

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 1 – Detailed written replies and miscellaneous comments

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
British Beer and Pub Association.	Public Health,	Para 6.18 refers to the impact of alcohol on public health. We recognise that alcohol misuse can be detrimental to personal health but as this is not promoted as a licensing objective such observations have no place in your Licensing Policy.	In our view the policy rightfully touches on the link between alcohol misuse and public health. The health problems associated with excessive consumption of alcohol are well known and are not in dispute. The policy does not at any point state that the licensing authority will impose conditions related to public health and as such we feel it is right and appropriate for a statement of licensing policy to make this link (indirectly) to the licensing objectives.	None required.
British Beer and Pub Association.	Risk Assessments,	At para 9.8 the policy says: “It is recognised that some areas of the risk assessment may duplicate issues which applicants have previously addressed in order to satisfy other legislation. Where this does occur the Operating Schedule may cross reference to such alternative documents and copies of the same may accompany the application. An example of this is an existing fire safety certificate or electrical test certificate.” This is unnecessary duplication and should not	Comments accepted. The provision of copies of risk assessments will not be necessary as they will have been provided to the appropriate responsible authority for the purpose of fulfilling other legislation.	Para 9.8 amended so not to require copies of other documentation.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
		occur. If legal requirements under other legislation are copied to the Operating Schedule, the licensing authority will inevitably turn those into conditions and therefore a legal requirement under the Licensing Act. Failure to have a fire safety certificate, for example, should be prosecuted under the Regulatory Fire Order and not under licensing law.		
British Beer and Pub Association.	enforcement	<p>We would welcome recognition of the Hampton principles of inspection and enforcement in the policy, which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No inspection should take place without a reason • Regulators should recognise that a key element of their activity will be to allow or even encourage, economic progress and only to intervene when there is a clear case for protection 	Comments accepted. Policy amended to expand on the enforcement principles	Section 13
British Beer and Pub Association.	General observations	<p>We are concerned that the Council may receive representations for change to which we will be unable to respond until after the policy is approved by the Council. We would take this opportunity to highlight the following, which we would not support being included in the final policy document as they are beyond the provisions of the Licensing Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applications to be completed in a specific manner, other than that prescribed in regulations. There is a danger that the licensing authorities 'expectations' could be construed as requiring applicants to offer a 	The council will not seek to insert any of these areas in to the policy, which would all appear (at this time) to be outside the scope and spirit of the legislation.	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
		<p>significant number of restrictions in their operating schedules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any blanket or standard conditions on licences eg. CCTV, hours, use of polycarbonate/plastic glasses, capacity limits, membership and attendance at Pubwatch meetings etc. • the Designated Premises Supervisor to be on the premises at all times, or to have a specific level of experience, training or qualification in addition to the personal licence qualification etc. • written authorisation for the sale of alcohol. • more than one personal licence holder on the premises. • measures that duplicate existing legislation, eg. health and safety (eg. smoking, fire etc.) or disability provisions. 		
Poppleston Allen – Licensing Solicitor	Alcohol promotions	<p>We have been instructed by Mitchells & Butlers Leisure Retail Ltd, who own and operate several licensed premises within Leeds, to comment upon paragraphs 6.19 and 6.20 of the draft document.</p> <p>Our client fully supports the intent of the paragraphs but believes that the terms, 'heavily or extensively discounted' in relation to alcohol sales should not be used. Operators will be uncertain as to what is an 'acceptable price'. They may follow the lead of other local operators when determining this. There is also a question as to what is meant by 'discounted'. You will appreciate that lawyers could spend</p>	Comments accepted. Terms such as 'heavily or extensively discounted' have been removed from the policy and replaced with examples of unacceptable drinks promotions, taken from the British Beer & Pub Association guidance document 'Point of Sale Promotions' as suggested.	Paragraphs 6.18 – 6.24

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
		<p>hours arguing over this term – ‘Who sets the price? Discounted from what?’</p> <p>Our client believes that the focus should firmly be upon tackling ‘irresponsible promotions’ and that your policy should place greater reliance upon industry codes to assist operators to determine what is, and what is not, responsible.</p> <p>The British Beer and Pub Association guidance document “Point of Sale Promotions” sets out the standards for management of responsible drinks promotions including happy hour. The document deals with the following points:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standards and principles for well-managed promotions; 2. Guidance on how to ensure that the promotion is run responsibly; 3. Ten Tips to encourage customers to drink responsibly; 4. Guidance on what are irresponsible promotions; <p>We note that paragraph 6.21 advises applicants to consider this document when completing their operating schedule and managing their premises generally. However our clients believe that a greater emphasis should be placed on actually complying with the BBPA’s Guidance and that references to ‘price or discounted drinks’ should be</p>		

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
		<p>removed.</p> <p>The BBPA guidance rightly points out that a well managed promotion is a legitimate way of maintaining and developing a business. The guidance also advises against promotions that encourage individuals to drink to excess, behave in an antisocial way or, which fuels drunkenness.</p> <p>We ask you to consider the above as part of the consultation process into the Statement of Licensing Policy for 2007 – 2010.</p>		
Ford and Warren – Licensing Solicitor	Licensing hours – Paragraphs 6.8 – 6.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At paragraph 6.9 the draft policy refers to customers who may be noisy when leaving, or leave litter after using the premises. We do not condone this behaviour and accept responsibility for patrons who act in this way while still on the premises. However paragraphs 2.38 and 2.39 of the DCMS S182 guidance is very clear on the point of patrons who are no longer under the immediate control of the premises licence holder or designated premises supervisor. They state that it is a matter for an individual who chooses to engage in anti-social or illegal behaviour, and not a matter for the licence holder or premises manager. Paragraph 6.9 of the policy also refers to the impact of on street parking. We don't believe that this is relevant to the licensing objectives. On street parking is a public facility and as such any individual has as 	<p>In any licensing decision the Committee Members will be guided by paras 2.38 & 2.39 of the DCMS guidance. Conditions will be focused on measures within the direct control of the licence holder and not once the customers are beyond the control of the licence holder.</p> <p>We refer to on-street parking (para 6.9) for the purpose that nuisance may be caused by customers when vacating the area</p> <p>We are not specific in Para 6.13 as to transport arrangements as this will need to be addressed on a</p>	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Source	Theme	Comments made	Reply	Policy Changes
		<p>much right to park where s/he chooses as the next person, regardless of a licensed premises in the locality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 6.13 refers to appropriate facilities being available as a relevant measure in the operating plan. We request clarification on whether provision of a taxi service phone number adequately deals with this issue. We do not believe premises that do not fall on a regular public transport route should be unfairly prejudiced. 	<p>case by case basis and a number of options could apply.</p>	
Ford and Warren – Licensing Solicitor	Alcohol Promotions – Paragraphs 6.18 – 6.23	<p>We fully support measures to prevent irresponsible alcohol retailing. We request clarification on the point that discounted drinks promotions are allowed on the basis that they are not heavily or substantially discounted. For example a couple who buy a meal and on ordering 2 glasses of wine receive the remainder of the bottle, we do not believe to be irresponsible. We do not accept that a drinks promotion on a licensed premises can be held responsible for anti social behaviour off the premises as paragraph 6.23 suggests. We repeat the contents of paragraphs 2.38 and 2.39 of the guidance as they are referred to above.</p>	<p>See response to Poppleston Allen, Licensing Solicitor, above.</p> <p>The council will consider action against a premise where there is clear evidence that a drinks promotion is having an adverse impact on the licensing objectives.</p>	Paragraphs 6.18 – 6.24

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 2 – Questionnaire replies on the policy in general

