

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Gokhan Saygi

Address: 1 waterlane Flat121 London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: This is a public area where London tower is viewed, public takes a rest.

There is a residential building where the residents settled and do not want a restaurant that will cause noise and smell of food 24/7.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Iain Reitze

Address: Flat 157 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: We have lived in Sugar Quay over 5yrs and look directly onto the Jetty. This Jetty is like our village green and it can be a real peaceful part of living in The City of London.

Having restaurant seating out there with increase noise, smells, litter, broken glass, encourage drunkenness, rowdiness, vermin.

It will take away valuable public space in an iconic viewing area for tourism and become dangerous as the jetty will become more congested.

This really is not conducive to have directly below residents rooms nor in keeping with this beautiful jetty out in the river.

Strongly object.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Dr Prasanna Sundaralingham

Address: 140 sugar quay London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I object to this proposal based on:

- 1) undue noise pollution to those living in the residential development as well as the hotel next door.
- 2) damage to the environment with risk of hygiene issues thereby attracting pests and vermin. This has previously been an issue causing damage to the jetty resulting in its temporary closure.
- 3) increased traffic in an area which is already busy due to tourists/buses/coaches/taxis
- 4) concerns regarding privacy as people will be able to see into apartments in the lower floors
- 5) offensive odours and food smells entering the apartment building which is undesirable
- 6) this will unduly affect the character of the area with a listed building next door which will affect its setting

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr James Li

Address: Flat 102 Sugar Quay London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: As a long-term resident of Sugar Quay, we strongly object the planning application for a restaurant in our building and the jetty. While I appreciate the idea of new businesses, this proposal raises serious concerns for those of us living here.

1. Noise: A restaurant will bring late-night noise from customers, staff, and deliveries, disrupting the peace we value as residents.
2. Smells and Waste: Cooking odours, pest control and waste management could create unpleasant living conditions, especially in a shared building.
3. Traffic and Parking: Increased visitors and deliveries will strain parking and traffic in an already busy area.
4. Building Strain: More footfall could lead to extra wear and tear on communal areas and security concerns with people coming in and out.

We moved here for a peaceful, residential environment, and this proposal doesn't align with that. I hope you'll take our concerns into account and reject the application.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Antonia Osgood

Address: Flat 53 Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Overcrowding will be a serious issue. The area should be conserved, not used for carrying food to and from through a small pedestrianised area. Noise pollution will disturb myself and other residents. There will also be an increase in rats to the area due to food waste and spillages.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Alastair Macaulay

Address: 63 Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: This area is a valuable public amenity as was recognized when permission to develop was granted. Changing its use and restricting access and egress not only deprives the community of this public space but also brings safety hazards in the event evacuation is needed whether from the jetty itself or from neighboring areas.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Ms Fiona Hazell

Address: Hamnvägen Stockholm

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The jetty is a space for sightseers to enjoy the views of tower bridge for free and should not be commercialized.



# Contact the City

Reference:CTC 674165041

Date :30/12/2024 16:30:46

Customer details

First Name	Patrick
Last Name	Goldrick
Customer Email Address	
Telephone	

Enquiry

Service Area	Planning
Enquiry	Consultation/Public objection
Enquiry type	Consultation/Public objection
statictext2	
Address	

FLAT 123 SUGAR QUAY, 1 WATER LANE LONDON EC3R 6AP

United Kingdom

Details Of Enquiry	SUGAR QUAY JETTY
--------------------	------------------

End of email



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ting Qin

Address: Flat 107, Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed use of Sugar Quay Jetty for restaurant and drinking establishment purposes due to the following reasons:

1. Loss of Public Space: The jetty is a vital public amenity offering unobstructed access to the river. Privatizing this space for commercial use diminishes accessibility and sets a harmful precedent prioritizing private enterprises over public benefit.
2. Noise and Disturbance: Outdoor seating and service for a drinking establishment will result in significant noise pollution, particularly in the evenings, disturbing residents and visitors who seek the jetty for peace and tranquility.
3. Visual and Environmental Impact: Commercial furniture and planters will alter the jetty's natural riverside character, while increased activity risks littering and environmental degradation.
4. Congestion and Safety: The limited space on the jetty cannot handle increased footfall and service activities, raising safety concerns and obstructing pedestrian access.
5. Precedent for Commercialization: Approving this proposal risks encouraging further commercialization of public spaces, undermining the communal and open nature of London's riverside.

I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal to preserve the jetty as a valuable public resource.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ting Qin

Address: Flat 107, Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed use of Sugar Quay Jetty for restaurant and drinking establishment purposes due to the following reasons:

1. Loss of Public Space: The jetty is a vital public amenity offering unobstructed access to the river. Privatizing this space for commercial use diminishes accessibility and sets a harmful precedent prioritizing private enterprises over public benefit.
2. Noise and Disturbance: Outdoor seating and service for a drinking establishment will result in significant noise pollution, particularly in the evenings, disturbing residents and visitors who seek the jetty for peace and tranquility.
3. Visual and Environmental Impact: Commercial furniture and planters will alter the jetty's natural riverside character, while increased activity risks littering and environmental degradation.
4. Congestion and Safety: The limited space on the jetty cannot handle increased footfall and service activities, raising safety concerns and obstructing pedestrian access.
5. Precedent for Commercialization: Approving this proposal risks encouraging further commercialization of public spaces, undermining the communal and open nature of London's riverside.

I urge the planning authority to reject this proposal to preserve the jetty as a valuable public resource.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr PAT GOLDRICK

Address: SUGAR QUAY 1 WATER LANE

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free accessible access 365 days /year.

It is utilised by hundreds of people from:

- Neighbouring communities, visitors, tourists, tour guide operators, accompanied schoolchildren & students on educational tours, city & local workers, residents for walks.
- Frequently utilised platform to take pictures of iconic backgrounds (Tower Bridge, HMS Belfast, Shard).
- To watch, listen, video & photograph on Royal occasions, Canon salutes from Tower of London & HMS Belfast. Admire & capture the wonder of Tower Bridge opening/closing too.
- Exercising groups, performers, dancers to practise their skills, children playing, families of all ages & abilities having fun

Sugar Quay Leaseholders pay 100% of the Jetty cost (circa. £100k p.a.) which includes Port London Authority, Licence, Lighting, Insurance, Housekeeping, Firtport management & fees. These costs & fees are included in our 999 year leaseholders agreement.

My wife & I, both in our mid-seventies, have lived at Sugar Quay since 2018 with no recollection of noise disturbance, excessive smoke pollution or smells. We love our river facing home.

