

Thomas & Thomas

Partners LLP

Your ref:
Our ref: AT/HED.1.1

38a Monmouth Street
London WC2H 9EP
tel: 020 7042 0410
fax: 020 7379 6618

Licensing Service
City of Westminster
64 Victoria Street
London
SW1E 6QP

18 April 2017

By e mail

Dear Sirs

Application by Hedonism Wines Ltd
Address: 85 Piccadilly, W1J 7NB

We act for the Applicant.

The application follows the grant of planning permission, pre-application advice and a stakeholder consultation. The application is consistent with the planning permission.

The Premises are outside the Cumulative Impact Area . The use is as a model-conditioned restaurant with hours only slightly later than the Council's Core Hours. The hours for the sale of alcohol are amended to **00:40 Monday to Saturday and Sundays remaining at 23:30** so as to ensure all customers are off the premises in line with the planning hours. The proposed customer capacity is 250, which is less than the 330 granted by planning.

The Premises are currently licensed on the ground and first floor as a restaurant and bar with a combined capacity of 229. The basement restaurant with a capacity of 50 replaces a nightclub whose 260-person capacity licence was revoked before the Applicant took a lease of the premises: there are no connections between the previous Tenant and the Applicant.

The aspiration and expectation is to have two Michelin stars on the mezzanine floor and one star on the floors below. A full menu is provided in the basement area and can also be used by persons waiting to dine on the ground and mezzanine floors or who have dined.

The representations of the Interested Parties have been carefully anticipated and responded to below. A meeting is also scheduled to take place before the hearing with Mr Brown of the Advice Project and Mr Nevitt of the EHCT. There is no Police or Licensing Authority representation.

The Applicant, who also operate premises in nearby Davies Street, has waited to make an application until they have a chef and management team in place. That team whose details are included below have operated in Camden and Westminster and have a wealth of relevant experience.

Planning Permission was granted in September 2013 and December 2014 and made several findings in favour of a single-user restaurant and particularly the impact of that use on residential amenity.

The enclosed Table addresses Mr Jones's letter and the other representations which seem to contain the same or similar content.

We enclose:

1. Schedule of existing licences.
2. Table summarising the issues in dispute.
3. Amended Operational Management Statement.
4. Amended Conditions.
5. Policy submission.
6. Expert report of Adrian Studd.
7. Expert report of Duncan Newell including previous acoustic reports.
8. Letter from Rolfe Judd Planning.
9. Letters from neighbours in support.
10. Witness statement of Tatiana Fokina.
11. CV of Ollie Dabbous.
12. CV of Oskar Kinberg.
13. Stakeholder Consultation Summary.
14. Transport report.
15. Site plans and photographs.
16. Design package and menus (To follow).

We request the right to ask questions of the interested parties with the permission of the committee as may be appropriate.

Ms Tatiana Fokina, Managing Director of the applicant company, Ollie Dabbous (chef), Oskar Kinberg (manager), Adrian Studd and Duncan Newell will be present to answer any questions that members may have.

Mr Stephen Walsh QC and Mr Alun Thomas will be representing the applicant.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a vertical line that curves to the right at the bottom.

Thomas & Thomas Partners LLP

tel: 020 7042 0412

email: athomas@tandtp.com

Resident Name	Address	Para.	Representation	Response	Reference	Page.
Andrew Jones (Representation made on behalf of all those listed below, but those with an asterisk did not make any individual submission)	47 Clarges St		Representation is made on behalf of myself; 85 Piccadilly; 47 Clarges Street; 89 Piccadilly; and 17 Clarges Street	The application follows a stakeholder consultation sent to 85 local residents. There were no replies.	Stakeholder Consultation	1-6
			The flats fronts onto Piccadilly	Following the grant of planning permission, the restaurant is in the course of fit out having been originally granted planning for nightclub and restaurant use in the 1960s.	Report of Strategic Director Built Environment - Planning Permission 12/12616/FULL Decision Notice 12/12616/FULL	7-46 47-52
			The living areas and main bedroom are directly above the entrance to the premises.	This entrance was found by the planning committee to be an appropriate location due to the high ambient noise levels in Piccadilly.	Report of Operational Director Development Planning - Planning Permission 14/08017/FULL	53-74
					Decision notice 14/08017/FULL	75-80
					Bedroom location plan	81
					Elevation plan Cross-section	83 85
					Photo Rolfe Judd letter	87 159

