

Dear Ms Murray,

I do **not** wish to withdraw my objections. I would always want to support and applaud community activities and so, in truth, I m unhappy at having to express myself as an objector in even stronger terms.

However, some comments made in this letter have made me even more concerned and I mention why below.

1 How is this licensing consistent with the PSPO which - I understood - is to be brought into force on April 1st?

2 I note the comments re sharing the premises with adjoining users of the buildings, and other park users. However, that making available to other bodies within the area (and other users of the Barham Buildings complex) is precisely what was offered in the rental bid for the unit - the social value element, which was clearly relevant to the Council/Trust as landlord 's decision to let the premises to the tenant at a reduced rent.

Their application did not mention hiring out of the premises on a commercial basis, and nor does their letter in response.

3 The planning use is D1. If premises are to be licensed for alcohol, music & dancing for 11 or 12 hours daily 7 days a week, starting at noon, is this not more akin to a public house A3/A4 use?

4 To say "*We have been guided **by the council** to state the details in such as way in the application. In practice, will have activities which exercise the licence 5-6 times a month after 5pm.*" first of all does not make sense. What does it mean in fact? Which licence? Licence for alcohol? licence for music and dancing? Both? It would seem only music and dancing from the comment which follows: "*The PA system is used for health and well-being classes and celebrations as we have always done since our tenancy began.*" - but it is not clear. I cannot see how I can be expected to comment fully on this vague basis.

The main issue, however, for me is whether **it was the Council who guided the applicant** to go for these lengthy hours for the licensed activities of music/dancing/alcohol - and, if so, who within the Council? Obviously, depending on the answer, it could cast doubt on the **independence of the licensing process.**

If the applicant wants 5-6 regular slots a month at times to be stated but after 5pm, why was that not what was asked for in the application - with details of what was sought?

"The PA system is used for health and well-being classes and celebrations as we have always done since our tenancy began." Does this mean that the music and dancing licence is required for longer? So why isn't there discrimination between the types of licensing requested.

As stated in my original objection, no-one told any of the occupiers of the building, or nearby residents, and the Licensing notices are not especially prominent even now.

5 Clearly there were some breaches which attracted the attention of the Council or the police, which presumably provoked the Council/police to get the applicant to make the application? If all that the tenant wishes to do is hold the events outlined in the letter, why would they need 12 hour daily licensing of alcohol, music and dancing?

6 The applicant has not mentioned anywhere in this letter the fact that they hire out the premises, and it is these hirings that are obviously of concern. the applicant says in its letter: " *No sale of alcohol will made on the premises. No consumption of alcohol will be authorised to under 25 years. TSUK SIA officers and licensees are working with police partner licensing constable PC Paul Scott PC3302NW to ensure we remain compliant since being asked to submit this application and attend have been invited to regular 6 monthly licensing training with the Metropolitan Police.*"

The applicant does not say whether it will be present at all the parties and hirings. If so, will this always be the case? How will the applicant police the people hiring, either in the consumption of alcohol, or the spilling out into premises it is licensed under the terms of its lease to use outside? Indeed the letter indicates that people will spill out into the QE Gardens outside the Community Library opening hours - see below! If the applicant is policing, will the applicant constantly be present? Clearly there will be health & safety concerns in terms of numbers of users, if the doors are kept locked, as the windows are already said to be locked.

The applicant states" *We have not requested this licence for everyday use.*" - but the applicant has. 11/12 hours every day, 7 days a week. If ad hoc licensing were to be required, then apply for that, and restrict any application to what is required.

However, the above does not seem to be the full story. It appears more to relate to a comprehensive availability for hiring out - **which is not mentioned anywhere in the applicant's letter.**

In my original objection, I referred anecdotally to a "wake" being held with perhaps 200 people, and to the 50th anniversary party held recently. As above, the applicant does not refer at all to commercial hirings, which are clearly undertaken. See application form attached from <https://tamusamajuk.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/TSUK-Nepalese-community-centre-hire-form.pdf>. A full year calendar is set out - no blocking out of regular applicant activities dates. I do not have a copy of the Code and schedule of charges referred to but this is clearly more than the **activities by the applicant** described in the letter.

