From: I

Sent: 07 November 2025 14:45

To: Gardiner Neil: H&F <Neil.Gardiner@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Powerleague Fives Limited - Premises variation Shepherds Bush

Dear Neil

Thank you for your email

I need to speak to some of the CAB about this and also the Friends of Hammersmith Park and I am little concerned by your time frames as it is already Friday afternoon and you have asked for feedback by Monday

I will see what I can do.

From: <

Sent: 07 November 2025 14:15

To: Gardiner Neil: H&F <Neil.Gardiner@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Powerleague Fives Limited - Premises variation Shepherds Bush

Neil - thank you for sharing and good to know you're liaising on this.

Please note that we would still object to what the solicitor's proposing as believe it would be difficult to implement. Basically as standard in vicinity of football stadiums, alcohol should not be for sale around times of matches whether that's in pubs or in this case a 'family-friendly sports venue with direct access to public park'.

We trust they withdraw their application.

With thanks

From: Harris of the second of

Sent: 11 November 2025 17:45

To: Gardiner Neil: H&F <Neil.Gardiner@lbhf.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Powerleague Fives Limited - Premises Licence application.

Dear Neil Gardiner,

Thank you for forwarding the letter and for inviting a response.

The correspondence raises several points that require clarification and correction. Firstly, the account of the "error" relating to the charity event materially misrepresents the nature of that incident. While the event in question has been cited as a singular lapse, it was in fact one of a number of occasions on which breaches of conditions have taken place. This one was highlighted in response to the proposal to relax restrictions, however, this is not an isolated oversight but part of a wider pattern of failures in compliance and in protecting the community from negative impacts resulting from their

customers. Such a pattern points to an ongoing and relaxed approach to the obligations imposed by planning, licensing, and management controls, and to the adverse impacts that both the breaches and the behaviours of their customers have had on the local community.

It is also unclear whether Powerleague's management is unaware of, has failed to record, or has chosen not to disclose the full extent of previous breaches. In any of these scenarios, the omission calls into question the operator's diligence, transparency, and capacity to uphold conditions in the future.

In respect of the proposed wording, it is entirely contrary to the assurances that were given at the time that a concession to allow the sale of alcohol on the premises was agreed between all parties. The proposed variation to remove/reword Condition 17 is wholly inconsistent with the original assurances given to the Council and local residents when the licence was first granted. At that time, agreement to permit the inclusion of a bar in the design and sale of alcohol was a carefully negotiated concession, based on the understanding that the bar would serve only players using the pitches, allowing them "a quick drink after playing." This limited purpose was central to securing local consent. Hosting pre-arranged events or gatherings connected to Queens Park Rangers fixtures is entirely at odds with that understanding and would represent a fundamental change to the character and operation of the premises. The Home Office Section 182 Guidance (particularly paragraphs 1.16–1.17 and 9.43– 9.44) emphasises that conditions should be clear, enforceable, and proportionate to the risks identified, and that they should not be removed unless circumstances have **demonstrably changed.** There is no evidence of such change here. On the contrary, the operator's past conduct suggests that relaxing this safeguard would likely undermine the very objectives the condition was designed to protect—most notably, the prevention of public nuisance and possible disorder on QPR match days.

The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Statement of Licensing Policy (2022) also underlines the importance of cumulative impact, local amenity, and responsible management within residential and parkland areas. The policy stresses that applications will be considered particularly carefully where there is a history of negative impacts and non-compliance.

In light of the above, Condition 17 remains both necessary and proportionate to promote the licensing objectives and to protect the amenity of residents and park users. The operator has not demonstrated full compliance, a pro-active approach to ensuring their customers are mindful of impacts to the general public and local community when arriving or leaving or any significant change in circumstances that would justify its removal.

For these reasons, I continue object to the application to remove or change Condition 17.

Kind regards