	<p>The premises are located within a residential block comprising 16 flats directly above (85 Piccadilly/47 Clarges Street).</p> <p>89 Piccadilly is in the same block, contains a further 16 flats, 11 of which are above the premises.</p> <p>17 Clarges Street is a residential block which is a short distance from the premises.</p> <p>6-12 Clarges Street, a large new residential building.</p> <p>Will impact adversely on the promotion of the licensing objectives.</p>	<p>The letters are in almost identical form.</p> <p>Some letters of representation are duplicated and either come from the same person in different roles or from different members of the same household.</p> <p>A number of the flats are foreign-owned and un-occupied for large parts of the year.</p> <p>There is a car park on the first floor.</p>	<p>Cross section Plans & photo</p>	<p>81-87</p>
		<p>17 Clarges Street is approx 100 metres away from the premises where four representations have been received, three within the same flat.</p> <p>6-12 Clarges St and 82-84 Piccadilly are mixed use developments of residential, office space, private members club and an A3 restaurant with an ancillary bar use and 150 covers.</p> <p>Planning permission for that development including the A3 use (13/04041/FULL) was granted in 2013.</p>	<p>Site map</p>	<p>8</p>
		<p>The entrance to the premises is on Piccadilly, the main A4 in and out of Central London.</p> <p>The location of the entrance is an original location but this location was re-considered and approved by planning in it's current proposed location. It has always been designated as a</p>	<p>Planning Permission 14/08017/FULL report and decision notice</p>	<p>53-80</p>

	<p>door and never restricted from use as an entrance by planning.</p> <p>The entrance is in Piccadilly due to the higher noise levels on the street in this location.</p> <p>The report of Duncan Newhall and Adrian Studd address the likelihood of public nuisance.</p> <p>There is no regulated entertainment and music will be played at background level only.</p>	<p>Duncan Newhall Expert report Adrian Studd Expert Report</p>	<p>95-148 149-157</p>
<p>Proliferation of licensed premises in the immediate vicinity</p>	<p>This site has a minimum 48 year history as a nightclub and bar/restaurants.</p> <p>Planning permission was granted on 9th October 1969 for use of the basement as a nightclub or restaurant, the ground floor as a restaurant, reception area and bar and the mezzanine floor as banqueting rooms and a restaurant.</p> <p>All of the residential use were purchased in the knowledge of and whilst this premises was either used as restaurant/bar/nightclub. The existing licence for the first floor allows bar use.</p> <p>The location is already licensed. The replacement of the existing uses is in accordance with the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy ('SLP').</p>	<p>Rolfe Judd letter Chronology</p> <p>Planning Permission 14/08017/FULL report and decision notice</p> <p>Policy submission SLP 2.5.13</p> <p>Adrian Studd Expert report</p>	<p>159-160 161-162</p> <p>53-80</p> <p>163-168</p> <p>149-157</p>
<p>Could give rise to a negative cumulative impact</p>	<p>There is no evidence, in this location, that cumulative impact is likely to impact on either amenity or the licensing objectives.</p> <p>The licences are offered for surrender and will be replaced by a less-intensive use as a single-user restaurant with stricter conditions.</p>	<p>Current Premises licences SLP 2.4.7</p>	<p>169- 192</p>