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/001	Public	General support for the policy but needs applying strictly	In making their decision the Licensing Committee have regard for the Guidance issued by the DCMS and the Statement of Licensing Policy.	None Required
STPC/007	City Town or Parish Councillor	I favour tighter restrictions.	The council is bound by the legislation and must determine each application on its merits. Certain areas on the Policy (Excessive consumption & Enforcement) have been improved.	
STPC/010	Public	This is a step only. 24 hour drinking was always a stupid policy. It should be stopped.	The council is bound by the legislation and must determine each application on its merits. The guidance issued under section 182 also states that supermarkets should generally be able to licence themselves for the sale of alcohol in line with their normal opening hours, resulting in 24hr	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			licences for such premises. In Leeds there are no pubs/clubs with a 24 hr licence.	
STPC/024	Public	Currently extended opening hours has negative impacts on my area - Woodhouse/Hyde Park and Headingley - Fast food and drinking establishments produce noise, nuisance, litter, antisocial behaviour. Policy not pitched at right level. Needs to be strengthened.	The Cumulative Impact Policy for Headingley has been strengthened and now makes reference to alcohol led premises and takeaways.	Section 7
STPC/026	Public	In areas where there are known problems, then the policy should discourage additional licences or extensions to licences that could further exasperate the problems.	Cumulative Impact Policies have been identified for those areas where evidence of nuisance, crime and disorder and identified.	Sections 7
STPC/029	City Town or Parish Councillor	Concerned about later opening hours leading to social difficulties in residential areas.	The council has strengthened the part of the policy that deals with licensing hours in line with the governments new section 182 guidance. The Act does contain the power of review for premises which continually undermine the licensing objectives, and this is one of the key safeguards in	Sections 6.8 - 6.15

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			the Act.	
STPC/035	Residential Home Manager, Horsforth	Should not be more extended licensing hours.	The council is bound by the legislation and must determine each application on its merits. The council has strengthened the part of the policy that deals with licensing hours in line with the governments new section 182 guidance.	Sections 6.12 & 6.13
STPC/038	Public	The period for drinking up time should not be recommended, it should be implemented and enforced. Feeble. The present situation in Hyde Park and Woodhouse contravenes at least 2 of the licensing objectives - prevention of public nuisance and prevention of crime and disorder.	The Act does not allow for the Authority to apply drinking up-times as standard. Such measures may only be imposed upon the receipt of relevant representations. Also to note that the consumption of alcohol is not a licensable activity. Evidence from Responsible Authorities does not suggest that the Cumulative Impact Policy for Hyde Park/Woodhouse needs to be strengthened at this particular time.	None required.
STPC/041	Solicitor	Too many premises being open late	The council has	Sections 6.12 & 6.13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		leads to disorder well into the early hours. Further restrictions are required in my view.	strengthened the part of the policy that deals with licensing hours in line with the governments new section 182 guidance. The Act does contain the power of review for premises which continually undermine the licensing objectives, and this is one of the key safeguards in the Act.	
STPC/042	Community group representative	Extended opening hours should certainly only be granted where the applicant can demonstrate that the application will not undermine the licensing objectives. Within CIP Areas 3B and 3C it is not at all clear that this is the case. The Policy should be pitched at a much more stringent level, given the scale of alcohol-related problems in these Areas.	The Cumulative Impact Policy for Headingley (Area 3B) has been strengthened and now makes reference to the growth of alcohol led premises irrespective of the hours. Evidence from Responsible Authorities does not suggest that the Cumulative Impact Policy for Hyde Park/Woodhouse (Area 3C) needs to be strengthened at this particular time.	Section 7

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/051	Public	I feel that a more liberal policy towards extended hours is needed to facilitate a more civilised continental style drinking culture.	The council has reviewed the part of the policy that deals with licensing hours in line with the governments new section 182 guidance. The policy is clear that each application will be determined on its merits.	Section 6.8 – 6.15
STPC/052	Public	I would like local residents to have much more powers and not to be overruled on appeal - but I think the policy is the best that the council can draw up under existing legislation.	Local residents do have the opportunity to object to an application or make a review application where a licensed premises is undermining the licensing objectives. However, all parties will have an equal right of appeal.	None required.
STPC/071	Public	Strict closing times for all licensed premises including restaurants not piece meal.	The council is bound by the legislation and must determine each application on its merits in line with the four licensing objectives.	None required
STPC/079	Public	It needs to be stronger. Can we shorten hours?	There is no scope in the legislation for the LA to restrict or shorten a premises' hours unless a responsible authority or	None required

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			interested party applies for a review of a licence.	
STPC/083	Public	I would like to see the Council being much more restrictive in terms of granting special licenses and extensions	The licensing authority can only consider the application of licensing restrictions to an application where relevant representations are received. The LA therefore relies upon the responsible authorities and interested parties to provide the necessary evidence to support any specific licence restrictions.	None required.
STPC/087	Public	Unrestricted hours of sale of alcohol.	The council will determine each application on its merits in line with the four licensing objectives.	None required.
STPC/094	Public	I would prefer no extended licenses full stop. I am particularly interested in Headingley and feel that any extended licenses granted result in all the pubs feeling that they have to compete so that there is a gradual increase in opening times across all establishments. A flat no policy would give a clear message to proprietors.	The Cumulative Impact Policy for Headingley has been strengthened and now makes reference to alcohol led premises and takeaways.	Section 7
STPC/096	Public	I would like to see a more restrictive policy in operation. The social	The council has strengthened the part of	Sections 6.12 & 6.13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		consequences of extended drinking hours are very severe both in terms of individual people and the communities within which drinking establishments are located.	the policy that deals with licensing hours in line with the governments new section 182 guidance. The Act does contain the power of review for premises which continually undermine the licensing objectives, and this is one of the key safeguards in the Act.	
STPC/100	Public	The expansion of alcohol sales has been driven by commercial interests rather than by the need for a livable environment. Headingley centre is now an area avoided by families. Anti-social behaviour, such as public urination, is common. If we want to use laws to support livable communities (in line with gov't and council policies), it is time to do so. Sales of alcohol should be restricted to small volume establishments, designed for small numbers of people to enjoy alcohol in small quantities. It is wrong to allow commercial interests to destroy Common Goods such as a quiet, pro-social atmosphere in our public spaces. Alcohol sales should also be restricted in time (eg no sales after 10.30pm) so that local residents don't end up	The Cumulative Impact Policy for Headingley has been strengthened and now makes reference to alcohol led premises and takeaways.	Section 7