The Jetty is the only open space available to the Sugar Quay residents nearby.

In its current use, it forms the ambience & cornerstone of our community. We will be stripped of our regular daily walks which benefits our wellbeing.

I strongly object to the above planning permission.

Pat Goldrick



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Ros Goldrick

Address: Sugar Quay-Flat123 Water Lane

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free accessible access 365 days /year.

It is utilised by hundreds of people from:

- Neighbouring communities, visitors, tourists, tour guide operators, accompanied schoolchildren & students on educational tours, city & local workers, residents for walks.
- Frequently utilised platform to take pictures of iconic backgrounds (Tower Bridge, HMS Belfast, Shard).
- To watch, listen, video & photograph on Royal occasions, Canon salutes from Tower of London & HMS Belfast. Admire & capture the wonder of Tower Bridge opening/closing too.
- Exercising groups, performers, dancers to practise their skills, children playing, families of all ages & abilities having fun

Sugar Quay Leaseholders pay 100% of the Jetty cost (circa. £100k p.a.) which includes Port London Authority, Licence, Lighting, Insurance, Housekeeping, Firstport management & fees. These costs & fees are included in our 999 year leaseholders agreement.

My husband & I, both in our mid-seventies, have lived at Sugar Quay since 2018 with no recollection of noise disturbance, excessive smoke pollution or smells. We love our river facing home.

The Jetty is the only open space available to the Sugar Quay residents nearby.

In its current use, it forms the ambience & cornerstone of our community. We will be stripped of

our regular daily walks which benefits our wellbeing.

I strongly object to the above planning permission.

Ros Goldrick

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Evie Watson

Address: The Bourne, Kingston Lane Uxbridge

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment:

The jetty should not be commercialised because it is a place where tourists and locals go to see the stunning views of London City.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Jon Goldrick

Address: 168 West End road Ruislip

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This public space is highly valued by locals and tourists and is used by many as an outdoor exercise and wellbeing location. The proposed application will severely impact the enjoyment of this space by locals and visitors as well as significantly limit the use for any kind of exercise and wellbeing.



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Joanna Watson

Address: The Bourne Kingston Lane Uxbridge

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: This public space is highly used daily by local communities and tourists alike for well being, exercise and education about the many iconic London buildings and surrounding areas you can see from the jetty.

Changing it to commercial use will deprive the locals and tourists now and for many generations to come, the freedom to use this open space.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Sophie Hill

Address: Sugar Quay, Apartment 83 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: We have been residents of Sugar Quay since 2019 and strongly object to the proposals for the ground floor of the Sugar Quay building and the jetty.

Having a restaurant / drinks establishment on the ground floor will increase noise pollution and congestion within and surrounding the building, which will inevitably disrupt residents in their homes during early hours and late nights. We are particularly concerned at how this will encourage drunkenness and rowdiness in the area, and how this will compromise the security and atmosphere of Sugar Quay, with customers lingering around or attempting to gain access to the building entrance, which is located in close proximity to the ground floor / restaurant doors, and the jetty. We are dissatisfied with the disregard for the privacy and safety of residents.

Residents of Sugar Quay pay 100% of the costs surrounding the upkeep of the Jetty and we anticipate an increase in waste, broken glass, cigarette disposals, and litter and are dissatisfied with the prospect of continuing to pay such fees for it to become commercialised as a drinking and food establishment.

The jetty has been enjoyed all year round by communities and tourists alike for many years as a place to view iconic aspects of London (Tower and London Bridge, the Shard, etc) and to exercise, read, sit in the sun and relax. Being in close proximity to the Tower of London, it is

constantly occupied by tourists. We object to its privatisation as we feel this will deprive locals and tourists of the pleasure of an open and free space.

Sugar Quay has been a safe, peaceful and happy home for many years and we are apprehensive of the proposed plans.

Thank you for your consideration.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Wayne Watson

Address: The Bourne Kingston Lane Uxbridge

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: The Jetty is a space to be enjoyed by residents and tourists alike. It is used all year round and should not be for a commercial venture.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Kyle Watson

Address: The Bourne Kingston Lane Uxbridge

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I object to the proposal to enable the commercial use of the Sugar Quay jetty. Many residents and tourists alike use the space to enjoy the views that can be enjoyed from the space. The planned changes will have a detrimental impact on a multi-purpose jetty and create unnecessary noise pollution for local residents.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Stella Sutcliffe

Address: Cobwebs 108 Ebury Road Rickmansworth

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This is a beautiful spot where people walk by and collectively enjoy the area without needing to pay to do so.

I have enjoyed this spot for years and would not want to see so much space taken up for commercial purposes.

It's a great place to exercise and now there may be people using it as a smoking area?

Isn't this a public place? - How can this be allowed?

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Mikael Olsson

Address: Flat 164, Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free accessible access 365 days /year.

It is utilised by people of all kinds, residents, tourists people from neighbouring communities, schoolchildren & students local workers etc.

It has a free view to iconic landmarks as the Tower Bridge, HMS Belfast, the Shard etc and it is a safe, non commercial place for public use as photography, people exercising or just enjoying bathe neighbourhood.

Sugar Quay Leaseholders pay 100% of the Jetty cost (circa. £100k p.a.) which includes Port London Authority, Licence, Lighting, Insurance, Housekeeping, Firtport management & fees. These costs & fees are included in our 999 year leaseholders agreement.

My wife & I, both in our sixties, have lived at Sugar Quay since 2018 with no major noise disturbance (however the noise of party boats and exercising groups on the jetty is very audible however for short moments only), excessive smoke pollution or smells.

We love our river facing home.

The Jetty is the only open space available to the Sugar Quay residents nearby.

In its current use, it forms the ambience & cornerstone of our community. We will be stripped of our regular daily walks which benefits our wellbeing.

Any commercial use would limit public access and add very much noise, litter as well as other disturbances to this beautiful addition to the Thames area.

I strongly object to the above planning permission.

Kind regards

Mikael Olsson



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sonja Katarina Olsson

Address: Flat 164, Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:

Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free accessible access 365 days /year.

It is utilised by hundreds of visitors, tourists, schoolchildren city & local workers and residents as well as exercising groups, performers, dancers, photographers.

Sugar Quay Leaseholders pay 100% of the Jetty cost (circa. £100k p.a.) which includes Port London Authority, Licence, Lighting, Insurance, Housekeeping, Firtport management & fees.

These costs & fees are included in our 999 year leaseholders agreement.

