<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Name of Respondent</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Evaluation of Comments</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action taken by officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B&amp;DLS1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>It is apparent that references to issues of noise and disturbance have been introduced into the draft document. It is unclear from the second paragraph whether there is an indication that new student accommodation allegedly exacerbates such noise and disturbance or whether it is sought to protect these students from noise and disturbance. References are made to new student accommodation within the Town Centre, but it is not clear what point is being made here and one questions the advisability of singling out one part of the community in this regard. In any event, whilst it is to be expected that there may be more noise and disturbance experienced in a town centre it is felt that the Licensing Authority should be mindful of excessive noise and disturbance wherever it occurs. It is important as a town that the evening economy feels safe for all its residents and the visitors we are hoping to attract for conferences, business and leisure. The importance of attracting and developing the town in terms of business commerce should be a consideration within licensing policy.</td>
<td>The second paragraph which refers to noise disturbance outside the Town Centre does not appear to make any relevant point. Paragraphs 1.3 to 1.9 cover all parts of the Borough and their relationship to the licensed leisure and entertainment industry without singling out one particular venue. BOURNEMOUTH. Therefore, it may be appropriate to remove the second paragraph of 1.3.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.3 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B&amp;AH2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>It is apparent that references to issues of noise and disturbance have been introduced into the third paragraph of the existing Policy, a decrease of 3 licensed premises). (It is assumed that this includes those licensed to sell alcohol as well as Club Premises. • First paragraph refers to there being 799 premises licensed to supply alcohol throughout the Borough (this is compared with 802 stated in the existing Policy, a decrease of 3 licensed premises). (It is assumed that this includes those licensed to sell alcohol i.e. Premises Licences and Club Premises Certificates.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.3 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>SC01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>4th sentence after “40,000” Begin new sentence “All have contributed hugely...”</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.4 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>SC02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>4th sentence after “The Council wishes to encourage early evening activity within the Town Centre (i.e. between 18.30hrs and midnight) by means of a diverse offer appealing to families and divers.”</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.6 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>B&amp;DLS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>My strategy to increase early evening activity within the town centre is welcomed and supported. Every effort should be made to encourage a variety of quality establishments to attract early evening business to the town and provide added value.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.6 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>B&amp;AH3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>We welcome and support any strategy to increase early evening activity within the town centre. We consider every effort should be made to provide leisure, entertainment and a variety of dining facilities for a wide range of visitors (including families and business tourists) to the town centre.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.6 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>PD01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phillip Day, JLP Solicitors</td>
<td>Don't have access to your statistical information but I do query whether the numbers quoted are correct; I would also note that since the policy was last reviewed, a number of premises have either closed or their licences have been surrendered, revoked or lapsed. It might be helpful to include some information regarding those.</td>
<td>The statistics are incorrect and need correcting.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.6 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>SC03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>Total sentence in this paragraph to read: In November 2010, Bournemouth received the Purple Flag Award in recognition of the Council’s initiative in creating a right-time economy that is broad in choice and largely safe for both visitors and residents, an Award which the Council continues to proudly hold.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.6 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>B&amp;DLS3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>The statistics provided within this paragraph deserve at least some clarification as there are apparent inconsistencies. The second paragraph refers to the number of licensed premises within the Borough in 2004 an apparent increase of 46 since the existing Policy was created in 2011 but the sum of the individual breakdown of types of licensed premises within that paragraph does not total 464. • The number of late night refreshment premises appear to have risen inexplicably from 97 five years ago to 460 in this draft Policy. If there exists such exponential rise in this type of licensed premises this deserves some explanation in the draft Policy. Arguably such an increase may well cause additional noise and disturbance in and around such premises which provide a focal point when on-licensed premises close at the end of an evening. Consideration should be given to ensure that such premises do not generate litter and food smells which create a bad image for the town. • It is noted that the draft Policy suggests such premises should be required to have named packaging which is commendable but extra safeguards are also necessary.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.8 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>B&amp;DLS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>The second paragraph refers to the number of licensed premises within the Borough in 2004 an apparent increase of 46 since the existing Policy was created in 2011 but the sum of the individual breakdown of types of licensed premises within that paragraph does not total 464. • The number of late night refreshment premises appear to have risen inexplicably from 97 five years ago to 460 in this draft Policy. If there really has been such exponential rise in this type of licensed premises this deserves some explanation in the draft Policy. Arguably such an increase may well cause additional noise and disturbance in and around such premises which provide a focal point when on-licensed premises close at the end of an evening. Consideration should be given to ensure that such premises do not generate litter and food smells which create a bad image for the town. • It is noted that the draft Policy suggests such premises should be required to have named packaging which is commendable but extra safeguards are also necessary.</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.8 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>B&amp;AH4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>Please give clarification of some of the statistics quoted which appear inconsistent. First paragraph refers to there being 799 premises licensed to supply alcohol throughout the Borough (this is compared with 802 stated in the existing Policy, a decrease of 3 licensed premises). (It is assumed that this includes those licensed to sell alcohol as well as Club Premises Certificates supplying alcohol).</td>
<td>This recommendation tidies up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph 1.8 made in tracked changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second paragraph refers to the number of licensed premises within the Borough as an apparent increase of 45% since the existing policy was created in 2011. This does not seem to correspond with the sum of the total of individual breakdown figures quoted.