	<p>The SLP provides (in the context of premises in the CIA) <i>“the substitution of existing licensable activity at the premises with licensable activities which have less impact on the area and would be more likely to further the licensing objectives”</i></p> <p>The operation of single user fine dining restaurant is a lesser impact than two casual dining restaurants and clearly much less than a nightclub.</p> <p>One operator at this site will reduce servicing and waste trips as well as reduce the amount of staff and number of entrances.</p> <p>The alternative is other uses who do not offer fine dining, but who instead could operate to the capacity of 330 and as casual dining operators would have a much higher turnover rate as the dwell time is much shorter.</p> <p>The proposed restaurant requires the opening hours to serve two dinner sittings, particularly if a tasting menu is being taken.</p>	<p>Adrian Studd</p>	<p>149-157</p>
<p>Scale, Late terminal hour,</p> <p>Sensitive entrance/exit to the premises</p> <p>Lack of experience of the applicant</p>	<p>There is a three/four lane dual carriageway immediately outside the premises with a high vehicular and pedestrian footfall throughout the night.</p> <p>It is understood that most of the residential units have single and secondary glazing and many have installed air-conditioning.</p> <p>The location of the entrance has been considered and approved by planning.</p> <p>The management team have a plethora of relevant experience and indeed a track record of successfully running premises. Fine dining is provided by Michelin starred chef Ollie Dabbous, in association with Hedonism’s fine wine list.</p>	<p>Tatiana Fokina witness statement</p> <p>Photos Adrain Studd Duncan Newhall</p> <p>Planning Permission 14/08017/FULL</p> <p>Ollie Dabbous CV Oskar Kinberg CV</p> <p>Letters of support</p>	<p>193-199</p> <p>149-157 95-148</p> <p>53-80</p> <p>201 203</p> <p>205-216</p>

	Track record of the freeholder	The Applicant has a long leasehold interest and will run the restaurant with the management team.		
Vagueness of the action plan	OMS	A detailed Operational Management Plan has been submitted.		217 – 229
Maximum 75 seat capacity subject to Core Hours	Planning Permis- sion report & De- cision notice 12/12616/FULL & 14/08017/FULL	Planning has been granted for a 330 cover restaurant.		7-80
OR Maximum 150 seat capacity subject to closing 11:00 p.m. Monday-Saturday; 10:30 p.m. Sunday;	TF witness state- ment	It is not possible to restrict the capacity to less than 250 persons as a fine-dining restaurant or to lesser hours.		193-199
Customers and staff may only smoke on the Green Park side of Piccadilly, sub- ject to a maxi- mum of 5 smok- ers at any one time;	OS map	The alternative would be for a 330 casual dining restaurant with higher levels of smokers, noise and servicing. It is also not possible to restrict smokers to the Green Park side of Piccadilly although a proposal for a smoking area outside the car-pet shop has been proposed.		231
No sound from restaurant, un- derground or extraction units/plant is audible	Conditions pro- posed	Triple glazing has been installed on all floors of applicant's premises. A condition has been agreed that no sound from the restaurant is audible so as to cause a nuisance.		233-235
	Duncan Newhall	The London underground is 'barely audible or subjectively inaudible'.		95-148
	Cross-section	Further soundproofing works will be completed during the progress of the build.		237

<p>Appropriate conditions in relation to plant have been agreed and will be implemented in accordance with planning permission 14/08017/FULL and plant planning permission 14/09157/FULL.</p>	<p>53-80</p> <p>Planning Permis- sions 14/08017/FULL & Decision notice 14/09157/FULL</p> <p>239 – 243</p>
<p>Cars to wait for/pick up customers only on Green Park side of Piccadilly; and</p>	<p>Transport report</p> <p>245-283</p>
<p>No off sales.</p>	<p>Proposed condi- tion</p> <p>233-235</p>
<p>Long and fraught history to the operation of the various licensed premises.</p>	<p>OMS</p> <p>217-229</p>
<p>Although the operators of these</p>	<p>The applicants have no knowledge, contact or</p>

	<p>premises are not associated with the applicant for this premises licence the history is relevant</p> <p>The freeholder caused problems for the residents</p>	<p>relationship with the previous nightclub operator and took a new lease after the previous tenant's lease for the basement was forfeited by the landlord. The Landlord has only a contractual relationship with the Tenant in respect of the lease.</p> <p>The freeholder will have no operational involvement in the premises.</p>		
<p>The premises have not operated since 2012.</p>		<p>The Brasserie licence allows the sale of alcohol to core hours. Fakhreldine has opening hours beyond core hours and allows bar use. Representations from 14 residents incorrectly state that the premises closed at 10.30pm.</p> <p>Whilst the licence is not being used, it is extant and could be used if either that part of the premises was reinstated to the consented layout or amended by way of a minor or full variation.</p>	<p>La Brasserie Premises licence & Fakhreldine premises licence</p>	<p>169-192</p>
<p>No recent 'foot print'</p> <p>The scale of the restaurant location and terminal hour would be detrimental.</p>		<p>Unlike other applications which have been recently considered in the area, there is a very recent, substantial and enduring footprint</p> <p>The City Council have exercised its planning functions and have found that amenity is not compromised by a restaurant operating until 1.00 am with a capacity of 330.</p> <p>The applicant, however sensibly and sensitively, recognises the location of the premises and only intends to operate with a maximum capacity of 250 customers at any time.</p>	<p>Current premises licences</p> <p>Planning Permission 12/12616/FULL & 14/08017/FULL</p> <p>RNT1</p>	<p>169-192</p> <p>7-80</p>

