

Natalie Thompson

From: Bobby Nagpal <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 18 April 2019 15:08
To: Natalie Thompson
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Fw: Further response from 1 objector
Attachments: Appendix 1.jpg

Dear Natalie Thompson

I have been forwarded your communication addressed to Mr Ricky Wong for clarification of the facts and to set the record straight.

It is imperative that the committee members are presented with accurate facts (not misleading comments made by the objector) in order for the Committee to give the application due consideration. It would like the Clerk (or any other nominated person) to circulate a copy of this document to Committee members ahead of the meeting. I would also request that the Chair of the meeting read out this communication for the benefit of all members and attendees (who may not have had an opportunity to see this document).

Let me first deal with the pertinent matter of the building:

- I am the freeholder of the property. The site has been owned by my family for around two decades. I inherited and took over the management of the building in 2008.
- The building itself extends and wraps around from Whitechapel High Street on to the adjoining Gunthorpe Street. It is common with buildings which occupy a large footprint and which front on to two streets to have multiple entry/exit points often from different roads. Along with others, there is one entry on the high street which serves the front part of the building. There is also (and always has been) a doorway which leads into the building from Gunthorpe Street. Once through the black metal gate, you are met by an additional door - this beige colour door is visible in the objector's own photograph just beyond the black painted gate (see appendix 1 attached). Once through the gate and then the door, you have access to various parts of the building including the ground floor as well as upper floors by way of a stairwell.
- The access way the objector refers to was regularly used by vagrants as a toilet area. It was frequently stained with human urine and faeces. This is a plight that still plagues Burger King who has an accessway from Gunthorpe Street round the back of the White Hart pub into their kitchen area. My building also suffered from burglaries and those intent on causing malicious property damage. Consequently, the gates were erected for security purposes.
- This doesn't change the fact that tenants of my building have used access through this gate on Gunthorpe Street since the beginning of time. A great many tenants have come and gone through this accessway without any concerns from the objector until now. I, too, have used this very accessway from 2008 to 2016 for ingress and egress to/from my building when I occupied the ground floor retail unit of the adjoining building (1 Gunthorpe Street).
- The objector has presented extracts from a planning application made by a tenant in 2016 in which the stairwell is marked as a fire escape. This is correct in that the upper floors

can use the stairwell and the accessway as their means of escape in the event of a fire. However, the objector has presented the facts inaccurately - An accessway can have a dual purpose - be used as a means of fire escape **in addition** to it being used as an entrance/exit. The objector's own building (4 Gunthorpe Street) has a main entrance which also serves as a fire escape. It is common practice for buildings to have an entry/exit point ALSO labelled as a fire escape. Subsequently the objector's comments about the access being "unsuitable for purpose" are inaccurate, false and must be completely disregarded. These objections must have no bearing on the application.

It is important for the Committee to also be aware of the history I have with the objector.

The identity of the principle objector is no secret. This person routinely, correction...almost daily, raises complaints about almost every neighbouring business and/or building owner. He uses his own email address or alternatively through a handful of other friendly neighbours accounts when he wants it to look as though there are several objectors.

Mr Daron Pike (who also routinely communicates via Mr Craig Hutchinson and from most recently through Dr L Messias, Diana Huges and Zeta Azevedo) has been a nuisance to the operators of Burger King on Whitechapel High Street, to the tenants of 1 Gunthrope Street as well as myself. Since I inherited my later father's properties in 2008, not even six months have passed without Mr Pike et al making misleading, inaccurate comments/complaints about myself and/or my buildings.

Over the past couple of years, he has taken issue with one of my tenants, but instead of taking the matter to them directly, he has chosen to publicly attack my name - going as far as to contact Tower Hamlets, Epping Forest District Council as well as newspapers. Mr Pike has my personal mobile number and email address, as well as the contact details of my managing agents. Yet he has never engaged with any one of us. Around 4 years ago, after he raised yet another complaint against me, I bumped into Mr Pike and explained that should he have any concerns he should pick up the phone to me and I will always assist and act neighbourly. However, he has ignored my efforts to co-operate and failed to engage with tenants or managing agents. Instead, he has undertaken a systematic public blacken of my name.