My wife & I, both in our sixties have lived at Sugar Quay since 2018 with no recollection of any major noise disturbance (except the noise from party boats and loud exercising groups, however it is only for a few minutes), excessive smoke, pollution or smells.

We love our river facing home.

In its current use it is a great addition to the riverfront. This would dramatically change to the worse with commercial use of part of the jetty in terms of view, access, noise, litter etc.

A change would be against the very fundamental reason why the jetty was built, why people like it so much.

I strongly object to the above planning permission.

Katarina Olsson

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr james Maguire

Address: 11 Beacon Close Uxbridge Middlesex

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This area should be open to the public at all times and not restricted by being used by a private venture.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Scott Hayward

Address: 8 Ivyhouse Rd Uxbridge

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Traffic or Highways

Comment: It should be open to all

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Sarah Bruton

Address: 3 Brackley Close Aston Clinton Aylesbury

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: The walk way should be open to the public to freely pass

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Daniel Burke

Address: Bloemfontein road London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: This area should be remain open to the public at all times and not restricted.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Damian Finnegan

Address: 22 Derwent Close Watford

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: This is not good for friends who live there. They don't want a restaurant in their back garden. Noise & cooking smells would be atrocious and an eyesore for the area. This cannot go ahead

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Ms Troo Heath-Crew

Address: Flat 154 Sugar Quay 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: We have been residents of SQ since 2020 and have always known of the restaurant option on the ground floor. However this new proposal to convert the public jetty into a majorly private dining terrace gives rise to some serious concerns:

1. Our apartment faces east with our terrace overlooking the internal quadrangle with an 'opening' to the Thames. This opening (where the restaurant door will be) creates a kind of acoustic cone so noise from the party boats for example is massively amplified. We have to raise our voices to be heard when the terrace doors are even ajar. Clattering trolleys with crockery & glassware 12 hours a day is a horrifying prospect.
2. Much is made of the buildings' Comfort Cooling (not air conditioning) & MVHR systems in the application. In practice however, their functionality is limited at best, and we should not be forced to close our terrace doors (the only means of acquiring fresh air as no windows open) & live in a hermetically sealed unit so as to shut out the noise & disturbance.
3. Retaining the jetty for public use was a stipulation in the original planning when the development of SQ was approved. This change of use to severely limit public access contravenes this, taking a public amenity away for commercial gain.
4. The selective data provided in the various 'reports' suggests that typically 20 people use the jetty at any given time. We wholly dispute this. It is contrary to our lived experience when we typically see numbers in excess of 40 people on the jetty during dry days & in excess of 80 during warm days at any given time.

5. The jetty is very exposed to the elements, and strong winds gust along the river. There has been no mention of sunshades to protect diners from the strong sun, nor how other furniture will be secured, and items such as glasses and napkins not strewn around. This impacts residents & the public alike.

6. Many more objections incl security (garage/side entrance) but limited space for comments doesn't allow



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Gokhan Saygi

Address: 1 waterlane SugarQuay apt 121 London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment:

Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free access through out the year. It is utilized by residents, tourists, schoolchildren, students local workers etc.

It has a free view to iconic landmarks as the Tower Bridge, HMS Belfast, the Shard etc and it is a safe, non commercial place for public use as photography, people exercising or just enjoying neighborhood. Sugar Quay Leaseholders have been paying the cost of Jetty for years which includes Port London Authority, Licence, Lighting, Insurance, Housekeeping, Firtport management & fees. These costs & fees are included in our 999 year leaseholders agreement.

We purchased the SugarQuay apt for a peaceful retirement life in London away from all kinds of pollution (noise, car, smoke and smell)..

The Jetty is the only open space available to the Sugar Quay residents. Any commercial use would limit public access and add a lot of noise, litter, smell as well as other disturbances to this beautiful addition to the Thames area. I strongly object to the above planning permission.

Best regards

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Peter Egnor

Address: 111 New Crane Wharf 11 New Crane Place London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: Loss of public amenity

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss liana zhao

Address: flat 144 sugar quay london

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways

Comment: i hate human around me including denial of public access.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Julian Keller

Address: Flat 104, 1 Water Lane Sugar Quay London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Against the privatization of the jetty. The public and especially residents of the building should be to use it without restrictions.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Iain Reitze

Address: Flat 157 Sugar Quay London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: As a resident of Sugar Quay I very strongly object to this outdoor seating application for numerous reasons.

This is a lovely, quiet area on the river away from The City, as a resident it feels like our village green.

It is enjoyed by many many tourists watching the river and and the bridges.

Having a large seated restaurant will certainly take this away making the area smaller & congested.

It will increase noise levels for residents with people drinking, eating, it will increase the odours into our homes and no doubt increase the chance of vermin because of dropped food.

I would also like to know the impact on marine life with food, drink, cigarettes being dropped through into the water and the smoke travelling into apartments.

The local council and The Port Authority really do have an obligation to look after our riverside and our residents.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Jackie Alexander

Address: 157 Sugar Quay, 1 Water Lane London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: As a resident of Sugar Quay I very strongly object to this outdoor seating application for numerous reasons.

This is a lovely, quiet area on the river. You can easily forget you are in London and we sit on our balcony enjoying the tranquility and peacefulness of the river before us.

There is a constant stream of people and tourists enjoying the stunning views from the pier. We also regularly enjoy walking our dogs around there too..

Having a large seated restaurant will certainly take this away making the area smaller & congested.

It will increase noise levels for residents with people drinking, eating, it will increase the odours into our homes and no doubt increase the chance of vermin because of dropped food.

The constant crossing on the walkway to deliver food and drinks will be restrictive, noisy and will make it very difficult to walk our dogs outside the home where we live.

I would also like to know the impact on marine life with food, drink, cigarettes being dropped through into the water and the smoke travelling into apartments. The issues with drinking and people lingering into the night. Not to mention the increase in litter which is a regular occurrence outside Coppa.

We support a restaurant within the building but the area outside should remain a safe and pleasant space for all to enjoy.

The local council and The Port Authority really do have an obligation to look after our riverside and

our residents.

This area should be enjoyed by the many and not just the few who book to eat and drink there.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Jeanette Gowney

Address: 80 Tan House Drive Wigan

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: This would spoil a lovely area there is already a restaurant 2 mins walk away at Copa so I don't see the need for this to be built



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Lord Jeff Williams

Address: 7 Weybourne Drive Wigan

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I am a frequent visitor to this area of London, I have friends who live in the apartments above the proposed area to be changed into a restaurant. This area should remain 'an open public access area' as the noise, smells and general disturbance will massively affect the residents who live above, if a restaurant was to open there.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Julie Williams

Address: 7 Weybourne Drive Goose Green Wigan

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Having spent a significant amount of time visiting friends living in Sugar Quay I feel that the planned takeover of The jetty is unnecessary and will actually spoil the entire vibe of the waterfront and will certainly cause disruption to the residences.