	<p>The SLP does not require an exception to be proved for this use and location.</p>	
<p>Main entrance moved to the detriment of residents:</p>	<p>The location of the entrance has been considered in some detail in both the acoustic reports and the report of the City Council when granting planning permission.</p>	<p>53-80</p> <p>Planning Permission 14/08017/FULL</p>
<p>The redevelopment of the building has necessitated a number of planning applications. Among the changes sought by application ref: 14/08017/FULL was to move the main entrance on the corner of Clarges Street and Piccadilly, to Piccadilly itself.</p>	<p>The City Council found the main entrance in Piccadilly to be an appropriate location for the restaurant.</p>	<p>95-148</p> <p>Duncan Newhall Expert report</p>
<p>The redevelopment of the building has necessitated a number of planning applications. Among the changes sought by application ref: 14/08017/FULL was to move the main entrance on the corner of Clarges Street and Piccadilly, to Piccadilly itself.</p>	<p>Planning Permission was granted in September 2013 and December 2014 and made several findings in favour of a single-user restaurant and particularly the impact of that use on residential amenity. Many of those findings are directly relevant and germane to the licensing application. The Officer's report(s) concluded:</p>	<p>7-52</p> <p>Planning Permission 12/12616/FULL report and decision notice & 14/08017/FULL report and decision notice</p>
<p>The redevelopment of the building has necessitated a number of planning applications. Among the changes sought by application ref: 14/08017/FULL was to move the main entrance on the corner of Clarges Street and Piccadilly, to Piccadilly itself.</p>	<p><i>"In comparison to the previous situation it is not considered that the creation of a new large scale restaurant in place of the three separate entertainment uses (one particularly intensive and problematic) will lead to an over-concentration of entertainment uses in the vicinity or have a detrimental impact on local environmental quality and residential amenity. There is likely to be a significant improvement in residential amenity in terms in comparison to another nightclub or bar occupying the basement premises. Taking into account the history of the site it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances to allow the introduction of a new large scale entertainment use".</i></p>	<p>53-80</p>
<p>The redevelopment of the building has necessitated a number of planning applications. Among the changes sought by application ref: 14/08017/FULL was to move the main entrance on the corner of Clarges Street and Piccadilly, to Piccadilly itself.</p>	<p><i>"By granting planning permission for a single large restaurant the City Council can maintain tight planning controls over the way in which the entire premises are managed".</i></p>	
<p>The redevelopment of the building has necessitated a number of planning applications. Among the changes sought by application ref: 14/08017/FULL was to move the main entrance on the corner of Clarges Street and Piccadilly, to Piccadilly itself.</p>	<p><i>"The way in which a nightclub and restaurant operates differs to a restaurant. Large groups of customers would often exit the nightclub premises at the</i></p>	

closing hour and are likely to congregate outside for sometime after the premises shuts. With a restaurant there is likely to be a more gradual dispersal of customers with fewer customers remaining on the premises at the terminal hour. Further, customers are unlikely to congregate outside the premises talking or waiting for taxis. Many customers would use the nearby Green Park tube station or buses for their journey home".

"The 1am closing time is a reduction in the hours of operation in comparison to the nightclub and is only half an hour later than the restaurant at mezzanine level. It is accepted that restaurants of this size are not generally located directly beneath residential accommodation. However, the nightclub and restaurant uses are longstanding and cumulatively constituted a large scale entertainment use. The applicant has submitted a management plan which outlines how the premises are to be operated without adversely affecting residents to the floors above".