In every correspondence to Tower Hamlets and others, Mr Pike refers to me as "Cllr Bobby Nagpal". Whilst it is correct that I am an elected Councillor in Essex, this volunteer position and title has nothing to do with my ownership of buildings within the Borough of Tower Hamlets. I have every right to run my property business in complete isolation and segregation to my Councillor duties. However, Mr Pike makes every effort to tie the two together. In recent communications with Tower Hamlets, he has phrased correspondences to suggest I am running an illicit and immoral sexual service business. He even went as far as conducting detailed research into my life, looking closely at my volunteer Councillor roles, then making false claims to Epping Forest District Council that I had violated Nolan Principles by not declaring my ownership of buildings within Tower Hamlets. He also made numerous other false and malicious accusations in order to interfere with my civic and business activities.

In the past month, it said to me "Bobby why has this Mr Pike got it in for you so much?". Until recently I had assumed his malicious anarchist actions were politically minded since his efforts are especially focused around election times. However more recently it appears that his motives are

[REDACTED]

I, like the Councillors in the Committee selflessly volunteer valuable personal time in the service of the others. We do this because we want to give back to the community. I am saddened that [REDACTED] I hope the Committee can see the underlying motives behind the objector's false claims in order to give the application fair consideration.

Kind regards
Bobby Nagpal

----- Forwarded message -----

From: ricky wong <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, 13 Apr 2019 at 14:57
Subject: Fw: Further response from 1 objector

From: Natalie Thompson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 April 2019 15:45:29
To: 'ricky wong'
Subject: Further response from 1 objector

Dear Ricky

Please see the below comments regarding the application from 1 objector.

As discussed I have sent this to planning to clarify but they have not yet replied. Please check the situation with your landlord. I will let you know the date of the meeting as soon as possible.

Kind regards

Natalie

I think it's important for the licencing committee to have a clear picture of the premises. In the spirit of the applicant adding comments at this stage, I would also like to.

The premises referred to as **87 Whitechapel High Street, 2nd Floor, E1 7QX** is unsuitable for the purpose because it will be dependent on staff and clients accessing via a caged fire escape in Gunthorpe Street not fit to be a commercial entrance. (See attached photos). The business calling its address **87 Whitechapel High Street, 2nd Floor, E1 7QX** should be accessible via the front door which is indeed in Whitechapel High St. (See attached photo).

Documents attached relating to PA/16/00916/NC show the premises to have been authorised change of use from B1 to D1 where it is submitted that the first and second floors were let together and entry would be appropriately via **87 Whitechapel High Street**. The agent has now let the first and second floors separately leaving the second floor with no entry apart from the rear fire escape and as such this partial use of the building renders the premises not fit for the purpose applied. (See example planning documents attached).

At the meeting I also intend to respond to the factual incorrectness of the applicants comments to my objection.

Working Together for a Better Tower Hamlets
Web site : <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk>

London Borough of Tower Hamlets E-Mail Disclaimer.

This communication and any attachments are intended for the addressee only and may be confidential. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this E-Mail in error please notify us as soon as possible and delete this E-Mail and any attachments. This message has been checked for viruses, however we cannot guarantee that this message or any attachment is virus free or has not been intercepted or amended. The information contained in this E-Mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information is legally exempt from disclosure, the Confidentiality of this E-Mail and your reply cannot be guaranteed.

If your request relates to a Freedom of Information enquiry, please resend this to foi@towerhamlets.gov.uk

Please consider your environmental responsibility: Before printing this e-mail or any other document , ask yourself whether you need a hard copy.

If you are not the intended recipient, the e-mail and any files have been transmitted to you in error and any copying, distribution or other use of the information contained in them is strictly prohibited. This e-mail message does not amount to a contractual or other legal commitment. All communications are subject to contract. E&OE.