APPENDIX E

rom: Ian.Clements@met.pnn.police.uk [mailto:Ian.Clements@met.pnn.police.uk]

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 4:21 PM

To: rmh@watchhousecoffee.com **Cc:** Mills, Dorcas; Regen, Licensing

Subject: RE: Confirmation

Dear Mr Horne

Thank you fro your recent communication confirming your acceptance of our proposed licensing conditions. As a result I am now in a position to withdraw our representation.

Kind Regards

Ian Clements

Licensing Officer Southwark Borough

Phone: 0207 232 6756Mobile: 07974 836444

■ E-mail: _ian.clements@met.police.uk

■ Mail: Licensing Office Southwark Police Station

323 Borough High Street

SE1 2ER

From: Al-Samerai, Anood

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 3:52 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: RE: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Dorcas,

I met with the applicant yesterday and have just emailed them as well.

I explained that the letter addresses a number of concerns which is helpful. However, when we met we also discussed whether they would be willing to stop serving alcohol earlier in the evenings and whether they would agree to a condition about keeping doors and windows closed in the evenings.

A resident has also suggested a possible condition about only ever serving alcohol with food which seems like a good idea and I have asked them about this as well.

These additional measures would be greatly helpful in reassuring residents and reducing potential issues.

Best wishes, Anood

Councillor Anood Al-Samerai Liberal Democrat Cllr for Riverside Ward Leader, Southwark Liberal Democrat Council Group

020 7525 0137 @cllr_anood on twitter

Liberal Democrat Councillors hold an advice surgery every Saturday morning between 10.30 and 11.30am at Pop in at the Blue, 53 Rock Grove Way, SE16 3UQ (opposite the Blue Anchor Library)

As your locally elected councillors, we may use your email address to contact you from time to time with updates about the issue you have contacted us about or other issues which affect your area. If you do not wish to receive such emails, please let us know.

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:37 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: RE: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Ms Mills

Thank you for passing this on – it certainly is useful, and helpful is addressing various concerns. I do just have one question – and I think it is covered in the letter but I would just like to clarify this – collection of refuse and bottles in the evenings is not so much a problem, it is the early morning ones that are most disruptive. While I understand that, with 20 covers, this business would not be the biggest potential issue but I wondered when it was proposed that bottles in particular would be collected? There's a reference to no deliveries before 9am but I just wonder about bottle and waste collection. I am sure that, as long as it is in line with what other businesses on Shad Thames do, I can't see a reason to object.

I note a sense of frustration that the letter calling for objections was circulated. That is a little unfair – there was nothing to stop the Watch House from communicating directly with us themselves. STAMP seem to hold themselves out as rather important, but they do not ever (and I mean ever – I have lived on Shad Thames for over ten years) communicate with those outside a rather limited circle – they do not speak for, or to, me. The letter from Watch House is most helpful, and very welcome, and all I can say is that direct communication is only to be encouraged!

Kind regards

From: Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:37 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Dorcas,

Thank you for your email.

I am resident of received no invitation to view plans or meet with the owners. The first knowledge I had of the Watch House's proposed plans was in a postscript in a letter from the Building Agents on another matter.

I would happily attend an opening evening to learn more about their plans as the letter does not sufficient persuade me that their premises won't equal more noise.

I would also plan to attend the hearing on the 5th if my schedule permits.

Many thanks,

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 4:14 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Dorcas Mills,

Thank you very much for sharing this information and which I will digest and consider carefully before deciding my intention. However I do have a question for you which will help me to decide.

One of the issues I have seen in the conciliatory statement and other emails is that the license can be invoked at any time, if the conditions are not adhered too.

If that is the case why is it then, that;

The Pont De La Tour who continuously break their conditions are never challenged by the Council. The local residents receive absolutely no support from the Council apart from the hardworking Lib Democrat MP's who are the only voice of reason. So why should residents trust the Council in supporting residents if businesses like these, are less conciliatory later on once they have received their license?