Noise, food smells and litter would not be acceptable and given its proximity to a major London landmark (the Tower) with its ample eateries and bars is an unnecessary addition.

Please bear this in mind when making your decision.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Jason Robins

Address: Monks Hall, Parsonage Farm, Abridge Road Theydon Bois

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: Our friends have a luxury apartment overlooking the jetty. The smells and noises emanating from the "private" food venture coupled with the noise from the external air conditioning would be unacceptable to them.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Susan Catterall

Address: 64 Almond Green Avenue Standish Wigan

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: Too many restaurants in area already. Increase in noise and smells will detract from a pleasant pedestrianised thoroughfare.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr John Catterall

Address: 64 Almond Green Avenue Wigan

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: With open spaces such a limited commodity these days, such a beautiful area as Sugar Quay should be

kept as such. Eating establishments are already in place, there is no requirement to further extend this restaurant other than pure greed.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Danielle Pointing

Address: 58 Heronway Brentwood

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: Another unnecessary establishment. I used to live next door and the noise from party boats was bad enough. This will be highly disruptive, noisy, smelly and likely unsightly amongst an area of history.

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



**24/01196/FULL | Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty : OBJECTION**

**Letter sent as email to Samuel James, Planning Officer, City of London**

**[Samuel.James@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Samuel.James@cityoflondon.gov.uk); [plncomments@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:plncomments@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

**December 28 2024, modified January 14 2024**

**Dear Sirs,**

## **THE RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP**

The River Residents Group (RRG) is made up of people who live, work and travel on or by the Thames and/or are concerned with its conservancy. The RRG is unincorporated, self-funding and run by a volunteer steering group guided by our constitution. We publish regular newsletters. Working with communities in six riparian boroughs, we respond to Planning and Licensing applications on the Thames, working with riparian Environmental Health, Licensing and Planning officers and the London Port Health Authority (LPHA), arranging public and virtual meetings. We liaise with councillors and MPs to raise the concerns of our communities. We have developed a Google Tool to document and analyse excessive noise from vessels, recording 2600 incidents in the last three years.

## **OUR OBJECTION TO 24/01196/FULL: A SUMMARY**

We object to this application on the grounds that it will cause Significant Observed Adverse Effect on the residents of 164 adjacent apartments, who will suffer their quality of life diminished due to a major change in the acoustic character of their area as well as the loss of amenity space that has contributed to their health and well-being for years.

The applicants have commissioned an acoustic report that quotes national and local policy on noise nuisance – but have failed to offer actual design mitigations – such as a roof – or any workable, enforceable conditions to protect residential amenity. The applicants' case is that double glazing and air-conditioning in adjacent apartments mean that any noise nuisance will be inflicted **by the residents choice** – if they choose to open their windows. We contend that, as the Agent of Change, it is not for the applicants to dictate that longstanding residents may no longer be allowed fresh air

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



except in exchange for the noise of 169 drinkers, bottling and servicing under their homes fourteen hours a day, seven days a week.

We also lament the colonisation, commercialisation and narrowing of a very large area that is currently offered as public space on one of the busiest stretches<sup>1</sup> of the Thameside walkway – for a scheme that will create private profit at the cost of loss of amenity to residents and non-paying visitors alike.

In all the foregoing, this scheme fails to comply with national or local Planning policy.

In detail:

## DISINGENUOUS APPLICATION WORDING

The D & A characterises this as “sui generis restaurant/bar”. That is not an entity under the new planning classifications established under the 2020 Business and Planning Act. While restaurants (former A3) are now Class E, former class A4 drinking establishments such as a public houses, wine bar or other drinking establishments are now classified as 'sui generis' which means they are a use beyond classification and do not benefit from any permitted development right to move to any other use. “Sui generis” in this case signals a bar, not a restaurant. The designs do not feature a kitchen: they appear to demonstrate that this is just a bar, maybe with cold or microwaved bar snacks. There is just “storage” and a “Services area”.

And what exactly do the italicised words mean here: “The Jetty would be use as a sui generis restaurant/bar seating area **serving the existing A3/A4 uses of Ground Floor retail unit of Sugar Quay**”?

How does that assertion work in conjunction with the words, “*The staff will be serving tables from the Services area provided in the jetty which will store food and drinks*”? This appears to state that the proposed new bar is self-contained and **not** “serving” the existing uses in Sugar Quay. It is an entirely new bar area: **there will be no need for the drinkers to proceed to take a meal with food inside the building.**

If the applicants are going to insist that this is not just a bar, and that food is being cooked inside Sugar Quay, then hot food is going to be shuttled across what is left of

---

<sup>1</sup> According to The City of London’s RIVERSIDE WALK ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY 2014



# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



the reduced footway? How would that work in terms of public safety? See below for our concerns about the open space colonisation.

Clarification is required: would the patrons use this bar without taking a meal inside Sugar Quay? The very blurring of the terminology might be seen to suggest that this may well be the intention.

If the plan is in fact to set up a large bar of “sui generis”, that usage would affect the kind of conditions – as well as design mitigations – that would need to be added to any consented scheme.

## **PUBLIC NUISANCE**

This is an enormous bar – 436m<sup>2</sup> with 169 covers proposed in the Operational Management Plan.

Interestingly, the heavily illustrated D & A avoids showing any representation of the bar with people in it.

A seating plan is merely ‘indicative’ meaning that vertical drinking is not ruled out.

People who drink without eating make more noise. The river transmits noise very efficiently in all directions. Above the proposed premises are multiple residents and opposite the proposed premises lies the London Bridge Hospital, which has rooms for patients on the river.

While the Noise Impact Report suggests no external amplified music, we see nothing of this specified in the D & A. No noise mitigations are proposed in the D & A. No design mitigations are proposed to stop the principle escape of loud human voice noise – no roof.

The ‘Template OMP’ – which should offer binding measures to mitigate noise management and dispersal – basically limits those undertakings to a sign asking people to leave quietly. It does not take on board most of the extremely detailed suggestions of the applicants’ own Noise Impact Report.

