

**To:-**

**Ash Waghela | Harrow Council Licensing Officer  
Public Protection | Community Directorate**

20<sup>th</sup> June 2021

A. Thank you for the list of documents relating to the Hearing this Wednesday which are very useful, but having now seen those documents they raise serious concerns whether or not the application is in compliance with the Legislation. The shop is already fitted out and ready to trade ahead of any Decision at the Hearing.

B. Further, there is no reference in the documents to the Police reports about recent anti social and violent crimes in and around Canons Corner. In fact it is the same shop when it was run as an off-licence by Unwins when after a gun attack forced them to install a grille during opening hours with button access.

C. We raise all these concerns now in case the question is put at the Hearing why they were not raised before. To our mind the Hearing should be delayed until the Applicant addresses these concerns: -.

1. The applicant has applied for a Premises License as an individual, but omits to tell the Authority the business name mentioned is the trading name of a Limited Company, Dunstall Food and Wines Ltd. of which he is a Director. The use of the name is not a contravention but the statement is by omitting to mention the Company is involved.

2. The applicant's sketch indicates the whole of the premises will be used for a Licensable activity. However it shows the sale of alcohol spread around the shop mixed with standard convenience items whilst some shelves are not identified for any use. In that case the sale of alcohol could be out of sight of the cash desk.

3. As flammable liquid is to be stored in the premises there is nothing in the applicant's Operational Schedule to give reassurance with flats above that he will do anything more than to "comply with all current fire, health and safety laws". That rather scant undertaking is worrying particularly as the shop is already fitted out ready to open for trade and we do not find any Fire Risk assessment submitted with the documents under the Fire Regulatory Reform Act.

4. There is no reference made by either by the Applicant or the Council to the covered passage immediately adjacent to the premises and which leads to the flats above the shop. It is used by drunks for urinating and defecating. Surely this needs addressing including showing its location in relation to the shop in the sketch plan for Environmental issues.

5. There is no mention by the applicant of the noisy operation of recently installed metal roller shutters front and rear below the flats early in the morning ( cf Noise Act).

6. We find nothing in the Operating Schedule that addresses abatement of any other noise day or night nor anything on clearing environmental waste in or around the site such as that currently dumped in the rear yard. (cf Clean Neighbourhoods and Environmental Act).

D. Apologies if we overlooked that our above concerns may have already been spotted by the Council Officers. It is otherwise requested that the Hearing be postponed until all these issues are scrutinised in more detail before a decision is taken on whether or not this application should be approved.

E. One positive note is that the Council officers have already recognised that the activities in and around this proposed off licence in this relatively quiet suburban

neighbourhood shopping parade are likely to lead to an increase anti-social activity.

Yours sincerely,

G Dyan