Can you please set out what the Council are obliged to do if a licensee does not do what they say they will under the conditions of the license and can conditions be reviewed?

I look forward to your reply

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 5:05 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Sir/Madam,

The conciliatory statement is well argued and my objection was certainly based on inaccurate information. I would withdraw my objection and, indeed, would now actively support the application.

Regards

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 10:28 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: RE: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Hi Dorcas,

Thanks for your email.

After reviewing the response from The Watch House to the objections and spending additional time researching the company and their existing Bermondsey business yesterday, I am satisfied that they will be able to manage the potential noise and disturbance issues that I was initially concerned about. On this basis, I am happy not to proceed further with my objections.

Kind regards,

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 8:57 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Hi Dorcas

Many thanks for your email.

I write as a director of one of the management companies representing 92 resident and 4 other commercial units as well as a resident.

I would note that there remains a strong formal objection.

- 1. Coffee is not drunk excessively in the evening certainly not to the point of sustaining a business their comment cannot be correct.
- 2. There are proposing to limit consumption of alcohol to by the glass?
- 3. We have to manage the removal of bottles from our commercial premises and it is a difficult issue even in the morning
- 4. The application comments are relying it seems on lack of coffee shops and whilst equally inwould comment that coffee can be readily purchased next door, Starbucks, all bar one and chop house if the owner feels this is needed I'm not sure then of the relevance of the alcohol license

Finally, would comment that we reiterate our objections on behalf of spice quay management company (at the request of our residents and owners) and individually.

Do we have formal ability to terminate the application via the council or would you recommend we appoint independent lawyers to act ?

Thanks and best wishes

Sent from my iPhone

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 8:39 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: RE: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Thank you for the correspondence and on the basis of what has been said withdraw my earlier objection.

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 7:18 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Ms Mills

Thank you and I will be responding to the letter and send direct to you.

For the record, no one at Butlers Wharf Building, and the new premises are directly opposite, was contacted by the Applicant. We only found out about the application by pure chance.

I will revert with full comments.

Yours sincerely

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 6:41 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Ms Mills,

Thank you for the letter below. If correct the letter from Watch House helps to clarify some important points.

I do not know the details of how the licensing process works, however if the following points were made a specific requirement of any license issued I would remove my objection -

- no bar sales, i.e. no drinks sold to customers from a bar
- wine and coffee related alcoholic drinks sold to seated customers only
- capacity limited to 20 pax
- doors shut at all times
- no bottle recycling past 18:00

If you could provide any clarification regarding the ability of a license to specify these points that would be very useful.

Best Regards

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 10:00 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Dorcus

Thank you for the email below. Having read through the contents I would like to withdraw my objection to the proposed application. Thank you for bringing the full details to my attention. Kind regards

Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 7:22 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises Licence application - Watch House, 31 Shad Thames, London SE1 2YR

Dear Ms Mills

I am afraid I think it is unlikely that this establishment's patrons will drink coffee in the evening (as opposed to alcohol) and stay inside or smoke away from the entrance. Nor am I convinced that the doors will remain closed all year around. This sounds primarily like a bar, not a restaurant. Serving small plates is not going to encourage customers to stay inside and eat. It will struggle to contain the noise and disruption to residents. I anticipate people taking glasses of wine and other alcohol onto the street to smoke and to drink.

Factually, this letter is incorrect about the availability of speciality coffee. There is a coffee establishment closer than Starbucks. Café Paradiso is open until 7pm.

This type of establishment changes the face of Shad Thames. There are already bars on the riverfront and in my opinion there is no need for a bar further back. Shad Thames should be safe and free from intimidation from people drinking and smoking outside.

If this establishment is primarily for speciality coffee, as it states it is, it will not need an alcohol licence and will not need to stay open late.