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		wanting to move out of the area because they cannot get a clear night's sleep. There is a glaring social problem that can be seen any night in Headingley centre - laws such as the CIP are one of the ways that we have some chance of addressing this problem. The CIP should be used to the maximum.		
STPC114	Public	Think its about time this council stopped restricting every thing. the suppliers of the cheapest booze that encourage binge drinking must be the supermarkets. try targeting them first.	The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol, but where clear evidence suggests that alcohol sales from a given premises is having an impact on the licensing objectives, then a responsible authority may apply for a review of the licence.	None required.
STPC/118	Public	Would like to see applications also judged in the light of how many extended hours licences are already granted in vicinity.	The Act requires the Licensing Authority to consider each application on it's own merits which would not allow for the times of other licensed premises in the vicinity to be taken into	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 1) Do you feel the new policy on licensing hours is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			consideration.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/001	Public	To be enforced comprehensively. Can it include advertising and promotions.	Policy amended to expand on the enforcement principles and the excessive consumption of alcohol.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13.
STPC/004	Licensed business	I consider it highly misleading that premises can be open 24 hours yet the new policy is aimed at reducing / removing the opportunity for binge drinking.	The Act allows for 24 hour licences where the applicant demonstrates that it will not undermine the licensing objectives.	None required.
STPC/010	Public	All discounted alcohol sales should be stopped. You are just putting another level in place that has to be policed.	The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol, but where clear evidence suggests that alcohol sales from a given premises is having an impact on the licensing objectives, then a responsible authority may apply for a review of the licence.	None required.
STPC/024	Public	Enforcement is key here. Premises that encourage binge drinking and discounted sales should have licence removed. Strong enforcement is essential.	The policy has been strengthened in these areas.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/025	Public	Enforcement with penalties made clear.	The policy has been	Section 13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		Licence removal. Otherwise it will be ignored.	strengthened in this area.	
STPC/030	City Town or Parish Councillor	Could last line of 6.20 state 'will' rather than 'may'.	Paragraph amended	Paragraph amended NB: Due to renumbering 6.20 now appears as 6.22.
STPC/040	Community group representative	If enforcement means what it should mean - closing offenders down by the withdrawal of licence - It's fine. Otherwise: Not worth the paper it's written on.	The Section on Enforcement has been strengthened. Also to note that a premises cannot be closed down under the Act without a review of the licence.	Section 13
STPC/041	Solicitor	Stop if at all possible the 'out of control' themed drinking that goes on - particularly this time of the year (September /October onwards.)	Policy amended to expand on the enforcement principles and the excessive consumption of alcohol.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/056	Public	This does not sound strong enough to me. I think licences should be revoked rather than wrists slapped. Enforcement needs to be much tighter.	The Section on Enforcement has been strengthened. Revocation of a licence may only take place following a review application.	Section 13
STPC/059	Public	Enforcement action on premises encouraging binge drinking is a key issue, without it the licensing policy is worthless. For premises where binge drinking takes place and can be due to licensee encouragement, eg. 2 for 1 offers, then action should be taken by	Policy amended to strengthen the enforcement principles and excessive consumption of alcohol	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		the council to remove licences.		
STPC/062	Public	An aggressive enforcement of strict limits including the removal of licences.	The policy has been strengthened in this area.	Section 13
STPC/067	Public	Bigger police presence. There are many promotions. - The freshers week promotions made it almost impossible to walk in Headingley - A nightmare for pushchairs and older people. These must be heavily censured.	Waste generated by promotional material is monitored and addressed through the Environmental Health Services (City Services). Environmental Health or any interested party may apply for a review of a licence where there is evidence that the specific premises are undermining the licensing objectives.	None required.
STPC/068	Public	Any premises encouraging binge-drinking should lose their licence - the threat would be a strong deterrent.	Policy amended to strengthen the enforcement principles and excessive consumption of alcohol.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/069	Public	Revoke licences and impose heavy fines on breweries / owners eg. the Box, Headingley for encouraging binge-drinking and for noise and outrageous behaviour generated on the streets as a result.	A responsible authority or interested party may apply for a review of a licence where clear evidence demonstrates that the premises are undermining the licensing objectives. The Licensing Authority may not apply fines, but	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			may suspend/revoke or attach conditions / remove activities.	
STPC/080	Public	But there seems no enforcement. Banners outside eg. Hyde Park offer cheap student drinks. The Vodka wagan plies students with cheap vodka.	The Licensing Authority has no jurisdiction over the Vodka wagon which supplies samples free of charge. Those venues advertising cheap drinks are monitored and where evidence suggests that these are having an impact on the licensing objectives then a review of the licence is probable.	None required.
STPC/081	Public	The policy will only be effective if there is strict and regular multi-agency enforcement visits.	The Council does have an Enforcement Protocol signed by all partner agencies and multi-agency visits are regularly undertaken at identified problem premises.	Section 13
STPC/083	Public	Don't all discounted sales outlets encourage binge drinking?. I am uncertain what multi-agency enforcement means - what precisely are these agencies enforcing?	The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol, but where clear evidence suggests that alcohol sales from a given	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			<p>premises is having an impact on the licensing objectives, then a responsible authority may apply for a review of the licence.</p> <p>Policy amended to strengthen the enforcement principles and excessive consumption of alcohol.</p>	
STPC/084	Public	<p>This is a real concern in the City Centre and one reason why I go there rarely now. This binge drinking culture attracts the kids but if Leeds really wants to go up a league as an international city more must be done to address this drink cheap - get drunk culture. It is unpleasant at best and unsafe at worst. We are a long way from being a civilised European city which feels safe and welcomes people of all ages and interests.</p>	<p>Problems in the City Centre have been identified hence the Cumulative Impact Policy. Similar concerns with control measures are addressed through the Enforcement Group and similar multi-agency forums.</p> <p>New legislation available to the Police will also assist in tackling alcohol related anti-social behaviour.</p>	Section 7.
STPC/087	Public	<p>Discounted alcohol sales should be at the discretion of the supplier. its a market decision not a council decision</p>	<p>The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol, but where clear evidence</p>	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			suggests that alcohol sales from a given premises is having an impact on the licensing objectives, then a responsible authority may apply for a review of the licence.	
STPC/088	Public	Heavily discounted should be worded as discounted and enforced more strictly	Reference to discounted drinks has been removed due to questions of interpretation. The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/090	Public	It will be hard to prove (beyond reasonable doubt) that an establishment was "encouraging binge drinking" however "binge drinking is defined in Law... Better to penalise any establishment "permitting binge drinking".	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/091	Public	No. Again it needs to be much firmer since eg. two for one or happy hours merely encourage the drinking which gives rise to the problems. Offers should simply be banned.	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13.
STPC/092	Health Development	From a health viewpoint, the policy is	The council has no	Non required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
	Manager	<p>too heavily reliant on the prevention of crime and disorder, safety and nuisance in the 4 licensing objectives. The Chief Medical Officer for England recently said that alcohol abuse was in danger of wiping out all the health gains from going smokefree. You have tried to address this in 6.18 - 6.23 but in 6.19 have linked this inappropriately to the licensing objectives , which are not "health" based. In 6.20 a review of licence for promoting discounted drinks will only occur "when there is evidence of undermining of the licensing objectives". Why make this conditional? What about a blanket prohibition of such drinks promotions? Such a prohibition would render 6.22 and 6.23 unnecessary. Are we saying it is acceptable to have such drinks promotions if the licensed premises are suitably remote from anywhere and there is no chance of nuisance? How much evidence do you need of a clear causal link? I do not think that targeting premises for multi-agency enforcement visits (para6.20) will act as a deterrent. These premises are often part of company chains and should be compliant anyway in trading standards and environmental health and should</p>	<p>discretion to promote the area of 'public health' to a licensing objective. The four licensing objectives are bound in law and the council must operate within the scope of the legislation.</p>	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		harbour no fears of a visit. Licence review would be more effective.		
STPC/097	Public	Heavily discounted alcohol promotions may be detrimental to crime levels and disturbance in Nightclubs but not in 24hour stores where drink is purchased for drinking in the home and most often, drank over a long period of time rather than rushed before a premises is shut.	The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol, but where clear evidence suggests that alcohol sales from a given premises is having an impact on the licensing objectives, then a responsible authority may apply for a review of the licence.	None required.
STPC/099	Public	The words 'heavily discounted' could be made clearer - is two-for-one a heavy discount or not? I feel that any promotions that encourage binge drinking should be curbed, because of the related health and social problems we are generating. Some clarification would stop pubs 'slipping through the net'.	Reference to discounted drinks has been removed due to questions of interpretation. The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/102	Public	It is very vague - what price constitutes "heavily discounted"?	Reference to discounted drinks has been removed due to questions of interpretation. The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			and enforcement.	
STPC/103	Public	Enforcement of premises encouraging binge drinking is a key issue, without it the policy is worthless. At premises where binge drinking results due to licensee encouragement, e.g. 2 for 1 offers then action should be taken by the council to remove licences.	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/109	Licensed business	The policy does not differentiate between off-licence and on-licence premises. There would also appear to be some subjectivity in determining what is an irresponsible promotion. It is unlikely that off-licence promotions are likely to undermine the licensing objectives.	The Council does not recognise any difference between off and on licence sales – all licensed premises have an obligation to promote the licensing objectives. Reference to discounted drinks has been removed due to questions of interpretation. The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/111	Public	I would prefer a strong line to be taken and that quick closure of offending premises should occur.	A recent amendment to the Licensing Act will allow for an expedited closure but this would need to be supported by clear evidence specific to the premises concerned.	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/116	Public	Issues of enforcement and ensuring that licences will be removed where there is proven binge drinking.	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/118	Public	So long as the threat of enforcement is backed up by action.	Enforcement is carried out in accordance with the licensing enforcement protocol and the Hampton Principles (risk based inspections/remedial actions)	None required.
STPC/126	Public	Basically to combat binge drinking, ideally the promotions should stop. What about those venues that don't heavily discount their alcohol, but still have high instances of antisocial behaviour?	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement. Premises identified as undermining the licensing objectives are subject to enforcement attention.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/127	Public	The real issue is enforcement - the advertising to freshers in Headingley last weekend was disgraceful and plugging the idea of drinking lots for very little cost. Unless and until a couple of bars are actually closed down they will continue to flout the spirit if not the letter of the law.	Those venues advertising cheap drinks are monitored and where evidence suggests that these are having an impact on the licensing objectives then a review of the licence is probable.	Para 6.22
STPC/128	Licensed business	The measures are not harsh enough!	The Policy has been	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 2) Do you feel the new policy on discounted alcohol sales is pitched at the right level?				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Section 13