"While the City Council have sympathy for local residents who have experienced years of problems associated with the nightclub use it would be unreasonable to withhold permission for a new restaurant on this basis. The proposed restaurant will be managed by an operator in accordance with conditions to restrict the operation...the proposal provides an opportunity to significantly improve the existing authorised situation. The alternatives would be long term vacancy of the basement or another nightclub/bar use operating from the premises".

"The Residents Society of Mayfair and St James have expressed support for the proposal and consider it "an improvement to the area".

"It is considered that there are exceptional circumstances i.e improvement to residential amenity and local environmental quality, to allow this change of use from one entertainment use to another...."

The sub-committee report dated 2nd December 2014 recommending grant stated "The restaurant located main customer entrance to the restaurant

<p>would not result in increased overall harm compared to the existing lawful uses as a nightclub and 2 restaurants, especially given that one of the restaurants has an entrance in this location anyway which it would be perfectly entitled to use."</p> <p>Furthermore, "the flats within the application site are separated from the restaurant floorspace at ground and mezzanine level by a floor of car parking".</p>			
<p>Previous references to other planning applications are not relevant as they have been superseded by the most relevant consents which are being reflected in the application.</p> <p>See above.</p>	<p>A previous planning application in 2009 (ref: 09/06019/FULL) which sought to move the entrance in this way was withdrawn.</p> <p>A planning application in 2012 (ref: 12/12616/FULL), which permitted the creation of a 3 storey 'mega restaurant' was made and permission granted on the explicit basis that the entrance would not be moved.</p>	<p>Opening hours - 7.30am to 1.30am Mon-Sat, 8am to 11.30pm Sun</p>	
	<p>The opening hours are until 1.00 am Monday to Saturday and 23.30 on Sundays</p>		
	<p>TF witness statement Adrian Studd expert report</p>		<p>193-199 149-157</p>

<p>The terminal hour is too late</p>	<p>The ground floor previously operated within the council's core hours but the first floor operated until 00.30 and the basement and nightclub operated until 3.00 am.</p>	<p>Current licences Adrian Studd expert report TF witness statement</p>	<p>169-192 149-157 193-199</p>
<p>The location of the entrance would inevitably lead to significant and disproportionate noise</p>	<p>See findings of the planning committee above. No acoustic evidence has been provided and objectively assessed that the location in Piccadilly would be inappropriate.</p>	<p>Planning documents Duncan Newhall expert report</p>	<p>7-80 95-148</p>
<p>Internal noise being transmitted through the structure</p>	<p>No regulated entertainment is proposed in the application and all music in the restaurant will be purely background and can be set at an appropriate level in agreement with the environmental health consultation team.</p>	<p>As above Conditions proposed</p>	<p>233-235</p>
<p>The proposed restaurant is on a very large scale - a 'mega restaurant'.</p>	<p>This is not a restaurant on a "very large" scale nor is it a "mega restaurant".</p>	<p>Existing use - proposed use</p>	<p>169</p>
<p>The intensity of use of the proposed premises will be much greater than the total intensity of</p>	<p>The proposed capacity of 250 is perfectly consistent with restaurants of a similar operation in the West End. For example, Barbecoa has a capacity of 160 on the ground floor and 280 in the basement. Hakkan has a capacity of 275. Park Chinois on Berkeley Street has a capacity of 250 on the ground floor and 250 in the basement but with a condition for no more than 450 customers at any one time. Sketch has a capacity of 300 on the ground floor and 150 on the first floor.</p>	<p>Adrian Studd expert report TF witness statement</p>	<p>149-157 193-199</p>
<p>The combined capacity of the previous 2 restaurants was 229 persons. Proposed is 250.</p>	<p>The combined capacity of the previous 2 restaurants was 229 persons. Proposed is 250.</p>	<p>As above RNT1</p>	<p>As above RNT1</p>