The options for the hiring (whilst referring to extra licensing for temporary licences) include **selling** alcohol and clearly states that the **hirer** is responsible for the building and guests. Not the applicant, so my points about who looks after the licensed activities are valid.

Was this form and the ancillary Code and charges supplied with the Licensing application? Has the Department or the Council generally approved it? If these were supplied with the application, then it is doubly unfair on a person considering the application not to have sight of any of this in considering whether and to what to object. If it was not, then a full picture was not presented to Licensing.

The form - which may not be up to date but is all I could find - does seem to contradict the assertions made by the Applicant.

7 I am interested by the comment "*TSUK was approached by Brent Council to apply for a licence to legitimise our activities and remain compliant.*" Was this by the Council/Trust as landlord and what particular feature was not compliant with what?

The activities in the unit are governed by planning as D1 and the terms of the Lease. Did the Council suggest for the park 12 hour/7 day weekly permission for alcohol and music and dancing? If so, this must cast some query on the independence of the Council on licensing this matter. Please ask the tenants who approached the tenants, with whom discussions have been held and

what suggestions were made? No discussions on the issue of nuisance to other tenants have been undertaken with any of the tenants, as far as I am aware.

8 Whatever the tenant did to the unit when it moved in is irrelevant, as the unit was advertised for letting, the rent was low in light of (a) the state of the premises and (b) the social value element offered by the tenant's proposed use, which did not mention 11/12 hour daily hirings/music/dancing/alcohol.

The terms of its lease will require repair, compliance with standards, health & safety, planning, statute etc. Any tenant would have been in the same position. The fact that it took the landlord a very long time to sort out tenders and eventually let the Card Room, thus allowing for lack of repair (and rough sleeping if that did indeed take place within the card room) is irrelevant.

9 The comments on availability of parking do not take on board the imminent closure of Sudbury Town car park, when development starts of the pocket flats. A development already giving rise to concern on the part of local residents on parking. (see for example most recent Sudbury Town Residents Association meeting, addressed by a Brent Planning officer and Pocket Studios staff.)

Further, the Fusilier car park is a **private** car park, Currently, the hotel/pub is not open at all, and the car park chained off. When it is open, it is for the private use of the hotel & pub users, other than by private arrangement with the owners.

The Barham Park car park is used by all park users, and is likely to be more used, once Sudbury Town closes. The surrounding residential streets are used by residents. The Post Office is open 7 days a week. I repeat this application is for 11/ 12 hours daily 7 days a week. The Community library users also use car parking.

10 The QE gardens are to be refurbished with CIL fund money. The area which the applicants' lease entitles them to use is at the other side of the building and directly abuts the park. I did not indicate the applicant damaged anything. I would expect damage not to be caused, and indeed the applicant's lease would require damage to be made good, and no nuisance, etc caused to other users. I am very concerned by what was evidently intended to be a comment of comfort:

*" Specifically, TSUK will ensure there is **no consumption of alcohol outside in the shared garden premises during the Barham Park Community Library opening hours and 1 hour after closing to minimise any anticipated risk to children and families.**"*

The QE Gardens are shared by all park users. The Library does not have any right to use it over and above any other park user, and my objection was not only as a Library user and volunteer but as a user of a public park, and one left in trust to the Council.

Drinking outside in the garden will discourage park users, and again, a PSPO is being imposed on the whole Park like all parks in Brent, because of the chilling effect on park users, especially but not exclusively children and families, the vulnerable elderly and women on their own..

My point is that this part of the Park is as available to members of the public as is any other. I was unaware that the toilets in the premises had been made available to all park users - which I am sure will be seen as very good news by all. However, I do not see the relevance of this to the issues arising from an application for 11 hour (sometimes 12 hours) seven day a week licensing for music, dancing and alcohol consumption in a Park at all - let alone a Park that is about to be the subject of a PSPO. No risk of harm at all to children, families or any other park users should be permitted. Minimisation is not enough.

I shall be away till the end of the month. I hope that the application will not be heard before I return, especially as you assured me the advertisement time was to be extended to 28 days from when the application was properly advertised. I believe this may be until 20th March. I have not checked but I hope that the Licensing Register has been corrected to show the expiry period which actually applies.

Yours sincerely,