Apart from the noise of 169 drinkers, plus their comings and goings, it appears from the OMP that the noisiest process – moving of bottles (across the footpath) – will be happening at night up till 10pm. Up to 169 drinkers, how many sittings? – this is going to be a significant migration of bottles. What of the bottles being dumped all through the

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



day into waste areas? The residents are being asked to put up with a large noisy bar and a continuous bottling operation for fourteen hours a day, seven days a week. The reason that no serious mitigation has been offered is because it is impossible and the problem with this application is exemplified here: the size of this enterprise is exaggerated beyond what is reasonable for a site with residents upstairs and a hospital nearby.

The proposed hours are not late. But this is deceptive. Doubtless, the applicants will seek an off sales licence. As they recommend their project for exemplary public seating by the river, the drinkers will simply prolong their nights' consumption at the places conveniently provided, and then those drinkers will be the problem not of the applicants, who have sold them the liquor, but of the residents and the hospital.

While we understand that acousticians work with templates, we would request that they update them when new policy documents are implemented. This Noise Impact Assessment quotes outdated version of the NPPF and London Plan.

The proposed plans do not conform with the London Plan (2021) **Policy D13 Agent of Change**. The Agent of Change principle places the responsibility for mitigating impacts on the entity that is proposing a change.

*C New noise and other nuisance-generating development proposed close to residential and other noise-sensitive uses should put in place measures to mitigate and manage any noise impacts for neighbouring residents and businesses.*

*D Development proposals should manage noise and other potential nuisances by:*

- 1) ensuring good design mitigates and minimises existing and potential nuisances generated by existing uses and activities located in the area*
- 2) exploring mitigation measures early in the design stage, with necessary and appropriate provisions including ongoing and future management of mitigation measures secured through planning obligations*
- 3) separating new noise-sensitive development where possible from existing noise-generating businesses and uses through distance, screening, internal layout, sound-proofing, insulation and other acoustic design measures.*

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



*E Boroughs should not normally permit development proposals that have not clearly demonstrated how noise and other nuisances will be mitigated and managed*

The City Plan 2040 endorses this policy:

*“4.5.2 The ‘Agent of Change’ principle makes developers responsible for addressing at the design stage the environmental and other impacts of development on existing neighbouring occupiers. Applicants for development near to existing residential properties should identify potential impacts on residential amenity and set out measures to mitigate those impacts within their Design and Access Statements or other supporting application documents.”*

City Plan 2040 Strategic Policy S3: Housing states

*“The City Corporation will protect existing housing and amenity ... by ... 4. Ensuring that other new land uses within identified residential areas are compatible with residential amenity.”*

By this reasoning, the Committee should not permit a bar without a roof or concrete enforceable conditions embodied ideally in a credible OMP.

The Noise Impact Assessment refers to the City of London Plan 2015 rather than the upcoming City Plan 2040. But the latest plan notes that more residents will be populating the City in the future, and preserves the same rights of residents, providing that planners should resist schemes which would cause undue noise likely to generate disturbance to residents; also requiring new development near existing dwellings to demonstrate adequate mitigation measures to address detrimental impact as well as managing the impact of tourist attractions in the area to minimise disturbance to workers and residents and reducing residential exposure to air and noise pollution.

City Plan 2040 3.13.0 notes

*“The City increasingly operates on a seven day a week basis, with an increase in evening and night-time uses. This will result in an increase in pedestrian movements within the City as patrons enter and exit public houses, bars, night-clubs and restaurants. Anti-social behaviour, including noise, disturbance and odours arising from the operation of the premises can be disruptive to City*

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



*residents and occupiers and proposals should seek to mitigate any negative impacts that may arise, incorporating the Agent of Change principle.”*

This section of Plan notes that servicing can cause significant noise, as can departing patrons. No concrete or workable or substantial mitigations are proposed in this application.

This application offers none of the above.

In fact, the Noise Impact Assessment states complacently that Sugar Quay has high quality double glazing and air-conditioning so this proposal will not be a problem as the residents can breathe without opening their windows. The applicants draw the quite astonishing conclusion that if this huge bar causes noise to residents, ***it will be by the residents' choice:***

*(4.19) “Notwithstanding this, apartments have openable windows to balconies that are openable at user choice and/or to assist with ventilative night-time cooling of the properties (with an obvious corollary that openable windows will give rise to increased noise intrusion, but such noise increased ingress is allowed by user choice).”*

The Noise Impact team proposes a whole list of management offers which, troublingly, do not appear in the OMP. Perhaps this is because these measures are largely utterly unenforceable. When you have 169 customers at capacity, no one is going to be able to enact, supervise or ensure such finessing as *“used glass bottles to be placed carefully in recycling bins”* or *“Stock to be unloaded carefully using good lifting techniques to avoid impact type noises from dropping items”*. Also, we note *“Stock to be transferred between the jetty and restaurant using plastic contained / trolleys”* – when it is noisy wheels grinding over hard services that causes noise rather than food, which tends to be silent.

The long list of dream-scenario provisions are also at odds with the OMP which says that all the bottles will be moved at the end of service. This Noise Impact Assessment provides for, *“Avoiding the transfer of recyclable waste (e.g. bottles) during the later evening period”*.

In fact, these unrealistic, contradictory and unenforceable suggestions – and their absence from the OMP – gravely undermine a report that is based on them.

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



The elephant in the room here is that there is no design measure taken to mitigate noise ... i.e. adding acoustically effective roofing or walls. Of course that would cost money, but it is the only way to make sure that this development would confirm with NPPF and local planning policy.

The importance of preserving and protecting open air spaces for City residents is stressed in the City Plan 2040, with a special mention given to the riverside:

*“3.1.6 3.1.7 Outdoor spaces and the public realm provide places for relaxation, amenity and leisure. The location and nature of the City means that perceptions of tranquillity and quieter areas are often based on the relative noise levels of an area compared to its surroundings, rather than absolute noise levels. The City Corporation’s Noise Strategy 2016-2026 supports the creation of tranquil areas in the City and **promotes awareness of the importance of protecting and enhancing these locations where possible. Examples of quieter areas in the City are open spaces, parts of the Riverside Walk, churchyards and housing estates. Research on traffic noise has found that long-term exposure to noise above a certain level can have negative impacts on physical and mental health. It is therefore important to protect the relative tranquillity of some of the City’s open spaces to confer benefits to health and wellbeing by providing places of respite from the City’s generally high ambient noise levels, and assisting in the restoration and recovery from sensory overload.**”<sup>2</sup>*

1. Apart from costing them peace, this application may also cost the residents money. We wish to draw the Committee’s attention to a difficult potential consequence of consenting this scheme. The Jetty is subject to a River Works Licence (RWL) of 2014 (with a variation in 2019) with fees paid annually to the Port of London Authority (PLA). We understand that the residents are obliged to contribute to those fees. If the Jetty is commercialised as a bar, the PLA is likely to require a revised RWL with added fees. This means that the City’s tax-paying residents would likely have to pay more for the very River Works Licence that would mean they may not be able to open their windows or use their balconies fourteen hours a day, seven days a week and would also be deprived of their valued (and paid for) private amenity space.