<p>use of the building even when there was 3 licensed premises situated within it.</p>			
<p>The proposed terminal hour is well outside the City Council's policy HRS1</p>	<p>The proposed terminal hour follows the findings of the planning committee and is consistent with the RNT1 and HRS1 Policy.</p>	<p>SLP 2.5 & 2.3 Policy submission</p>	<p>163-168</p>
<p>Location of entrance to premises.</p>	<p>The location of the premises has been previously considered in detail by the planning committee and found to be appropriate in this location. Management controls will be put in place in line with the operational management statement to mitigate the effect of persons leaving the premises.</p>	<p>Planning Permissions 12/12616/FULL & 14/08017/FULL</p>	<p>7-80</p>
	<p>Management controls will be put in place in line with the operational management statement to mitigate the effect of persons leaving the premises.</p>	<p>OMS</p>	<p>217-229</p>
	<p>It is not anticipated that there will be any queuing but again this is dealt with by way of appropriate condition.</p>	<p>OMS proposed conditions TF witness statement</p>	<p>217-229 233-235 193-199</p>
<p>It does not seem that the Applicant has any demonstrable history or experience.</p>	<p>Until now, it has not been possible, for commercial reasons, to disclose the name of the Michelin chef and his management team. It can now be revealed that this is Ollie Dabbous and Oskar Kinberg.</p>	<p>CVs Letters of support</p>	<p>201,203 205-216</p>

		<p>Together, they have operated a restaurant at 39 Whitfield Street.</p>	<p>OS map</p>	<p>231</p>
<p>Where will smokers go? How many smokers will there be?</p>	<p>Smokers are not expected to be high in number but will be restricted to the area as shown on the site plan. The pavement outside the carpet shop is approximately 5 meters wide and would easily accommodate a modest number of smokers without either causing a nuisance or obstructing the highway.</p>	<p>Staff will not be able to smoke within 25 metres of the restaurant and will be discouraged from smoking due to its potential adverse effects upon taste and of course hygiene.</p>	<p>TF witness statement</p>	<p>193-199</p>
<p>Smoking outside the entrance, or anywhere underneath residential flats, will mean the smoke will come in to our flats.</p> <p>How will dispersal be managed?</p>	<p>Dispersal will be managed by door staff directly onto Piccadilly asking customers to leave quietly and directing them in the direction of appropriate and numerous transport links.</p>	<p>It is not anticipated that restaurant customers will behave in an anti-social manner, unlike the previous nightclub use.</p>	<p>OMS</p>	<p>217-229</p>
<p>No information about the previous experience of applicant?</p>	<p>See Ollie Dabbous' and Oskar Kinberg's CVs.</p>		<p>CVs</p>	<p>201, 203</p>

<p>The proposals are largely aspirational.</p>	<p>Quite the contrary. The Applicant has waited until the management team were in place and the exact nature of the operation and offer is known, which are reflected in the OMS.</p>	<p>OMS & Menu</p>	<p>217-229</p>
<p>There is no information on the expected numbers of customers leaving the premises</p>	<p>Customers will be able to wait inside the Premises until their taxi has arrived to ensure a quick and quiet exit.</p>	<p>OMS</p>	<p>217-229</p>
<p>App based taxis may be used.</p>	<p>There will be an SIA registered doorman, at all times the premises is open.</p>		
	<p>On Thursdays-Saturdays from 21.00 – 01.00 there will be an additional marshal monitor cabs and parking.</p>		
	<p>The Transport Report concludes there is the highest access of public transport and a de-intensification of servicing to the location.</p>	<p>Transport report</p>	<p>245-283</p>
	<p>The Transport shows the proposed trip attractions. This was based on a capacity of 330 persons though now capacity has been further reduced by 25% to 250 persons so the figures in their analysis should be reduced accordingly.</p>		
	<p>Analysis demonstrated that proposed change of use of the basement level to a restaurant would result in significant reduction of 35% and 28% in total trips to the site during the Friday and Saturday evening services respectively (same re figures to be reduced accordingly)</p>		
	<p>The transport report makes clear that given the difference in operating times of the 2 uses there would be an increase in trips attracted between 17.00 – 22.00. However, this occurs at a time when many transport options are available to visitors. It is also far outweighed by the reduction in trips between 22.00 –</p>		

04.00 during the peak periods for the nightclub. The significant reduction in trips should be a major improvement on noise nuisance.

Customers will be able to wait in the basement for taxis until 01.00.