- The number of late night refreshment premises appear to have risen inexplicably from 97 five years ago to 460 in this draft Policy. If there really has been such exponential rise in this type of licensed premises at best this deserves some explanation in the draft Policy and at worst deserves some focus on such premises which arguably in such numbers can cause additional noise and disturbance with persons lingering around the premises late at night and acting as a potential hot spot for trouble when the night clubs have closed. In addition, consideration should be given to ensuring that such premises do not generate litter and food smells which create a bad image for the town.

- It is noted that the draft Policy suggests such premises should be required to have named packaging, which we would support, but we consider extra safeguards are necessary in addition.

- For the first time in the Policy this draft distinguishes those hotels (guest houses) having 24/7 premises licence by means of the numbers of storeys they possess. What relevance has this to their licence? Surely it is more meaningful to describe hotel premises by their type of operation rather than their storey? We cannot understand the purpose of such differentiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>1.16</th>
<th>BAHA6</th>
<th>Sandra Graham on behalf of Bournemouth ACCOMMODATION &amp; HOTEL ASSOCIATION (BAHA)</th>
<th>Suggested changes to paragraph 1.18 made in track changes</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>BAHA5</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of Bournemouth ACCOMMODATION &amp; HOTEL ASSOCIATION (BAHA)</td>
<td>Suggested changes to paragraph 1.18 made in track changes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>SC04</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>The paragraph incorrectly refers to DCMS Guidance and should be amended to read “Home Office Guidance”.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>SC05</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>This recommendation identifies a more appropriate term to replace “partnership”.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>SC06</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>This policy should include relevant links to other documents if they are available online. The links are not currently available on <a href="http://www.bournemouth.gov.uk">www.bournemouth.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>SC07</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>The recommendation takes up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>FCC01</td>
<td>Martin Undemth, Dorset Police &amp; Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>The links are not currently available on other documents if they are available online. The links are not currently available on <a href="http://www.bournemouth.gov.uk">www.bournemouth.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>FCC02</td>
<td>Martin Undemth, Dorset Police &amp; Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>Science holders are not responsible for persons who are outside of their direct control (either on or in the immediate vicinity of their licensed premises). Other mechanisms outside of this policy may be more appropriate to deal with dispersal.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>FCC03</td>
<td>Martin Undemth, Dorset Police &amp; Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>The recommendation takes up the paragraph without altering the meaning.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 1.27 SC10 Councillor Stephen Chapple

Agreed.

7 27 27

the number of licensed taxis, and the location of taxi ranks, in order to ensure that taxis are readily available at a time to serve the night-time economy.”

28 1.27 FC02 Marilyn Underhill, Dorset Police & Crime Commissioner

Agree

7 28 28

related alcohol admissions in Bournemouth than the England average (PHE 2013). See appendix Public Health for more detail.

29 1.28 JT01

Alcohol related harm is a major public health problem. According to the Local Alcohol Profiles (LAPs), produced by Public Health England (PHE), Bournemouth experiences significantly higher rates of alcohol related harm than the England average. This harm is expressed in terms of alcohol specific hospital admissions for under 18’s, alcohol specific hospital admissions for females, admission episodes for alcohol related conditions, and binge drinking. In addition males in Bournemouth experience significantly more episodes of alcohol specific mortality, mortality from chronic liver disease, alcohol specific admissions and alcohol related admissions than the England average (PHE 2013). See appendix Public Health for more detail.

