

# Appendix 9

**Objector - Flat 36 Ravilious House 273 King Street London**

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 19 August 2025 10:44

**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Re: 2025/00798/LAPR The Black Bull (New Premises Licence)

Thank you, Matt.

Strong no from our side.

The max acceptable opening time for this would be to 8pm.

There are children and workers in the block. We need to be able to sleep.

Happy to chat, and thank you.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my mobile

## Objector - 5 Merchant Terrace Beavor Lane London

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 11:29  
**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: 2025/00798/LAPR The Black Bull (New Premises Licence)

Dear Matt (if I may),

I am most grateful for the opportunity to consider the latest documentation in relation to this application.

First, I have some experience in connection with correspondence issued by practicing lawyers in England and wish to observe that the letter headed "*SUBMISSIONS IN RELATION TO THE APPLICATOIN [sic] FOR A NEW PREMISES LICENCE AT:*" stated to be from someone called Piers Warne is not in a form I would have generally seen before. It is not dated, it is not on the law firm headed paper, nor is it signed by him as a practicing solicitor (I have checked the SRA register and he is a practicing solicitor). He does not identify the applicant, his firm's client (presumably), by name, nor does he set out any particular legal analysis or reference against which that which he asserts in his letter can be checked. I find all of this to be unsatisfactory particularly given the seriousness of the issue for those of us residing near the premises in question. I also believe that this should be cured by him for your satisfaction given the undoubted significance and benefit his client seeks to obtain from the issuance of a licence. I believe this is a matter to be raised with him by LBH&F.

Secondly, leaving aside the foregoing points about the letter itself, it raises more questions than answers.

- At point 15 he says that "there would be next to no chance that the premises would re-open as that would prove to be economically unviable" in the event of a 10pm closing. That is stated as a conclusion without any apparent rationale. Also, it is not a legal matter but an economic one, and in order to meaningfully to assess such an assertion one would expect someone within the applicant, by individual name, with the actual expertise in such matters to articulate why this would be the case.

- At point 11 he says that "... (albeit at the time of writing, there was still an outstanding matter in relation to the terminal hour for recorded music)". This is most unsatisfactory. It is of crucial importance to understand exactly when the playing of recorded music within the premises would stop. One cannot possibly be expected to comment in the absence of such information and the fact that such matter is not resolved by the time of writing of the letter (whenever that was) speaks volumes as to nature and credibility of this application.

- The playing of recorded music internally also raises the question of the nature of the music to be played which also engages a question on the nature of the premises. Does this applicant intend playing music of an elegant lounge nature, or is the music intended to be raucous/deep bass variety, or what? Also, what proposals are likely to be made (none that I can see in the materials) to ensure that there is little to no leakage of

noise from within the premises. This also prompts the question as to what use, if any, will be made of the area to the front or to the rear of the premises for customers who purchase drinks within. While music may be played within, what about the noise of customers outside?

Finally, one gains little confidence from the manner by which the letter is presented on behalf of the applicant. This is a more general point and does not indicate that the applicant is sufficiently serious about present a coherent, comprehensive and accurate (even leaving aside the rather clumsy and obvious spelling mistake noted above) application. That is not a portent of good things to come if this licence were granted.

Thus, I maintain my objection and reserve all rights.



## Objector - Flat 46 Ravilious House 273 King Street London

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 19 August 2025 15:38  
**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: 2025/00798/LAPR The Black Bull (New Premises Licence)

Dear Mr Tucker,

Thank you for your email and for sharing the applicant's solicitor's letter dated 19 August 2025 together with the conditions agreed with the Police. I have carefully reviewed both documents.

While I acknowledge the amendments made to the proposed hours and the additional conditions, my concerns remain.

My residence is located directly opposite the Black Bull, with my bedroom windows facing the premises. I am therefore particularly vulnerable to noise disturbance late at night. Even with recorded music ceasing at 23:00, the proposed terminal hours of alcohol sales (00:00) and closing times (00:30) are likely to result in significant late-night disturbance from customers leaving the premises, smoking outside, or congregating on the street.

This area is a quiet residential neighbourhood. Allowing the premises to operate until 00:30 would, in my view, undermine the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance under the Licensing Act 2003. I am particularly concerned about:

- Noise from departing patrons between 23:00 and 00:30, directly affecting my ability to sleep.
- Outdoor congregation and smoking, leading to raised voices under my bedroom windows.
- Noise from closing operations (bottles, waste disposal, deliveries) occurring late at night.
- The overall unsuitability of such late hours for a pub situated in a residential area.

For these reasons, I do not believe that the amended application adequately addresses the impact on nearby residents. Accordingly, I will not be withdrawing my representation.

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

## **Objector - Flat 46 Ravilious House 273 King Street London**

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 19 August 2025 17:53

**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Re: 2025/00798/LAPR The Black Bull (New Premises Licence)

Dear Mr Tucker,

Thank you for forwarding the solicitor's letter of 19 August 2025 and the list of revised conditions agreed with the Police. I have read both carefully.

While I note the changes proposed by the applicant, unfortunately they do not resolve my concerns.

My flat is directly across from the Black Bull, and my bedroom windows face onto the premises. This means I am particularly sensitive to any late-night activity. Even with music ending at 23:00, the proposed alcohol sales until midnight and closing at 00:30 are very likely to result in noise from people leaving, smoking outside or gathering on the street at a time when residents are trying to rest.

This is a quiet residential area, and I believe such hours would inevitably lead to disturbance. My main concerns are:

- Noise from customers departing after 23:00.
- Groups smoking or talking outside directly beneath my windows.
- Late-night operational noise from closing up, bottle disposal or deliveries.

I do not feel that the amended application offers sufficient protection against these impacts. For that reason, I cannot withdraw my objection.

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

## **Objector - Flat 26 Ravilious House 273 King Street London**

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 August 2025 12:38  
**To:** Tucker Matt: H&F <Matt.Tucker@lbhf.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: 2025/00798/LAPR The Black Bull (New Premises Licence)

Dear Mr Tucker,

Thank you for your email and for sharing the applicant's solicitor's letter dated 19 August 2025 together with the conditions agreed with the Police. I have carefully reviewed both documents.

While I acknowledge the amendments made to the proposed hours and the additional conditions, my concerns remain.

My residence is located directly opposite the Black Bull, with my bedroom windows facing the premises. I am therefore particularly vulnerable to noise disturbance late at night. Even with recorded music ceasing at 23:00, the proposed terminal hours of alcohol sales (00:00) and closing times (00:30) are likely to result in significant late-night disturbance from customers leaving the premises, smoking outside, or congregating on the street.

This area is a quiet residential neighbourhood. Allowing the premises to operate until 00:30 would, in my view, undermine the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance under the Licensing Act 2003. I am particularly concerned about:

- Noise from departing patrons between 23:00 and 00:30, directly affecting my ability to sleep.
- Outdoor congregation and smoking, leading to raised voices under my bedroom windows.
- Noise from closing operations (bottles, waste disposal, deliveries) occurring late at night.
- The overall unsuitability of such late hours for a pub situated in a residential area.

For these reasons, I do not believe that the amended application adequately addresses the impact on nearby residents. Accordingly, I will not be withdrawing my representation.