---

<sup>2</sup> The words in bold are selected by me

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



The 2014 RWL contains a clause prohibiting nuisance: 14. *“Not to do or allow to remain upon in under or at the Works anything which may constitute a nuisance or which may cause damage or inconvenience to the PLA or anyone on the Thames or to the riverbed or anything in or on the river and not use the Works for any illegal or immoral purpose.”* Setting up a bar in this space seems very likely to violate this provision against nuisance. However, the PLA does not take responsibility for noise pollution<sup>3</sup>, so the duty of care rests with the City of London in this case, and this has been reinforced in our correspondence with the PLA. In an email on January 9 2025, James Trimmer of the PLA stated, *‘Whilst there’s a general condition on nuisance (Sect 3, Para 14), as you know CoLC is EHO for the purposes of noise and would principally enforce around this area.’*

The PLA also confirmed to us 9.1.25<sup>4</sup> that a new RWL would be required for this current application: *“There will need to be a new RWL granted as there has been a change of ownership, notwithstanding any potential change of use”*. James Trimmer at the PLA was also kind enough to supply (redacted) copies of the two RWLs currently in place for the jetty, one from 24 April 2014 and the other a variation from 16 August 2019. The variation provides for the landscaping, decking and benching of the ‘private area’, with a private entrance (interestingly entitled “the Ecological works” ... but it also specifies that the landscaped area may be used for nothing other than private amenity space for the residents:

---

<sup>3</sup> At West India Pier, the residents protested the granting of a River Works Licence to the *Oceandiva* consortium, which wanted to set up a charging and servicing station in front of their homes. The PLA allowed the 750 residents affected only a “non-statutory consultation” and limited comments to navigation and flora, fauna, historic sites as per Section 48A of the Harbours Act 1964.

<sup>4</sup> Email from James Trimmer, PLA, to Michelle Lovric

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)



# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



1.3.2 the addition of a new paragraph 13.3:

“13.3 not to use the area of the Jetty reserved for private use other than as private amenity space for the residents of the adjoining residential block known as Sugar Quay and not to hold any events or private parties within this area.

13.4 not to use the area of the Jetty reserved for public use other than as public amenity space and not to hold any events or private parties within this area.

Clearly this application betrays the intention of this RWL by commercializing the space and depriving the residents of their amenity space, (whether public or private).

We note also a paragraph about the Highways implication in the 2014 RWL. It would appear that there is work to be done on this issue to satisfy the PLA's RWL requirements and that the applicants' attested intention to keep the southern riverside area as part of the Public Highway may be in contravention of their RWL unless conditioned appropriately?

## Highway and Walkway

25. Not to allow any walkway created on the Works to be dedicated as a highway under the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 nor agree to it being declared a walkway under the provisions of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1969 without a prior agreement being entered into between the walkway authority the Commissioners and the PLA covering removal of the walkway on revocation or termination of this Licence and indemnification of the Commissioners and the PLA against future maintenance repair provision of support and replacement of the walkway and other claims arising from the existence state or use of the walkway and to ensure that upon termination of this Licence any rights to use the walkway terminate.”

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



## COLONISATION OF RIVERSIDE OPEN SPACE FOR NEGATIVELY IMPACTFUL PRIVATE PROFIT

The RRG is uneasy about any privatisation and colonisation of precious riverside outdoor space. We need more public places, not fewer. The riverside walk at this site is already congested with walkers, especially during the summer.

Yes, a sliver of footpath remains on either side of the bar, but the area accessible to the non-drinking/non-paying public is seriously diminished. This creates a precedent that worries us. We've already seen what happened at nearby Coppa: there's a permanent bottleneck there since Coppa's owners were permitted to extend the dining area.

The London Plan resists any attempt to diminish access to healthy streets and walkable areas.

The City Plan 2040 states

*12.1.0 12.1.1 The City is densely built up and most of its open space provision consists of small spaces at street level. Open spaces are vital to the City, offering residents, workers and visitors outside spaces in which to spend time, relax, and encounter nature, and play a crucial role in providing opportunities for play, exercise and recreation, and social interaction. Open spaces are also inclusive, providing free access for everyone. They are important havens for wildlife and enrich the City's biodiversity, and help to mitigate the effects of climate change, improve air quality and benefit wellbeing, and physical and mental health.*

It also recommends (Strategic Policy S17: Thames Policy Area)

*d. refusing development on or over the River Thames, except for structures that specifically require a waterside location for river related uses;*

A private bar is not a river-related use.

The same policy asserts that any riverside terraces only in places where *"they do not impact adversely on protected views, the amenity of occupiers or nearby residents"*

*It also provides for*

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)



# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



*a. protecting and enhancing permanent public access and river views along the Riverside Walk;*

*b. improving access to the River Thames by enhancing north-south routes and the widening of the Riverside Walk;*

*c. maximising opportunities for public open space along the riverfront and seeking public realm improvements and increased permeability to the north of the Riverside Walk;*

This scheme reduces the public walkway, making it less permeable and blocking views – it does everything that the City Plan 2040 seeks to resist.

The City of London’s RIVERSIDE WALK ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY 2014 listed Sugar Quay as one of its high priority projects to “*Open up private walkway to allow public access*”. The project was that the “*existing walkway will be widened and enhanced ... There is an aspiration to make this area publically [sic] accessible as an additional public space along the Riverside.*”<sup>5</sup> That has been achieved. Why should it now be reversed or diminished?

It is not just residents who will suffer a reduced amenity as a result of this scheme. Visitors, those taking exercise, commuters – will all suffer reduced access to the riverside pathway. The RIVERSIDE WALK ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY noted that this area had heavy traffic: “*London Bridge was the main point of entry with the heaviest flow of people heading east towards Custom House/Sugar Quay.*”<sup>6</sup> Section 5.6 on Current and Future Movement notes that the walk is used by local works, residents, children, joggers, tourists, families, those heading to places of food and entertainment. It notices that “*significant*” numbers of joggers are using the path. It lists one of the constraints of the Riverside Walk as “*Not enough green spaces or places to rest / play*”.