The Transport concludes the development is in accordance with relevant policy guidance and that transport demand attracted by the use can be successfully accommodated by the local highway, public transport and walking and cycling networks: *"The development proposals at the site accord strongly with policy requirements. An excellent PTAL rating of 6b, along with excellent walking & cycling facilities surrounding the site mean it is easily accessible by all sustainable modes of transport."*

Adrian Studd in this report notes:

"A short distance away are premises such as Mahiki in Dover Street and Novikov in Berkeley Street that, although they promote themselves as bars and restaurants have a very different operation to that proposed."

I have considered the impact that Mahiki and Novikov have on the area to identify any differences or similarities to the proposed premises at 85 Piccadilly and also considered other premises that genuinely operate as quality restaurants in a similar style to that proposed such as Hakkasan in Bruton Street and The Wolseley in Piccadilly.

Hakkasan is similar in size to that proposed with a capacity of 275 excluding staff, with opening hours from 10.00am to 2.30am seven days a week and it occupies a street with commercial and residential properties. The Wolseley is a smaller capacity restaurant but occupies a location on the same busy Piccadilly A4 on the opposite side to the proposed premises and is open until 01.30 seven days a week.

No precedent for a similar restaurant of this scale in this locality

There are a number of licensed premises in the near vicinity,

None of the premises is of the same scale proposed here. The average size of the restaurants on the same block as the premises is 70 seats

Adrian Studd
Expert report

149-157

		<p>The average size of Michelin starred restaurants in the area is 76 seats</p>	<p>Both these premises operate as restaurants and are busy, however, they are well managed and clearly food led. The customers behave in a manner that shows consideration to residents and others using the area. I have visited these premises and conducted observations in the area and am not aware of any examples of them causing crime, disorder or nuisance.</p>	
	<p>Mr Taymore Tabbah</p>	<p>Flat 15, 89 Piccadilly</p>	<p>See above.</p>	
	<p>Johanne Wort</p>	<p>Flat 14, 47 Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Rob Monk</p>	<p>Flat 2, 47 Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Amos Maritime Inc</p>	<p>Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Moon Holdings Ltd (Rolf L Nordstrom)</p>	<p>Pent-house, 89 Piccadilly</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Melathron Enterprises Co</p>	<p>Flat 12, 86-89 Piccadilly</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Salim Moollan</p>	<p>Flat 7, 89 Piccadilly</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Eva Olsen</p>	<p>Flat 14, 17 Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Richard Olsen</p>	<p>17 Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>RTM Company</p>	<p>17 Clarges St</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	
	<p>Sara Haq</p>	<p>Flat 11, 47 Clarges Street</p>	<p>As per Andrew Jones' representation.</p>	

Armenistic SC Ltd	Flat 8, 47 Clarges St	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Laura Hodgson	Flats 1 & 4, 47 Clarges St	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Raffaello Monterosso	Flat 9, 89 Piccadilly	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Thomas & Karin Jones	Flat 7, 89 Piccadilly	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Juliet Sword	Flat 19, 17 Clarges St	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Jonathan Goodman	Pent-house, 85 Piccadilly	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Rei Jones Hw Jones	Flat 2, 89 Piccadilly	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
Rei Jones (on behalf of Flat 10)	Flat 10, 89 Piccadilly	As per Andrew Jones' representation.		
*also on behalf of: Alina Matsa	Flats 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12, 47 Clarges St	N/A		
*also on behalf of: George I. Matsas	Flats 9 & 10, 47 Clarges St	N/A		
*also on behalf of: Bashak-Juliana Demir Iftikar Ul Haq	Flat 11, 47 Clarges St	N/A		
*also on behalf of: V Valentis	Flat 12, 47 Clarges St	N/A		
*also on behalf of: Henry Jones	Flat 2, 89 Piccadilly	N/A		
*also on behalf of: Aly Wally	Flat 8, 89 Piccadilly	N/A		
*also on behalf of:	Flat 11, 89 Piccadilly	N/A		

Margaret Walkden Leonard Walkden									
*also on behalf of: George Gaviotis	Flat 12, 89 Piccadilly					N/A			
*also on behalf of: Farih Tabbah	Flat 15, 89 Piccadilly					N/A			
*also on behalf of: Nick Galea	17 Clarges Street					N/A			
*also on behalf of: Valerie Edwards	Flat 1, 17 Clarges Street					N/A			
*also on behalf of: Rupert Sword Jane Sword	Flat 19, 17 Clarges St					N/A			