

19th of July, 2019

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to comment on the application by Daisy Green (the “**Applicant**”) on 21 June 2019 in relation to 2 London Wall Place (the “**Property**”) (the “**Application**”) on the basis of 1) public nuisance 2) protection of children from harm and 3) prevention of crime. I am a tenant of [REDACTED] Roman House, Wood Street (the “**Apartment**”) for over three years, having lived in the City of London for over four and half years. My Apartment’s windows overlook the Salters’ Garden, the Apartment is located on upper ground floor and has a direct view of the 2 London Wall Place, and is at a similar elevation as the entrance of 2 London Wall Place. If the Application is granted, then I believe I will be forced to move out of my current home.

I am very concerned about the proposed license and below I list my concerns:

1) Public nuisance:

If the new license would be granted as requested by the Application, then it is likely to lead to unacceptable and disruptive public nuisance and disturbance to residents like me.

Opening hours

The Applicant presents itself as a café bar. The biggest concerns to me are the proposed opening hours, the proposals to serve alcohol from 11am to 11pm every day and the extent to which it can be expected that alcohol will be consumed on the terrace and surrounding areas by Applicant’s clients. It means as a resident I would have no reprieve from intoxicated clients of the café bar and the unreasonable nuisance they would create. Furthermore, the Application lacks effective steps the Applicant intends to take to mitigate 1) public nuisance 2) protection of children from harm and 3) prevention of crime.

The design

The design of the Property causes particular alarm to me as for 11.5 hours each day the Applicant’s clients would be consuming alcohol outside. Most tables are outside and the wall separating the outside space from the inside space fully slides, thus in effect potentially making all of the table outside. It is not possible to have a reasonable internal temperature inside my Apartment without having windows open during the summer. This means I would be very exposed to this nuisance.

The Applicant as per the Application intends to serve alcohol on the outside terrace until 22:30. The applicant mentions no steps it intends to take to prevent public nuisance until 22:30 other than serving of substantial food and non-alcoholic beverages, which is likely to be ineffective i) as “bottomless brunch” and “free flowing prosecco” will be offered and ii) it would function as café bar, meaning it is likely that a significant portion of customers would choose to visit it as a bar only. After 22:30, the Applicant states that it will not be serving alcohol outside and that customers will only be outside temporary for smoking. However, given that the customers would be intoxicated already, they could be loud and disruptive anyways. Furthermore, if the windows of the Property are open, that would lead to disruptive and unreasonable nuisance regardless of whether customers are inside or outside.

The Applicant has not listed any steps it needs to take to minimise the nuisance and disruption caused by the customers entering and exiting the internal premises of 2 London Wall Place.

Wood Street Bar and Restaurant

For example, the nearby Wood Street Bar and Restaurant (53 Fore St, London EC2Y 5EJ), which is in a similar setting to the Property to which the Application relates to, does not permit any consumption of drink outside its internal premises and its employees are proactive in ensuring this restriction is adhered to by all of its clients. Similarly, Wood Street Bar & Restaurant, based on my observations, does keep its doors and windows closed to prevent public nuisance. In contrast, the proposed design of café bar would instead encourage the consumption of drink outside as outlined above. This would not be compatible with a resident-friendly area. Furthermore, the impact Wood Street Bar and Restaurant has on the residents is mitigated by it being closed on weekends. In contrast, the café bar would be open every day.

Bad Egg

A further example in the area is Bad Egg (CityPoint, 1 Ropemaker St, London EC2Y 9AW), which has similar offering of “bottomless brunches”.

However, there are significant differences:

1. its opening hours are significantly shorter, particularly on weekends (Saturday 10am – 7.30pm, Sunday 10am – 5pm);
2. it describes itself as diner nor café bar;
3. it has no outside tables;
4. it does not permit alcohol to be consumed off its premises;
5. it keeps its doors and windows closed;
6. it is not located next to a historical monument like the Roman Wall in the Salters’ Garden;
7. it is not located in a family friendly garden frequented by school children; and
8. it is not at the same elevation as nearby residential buildings.

In conclusion, there are no comparable dining and drinking establishments located in the area around Roman House as proposed by the Application. As per below, granting the Application would lead to a significant change of character of the area to the detriment of the nearby residents.

Change of character of the area

The Applicant would fundamentally change the character of the space from resident friendly, calm environment for nearby workers to enjoy nature, to have a calm lunch in a relatively silent environment, to one dominated by a commercial café bar which is likely to cause public nuisance if the Application was granted. Since the opening of Salters Garden and the surrounding public realm of London Wall Place, the garden has been used for leisurely lunches and quiet conversations. This I believe would be fundamentally altered once the Applicant’s café bar is opened in the same space and granted the alcohol license with the proposed extensive opening hours. I work long hours, thus weekends and late evenings represent an essential rest for me. I believe that the proposed operation of the café bar will not

allow me to have the sleep and rest I require for my health and wellbeing, consequently I will be forced to move-out of my current home.

2) Protection of children from harm:

The Salters' Garden and the adjacent territory is frequently used by school children of different ages around lunchtime and after school. It would not be desirable to have in the same space a café bar such as Daisy Green. Particularly, the planned offering of “bottomless brunch” and “free flowing prosecco” is likely to encourage irresponsible drinking and resulting anti-social behaviour. This is not something children should be exposed to in an area, such as The Salters' Garden, which is intended to be family and children friendly. I believe an establishment with “bottomless brunch” and “free flowing prosecco” is not compatible with the family friendly events that took place in the Salters Garden this summer. The Application as submitted does not address this risk at all.

3) Prevent of crime:

The combination of a bar and the nature of the area surrounding the premises, particularly the Salters' Garden and the historical London Wall, can lead to crime as it is a uniquely sensitive area. Salters' Garden could experience alcohol induced trespassing, increasing littering, drug use, intoxicated sleeping on the benches and the London Wall could also be at risk. As mentioned above, the planned offering of “bottomless brunch” and “free flowing prosecco” is likely to encourage irresponsible drinking and resulting anti-social behaviour. The Applicant has not submitted any steps it intends to take to prevent this apart from CCTV, which is likely only to have retrospective effect after the crime has occurred or the damage has been inflicted.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns as outlined above.

Yours Faithfully,

Dzeneta Masteiko