Should this scheme be consented, the remaining northern sliver of public walkway at Sugar Quay will, it seems, be compromised by heavy traffic of trolleys, waiters, hot food (perhaps), drinkers going to and returning from the toilets inside cutting across those who wish to proceed along the walkway: the D & A states, “*The kitchen, toilets and staff areas are located inside the restaurant, in the Ground Floor retail unit of Sugar Quay, with existing consented A3/A4 uses.*” So it is disingenuous to claim that the northern

---

<sup>5</sup>8.3.2.10 Sugar Quay and Sugar Quay Jetty

<sup>6</sup> 6.1 Assessment of users of the Riverside Walk

<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



part of the walkway is actually retained for public use – unless the riverside bar is run completely as a self-contained bar with no real or substantial food.

As for the riverside section of open space – the new public seating (which take up several pages of the D & A) do not take into account how people will stick out their legs, place their bags, gather in groups facing the benches for socializing, further reducing the space for access.

## **PUBLIC SAFETY**

We note that a structural test on the Jetty was conducted by Beckett Rankine in 2015/16<sup>7</sup>. They appointed Swantest to undertake load testing. Swantest advised that the required loading was defined as 5kN/m<sup>2</sup> which will allow for pedestrian access only loading on the jetty. But what workings exist to show that

- a. The jetty structure can support the weight all the bars, table, chairs, umbrellas, planters and benches proposed?
- b. The jetty structure can also support 169 people plus staff in the bar PLUS those walking on the remaining public realm either side?

## **CONCLUSION**

This scheme does not comply with the national and local policy for residential amenity and permeable public spaces, particularly on the Thames riverfront. It contains insufficient mitigations to avoid public nuisance.

We urge the applicants to come up with design mitigations and a set of workable enforceable Planning Conditions that would allow residents to open their windows – and to discuss them with the residents affected by their plans.

Failing that, we urge the Committee to reject this application.

Finally, on the subject of resident amenity and public nuisance, we note the timing of this application, at Christmas, when many people are away or otherwise occupied and have not had an opportunity to see any notices. Had the application become visible at a

---

<sup>7</sup>Notes of Planning and Transportation Committee, January 12 2016 re Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, London EC3R 6EA Public use of the Sugar Quay jetty. Related to an application under Section 73 to make minor material amendments to planning permission dated 16th September 2013 (12/01104/FULMAJ) including lowering of the first floor soffit level and repositioning of the two north cores, rationalisation of restaurant deliveries and refuse collection, facade and landscaping improvements, changes to the internal configuration of residential units and associated works.

**<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>**

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

# RIVER RESIDENTS GROUP



different time, there would doubtless have been more objections from those who would be affected by the granting of this application.

[A petition](#) against the scheme has, at the time of writing, gained nearly 700 signatures. The petition is not, of course, Planning currency, but it is indicative of the public dissatisfaction with yet another piece of open space lost to the public and instead grabbed for private profit generated in a way that will impact negatively on City residents, workers and visitors alike.

Yours sincerely

Michelle Lovric, Vice-Chair, RRG

<https://riverresidentsgroup.co.uk>

[info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk](mailto:info@riverresidentsgroup.co.uk)

Environment & Planning Department  
City of London  
PO Box 270  
Guildhall  
LONDON  
EC2P 2EJ

Our Ref: dd/lb/Sugar Quay

Your Ref:

18<sup>th</sup> January 2025

Email only: [plans@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:plans@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

Dear Planning Authority,

Re: Proposed change of use of the Sugar Quay Jetty, Lower Thames Street, London, EC3R 6DQ to Restaurant/Bar seating area serving the existing A3/A4 uses of Ground Floor retail unit of Sugar Quay for up to 169 covers from 08:00 to 22:00 hours: Title no: EGL574894 Application no: 24/01196/FULL

We write with reference to the above and confirm we act on behalf of a number of residents of Sugar Quay, and we respectfully ask the planning authority to resist this application for a change of use in this residential area.

The proposed use will cause a substantial interference with the residents' ordinary use and enjoyment of their existing homes and external spaces, including their balconies, and will cause visual intrusion, and therefore result in a public and/or statutory nuisance and/or a significant adverse impact on residents.

The question the planning authority ought to ask is whether the applicants' use of land will cause a substantial noise change and interference with the ordinary use of the residents' homes<sup>1</sup>.

The outdoor use of this proposed licensed premises will involve noise from a large number of people, amplified music, and the carrying on of various activities including eating, drinking and smoking, which will necessitate the ingress and egress of many hundreds of people. These activities will lead to the transfer of substantial sound and cause a public nuisance (internal and external noise), a loss of residential amenity, and is likely to lead to anti-social behaviour.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fearn and others v Board of Trustees of the Tate Gallery, [2023] UKSC 4, 2023 WL 01424017.

## Dadds Solicitors

Crescent House, 51 High Street, Billericay, Essex CM12 9AX  
T: 01277 631811 F: 01277 631055 E: [office@dadds.co.uk](mailto:office@dadds.co.uk)  
W: [www.dadds.co.uk](http://www.dadds.co.uk) DX: 32202 BILLERICAY

Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority - Dadds LLP (OC358152).  
A list of the members is open to inspection at the office.

We believe by the standard of an ordinary or average person that the proposed activities would cause them substantial adverse harm, and there is no rule that such a nuisance can be committed simply because an area can sometimes be busy with people walking past or gathering nearby at various times of the day, week, or month.<sup>2</sup> The proposed activities will be a permanent change to the residential area and public walk ways.

The principle of “live and let live” Fearn, ¶¶28, 37, 71. The Applicants will say, there is no nuisance committed where acts are necessary for the common and ordinary use and occupation of land. We say, there is no defence in, however, of making reasonable use of one’s land (Fearn, ¶29, ¶¶54-56).

We understand in previous applications and leases, the city planners and developers had due consideration to future occupiers and residents of Sugar Quay, 1 Water Lane, EC3R 6AJ, and imposed the following noise criteria in relation to the Ground Floor Commercial Unit and this formed part of the tenant’s agreement for lease.