STPC/130	Public	If the premises are participating in heavily discounted sales then action should be taken beyond making a visit.	The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement. A visit will however be the initial action in order to witness the complaint and provide the licence holder with the opportunity to cease the promotion prior to instigating formal action.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/131	Public	I welcome the new measures. They will stand or fall on the level of enforcement given. 6.23 makes it look as if it will be quite difficult to get irresponsible promotions banned - I think residents should be able to look to the Council and Police to help them collect evidence if a quick examination shows a complaint may be well founded.	Comments noted thank you.	None required.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/003	Solicitor	Things constantly change. Policy should not be rigid.	The Policy is designed around the Licensing Act / Section 182 Guidance to Local Authorities (which has been subject to a recent change following a government review). The policy may be reviewed at any point should any changes have an impact on the policy contents .	
STPC/004	Licensed business	I am a hot food Take Away owner and would like to see a better internal relationship between the planning department and Licensing Authority than the one which exists presently. Similarly police concerns over binge drinking and anti-social behaviour should be transferred into stricter policy regarding drinking establishments. I am also concerned about the current licensing laws restricting public houses, bars and night clubs. Whilst I get the majority of my business from these places, much of the trouble experiences at my premises starts , or is fuelled by activities at these premises. The blame then rests with Hot Food Takeaways which is unjustified and unfair.	Liaison between the licensing and planning authority does take place. The problems occur as the Act does not allow for the cross over of legislation – ie the Licensing Committee are unable to have regard for planning constraints and vice versa.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/009	Public	I feel the area near where I live should be watched: Street Lane Roundhay to Roundhay Park. In recent years many more licensed premises /food venues have opened in a small stretch and quite a few are pending. But the licence application in the new somerfield is welcome. That supermarket will fulfil a need.	Interested parties (ie residents) may ask for a cumulative impact policy where there is evidence that a concentration of licensed premises are undermining the licensing objectives. It is recommended that residents firstly seek the support of local representatives and the police / environmental health services. Further advice may be supplied if required.	
STPC/012	Public	More Tax on takeaways littering roads.	Where there is clear evidence that a licensed takeaway is creating nuisance by way of litter, then a review application may be considered.	
STPC/023		Premises who sell to under age drinkers should be shut down.	There are many enforcement operations steered by the police and trading standards focussing on under age sales. Penalties can range from fixed penalty notices to the review of a	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
			licence.	
STPC/026	Member of The Public	The existing policy has not worked, because there are areas of the city with considerable problems and the existing policy seems to further licences.	The Council and responsible authorities are of the opinion that the Cumulative Impact Policy for the City Centre has been successful in that there has been little increase in the number of licensed venues in the identified areas.	
STPC/030	City Town or Parish Councillor.	We need to get stricter in shutting down problem premises.	Various provisions are available for addressing problem premises including the new expedited review procedures. In all instances, clear strong evidence is essential.	
STPC/046	Public	Binge drinking: Council should impose a licence condition prohibiting inappropriate sales promotions etc.	The council may only attach this condition where there is a relevant representation and evidence in support. Licence holders attention is drawn to the revised sections of the policy which address excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/049	Community group representative	I am concerned about the issue of licences – and the reduction of hours. I also favour stricter controls over young teenagers drinking.	Each application has to be considered on it's own merits. Multi-agency operations are held in order to detect and combat under age sales and consumption with penalties for the licence holder/offender.	
STPC/051	Public	I think the policy is good on discounted alcohol sales and promotions and positive on wishing a vibrant and thriving night time economy. But there needs more balance - control café/bars, night clubs etc and promote community traditional pubs, small restaurants, café etc. Not a blanket ban.	A blanket ban within a Cumulative Impact Policy is as a result of supportive evidence.	
STPC/051	Public	The 2003 Act gave an opportunity to liberalise the old licensing laws and move towards a more civilised relaxed continental style drinking regime. The present policy tends to hinder extended hours unnecessarily, without allowing the new Act a chance. It seems a small minority of binge drinkers or problem drinkers are able to set the agenda rather than the normal majority. A good mix of pubs, bars, clubs is important for a sustainable community.	Comments noted	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/052	Public	I think that alcohol promotions around freshers week must be controlled further – eg. mobile promotions of alcohol and alcohol related outlets, and the saturation leafleting etc.	Those venues advertising cheap drinks promotions are monitored and where evidence suggests that these are having an impact on the licensing objectives then a review of the licence is probable.	
STPC/054	Public	License should prohibit drinking in close proximity to passing pedestrians for example at the Box in Headingley.	The Licensing Authority may only restrict the licensed area following the receipt of relevant representations. Many outdoor drinking areas do not require a licence as consumption is not a licensable activity.	
STPC/055	Public	You should consider the provision of induction Loops for the hard of hearing - Venues of over 100 persons should be required to have induction loops for any amplified sound (live and recorded). Notices should state there is one. A light visible to the audience should indicate that the loop is switched on. All temporary microphones / instruments must be connected to the system. Smaller venues could have alternative methods eg. RNID's conversion system.	This would be a matter for the Disability Discrimination Act and consequently the licensing authority is unable to address such matters as the Act does not allow for the reproduction of governing legislation where this exists.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC067	Public	All drinking establishments should have maximum seating so that drinking becomes social and not only to make money. The social aspect of drinking is absent and all applications for licences wherever, should be reliant on proof of providing this. This should be done in retrospect.	Where it is evident that a premise is to be a HVVD (high volume vertical drinking establishment), a responsible authority may submit a representation on the basis that the nature and locality of the the premises could impact on the licensing objectives.	
STPC/071	Public	Not strict enough regarding closing times. Common closing time for all properties.	The Act does not provide for common closing times.	
STPC/072	Community Group Representative	Strict closing times for all premises.	The Act does not provide for common closing times.	
STPC/082	Public	A favour a clamp down on outside drinking and keeping tabs on shops who sell to under age drinkers.	The Licensing Authority may only restrict the licensed area following the receipt of relevant representations. Many outdoor drinking areas do not require a licence as consumption is not a licensable activity. Multi-agency operations are held in order to detect and combat under age sales and consumption with penalties for the licence holder/offender.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/083	Public	That parts of Leeds are now saturated with bars/pubs/clubs constructs a unpleasant image of the city that is very off-putting to those who don't visit these places (i.e. older people) Who would want to buy residential property in the city centre today? What effect does this weekend mayhem have on the city centre tourism strategy. I would like to see the council along with the police take a much firmer stance on public drunkenness (a no-tolerance strategy)	Problems in the City Centre have been identified hence the Cumulative Impact Policy. Similar concerns with control measures are addressed through the Enforcement Group and similar multi-agency forums. New legislation available to the Police will also assist in tackling alcohol related anti-social behaviour.	
STPC/086	Public	The policy is too soft on landlords who permit their clients to drink to excess. The only effective penalty is a cut in opening hours for bad landlords. Fines will not be effective.	There are various penalties for those who undermine the licensing objectives including the new provision for an expedited review of their licence which could include the suspension or revocation of licence. In all such instances, any such review application must be accompanied by sound evidence.	
STPC/087	Public	Councils should not interfere operationally in market situations. they	Reply as above	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		should however insist on proper policing and strict law enforcement. Proprietors who keep unruly premises should be closed down. This would also act as an example to others, an aspect of the law sadly missing in today's society.		
STPC/088	Public	Policy on discounted alcohol sales is weak and weakly enforced. cheap alcohol also makes the city look cheap and nasty as well as all of the other problems it causes. Also drinking hours are only relevant to British culture, the price of alcohol needs to rise substantially.	The Licensing Authority is unable to restrict the market pricing of alcohol. The Policy has been strengthened in the areas of Excessive consumption of alcohol and enforcement.	Para's 6.18 – 6.24 and Section 13
STPC/089	Leeds Primary care Trust	We have requested on several occasions that we should add a fifth objective that appears in the Scottish act in Leeds - To protect public health. We accept the judgement that this is not allowed within the scope of the act. We are grateful that the council did find the scope to include:- 6.18 The council is acutely aware of the link between the supply of discounted liquor and incidents of alcohol related disorder as well as the impact that excessive or binge drinking can have on public health.	Comments noted	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/092	Health Development Manager	The policy misses the opportunity to deal with the health issues associated with alcohol and the effects of a more liberal licensing policy on alcohol consumption.	The Policy touches upon the link between binge drinking and health. It would not be appropriate to expand on this given that public health is not a licensing objective.	
STPC/100	Public	It must say something about us, as a society, that we have allowed things to go so far, that so many of our cities and towns are such a disgrace in an evening. The levels of alcohol consumption, and the takeaway culture, combine to produce an ugly scene where police and ambulances have to be in regular attendance, where property is damaged, where the health of the drinkers is at risk, where urine and litter covers the pavements. What have we been thinking of, that we have allowed things to go so far? The situation is disastrous for our young people (who are being exploited) and disastrous for our communities. Pro-social community life is being driven underground, while our public spaces are taken over by rampant vulgarity. It is time we stood up to the only beneficiaries of the present situation - commercial interests - and passed effective legal safeguards to protect the	Comments noted.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
		kind of society we want to see in the future. These policies (as well as all the other measures that can possibly be taken) will only be effective when families and old people are again feeling safe to use our town centres: where a stroll in an evening in a town centre will show local residents of all ages, enjoying a quiet pro-social atmosphere, without endangering health, property, or anybody's peaceful night's sleep.		
STPC/102	Public	The consultation on this is lacking. There needs to be a "plain english" version, setting out simply what are the changes, that is accessible to a wider section of society, as it does not make easy reading. Having the questionnaire online is very good though, although it is hard to find on the Council website!	Given the complexity of the Act and S. 182 Guidance we consider that the Policy is easy to follow. The proposed changes were set out in the questionnaire. The configuration of the Council website is out of our control but we are continually striving to have attention brought to this.	
STPC/107	Public	This is a comment not on the policy but on this online questionnaire. For future consultations you should include a "previous" as well as a "next" button on each page to allow respondents to revisit their responses to earlier questions.	Comments noted	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Question 4) Thoughts on the policy in general / other miscellaneous comments				
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply	Policy Changes
STPC/111	Public	I favour visible presence of police officers in likely trouble spots and action to close offending premises.	Persistent offending premises may be dealt with by way of review applications.	
STPC/126	Public	The 24 hour licensing has worked in that it has granted the pubs when they can open and close. But it has done nothing to curb drunken antisocial behaviour, I would say that this has worsened in the city centre as a direct result.	Comments noted	
STPC/133	Public	Thank you for introducing these new [CIP] restrictions. They will be much appreciated by the resident communities.	Comments noted	
STPC/138	Licensed business	Not exactly related but the binge drinkers who police have to deal with and lock up. Let them pay directly for staying in prison for the night, why should the tax payer pay for this?	Comments noted	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 3 – Consultation replies related to the city centre (Area 1) CIP