I am interested in a hearing to represent my view. I was not made aware of an opportunity to enquire about the proposed business as referenced in this conciliatory statement. I have not contacted the applicant directly.

Regards

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 8:31 PM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises licence application - watch House, 31 Shad thames, London SE1

Dear Dorcas

Thank you for sharing the two conciliatory notes from the Watch Tower. They demonstrate a great attitude and they will be very welcome in Shad Thames as a coffee shop.

However I'm afraid I want to maintain my objection against their alcohol licence application.

Unfortunately, our experience is that local restaurants do not live up to their pre-opening promises and commitments. We have a persistent problem with cleanliness and waste and bottle disposals, despite huge efforts and cost on our part and extensive consultation with local restaurant management.

Our experience is that restaurant operations are delegated to junior members of staff after the excitement of opening. They are either not aware or not able to maintain commitments on waste disposal or managing customers who choose to smoke and drink underneath our windows, sometimes late at night. There is also a near-constant crowd of restaurant staff smoking in Shad Thames and Lafone St, underneath people's apartment windows. We simply do not want to risk adding to our current problems and setting precedents for more.

The Watch Tower suggests that a "wine only with food" restriction is not commercially viable for them - so effectively they will be an evening wine bar, whatever their preferred "small plates concept".

There is actually a good precedent for a "wine only with food" operation - Jose on Bermondsey St. This is also a very small space but has an alcohol-only-with food policy which is strictly enforced by the staff. Customers are also never allowed to take drinks outside. They do not appear to be suffering from it commercially - it's wildly popular. As a regular customer myself, I've also seen the amount of excessive alcohol that's taken on board, even with the only-with-food restriction! And Jose's kitchen also closes at 9 - not 10 or 11. Much as I love Jose, I do not want one underneath my flat.

The offer to keep the windows and doors closed is welcomed but how do they plan to manage the people waiting outside for a table? There is another precedent for problems here - Franco Manca in Bermondsey St. There is almost always a crowd of people waiting (loudly) outside. And the former Teapod unit is small. I'm imagining that, if it is popular, there will be people happy to wait. This is not a good prospect for the people living directly upstairs in the evening, particularly since noise and cigarette smoke carries easily in the street.

I am impressed by the Watch Tower's attitude and approach but Valentinas was similarly committed and helpful and that did not last longer than a few weeks beyond the opening period. Once the licence is granted, we are effectively powerless to do anything about the

way it's being implemented and, I have to say, we receive absolutely no support from Southwark Council in getting local restaurants to fulfill their part of the bargain of operating in a heavily residential area.

We are the ones who pay to maintain these lovely old buildings and the bridges and so much that draws people to the area and, although of course we're happy to share the area with everyone who uses it, but we do also deserve a degree of protection from the worst effects and that's what we need the licensing system to deliver for us.

I'm sorry about this as the Watch Tower is a lovely operation and the owners seem very committed and would be an asset to the street. But I'm afraid that I think we have to protect our fellow Cardamom Building residents from the effects of living above a wine bar (because that is what it will be in the evening ...), particularly if it proves popular and successful and attracts a big crowd.

Thank you for your efforts to let us have our say.

All the best

Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 11:35 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises licence application - watch House, 31 Shad thames, London SE1

Dear Ms Mills

I would like a response from the Applicants as to why they did not notify the Butlers Wharf Building of their application. Our block contains more apartments than any other block of apartments, and is directly opposite the Watch House.

Further, and in addition, the notice in the window is small, obscured by the vehicles parked outside so that you cannot see it during the day; it is not only that the painters might have taken it down, etc.

I doubt very much whether others in Butlers Wharf Building have had time to consider as we had notice only by pure chance on the evening before the time period expired.

Yours sincerely

From: Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 8:42 AM

To: Mills, Dorcas

Subject: Re: Premises licence application - watch House, 31 Shad thames, London SE1

Dear Ms Mills,

Based on this and previous information supplied I am removing our objection to this licence application.

Regards