

Dear Peter

I read it straight through, without comparing what we had last time. I thought this would give me a better picture of how the Draft reads.

Listing all I saw, including typos, which I guess may be helpful for you in getting the final document drawn up:-

P.1 Contents as well as needing to insert page numbers, Part B 3 you have L.F.E.Centres Part C 1 you have U.F.E.Centre (i.e. a singular). Should part C be 'Centres'?

P.3 1.3 final bullet why is licensing in a bracket?

P.4 2.6 are you going to list all categories of those to who the consultation was addressed, or only those who respond? If you have a poor response rate, the latter may not look too good
Consultation looks to be between 13th November (when you e-mailed Members) and 19th December. It's only 5 weeks, and I have somewhere in my mind that consultation periods are 6 weeks min.

2.11 line 2 ?person able to.? I think omit the 'able to'.

P.5 3.1 final full line you say 'any responses' should this be 'all responses'?

P.11 1.5 bullet 1 Do we need Vulnerable persons in here as well as children? ,

With the above little items of detail, I reckon it reads quite well. The legal introduction is essential, I suggest, as then those with licenses, or applying for a L. cannot say they didn't know that was the law.

Also, I wonder, in 5.3 on P.6, line 4 could you be a little less positive than 'elected representative represents the ward likely to be affected' I think of Revolution at 144 Leadenhall St, which is in Lime St. but an early licensing appeal was lead by a resident in Aldgate, and the appeal against the removal of conditions recently was also lead by another Aldgate Resident. It's the impact, not the location of the establishment, that is crucial. I know that is a licensing case, but similar circumstances could prevail in Gambling.

A bit of a miscellany, but maybe something of use.

Regards