Comment in support of the proposed City Centre (Area 1) Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP).			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/112	Public	Can LCC please ensure there is no overall increase in the number of licensed venues in Leeds city centre as I feel as a city centre provision has reached saturation point and the streets of Leeds at night are not a pleasant place to be, especially Fri/Sat nights.	It is proposed to maintain the current Cumulative Impact Policy for the city centre.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 4 – Consultation replies related to the Headingley (Area 2) CIP

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/001	Public	Excellent idea to include fast food outlets. Essential to check North Lane to make sure conditions are being adhered to. Need to revert to 11pm closing for all in order to cease attracting noisy late night customers and taxi trade.	It is proposed to amend the Headingley CI Policy to include a restriction (subject to relevant representations) on all predominantly alcohol led premises and takeaways that operate beyond 11pm. And to also refuse applications to materially extend the opening hours of any licensed premise.
STPC/007	City Town or Parish Councillor	Take Aways should be included in Headingley Policy. Headingley Policy should mirror tougher Horsforth Policy.	As above
STPC/045	Public	No more licensed premises (other than true restaurants) in Headingley. No more pubs. Headingley is still a shrine to student drinking and frightening and dangerous to locals as such. Any more you can do?	As above.
STPC/056	Public	CIP Needs to be extended from Headingley Hill to Hyde Park corner. The whole of our village is a Benidorm free for all. Permanent residents excluded from own area by bombardment of binge drinkers. All I know is that Headingley is being undermined by more and more drinking establishments and drink outlets. If the existing policy has allowed this to happen then its is obviously not working. Come and see for yourselves. See above - Needs tightening up. More enforcement, revoke licences, do not grant any more licences, enough already. All 'alcohol led' establishments should be included, not just vertical drinking licences. Why does the council have to "consider" imposing a licence condition about not	As Above. The Headingley Policy does not extend to Hyde Park corner but this could be a future area to be addressed upon the submission of relevant evidence.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		allowing irresponsible sales of alcohol. Just do it!! How many complaints from residents are enough to get changes made to revoke licences and to get renewals refused? We live here yet our voices are ignored. There should be some way of recording/monitoring residents views and TAKING NOTICE OF THEM.	
STPC/067	Public	Extended hours are already too long. These need to be changed. I can remember very few nights where I am not woken by returners from Headingley. Drinking hours and promotions - especially in freshers week need to be revised. Bigger police presence. There are many promotions. - The freshers week promotions made it almost impossible to walk in Headingley - A nightmare for pushchairs and older people. These must be heavily censured. From my experience of walking through Headingley from early afternoon to early morning I had assumed there was no policy or at least not one that was enforced.	It is proposed to amend the Headingley CI Policy to include a restriction (subject to relevant representations) on all predominantly alcohol led premises and takeaways that operate beyond 11pm. And to also refuse applications to materially extend the opening hours of any licensed premise.
STPC/070	Other business owner	I live in Headingley - fed up with waste from fast food outlets. Noise people, litter from takeaways - where are the litter wardens!! Broken bottles. Noise - Private Hire Drivers outside the Box, Headingley.	As above.
STPC/077	Public	As a resident of Headingley I am very concerned at the amount of drunkenness on the streets also the illegal parking of private hire cars on Headingley Lane outside the Box and Skyrack pubs. I have punctured a tyre on discarded beer bottles on Headingley Lane this week.	As above.
STPC/091	Public	No. fast food and drinking establishments have impacted badly on the area. The Arndale Centre now	As above..

