing Policy recognises that cumulative impact can arise outside designated Cumulative Impact Policy areas and that evidence concerning the particular area and premises can be relevant.

I therefore ask the Authority to assess the variation as a whole and not merely as a collection of isolated amendments.

11. Request for refusal

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the Licensing Authority **refuse the proposed variation**, particularly the elements which would introduce or materially increase:

1. the use of the external/car-park area by customers;
2. outdoor consumption of alcohol;
3. alcohol sales until 00:00;
4. opening to customers until 00:30;
5. recorded music outdoors;
6. recorded music until 00:00;
7. live music until 00:00; and
8. the overall intensification of the premises from a primarily butcher/food retail operation into a substantially more intensive hospitality, alcohol and entertainment use.

My request is based on the licensing objectives and the specific characteristics of the site, particularly the interaction between pedestrians, customers consuming alcohol and vehicles using the car park.

If the Licensing Authority is nevertheless minded to grant the variation, I respectfully request that the matter be determined at a hearing and that the applicant be required to provide clear and sufficiently detailed evidence addressing the public safety, crime and disorder, public nuisance and protection of children issues identified above.

I also respectfully request that the Authority provide clear reasons for its decision, including how it has considered the proposed external alcohol area, vehicle movements, the proximity of the neighbouring premises and the cumulative effect of the proposed licensable activities.

Thank you for considering this further representation.