



Licensing (Shared Mailbox) <licensing@hackney.gov.uk>

Re: Application for a premises licence at 31 New Inn Yard, Hackney, London, EC2A 3EY

1 message

11 September 2020 at 13:00

Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: "Licensing (Shared Mailbox)" <licensing@hackney.gov.uk>

Dear Hackney Licensing

The applicant's letter raises important issues. I will submit additional representations in due course. However, there are two (related) points requiring urgent attention.

The applicant implies I personally endorsed the application ("*The applicant consulted with [REDACTED] prior to submission. Thereafter the applicant prepared and submitted an application for a core hours restaurant license....*") and the revisions ("*The applicant has engaged further with [REDACTED] following receipt of his objection. After consideration of his concerns ... the applicant has voluntarily amended the application....*").

This is a gross misrepresentation, possibly intended to deceive. Neighbours have already contacted me, surprised that I agreed. I did nothing of the sort.

Correspondence with the applicant is attached, and is easily read. I told the applicant he should not over-reach. Later I told him I would not support the proposed revised hours.

More importantly, I've been involved in more licensing (and planning) hearings than I can count, and reviewed hundreds of applications. I have **never** seen an applicant abuse a neighbour's name and privacy like this. I am very uncomfortable with this breach of privacy protocol and good common sense.

For reasons to be raised in due course, I firmly believe the applicant can not demonstrate its ability to uphold the licensing objectives, and this application should be rejected in full.

Please can this note (and the attachment) be circulated to those who received the applicant's note. I normally request my personal details not be released, but the applicant has already breached that protocol. I have redacted all other personal details.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]