

From: Oonagh
Sent: 12 January 2026 15:05
To: Daliah Barrett <Daliah.Barrett@haringey.gov.uk>
Cc: Cllr Cathy Brennan <Cathy.Brennan@haringey.gov.uk>
Subject: additional evidence - Victoria Stakes N10 3TH

Dear Daliah,

I am writing to provide, for the Sub-Committee's consideration, a copy of a statutory declaration submitted by Mr Peter McDonald in support of a separate planning application (HGY/2025/3272) relating to the Victoria Stakes. I appreciate that planning and licensing are separate entities and I am not asking the Sub-Committee to determine any planning matter.

I am submitting this document (along with Mr Ben Abrahams' statutory declaration and the planning consent conditions) because it illustrates the type of factual inaccuracy and imprecision that I have experienced in evidence relied upon by the premises and which is also relevant to the weight that can be attached to assurances about management, control and impact in the licensing context.

Examples:

Mr McDonald states that he has "worked closely with neighbours to prevent disturbance". As the nearest residential neighbour to the covered dining area, I have never met Mr McDonald and have had no engagement with him.

The site plan attached to the declaration does not identify my home as a residential dwelling, despite it being directly adjacent to the covered dining area. This mirrors a wider pattern in which the sensitivity of immediately adjoining residential accommodation is understated.

The declaration refers to "small acoustic bands" performing in the rear covered dining area. I have never witnessed or heard an acoustic band performing in that space, despite my home being approximately three feet away and directly overlooking it.

The declaration also describes routine and continuous use of amplified music in the covered dining area for a wide range of events, including weddings, parties and community gatherings. This description mirrors statements made by the former owner, Mr Ben Abrahams, and sits uneasily with other representations suggesting that any music in this area is merely incidental or low-level.

Taken together, these sworn descriptions suggest that amplified sound in the covered dining area has been treated by successive operators as a normal feature of use, rather than an occasional or tightly controlled exception. I am not asking the Sub-Committee to make any findings on planning compliance. I raise this point because it bears directly on the reliability of the premises' evidence, the consistency of their narrative and the extent to which assurances about control can be relied upon in practice.

I ask that this material be taken into account when assessing the weight to be attached to the premises' evidence, particularly in relation to claims about neighbour engagement, management control and the nature and scale of activity in the rear covered dining area.

I'd be very grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this email.

Best wishes and thank you.

Oonagh