

Toby Brown
[REDACTED]
Bolt Court
London, EC4A 3DQ
[REDACTED]

16 March 2024

Dear City of London Licensing

Re: objection to new premises license for “Tokyo Hit” at 165 Fleet Street, London EC4A 2AE, applied for by Bloomsbury Leisure Holdings Limited

I write as a local resident to object to the above premises license application, which if granted would create serious nuisance and disruption to local residents and business workers. In reality, it would make living next door unbearable.

By way of background, I live next door at 6 Bolt Court, having been a permanent resident for 13 years, and I work nearby as a barrister.

The envisaged licensed premises would be completely inappropriate given the licensing objectives of the prevention of both public nuisance and of crime, due to:

- (a) **the adjacent narrow alleyway and small square**, and
- (b) **the close proximity of our residential building** (and offices too).

Immediately adjacent to the premises is a narrow alleyway, St Dunstan’s Court, into which a large number of patrons will inevitably congregate or pass through, both in arriving, leaving or to smoke/vape. Experience and common sense indicates that a proportion will be drunk. From the narrow alleyway, a number of patrons will unavoidably spill or travel into Bolt Court, which is continuous with St Dunstan’s Court.

St Dunstan’s Court, showing the premises at 165 Fleet Street on the right (looking South towards Fleet Street)



Bolt Court, showing the residential premises 6 Bolt Court on the left (looking East from the edge of St Dunstan’s Court i.e. just next to the proposed licensed premises)



Some of those patrons congregating in or travelling through St Dunstan's Court and Bolt Court will inevitably cause a public nuisance and/or commit the criminal offences of:

- (a) Public urination and vomiting;**
- (b) Littering of cigarette butts, disposable vapes, and drinks containers;**
- (c) Rowdy noise as expected from drunks and other revellers;**
- (d) In some cases, abusive/threatening language to residents/office workers;**
- (e) In the worse cases, fights/violent disorder from drunk or high patrons.**

These are not academic or unlikely concerns, rather it is common sense that such public nuisance and criminal offences will very likely result from the proposed premises license, especially given its size, location, and likely number of patrons given the floor plans which accompany the application. Just to share some of my own personal experience:

Re (a) above, we already see some late night/early night public urination in St Dunstan's Court and in Bolt Court, which would clearly be significantly worse with the proposed licensed premises. The first photo on the right is recent night time urination to the corner of our residential premises. The second photo on the right I took this morning in St Dunstan's Court, showing the side exit from the proposed premises at 165 Fleet Street.



Re (c), in the past week about 7.30pm a few minutes walk from my flat I encountered 3 drunk men, shouting and urinating in a small residential square (see photo to the right), including urinating against a residential door, and one of whom was simulating a sex act. This was directly outside a pub, whose staff did nothing to control or warn against their behaviour.



Re (d) I previously asked a drunk man adjacent to Bolt Court who was making noise to please keep the noise down, and in return he threatened to assault me, following me back to the door of our building. Unsurprisingly, most residents will likely be scared to ever try to ask patrons from the proposed premises to keep the noise down, not to urinate or to disperse.

To be clear, the area traditionally does not suffer significant public nuisance or crime, being usually a peaceful area especially from Friday evening through to Monday morning.

Given the public nuisance and related criminal behaviour which is very likely to result from the proposed license, the impact on residents at 6 Bolt Court will be significant. In

reality, such noise, urination etc will blight their lives, given the proposed licensing hours end at 2am, made even worse by the lack of any respite from Friday evening through Sunday evening (when residents currently enjoy peace and quiet).

But even if the hours were limited e.g. to 10pm, and to only open Monday to Thursday, one would still expect a level of public nuisance and related criminal activity, both in afternoons and evenings, which would affect both residents and local officer workers. People can and obviously do get drunk in the early evening, and act inappropriately as exemplified by what I saw locally at only 7.30pm as mentioned above, and such revellers can hang-about causing disruption for some time before they move on.

It is common sense that the application's mitigations of CCTV and signage "to leave quietly" will, in reality, do little to prevent such nuisance. We have all seen drunk revellers leave premises noisily and carry out anti-social behaviour, completely ignoring CCV and such ineffectual signage. And even with bouncers, they cannot effectively police the activities of patrons once they have left the premises, especially once they walk in the next door square.

Unsurprisingly, I was advised by someone with substantial policing experience, but who could not comment officially, that the proposed licensed premises would be "**a nightmare to police**".

For the above reasons, the City of London is respectfully asked to refuse the application.

I would be grateful to be given notice of any oral hearing of the application, so that I can make oral representations.

Yours sincerely

Toby Brown