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		<p>has a number of empty premises which are vandalised regularly and are therefore going to be difficult to find tenants for in an area where there has already been a reduction in "normal" shops. Noise/litter/anti social behaviour is common. Policy needs to be much firmer and cover a wider area. Everthing seems to be geared towards keeping Leeds as a centre for students and the long term residents are ignored. There needs to be a much tighter line on drinking in public, vandalism, grafitti and litter so there needs to be enforcement which means more police/CPOs actively on the streets for a longer period.</p>	
STPC/091	Public	<p>This review cannot be done in isolation. Alongside, there should be a review of how these matters are policed.</p> <p>The police have a difficult job and can be found in and around the main drinking spots late at night which is fair enough because there is an impact on traffic etc with a number of pedestrians falling in the road. Headingley is a "drink free zone" outside the pubs but no one polices it.</p> <p>However they are not able to cover the wider area at the same time so when the drinkers depart from their pubs they may disperse into the many take-aways in the area. On their travels, they may cause damage, (see windows in the Arndale Centre or the local bus stops) and they also drop litter. Noise is also a constant issue as is the illegal parking of taxis</p>	As Above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		seeking fares causing obstructions. The problems are much wider than simply a licencing issue but it is the right place to start.	
STPC/099	Public	I think the policy in Headingley should be strengthened to include take-aways, and the establishment of any further pubs. The existing policy has allowed the proliferation of take-aways and alcohol-selling outlets. The fines are not enough to stop some premises opening after their license as they make more money doing that, than they get fined.	As above.
STPC/100	Member of the public	The expansion of alcohol sales has been driven by commercial interests rather than by the need for a livable environment. Headingley centre is now an area avoided by families. Anti-social behaviour, such as public urination, is common. If we want to use laws to support livable communities (in line with gov't and council policies), it is time to do so. Sales of alcohol should be restricted to small volume establishments, designed for small numbers of people to enjoy alcohol in small quantities. It is wrong to allow commercial interests to destroy Common Goods such as a quiet, pro-social atmosphere in our public spaces. Alcohol sales should also be restricted in time (eg no sales after 10.30pm) so that local residents don't end up wanting to move out of the area because they cannot get a clear night's sleep. There is a glaring social problem that can be seen any night in Headingley centre - laws such as the CIP are one of the ways that we have some chance of addressing this problem. The CIP should be used to the maximum.	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/105	Community group representative	We strongly believe this policy is required. We agree that the Headingley policy should be extended as proposed to include late night takeaways, but also believe that the Headingley policy should be strengthened to refer not just to vertical drinking establishments but rather to all alcohol-led premises (or alternative wording as appropriate). The intention here would be to distinguish, for example, restaurants, licensed cafes, or arts venues - where patrons' primary purposes would be to have a meal or snack or to attend a cultural performance, respectively, and where the consumption of alcohol would be a, generally pleasant, secondary activity - from premises where patrons' primary purpose would be to consume alcohol, whether seated or standing. We do not support further restrictions on licenses for restaurants, cafes or community or arts venues.	As above
STPC/0105	Community group representative	Headingley Development Trust exists in order to "promote and develop a sustainable community in Headingley". We believe the prevalence of licensed premises in Headingley undermines the sustainability of the community and therefore strongly support the CIP for this area, amended as proposed, but also believe that it should be further strengthened as in 3 above.	As above.
STPC/106	Community Group Representative	Broadly speaking we would support any measures to strengthen the policy in response to this consultation. Our street lies between Headingley and Hyde Park, off Headingley lane, and although there are no licensed premises in the immediate vicinity we can suffer considerable disturbance from people travelling	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		along Headingley Lane and who have clearly been drinking.	
STPC/106	Community Group Representative	We certainly believe this policy is required. We agree that the Headingley policy should be extended as proposed to include late night takeaways, but believe also that the Headingley policy should be strengthened to refer not to vertical drinking establishments but rather to all alcohol-led premises (or alternative wording as appropriate). The intention here would be to distinguish, for example, restaurants, licensed cafes, or arts venues - where patrons' primary purposes would be to have a meal or snack or to attend a cultural performance, respectively, and where the consumption of alcohol would be a, generally pleasant, secondary activity - from premises where patrons' primary purpose would be to consume alcohol, whether seated or standing. With regard to the Hyde Park/Woodhouse policy, we would question why it is, compared to the others, so limited and would suggest that it is brought into line with the final Headingley policy.	As above.
STPC/107	Member of the public	I certainly believe these policies are required. I agree that the Headingley policy should be extended as proposed to include late night takeaways, but I believe also that the Headingley policy should be strengthened to refer not to vertical drinking establishments but rather to all alcohol-led premises, or alternative appropriate wording. The intention here would be to distinguish, for example, restaurants, licensed cafes, or arts venues, where patrons' primary purposes would be to have a meal or snack, or to	As above