30 1.28

As well as implications for health, alcohol abuse places a burden on the health and social care system in terms of accident and emergency admissions as well as the long term treatment of alcohol related illnesses and addiction. In addition to causing alcohol related health disorders and disease alcohol misuse can contribute to social and health inequalities as well as leading to antisocial and criminal behaviour. Bournemouth has seen a gradual year on year decrease in the numbers of violent assaults recorded in emergency departments; despite this alcohol related violent crime in the borough remains above the England average which is likely to be a contributing factor in the majority of assaults (including assaults in the home) and occurs at all levels of society irrespective of social economic status.

31

Whilst alcohol plays a part in social and family life, and contributes to employment and economic development, it is a toxic substance that can, when consumed above the recommended levels have a detrimental effect on physical and mental health and wellbeing. We have seen a shift in the patterns of alcohol consumption with an increase in home drinking and a decline in drinking in licensed premises. Supermarkets are now the leading providers of alcohol for home consumption, with alcoholic beverages now 61% more affordable per person than they were in 1980 (HESD 2013). These changes have contributed to the wider availability of alcohol for general consumption posing specific risks to the ability of children and young people to access alcohol as well as the ease of individuals to drink in their own homes and at increased and higher risk drinking terms.

32

The statement of licensing policy is one element of a package designed to reduce alcohol related harm in the borough. The Bournemouth and Poole Health and Wellbeing strategy supports the reduction in alcohol related crime through two of its major change priorities; preventing ill health and reducing inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles, whilst the Bournemouth Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy also outlines steps to maintain a balance between an economically thriving night time economy whilst reducing harm due to excessive alcohol consumption and reducing the cumulative impact of more licensed premises.

33

It would assist applicants if a list of Responsible Authorities and their contact details were referred to here for consistency with the application form and the Licensing Act 2003.

34

The newly inserted 1.28 refers to public health issues of alcohol related harm and states the Bournemouth experiences significantly higher rates of such harm than (typo in draft script) the England average to include hospitalisation and levels of binge drinking. Such statements are not specific to alcohol-related harm. Such data points to the wider availability of alcohol for general consumption posing specific risks to the ability of children and young people to access alcohol as well as the ease of individuals to drink in their own homes and at increased and higher risk drinking terms.

35

The Council has taken particular care with regard to the number of licensed taxis, and the location of taxi ranks, in order to ensure that taxis are readily available at a time to serve the night-time economy.”

9 2.2 JW01 Philip Wilt, B&L

Agreed

7 9 9

Suggested changes to paragraph 2.2 made to correct types

26 1.28 BA04

The newly inserted 1.28 refers to public health issues of alcohol related harm and states the Bournemouth experiences significantly higher rates of such harm than (typo in draft script) the England average to include hospitalisation and levels of binge drinking. Such statements are not helpful to the tourism economy. If such figures are above the England average such figures skewed due to admissions from transient visitors here for short periods of time on Stag and Hen weekends such that a valid comparison with other areas is not reflected in the statistics.

Suggested changes to paragraph 1.28 made to correct typo

36

Delete the word “guidance document Guidance to the Licensing Act 2003” and substitute “the Home Office Guidance.” [Defined in paragraph 1.16].

Suggested changes to paragraph 1.28 made to correct types

37

I know that specific concerns have been raised over people congregating in Horseshoe Common and the slow dispersal from the area. Can the Licensing Board to agree

9 3.1 SC13 Councillor Stephen Chapple

Delete the words “guidance document Guidance to the Licensing Act 2003” and substitute “the Home Office Guidance.” [Defined in paragraph 1.16].