“1 Ensure noise levels emanating from the demised premises measured at the external façade of the nearest residential unit to the demised premises do not exceed 45 dB LAeq,15minutes by reference to the code of practise of sound insulation and noise reduction in buildings BS 8233 and in case of noise emanating from any fixed or mobile plant used in or in connection with demised premises ensure it does not exceed 10 dBA below background noise levels measured at the same point of the aforesaid.” And

“2 Activity noise, either airborne or structure-borne, from any commercial unit must not exceed the following NR criteria in any adjacent residential unit:  
NR20 L1 – daytime (07:00 – 23:00 hours)

The above conditions are consistent with The City Corporation’s Noise Strategy, which seeks to protect residents from public nuisance from licensed premises, through the planning and decision making process. The proposed use does not comply with the aforementioned conditions, therefore is contrary to planning policy.

We are aware of the city’s policy about good acoustic design, which places constraints on activities and limits on hours of operation, to overcome the nuisance and loss of amenity. However, having read the report provided by the applicant, we are concerned that they have created an artificially low acoustically ambient noise level and have used Australasian standards of modelling noise outcomes rather than ISO 3382-3:2012. Notwithstanding the aforementioned, we do not believe that any

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, Fearn, ¶¶ 38-41

constraints on the proposed activities could overcome the substantial noise harm and loss of residential amenity.

The residents have therefore sought to instruct their own expert to undertake a noise assessment and report to them accordingly; we ask the planning department to consider this report and its finding.

The residents' expert report concludes that the proposal to change of use to a Restaurant/Bar seating area serving the existing A3/A4 uses of Ground Floor retail unit of Sugar Quay for up to 169 covers from 08:00 to 22:00 hours will lead to substantial noise change, harm and lead to a 'Significant Adverse Impact' to the existing residential amenity.

It is respectfully submitted, that the proposals should therefore not be considered acceptable on the grounds of noise nuisance and the loss of residential amenity, given the close proximity of the proposal to the residents' homes.

Please could you confirm safe receipt of this letter, and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask.

Yours faithfully



David Dadds, Barrister  
Solicitor-Advocate  
DADDS LLP

List of residents:

Marcus Silver apt 22  
Annie Le Quesne apt 24  
Nigel Le Quesne apt 24  
Loren Le Quesne apt 24  
Lara Le Quesne apt 24  
David Collins apt 36  
Karen Collins apt 36  
Jacob Collins apt 36  
Nathan Collins apt 36  
Derek Song apt 46  
Antonia Osgood apt 53

Alastair Macaulay apt 63  
Ming Zho apt 98  
Sylvia Zang apt 98  
Gokhan Saygi apt 121  
Hatice Muge Saygi apt 121  
Pat Goldrick apt 123  
Ros Goldrick apt 123  
James Prince apt 125  
Susan Prince apt 125  
Isabella Prince apt 125  
India Prince apt 125

Miles Prince apt 125  
Neslihan Yilmaz apt 127  
Graeme Anderson apt 156  
Iain Reitze apt 157  
Jackie Alexander apt 157  
David Whitehead apt 158  
Ms Qilan Fu apt 162  
Mikael Olsson apt 164  
Katrina Olsson apt 164

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Francisco Baeza

Address: 125 Buckler Court London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: We ask the planning authority to resist this application for a change of use in this public area that we use every weekend to enjoy the outdoors next to such iconic spaces. We also work in the area and found ourselves often enjoying our lunch breaks in this public space. It would be shameful to lose such an opportunity to enjoy such a privileged public space and constrain it to a mere walkway. There are already so many commercial outlets around the river side, that we do not think there is any more need.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Paul Snow

Address: 54 Englefield Road London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: Please ensure that access to the jetty by the general public is not limited if this application is granted.



# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr David Linnell

Address: 20 Eleven Acre Rise Loughton

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Sugar Quay Jetty is a public open space, with free access through out the year. It is used by residents and visitors.

I gather that Sugar Quay Leaseholders have been paying the cost of the Jetty for years (including the Port London Authority Licence, lighting, insurance etc) through their leaseholder agreements

Any commercial use would limit public access and add a lot of noise, litter, smell as well as other disturbances to this rare open space.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mrs Alicia Williams

Address: 23 crofts street London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Residential Amenity

Comment: I am writing to formally object to the proposed privatization of a public walkway for the benefit of a restaurant. This walkway is not just a path-it is an essential part of the Wapping community, providing residents and visitors with a valuable space to walk, exercise, and enjoy the riverfront.

Public access to the Thames is already being eroded, with several areas along the river having been privatized for commercial gain. Each of these losses diminishes the accessibility of the riverfront for the public, gradually turning what should be a shared community resource into exclusive spaces for private profit. Small public areas like this are vital to preserving the character and accessibility of Wapping, and once they are lost, they are rarely regained. The walkway in question serves multiple purposes beyond leisure. It is used daily by joggers, walkers, families, and those seeking a moment of peace by the water. It enhances the well-being of residents and fosters a sense of community by providing an open, shared space that is not tied to commercial interests. The Thames Path and its accessibility should be protected, not sold off piece by piece to businesses looking to expand their footprint.

If this privatization is approved, it sets a dangerous precedent for further restrictions on public land. The interests of local residents and the wider community must be prioritized over the commercial ambitions of a single business. Public spaces should remain public, ensuring that everyone-regardless of their financial means-can continue to enjoy the benefits of Wapping's historic and scenic riverfront.

I urge you to reject this application and preserve this walkway for the community.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Mr Roger Mchardy

Address: 2 Elder Oak Close London

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Areas like this, freely accessible to the general public should be retained as such. Access should not be restricted so businesses can make money from them.

# Comments for Planning Application 24/01196/FULL

## Application Summary

Application Number: 24/01196/FULL

Address: Sugar Quay Jetty Sugar Quay Walk London

Proposal: Use of part of Sugar Quay Jetty for seating and service in association with the restaurant and drinking establishment use (Sui Generis) located on the ground floor of the adjacent Sugar Quay, Lower Thames Street, together with associated works including installation of furniture, and perimeter planters and benches.

Case Officer: Samuel James

## Customer Details

Name: Miss Victoria Jenkins

Address: 69 Salisbury Road Moseley Birmingham

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: To keep the local community "on side", and thereby minimise anti-social behaviour, it would be wise to foster a sense of community. When a space is "OURS" as opposed to "YOURS", and not for the enjoyment of us", there is a sense of ownership and wanting not to deface it. If this space is no longer "OURS", why would locals take good care of it. I recommend that the restaurant works with the community to see the jetty as a shared amenity. It could go even further and involve the community in its "offer" to the restaurant's patrons - perhaps by getting local children to display their art work in the retail areas and by using their art work in the signage on the jetty. That way you would get whole families committing to the conservation principles that we should all be working towards.