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		attend a cultural performance respectively, and where the consumption of alcohol would be a generally pleasant secondary activity - from premises where patrons' primary purposed would be to consume alcohol, whether seated or standing. With regard to the Hyde Park/Woodhouse policy, I would question why it is, compared to the others, so limited and would suggest that it is brought into line with the final Headingley policy.	
STPC/041	Solicitor	I regularly pass through Headingley in the evening and late at night as part of my work. It has on Fri/Sat nights gone beyond sense. Headingley has become a 'destination' rather than a local drinking area. There are too many large bars. (Box/Trio/Skyrack/Oak etc) and no more should be considered. I drink at 'Arcadia' in the Arndale Centre - this shows how responsible drinking can work. I bet the police never need to attend.	As above.
STPC/115	Community Group Representative	We are grateful for the inclusion of Far Headingley, with its three pubs and various restaurants/takeaways, in the CIP zone. We are glad to see the proposal to change the policy to include late-night takeaways within the CIP for Headingley, as these can pose considerable problems for local residents in terms of late night disturbance (customer noise, car doors, taxi horns) and are closely associated with the "alcohol scene". We wonder whether such a policy might also be appropriate along the Hyde Park corridor. We also feel that comments on premises should be accepted from those who do not live "in the vicinity", tightly defined, but who travel through an area or use it as	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		their shopping or community base, or past whose houses drinkers are likely to travel homewards: these residents are affected by traffic congestion, noise, threatening behaviour, reckless pedestrians, and morning-after litter, glass and vomit, all caused by licensed premises.	
STPC/117	Member of the public	There should be tighter restriction on new alcohol licences. wording should be tighter than the current "vertical drinking" establishments to move towards no more "alcohol led" ones i.e. no more pubs at all.	As above.
STPC/120	Member of the public	City centre is correct place for extensions. I strongly agree CIP should be extended to take-aways in Headingley.	As above.
STPC/121	Member of the public	I would like a balanced provision in LS6. The current Headingley policy is to the preference of the 18-25 group, and this impacts badly on the remainder of the population.	As above.
STPC/123	Member of the public	I haven't the time to engage with this fully but I feel the CIP is vital to restore confidence in Headingley by ordinary owner occupiers at a time when landlords are beginning to sell and this is an opportunity to restore balance. But the scenes on the streets of Headingley after 10pm are scary if you are over 30!Binge drinking is such a problem, we are sick of tolerating rivers of puke and urine in our main streets drunken yobs shouting as if they are on a campus. We need all the help we can get to restore order. The main thing that would help is more officers operating between 12-4pm on noise and disorder problems, actively intercepting poor behaviour and enforcing fines. Locally we have found that telling new residents that one house in	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		Headingley was fined £500 for persistent noise abuse has the greatest impact on their behaviour - we need to stamp on this and noise in the streets. I would also like the non drinking restriction to include the Cardigan Road and the houses between the stadium, I am sick of broken glass and half finished vodka bottles in the street at weekends - its not what I was for my small boy and its what we have in our street (Chapel Lane LS6 3BW)	
STPC/125	Member of the public	The definition of 'vicinity' is too lenient to the licensed premises. There is disturbance to neighbourhoods along the core student walking routes from Headingley centre e.g. Weetwood Lane with lots of late night/early morning shouting, litter being dropped, bottles smashed etc. This impact should also be considered.	As above.
STPC/127	Member of the public	I believe that the current CIP in Headingley should be extended to include takeaways which have proliferated in recent years and pose some of the same problems as pubs. The same general approach should apply as to pubs - in particular i see no argument for allowing any takeaway to open until 5.00 am. More generally I would prefer the CIP to take the same form as the current Chapel Allerton and proposed Horsforth CIPs - it is inconsistent to apply different approaches to these parts of the city. As a Headingley resident i suffer like others from all the pubs being open for long hours. They generate a lot of noise and nuisance late at night as people leave and a mass of taxis queuing for trade in the early hours of the morning. It is essential to curb long opening hours	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		in order to reduce current problems - if the Council can't curb existing hours then it should at least restrict hours for new applicants.	
STPC/132	Member of the public	More emphasis should be placed on the unacceptability of drinkers spilling onto the public pavement outside busy pubs. In Headingley the Skyrac and the New Inn are examples. This problem arises partly (only partly) from prohibiting smoking within the pub.	As above.
STPC/134	Member of the public	Can't the authorities work out a formula for premises per no. of population to redress the balance. Live in Leeds 6 and it's turned into a 'dump' over the last 20 years.	As above.
STPC/140	Member of the public	The new draft looks great on paper. If it works in practice it will improve the environment and life for the residents of Headingley.	As above.
STPC/141	Other (not specified)	I think the council have taken the right decision including extending the CIP covering Headingley to include takeaways that intend to operate after 23:00. In addition refusing new applications to provide hot food to be taken away between 11pm and 5am will have a beneficial affect on local residents street cleansing, rodents and make Leeds a much cleaner environmentally friendly place. Well done Leeds City Council.	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.2 Sample of written comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Name	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/143	Ward Councillor- James Monaghan	Cllr Monaghan feels the CIP has been very successful in Headingley and completely supports its renewal. He also supports the extension to include takeaways given there has been a great deal of enforcement action on takeaways operating in Headingley that trade beyond their permitted hours.	It is proposed to amend the Headingley CI Policy to include a restriction (subject to relevant representations) on all predominantly alcohol led premises and takeaways that operate beyond 11pm. And to also refuse applications to materially extend the opening hours of any licensed premise.
STPC/144	Ward Councillor- Martin Hamilton	Cllr Hamilton supports the current policy and feels the policy has helped stop the growth of any further alcohol premises in Headingley. He feels the reference to HVVDs should be dropped because it is not a catch all. Cllr Hamilton supports the inclusion of takeaways in the policy, and would favour a policy which allows trading hours for late night refreshment to match a premises' planning hours.	As above.
STPC/145	Member of Parliament – Greg Mulholland	"I fully support the CIP in Headingley and believe this must be renewed and indeed strengthened. It has done much to address the proliferation of alcohol licensed venues in the area. Cllr Mulholland goes on to say that he feels the reference to HVVD premises should be removed as he feels it leaves a loophole where premises could argue that they have sufficient seating to not to be covered by the policy, whereas he feels the CIP should seek to stop any further pubs and bars without any such loopholes. In addition he also supports the extension of the policy to include takeaways	As above.
STPC/146	Member of the public	I have lived in Headingley for over 20 years and although I think of Headingley as a vibrant and lively place to live and enjoy living here, I have to say that since the debacle of the development of the alcohol	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

4.2 Sample of written comments in support of the proposed Headingley (Area 2) CIP.			
Name	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		led establishments has created a different atmosphere. Alongside the pubs problem is the litter, dirt and infestation created by the takeaways. Please, please – can we have no more takeaways.	
STPC/147	Member of the public	I am writing in support of the renewal of the CIP on licensing and would urge the inclusion of takeways in the policy. There is ongoing noise, disturbance, car vandalism, antisocial behaviour, litter, vomit and urinating with the excessive number of these outlets in Headingley.	As above.

Section 5 – Consultation replies related to the Hyde Park/Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP

5.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Hyde Park / Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/068	Public	No further licences should be considered! Takeaways should close at night - apart from the city centre all the areas are residential. Residents want to sleep at night.	Reports supplied by the responsible authorities did not suggest that there was adequate evidence to support the strengthening of the current policy for Hyde park / Woodhouse on this occasion. However due to the public comments received we will be seeking evidence reports from the responsible authorities in order to substantiate any future review.
STPC/038	Public	Support CIP in general. Need to see in the policy that Hyde Park/Woodhouse is on a par with Headingley /	As above

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

5.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Hyde Park / Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		City Centre which is clearly not the case on reading what is clearly a watered down version of the above 2 areas and enforcement is the key word. Residents in Hyde Park/Woodhouse have to put up with noise, rubbish, environmental health problems (rats) on a daily basis and its unacceptable. Vandalism is ongoing. These problems are directly and indirectly down to drinking, late night takeaways, shops licensed to sell alcohol until midnight and the volume of these people hanging around (drink fuelled) are intimidating. Long term residents have had enough.	
STPC/024	Public	Want to see no new licences in Headingley, Hyde Park and Woodhouse, plus no extensions to existing licences. Please ensure that the area between Headingley Hill and City Centre is included. (This includes Hyde Park corner). A revised and stronger policy needs more resources or enforcement and clearly publicised guidelines for the public so they can monitor compliance. Hyde Park / Woodhouse + Headingley has a major problem with binge drinking, noise anti social behaviour - No new licences. Please, stronger enforcement for those who flout their licence conditions.	As above
STPC/032	Public	There should be no further licences in Headingley, Woodhouse, Hyde Park, and enforcement should be stronger - especially at start of student terms. Change 'vertical drinking houses' to 'alcohol led'. Traffic is a major problem - like taxis parking on Headingley Lane, causing disruption and hazards to traffic/pedestrians. Police need to enforce ban on illegal parking which is encouraged by number of fast	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

