

From: Barclay Road Residents

Sent: 31 March 2025 22:55

To: Mckenna Lorna: H&F <Lorna.Mckenna@lbhf.gov.uk>; Licensing HF: H&F
<licensing@lbhf.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Representation Fwd: 31 March deadline 2025/00256/LAPR St Paul's Green application and plan, existing licence and existing plan attached.

2025/00256/LAPR

Dear Licensing

This is my Rep against this application.

I am very concerned about this application.

I have a copy of it. I have a copy of the existing license. It expires this year.

The applicant states the licence variation is

“To allow more frequent events to take place brings more income to the council budget and choice of events for residents”

As stated, THIS HAS Nothing TO DO WITH THE LICENSING Objectives.

As well, the application is advertised as to continue to only allow one 3-day event per year, but the Application reads as if more events are needed to bring in money to the ‘Council budget’. This very confusing. Is it a variation to make the licence permanent ie in perpetuity or is it to allow any number of 3-day events, or is it both?

It also gives the impression of multiple events per year, not just one 3-day plus two day set up event.

I question the validity of the application.

It further states,

It would allow the operator, who is actually the council itself, to have an infinite license to bring in third parties to hold Events on this small strip of land below a flyover. In theory this might not sound too bad but in practice it could turn into all sorts of things that perhaps are not in the interest of crowd safety, public safety, safeguarding and thus the licensing objectives could be severely undermined and not promoted by either the licence holder or its third and fourth parties contracting out for the event management, event safety, etc.

There are good reasons to issue licences one year and per event, not in perpetuity and for any undefinable Event.

The essence of the licence application focuses on alcohol and light entertainment, hot food etc. . Much crime and ASB can be associated with this, the essence of the Licensing Act.

And there is no exacting plan to show access in/egress in the sense of how people Will move across very difficult areas with no zebra crossings. There are very few if any

visible crossing roads out from under the flyover and back into Hammersmith. The area is admittedly a bit of a confusing wasteland, albeit landscaped for the better not long ago.

Some of these points are actually planning issues. Where is the planning application to underpin last year's ONE allowed Event and when did it take place, if it did take place. Pls send it to me.

I would like to better understand how the Events Team can apply for such a licence. They are not an entity. They have no corpus. They would be passing on responsibility for use of the licence through third parties. As far as I understand the Licensing Act, this is not how it works, ideally. If it did, Freeholders and landlords would simply pay for a simple licence and hand over the reigns to whoever, forever. The Premises Licence holder needs to be a human person, not a department.

I assume this is for up to 499 people vs 4,999 or more. The application seems unclear to me on this point. Pls explain.

I do question if the application is valid in its vague form.

I suggest rejecting the application on the grounds of inability of the applicant to promote the four licensing objectives because there is no operation plan nor any reason given for the events but to add money to a budget. As well, I have highlighted specific concerns above that are not addressed in the Conditions of the existing licence, time-limited licence for one year for one 3-day event. The Council needs to be far clearer regarding intent so that the bog standard Conditions match up with a provided operating plan for a precise event.