Paul Pavlou Pepys Street London EC3N 2NU

City of London Corporation, Licensing Section, Walbrook Wharf 78-83 Upper Thames Street EC4R 3TD

Hand delivered

4 June 2018



I am writing to register my objection to the granting of a premises licence to Gremio De London Limited at the premises, 26a Savage Gardens London EC3N 2AR and I am wholly supportive of the application to review it.

The basis for this opposition is that granting a licence for these premises will not promote the licensing objectives, particularly the prevention of public nuisance and the prevention of crime and disorder.

26a Savage Gardens lies within the City of London, Fenchurch Street Station Conservation Area. The premise is part of a residential corner of the city comprising over 100 homes. 25, 26 Savage Gardens and adjoining 1 Pepys Street houses the majority of these homes, including my own. The vicinity is manifestly residential and 26a is directly connected to and forms part of the structure of those homes. I understand from the plans submitted that the 26a outside derelict area enclosure which our homes back onto is planned for transformation into a terrace area for 60 covers and will be accessed through the proposed night club via a folding glass door which was recently installed by the knocking down of a railway arch wall.

This would be totally detrimental to the licensing's objectives. The derelict area is directly surrounded by homes. The only sound one generally hears emanating from that part is the sound of trains either coming into or leaving slowly from Fenchurch Street Station. These quiet sounds are amplified and echoed by the residential buildings which house our homes and directly surround the derelict area but the sound is of a generally acceptable level. No one anywhere (let alone 100 homes) should have to endure a night club/night spot/late night tapas bar etc. and its outdoor terrace being built in such a space.

The residents in the conservation area already receive a disproportionate amount of noise from existing neighbouring bars. A licence would provide a further source of alcohol and public nuisance at a larger scale within an area already so heavily populated with licensed premises that crime, disorder and public nuisance have already reached problem levels for the local residents. I have video evidence of an unacceptable level of disturbance taking place by

the presence of only 4/5 people loitering outside 26 Savage Gardens during the early hours of a Sunday morning. Just 4/5 people created enough noise to keep me and others awake. Sound in Savage Gardens travels because of the surrounding residential buildings. It's a narrow passage walkway/path. You can hear people speaking on the path. It's no place for a night club/spot and neither is the derelict area.

The word "vibrancy" and "bringing vibrancy" is used in the minutes from the hearing last year. I do not find the use of such a term to be responsible or appropriate when describing plans for the Fenchurch Street Station Conservation Area, a place of historical and cultural relevance that is heavily populated by residents of the City of London as well as tourists and business people staying in reputable hotels looking for a quiet place to sleep.

Parallels were drawn with the proprietor's club in Brixton which is in an old church crypt, surrounded by grounds and across a busy highway (the A3) to the nearest house. Any reading of the google reviews of that establishment will allow one to see that "vibrancy" is one of the aims of the club. Loud music, long queues to the bar etc. all form part of the recorded experiences.

Residents in the compact Fenchurch Street Station Conservation area already suffer noise nuisance and antisocial behaviour. It would be totally unacceptable and a display of complete disregard to those living here to permit this establishment to proceed. It's puzzling how one could think it appropriate to apply for a license in such a place.

Again this quiet corner of the city is manifestly residential. 26a Savage Gardens forms part of the residential buildings which houses most of the residents. Parallels cannot, nor should be, drawn with the proprietor's other establishment in Brixton.

In view of the above, I would urge the Licensing Authority to review the premises license.