Suggested changes to paragraph 1.28 made to correct types

38

I would advise applicants if a list of Responsible authorities and their contact details were referred to here

Suggested changes to paragraph 2.2 made in track changes

39

Suggested changes to paragraph 2.2 made in track changes

40

Suggested changes to paragraph 2.2 made in track changes

3 of 13
Councillor Stephen Chappell

The Licensing Act was intended to be a de-regulatory measure but it has proved to be anything but. It must not be forgotten that many applications that do not address the issues identified as this goes beyond the licensing objectives set out in the Act (which, I mention again, was supposedly a de-regulatory measure). It is perfectly permissible for applicants to state quite simply that they do not consider that their intended operation will give rise to any issues under any of (or all of) the licensing objectives and if they do so, that should not of itself give rise to an automatic refusal. If there are representations, it is for the Licensing Authority to determine not only whether to grant or refuse the application but also whether to grant subject to the imposition of conditions that were not volunteered. To that extent, it becomes the responsibility of the Authority to draft conditions (not, accepted, not the application form). To an extent, this is replicated in 3.9 but at 4.4, the test to be applied by the Licensing Authority is incorrectly stated – it should refer to “appropriate” as opposed to “necessary”.

Schedule of responses, evaluation and recommendations to public consultation on proposed Statement of Licensing Policy 2015

I would like specific attention given to licensing between 3am and 6am as I know that Dorset Police have concerns over ASB and alcohol related violent crime being too high in certain areas during these times (particularly the town centre). This appears to be as a direct result of the length of time that premises stay open, coupled with the high volume of late night takeaway (referred to later in the policy at 12.1).

Phillip Day, HLP Solicitors

The DPH has access to a range of data that is not routinely available to other responsible authorities, and the section 182 guidance makes it clear that public health have the ability to make relevant health based representations in regard to the promotion of any of the four licensing objectives. For example it recognises that hospital and ambulance data could be used to pass comment under the public safety and crime and disorder objectives, whilst under 18 admission, and proxy sales data could provide evidence for the protection of children from harm objective. Finally where Public Health hold relevant data and the effect is prejudicial to health it will also be possible to contribute under the public nuisance objective.

The DPH reads better without changing the meaning

Councillor Stephen Chappell

The DPH has access to a range of data that is not routinely available to other responsible authorities, and the section 182 guidance makes it clear that public health have the ability to make relevant health based representations in regard to the promotion of any of the four licensing objectives. For example it recognises that hospital and ambulance data could be used to pass comment under the public safety and crime and disorder objectives, whilst under 18 admission, and proxy sales data could provide evidence for the protection of children from harm objective. Finally where Public Health hold relevant data and the effect is prejudicial to health it will also be possible to contribute under the public nuisance objective.

Phillip Day, HLP Solicitors

The DPH has access to a range of data that is not routinely available to other responsible authorities, and the section 182 guidance makes it clear that public health have the ability to make relevant health based representations in regard to the promotion of any of the four licensing objectives. For example it recognises that hospital and ambulance data could be used to pass comment under the public safety and crime and disorder objectives, whilst under 18 admission, and proxy sales data could provide evidence for the protection of children from harm objective. Finally where Public Health hold relevant data and the effect is prejudicial to health it will also be possible to contribute under the public nuisance objective.

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

Martyn Underhill, Dorset Police & Crime Commissioner

We are unable to consider the impact on public or other public resources when determining licence applications.

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”

49  10  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13  3.10  SC13

Councillor Stephen Chappell

Delete and substitute the following: “A representation to be “relevant” must relate to the likely effect of the grant of the licence (or of its modifications) on the promotion of at least one of the licensing objectives. The issue of “need” is a commercial/market, or planning consideration, all representations must be made within the statutory time limit - and this date will appear on the statutory public notice.”
ACCOMODATION & HOTEL
BOURNEMOUTH

Sandra Graham on behalf of LAW SOCIETY (B&DLS)

BOURNEMOUTH & DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (B&DLS)

Chappell

Councillor Stephen Chappell

were removed when the Licensing Act 2003 came in to force. Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. It is an attempt to step back to the days of Public Entertainment Licence requirements which

The insertion of this statement is considered to be totally unnecessary and over-burdensome when such is adequately dealt with under the

6.2 is considered inappropriate and over-burdensome when such is adequately dealt with under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order

Whilst the safety of persons within premises is of paramount concern to all, the requirement now inserted in to the draft Policy as paragraph

This recommendation tidies up the sentence. Licensing Board to agree an amendment to paragraph 5.1 made in track changes

Implementing safety measures e.g. use of strengthened glass, glass collection procedures, not allowing drinking vessels to be taken outside of the premises, or active promotion of designated-driver schemes

