

In my own business model, owners will be required to work within their own operations continuously, at least one week every year, so they can gain oversight, humility, and insider insight. Without that, there will always be things missed from above.

I hope this feedback is received with gratitude, because I know the business values feedback and has asked people to come forward with information. This is exactly the kind of detailed overview I believe management has been looking for, but may not have known how to access. No one else may be able to give this exact perspective because it comes from being on the floor, seeing the staff, seeing the customers, seeing the policies, and seeing how everything connects, through lenses that preceded Fullers.

There is a possibility here for the business to value this not only as staff feedback, but as operational consultation from someone currently working on the floor. This is insider operational insight, and it has value.

The main concern I want to raise is security, staff pressure, and the way current decisions may be creating risks that are bigger than they appear.

Because we work inside a station building, there are continuous checks that need to be done to make sure everything is visible, accounted for, and safe. This is not a normal pub environment. The level of responsibility is higher because of where we are located.

At the same time, hours have been cut, staff are being made to pay for their food, and the team is under pressure. This has consequences. Recently, there was a review where a customer overheard staff complaining about their job. That situation put everything into perspective even more. These occurrences can be prevented by actually caring for the staff and not just expecting them to carry the business regardless of how they are treated.

When staff feel unsupported, it leaks into the atmosphere. Customers notice. The station notices. The business becomes exposed.

There is also the security issue. Staff know we do not have a dedicated security person for something that is extremely important. Staff talk. Station members are aware. The business has already failed security checks planted by the station itself, and the business had to close for almost a week because it was shut down as a risk to public security.

The response seemed to fall heavily on an assistant manager who was already overwhelmed by work and by the little I have gathered made a mistake and would assume from her absence, despite having worked for roughly eight years with Fuller's, hearsay I would clear on, I have not verified this information just yet, now owned by Asahi. The business then had to pay tens of thousands to reopen, just so it could continue making money, but the core issue still remains.

That is the part that concerns me.

No matter how good hourly checks are in theory, if the same overstretched staff are expected to manage service, customers, food flow, refunds, incidents, staff discounts, breaks, security sheets, kitchen communication, two floors, and operational pressure all at

once, then security becomes another repeated task rather than a fully conscious responsibility.

The danger is that repetition can create desensitisation.

People sign sheets to prove they know what to do. Managers remind staff to do checks. Staff repeat the same wording. Managers look for anything suspicious on an hourly clock. But after a while, it becomes a daily ritual. Something people know they have to do throughout the day, but not something that necessarily carries real value in the mind of the person doing it beyond repetition of theory, even though the eventuality is lethal, to an overstimulated mind, it loses focus, as survival need. You have to take into account psychology when it comes to people, not everything comes down to physical labour and reason. The in between matters enormously.

That is not enough for the level of risk attached to this building.

I understand I missed the training that was delivered, and at the first the only thing I asked was if I could sign the days off as holidays, barbaric of me, but there was no loyalty then, and I recognise that, while being forced to the gravity of the situation I experience daily.

I also recognise that I have not yet asked enough about the training I missed because I did not originally think I would be staying this long. But from what I have seen, if things stayed mostly the same after training, then the training may have addressed occasional occurrences rather than the deeper structural issue.

The deeper structural issue is that managers are being asked to hold too much.

They are already dealing with short staffing, floor oversight, kitchen communication, customer issues, accidents, refunds, access limitations, staff needs, food discount approvals, breaks, paperwork, and security responsibilities. These roles are mentally draining. When managers are stretched like that, they cannot focus with the level of clarity required for everything they are responsible for.

Hiring one person whose only focus is security could change this.

That person could make sure checks are done properly, bags and unattended items are accounted for, procedures are followed with actual awareness, and the safety of staff, customers, and the wider station environment is properly protected. This would also allow assistant managers and managers to do their jobs more appropriately and interact with customers with less stress. The business would lose the higher probability of failing another check, a data value I hope you are keeping track of, with the different aspects of your business that define this data point.

It would reduce pressure.

It would protect the public.

It would protect the staff.

It would protect the managers.

It would protect the business.

The staff make the business money. I cannot stress this enough. I am not saying this only because I am staff. I am saying this because I am building a business myself, and I am currently testing what being in this position looks like while paying my own bills. My experience in management precedes me, and the fact that a new starter can notice all of this while the boardroom may not have addressed it fully is concerning to me.

It concerns me for my own safety.

If something serious happened, the consequences would not only be emotional or operational. They could become legal, financial, reputational, and structural. There could be lawsuits from people who knew why things really happened. The business could face serious damage, not just in one site, but across other businesses connected to the same boardroom, because they may be seen as extensions of the same leadership culture. Customers, staff families, commuters, travelers, the station is quite international, and a lawsuit of that calibre would completely shatter any business within a mile radius to the name. As a best case scenario. As it was not the first time, there could be manslaughter added, as it was avoidable and was made known to you.

That would not be a good look for the business. It could cause huge loss, or even threaten wider operations.

This is why I believe the “small” things need more attention. They are not small. They are early warnings.

I also want to make clear that part of the reason I have been reluctant to take on more hours, even at risk of my own rent and bills, is because I do not want to be present for something that could have been avoided. I do not want to be there for what could become one of the worst accidents possible, knowing the signs were visible beforehand.

I am saying this because I care.

I care about the staff.

I care about the customers.

I care about the managers who are being stretched.

I care about the business.

I care about safety.

I care about responsibility.

I care about my own trajectory and what humanity could lose with me.

And I care enough to say what may be uncomfortable, because not saying it would be worse.

This feedback is also an invitation. If the business is serious about listening to staff, understanding blind spots, and improving operations, then this is a clear opportunity to do so. I believe there is value in having someone on the floor who can observe the business at this level and offer structured insight while still working within the operation.

That insight can support staff welfare, customer experience, security, management pressure, and wider business protection.

I hope this is received in the spirit it is intended: as honest, detailed, frontline feedback from someone who sees the value of the business, but also sees the risks that need to be addressed before they become consequences.

Kind regards,

Susan