

From:

Sent: 18 August 2025 16:55

To: Legister, Linda

Subject: RGP event hearing

I have long-delayed surgery later this week and have been advised to avoid stress and indeed to rest in the afternoons this week in preparation. In the circumstances in case I am not available to attend the virtual meeting this email needs to be included in the hearing bundle. For ease of reference I will number my concerns.

1) The applicants have thus far failed to sign the hiring agreement with Parks Services which include their own terms and conditions.

2) The arrangements take no account of the Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Act 2025- the so-called "Martyn's Law". Whilst I appreciate this legislation is not yet in force the Council should be concerned to impose appropriate requirements as if it were. I invite the committee to impose such requirements

2) I was initially pleased to see that the licensing authority appeared to share some of my concerns with a schedule of conditions. Some of these sought to meet my concerns but were too poorly worded IMO to be satisfactory. Those conditions have been accepted by the applicants and the authority has withdrawn their objections. However, that withdrawal of objections does not bind or limit the committee in imposing further requirements. Most concerning is the absence of any sanction in the event of a breach which renders the applicants agreement nugatory.

More specifically the requirement for leafleting needs to include a list of addresses and a time limit of no less than 14 days prior. I would point out that no leaflets were distributed and no attempt e.g. through the very active Residents Association to contact residents in 2023 was made.

4) Whilst I have no authority to speak on behalf of Kingsbury High School I know in 2023 that the Head was completely astonished (in the absence of any advance warning) at the disruption of teaching on the Friday caused by these people. Had this application been made before the end of term I am sure objections would have been made by KHS. On the school's behalf can I suggest that if the committee allows this application it is on the basis that there is to be no amplified music before say 4pm on the Friday.

3) Handling of complaints. The applicants paint a picture of concern for residents and interest in their "feedback". My experience two years ago was very different. When I approached the area containing "Management" about the noise I was initially blanked by a woman who I now believe may have been Pritee Varsani. Eventually with a clear

disdain toward me she gestured to someone who appeared to be a security guard to accompany me to investigate. He followed me complaining about my walking too slowly (I was then 73 with a number of health issues) stood for a few moments to listen to the noise, shrugged his shoulders and walked off without comment. That is the reality. If the event is to be given consent there must be a requirement that a clearly identifiable and suitably qualified representative of the council be on site throughout (at the cost of the applicants) to be the primary contact for resident complaints. There also needs to be a specific requirement that no sound checks are to be allowed more than ten minutes before the advertised start time.

4) The applicants state that the last event in 2023 went ahead without "substantial" complaint. I do not know what metric they are using to define "substantial" but when I wrote to Parks about it pointing out that the Glastonbury-sized stage (the children's picture book plan in the bundle is grossly misleading in how it shows the stage) they used was wholly inappropriate for this site the impression I got was that it was recognised to all have been a big mistake and as a result the event took place last year in Fryent Country Park adjacent to a "fast" main road far away from housing and far better suited for this kind of event.

5) The noise management plan has problems

a) the end times are not consistent with those stated in the application.

b) the first bullet point in para 8 makes no sense

c) the reference to the "nearest residential" and "noise-sensitive" properties is so generic that I conclude no specific properties have been chosen, much less will be tested. The omission of any houses on the "plan" is concerning and highly misleading.

In light of the above I invite the committee to refuse this application on all four grounds set out in the 2003 legislation. Entirely without prejudice to that if the committee feels the event needs to go ahead I invite it to impose the conditions I have suggested in the hope that these will at least partially mitigate the worst excesses of these events.