Public Health would look less favourably on applications which show potential to undermine the licensing objectives and cause alcohol related harm for example:

Premises aimed at very young customers or likely to promote binge drinking

Applications that increase the risk of access by young people due to the distribution mechanism e.g. alcohol delivery

Those who wish to open later than premises already operating

Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

Applicants are being asked to consider using door supervisors and they should therefore address this point in their operating schedule if any of the 4 bullet points apply. The type of premises is irrelevant as it is the manner in which the premises is operated that will determine whether the use of SIA registered door supervisors is relevant. Licensing Board to consider this comment and the appraisal in order to determine whether this paragraph should be changed

Implementing safety measures e.g. restriction of access to premises for family entertainment. In such situations the presence of door staff would send out totally the wrong message and deter people entering and be an unnecessary financial burden on the establishment.

Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

Premises aimed at very young customers or likely to promote binge drinking

Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

This comment has merit. Need to explore the circumstances under which this paragraph could apply. Licensing Board to consider this comment and determine whether this paragraph should be changed

Reducing Alcohol Related Harm

Public Health would look more favourably on applications which demonstrate additional measures have been considered and will be implemented which would promote the health and wellbeing of their customers, for example:

Promoting responsible drinking e.g. restricting special offers, providing information on the number of units in beverages, the recommended safety drinking levels, the dangers of excessive consumption, and where to seek help to reduce their drinking.

Reducing alcohol related harm e.g. aligning pricing with alcohol by volume (ABV), restricting the sale of ABV to below 4.5%, or preventing the sale of single cans of alcohol

Demonstrating measures to protect children’s health e.g. reducing the risk of passive smoking from creating areas, implementing challenge 21 or challenge 25 policy, removing visible advertising when located near to schools or youth clubs, or not selling ‘fizzy-pop’ where they could attract underage purchasers.

Training all staff to be vigilant to excessive consumption in customers, and assisting the service of those who are drunk

Introducing calming measures e.g. provision of a wide selection of reasonably priced non-alcoholic beverages, providing a food offer on the premises, having a ‘drinking up’ period, adaptation of hours so that alcohol is not sold for the entire opening times, having a last entry time, dispersal policies, or increased seating

Implementing safety measures e.g. use of strengthened glass, glass collection procedures, not allowing drinking vessels to be taken outside of the premises, or active promotion of designated-driver schemes

Premises in areas with a high density of licensed premises

Premises aimed at very young customers or likely to promote binge drinking

Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

All persons involved in the management of the premises must ensure that a sufficient number of responsible and trained persons are on the licensed premises at all times.”

The licensing authority expects the issue of occupancy capacity to be considered and addressed in an applicant’s operating schedule. This particularly applies to premises where the applicant specifies a maximum occupancy, where Responsible Authorities choose to do so, for example, Dorset Fire and Rescue Service, and in all large or complex premises or events where the number of persons present cannot readily be assessed. The operating schedule in these cases should set out an additional arrangements that will be put in place to monitor and control the level of occupancy to ensure that the agreed capacity is not exceeded.”

• Premises in areas with a high density of licensed premises

• Premises aimed at very young customers or likely to promote binge drinking

• Applications that increase the risk of access by young people due to the distribution mechanism e.g. alcohol delivery

• Those who wish to open later than premises already operating

• Premises with names that promote alcohol and drunkenness

• Door supervisors is relevant.

Applicants to address capacity limits through risk assessment rather than by use of a licence condition.

Licensing Board to consider this comment and determine whether this paragraph should be changed
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In my opinion, this is in effect an extension of a form of cumulative impact policy that would be borne when and I am not aware of any evidence that has been produced to support it. I will deal with the Cumulative Impact Policy below but, with respect, I consider that this “matrix” approach is a step too far and derogates from two basic principles of the Act itself namely that there should be a presumption of grant and that each case should be considered on its own merits.

For example - why should restaurants be limited to midnight or 11:30 in residential areas when, under the “old regime” they were permitted as of right to sell alcohol until midnight (other than on Sundays and Christmas Day) with a further 30 minutes “drinking up time”?