5.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Hyde Park / Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		food outlets and licensed premises.	
STPC/076	Public	I hope the new draft policy will reflect the concerns of the public concerning the licensable establishments which have had an increasingly negative effect on the Headingley, Hyde Park and Woodhouse areas. Eg. Anti-social behaviour, noise, late night disorder and litter. The current policy is not pitched at the right level to deal with this, including takeaways is essential also, as a huge amount of litter causes problems. Why don't establishments serving food have to provide litter bins?	As above
STPC/040	Community group representative	Ref: 7.7 The policy for Area 3 'Hyde Park' and Woodhouse corridor should be worded as those for area 1 'city centre and area 2 'Headingley'. Also The effects of the whole LS2 / LS6 area of extended and excessive drinking (and its associated phenomenon of takeaway food outlets) are already highly deleterious: noise nuisance, rubbish, vomit, growing tension between mainly older permanent residents and mainly younger transient residents, low level crime and vandalism, not to mention the health and well being of young people. The draft goes in the right direction but the trend needs reversing.	As above

5.2 Sample of written comments in support of the proposed Hyde Park / Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP.			
Respondent ID	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/148	Community Group – North Hyde Park Residents Association	The committee of the North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association, having considered the draft policy, and informed and exchanged views with	Reports supplied by the responsible authorities did not suggest that there was adequate evidence to support the

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

5.2 Sample of written comments in support of the proposed Hyde Park / Woodhouse (Area 3) CIP.			
Respondent ID	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		<p>our members (via email, at the forum, general communication and dialogue), warmly supports the CIP and welcomes its consolidation in the recent draft-revision. However, we doubt that it is as strong as is needed. The forum goes on to comment that they feel the new licensing laws have simply allowed the problems to occur later at night, which in effect worsens the noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour. The committee go on to say they are unhappy about the less stringent policy which is applied to their area as compared to areas 1 and 2 and argue such an approach invites the very displacement that the policy for their area seeks to stop. They are particularly concerned about the concentration of takeaways around Ragland Road which causes significant amounts of litter and rats living on discarded food and wrappers. The noise in this area also causes great distress to the residents of the Harrison Potter Home and beyond.</p>	<p>strengthening of the current policy for Hyde park / Woodhouse on this occasion. However due to the public comments received we will be seeking evidence reports from the responsible authorities in order to substantiate any future review.</p>

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 6 – Consultation replies related to the Chapel Allerton (Area 4) CIP

Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Chapel Allerton (Area 4) Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP).			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/058	Community Group Representative	We would like to see the CIP extended to cover restaurants as well as bars etc and we would also like to see as in Headingley - a hold on takeaways so there can be no new ones. We are saturated with all kinds of these establishments and they have been detrimental to many residents rather than a contribution - including loud music and a massive increase in traffic besides the alcohol problems.	It is proposed to maintain the current Cumulative Impact Policy for Chapel Allerton.
STPC/085	Member of the public	I have recently bought a house in Chapel Allerton and one of the things that appealed to me was the availability of restaurants and nice bars in a short walking distance. However the number of take aways and late night bars brings a different crowd into Chapel Allerton and we have seen problems with antisocial behaviour outside our property in the early hours. I would prefer that the number of take aways is limited to the number now, and that no more late night licenses are granted, perhaps even no further bars allowed to open. Try to limit new bars to independent operations such as exist now - rather than allowing chain bars i.e. Wetherspoons etc as they tend to have discounted drinks and attract a different type of person to an independent bar.	As above.
STPC/060	Member of the public	The Chapel Allerton CIP should be extended to include Chapel Allerton Lawn Tennis & Squash Club. Also too often existing premises get round restrictions by seeking (retrospective change of function.) and I	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Chapel Allerton (Area 4) Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP).			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		feel the policy needs to be effectively policed on continuing basis. Not enough attention to litter and associated rubbish / debris.	
STPC/061	Member of the public	[In respect of the Chapel Allerton CIP and licensing hours,] consider how you are going to persuade large groups of people to leave a number of venues in a narrow location without causing noise nuisance at 1am. I am regularly woken up at 2am as people have left bars reach the bottom end of Henconner Lane.	As above.
STPC/061	Member of the public	[In respect of your policy on discounted alcohol sales], Whilst this tackles binge drinking it doesn't address the real local issues. Chapel Allerton does not benefit from cheap alcohol. It has expensive alcohol from bars that create problems as well as give benefits. Following central government strategy is not the answer.	As above.
STPC/061	Member of the public	Chapel Allerton has lost local amenities to bars. An increase in bars is OK if you still have a variety of shops - otherwise the area becomes a waste land during the day. [Also you need to] Look at how people disperse from the bars. Anyone living below Chapel Allerton village cuts down school lane and Henconner Lane and then through Potternewton flats if they live in Scott Hall or Miles Hill. The shortest route is through my residential area. I have had frequent car damage and no longer park on the Road. Nor does any neighbour! Take away rubbish is dumped outside my house all the time. They seem to have finished eating by the time they get to my house.	As above.
STPC/113	Member of the public	More licensing restrictions please. One more food outlet has opened recently, another refurbishment of	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Chapel Allerton (Area 4) Cumulative Impact Policy (CIP).			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
		an existing one. We need more useful daytime shops such as a greengrocers, not more premises to make Chapel Allerton more like Ibiza after dark.	

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

Section 7 – Consultation replies related to the Horsforth (Area 5) CIP

7.1 Sample of questionnaire comments in support of the proposed Horsforth Area 5 CIP.			
Respondent ID(s)	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/013	Public	Any further control on binge drinking is happy and welcome. There are too many licensed premises in Horsforth already.	It is proposed to adopt a Cumulative Impact Policy for Horsforth restricting any new licensed premises (subject to relevant representations).
STPC/044	Public	I think it is far too late for Horsforth, which now has 15 outlets in Town Street. There seems to be no consideration for the impact of licensed premises to the area as a whole. Each licensed premises, if newly granted takes away other facilities.	As above.
STPC/039	Public	Having lived in the Town Street area for over 30 years I have already stated that noise, fighting, rubbish, unreasonable behaviour has been a regular occurrence over the years. I would just like to add that since the no smoking ban that there has been an increase in noise particularly at the weekend.	As above.
STPC/037	Public	Yes, I believe that Hall Park and surrounding neighbourhood should be included in any restrictions under the cumulative impact policy. I live on Hall Park Avenue, next to a foot path which links Hall Lane with Hall Park Avenue (Next to the old club) Young people regularly gather in this 'snicket' to drink alcohol and generally cause a nuisance, out of site of the police and wardens.	As above.

Appendix 1 - Summary of key consultation messages

7.2 Sample of written comments in support of the proposed Horsforth (Area 5) CIP.			
Name	Type	Comments made / summary of comments	Reply
STPC/148	Member of the public	I am writing to support any rules which apply to stopping any further development of bars, restaurants and takeaways at the lower end of Town Street. The area has virtually become a no go area for the older residents of Horsforth because of the vandalism caused by the alcohol they serve.	As above.
STPC/149	Member of the public	I am writing as a resident of Town Street concerning the CIP. We are swamped in Town street with eateries and bars. Most sell alcohol and all sell food, which gives scope for antisocial behaviour and disgusting rubbish left behind mainly at weekends. I know this to my cost because some of the rubbish is dumped in the entrance to my Drive..... I welcome the proposed CIP.	As above.
STPC/150	Member of the public	This member of the public explains that she suffers from noise nuisance caused by the customers of two takeaways near her. She believes the customers also throw rubbish in her entrance and feels the problem would worsen if any more licensed premises are allowed to open.	As above.