

21st of May, 2018

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to comment on the application for a new license (amended on 21st of May, 2018) for the 2 London Wall Place by Enoteca da Luca 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 for over two years, having lived in the City of London for over three and half years. My apartment's windows overlook the Salter's 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.

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

1) Public nuisance:

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

The applicant presents itself as a restaurant and a café serving substantial food, however it is more aptly described as a bar. Having last week visited two other establishments of the applicant [REDACTED] Basinghall St, EC2V 5BQ; [REDACTED] Watling St, EC4M 9BR), most people were not consuming food but solely drinking alcohol, despite it being dinner time. Furthermore, the attached plans of the premises to the application, indicate that the ground floor of the premises will be a bar ('bar area', 'bar', 'wine and spirits, 'ledge' in the plans) and there is no indicated area for 'restaurant', 'seated tables' or similar anywhere in the attached plans, which would be a core part of the premises if the application concerned a restaurant/café. To me from the plans submitted, it is unclear where the coffees, pastries, cooked Italian food would be consumed as outlined on page 4 of the application. The application seems to be incomplete to me, as despite applying for off supplies of alcohol, there are no details given as the proposed consumption of these as requested by the application form at the bottom of page 4.

The biggest concern for me is the public nuisance which would arise as a result of people consuming alcohol immediately outside the internal premises of the establishment, like at the area referred to the attached plans as 'court yard'. At the two above mentioned operating establishments of the applicant there is consumption of alcohol outside the internal premises of the establishments (please see the attached photos). Both of the establishments have provided design elements which facilitate consumption of alcohol outside (along the windows there is a narrow shelf ideal for placement of drinks, but unsuitable for consumption of substantial food). Even on a Tuesday evening, when the photos were taken, this resulted in noise that I would find very disruptive if it would take place in the premises covered by the application in question. Please note that opening hours of the two above mentioned operating premises are shorter, than those proposed in the amended application. This could lead to more noise at the premises covered by the application in question than currently present at the two operating establishments.

The proposed measures by the applicant to remedy the risk of public nuisance are insufficient. It is not sufficient to keep music and general noise to reasonable level, but should instead be kept at very minimum. The close proximity of the premises to residential building and the design/shape of the garden, which amplifies all sound, makes it necessary. Even music

that is only played in background can be disruptive, if doors and/or windows of the premises are open. As can be seen by the attached photos, the other two establishments of the applicant keep their doors open allowing the background music and other noise from inside to be audible outside.

For example, the nearby Wood Street Bar and Restaurant (53 Fore St, London EC2Y 5EJ), which is in a similar setting to the premises covered by the relevant application, 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, it does keep its doors and windows closed to prevent public nuisance.

Enoteca 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 bar which is likely to cause public nuisance. Since the opening of Salters Garden and the surrounding public realm of London Wall Place, the garden has been used for leisurely lunches and quite conversations. This I believe would be fundamentally altered once a bar is opened in the same space.

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 bar such as Enoteca.

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 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 can be seen by the attached photos, Enoteca da Luca's clients have used the property of City of London (glasses alcohol placed on the fire gate) for unintended purposes and whilst I was there such behaviour was not challenged by Enoteca's employees.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Yours Faithfully,

Dzeneta Masteiko



15.05.2018 20:28 (St Paul's branch)



15.05.2018 20:33 (Guildhall branch)