

From: Maldoom, Edwin
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 11:24 AM
To: office@complianceirectltd.com
Cc: prashtheva@ ;
Subject: RE: Carlton Lounge, 232-234 Kingsbury Road, NW9 0BH - Representation against the application to vary the premises licence (REF: 32523)

Good morning Sivashankar,

Just to clarify, my intention was simply to initiate discussions in the spirit of mediation. I'm still unsure why you haven't provided a response indicating which conditions within the representation (or subsequent attachments) your client would consider, or conversely, would not consider, let alone the reasoning behind that. This would be the naturally starting point for resolving the outstanding matters.

As you are aware, the stronger the conditions stipulated within a premises licence, the lower the risk of undermining the four licensing objectives. As a result, the Licensing Authority would have fewer concerns regarding the proposed hours outlined in the application to vary the premises licence. Well defined and robust conditions help ensure that the four licensing objectives are upheld and would help negate any potential concerns relating to the proposed hours of the variation.

Many thanks,

Edwin Maldoom
Licensing Enforcement Officer
Regulatory Services

From: office@complianceirectltd.com
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 10:22 AM
To: Maldoom, Edwin
Cc: prashtheva@ ;
Subject: RE: Carlton Lounge, 232-234 Kingsbury Road, NW9 0BH - Representation against the application to vary the premises licence (REF: 32523)

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your very prompt reply.

Thank you also for clarifying the Authority's position.

We have made our position very clear as to the extension of timings and and existing conditions many time before.

Hence, we really see no point forward in this ping pong emails or your insistence that there is something to discuss. We both have established positions.

It is our view that this matter is now for the Committee/Courts to decide.

Hope this helps

Sivashankar

From: Maldoom, Edwin
Sent: 12 September 2024 10:09
To: office@complianceirectltd.com
Cc: prashtheva@ ;
Subject: RE: Carlton Lounge, 232-234 Kingsbury Road, NW9 0BH - Representation against the application to vary the premises licence (REF: 32523)

Good morning Sivashankar,

Thank you for your response.

I have answered your questions below:

Have the LA dropped the objections for the hours applied for? – *No, as there have been no additional noise management measures (or even assurances) put forward describing how your client intends to negate any potential noise related issues due to the proposed extended hours.*

Have the LA now abandoned the proposal to amend the existing conditions? *No, as no feedback has been provided about what conditions your client would even consider (including removing the ones that I have suggested that are no longer relevant or enforceable).*

As I have said previously, if your client could let me know what conditions he agrees with, and what conditions he disagrees with, we will at least have a starting point so that we can begin discussions on how to find a resolution that works for both parties.

Many thanks,

Edwin Maldoom
Licensing Enforcement Officer
Regulatory Services

From: office@complianceirectltd.com
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2024 9:43 AM
To: Maldoom, Edwin
Cc: prashtheva@ ;
Subject: RE: Carlton Lounge, 232-234 Kingsbury Road, NW9 0BH - Representation against the application to vary the premises licence (REF: 32523)

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your email.

At no point we declined the invitation to discuss. Only brought to your attention that the lines of instructions are changing and it is only good practice we respect those legal lines.

However, we note your last para and the limitations imposed by a s36 application.

Just to be clear, can we clarify the following,

Have the LA dropped the objections for the hours applied for?

Have the LA now abandoned the proposal to amend the existing conditions?

Thanks

Sivashankar