Why should late night take-aways be restricted (across the Borough) to midnight and refused outright in the Ca’H. This is particularly strange given that on more than one occasion, the Licensing Board has accepted the argument that granting a further licence for late night refreshment is in fact likely to reduce issues of crime and disorder because late night take-aways do not of themselves attract people to an area and where there are a limited number, the opening of a new outlet means that the crowds already in an area (particularly Old Christchurch Road) will become more dispersed between the outlets, are dealt with more quickly and are less likely to become involved in conflict or engage in anti-social behaviour? With respect, this makes little sense.

Pubs. I fail to see the logic here of allowing new pubs until 11 p.m. in the CaH, allowing them to open until 3 a.m. in mixed residential and commercial areas but then 11 p.m. in residential areas. Realistically, a pub that is open until 2 a.m. is likely more than not to be a night club of sorts – where does one cross the line from being a pub to being a venue to being a nightclub? I also recall that before the Licensing Act came into force I was lecturing with the gentleman from the Home Office who was responsible for steering the legislation through. We were in Birmingham one night, working late and bemoaned the fact that we were “thrown out” of a bar at 11.20 p.m. when we had more to discuss and were found with the choice of going to a nightclub (where we wouldn’t have been able to hear ourselves think, let alone talk to each other) or retire to the hotel bar where we could carry on all night but unable to get a decent pint of real ale. Why restrict the hours during which middle aged (and hopefully responsible) adults such as yours truly can buy a pint in peace and quiet and convivial surroundings?

HVVD. An outright ban (or reversal of the presumption of grant) is wide open to challenge on judicial review. I will leave it at that.

Non-alcoholic lead (e.g. Theatre). This does not reflect reality and smacks of a form of class discrimination…..

Off licences. In 7.3 it is said that “If the Licensing Authority will normally allow shops, stores and supermarkets to sell alcohol for consumption off the premises at any times when the retail outlet is fully open for shopping……. How does one square this with a “ban” on new off-licence premises in the CIA and a restriction to 11 p.m. everywhere else? It is, with respect, entirely contradictory.

Members Clubs. Is this intended to be a reference to club premises certificates or is it intended to include all private members clubs? If the latter, then all one would have to do is to set up a membership scheme (without even perhaps any notice period etc) to then have a presumption of a grant for 24 hour drinking?

There are two problems with this – firstly, the matrix doesn’t “explicitly state it” anywhere and secondly, this policy would ignore cases such as “Brew Dog” in Leeds.

“The policy also appears to ignore the provisions of the Live Music Act (“Favourable consideration will be given to promoting the live music agenda”) although I note that this might be an “exceptional circumstance”. Personally, I would question whether this might fall foul of the Bribery Act.

This appears to be as a direct result of the length of time that premises stay open, coupled with the high volume of late night takeaways (referred to later in the policy at 12.1).
The Bournemouth Licensing Board has long had a pedigree of considering licensing applications and issues, based on its members' in-depth knowledge of the borough and its idiosyncrasies. A balanced and fair manner. It is very disappointing to find, therefore, that it now finds it necessary to wholly align itself with Brighton. That city has its own entirely separate and individual issues, and to "copy" the Brighton policy, in some places verbatim, is, with respect, neither appropriate nor genuinely reflective of Bournemouth and its individual needs and requirements. It appears to be an unwise and uncharacteristic abrogation of the committee members' duties to the borough.

The Brighton "matrix" (that may or may not be relevant to the Brighton Cls - which is a far more limited area than the BournemouthCls) that members propose to adopt appears to have little or no foundation or relevance to the Bournemouth situation, and also appears to be arbitrary. There is no reasoning given for the hours selected. It is difficult to see how the adoption of such a matrix will have anything other than the effect of moving the entertainment businesses out of the town centre to those areas now less restricted as a result of the reduction of the outlying Cls. This is the diametric opposite of the intentions of those who have put so much effort, time and input into the exciting Bournemouth By Night initiatives.

In such extreme parts of the borough are now covered by Cls given following an apparent reduction, the extent of which needs to be declared in the policy document) new operators - including those that the Authority may well wish to see in its area - will be strongly discouraged from coming to Bournemouth as not only does the policy advise that the matrix "would be strictly adhered to" is a step further than its Brighton equivalent by adding that: "a decision on the final hours permitted will always be made to ensure the promotion of the licensing objectives". This appears to be making an applicant's card that even more restrictive hours may be granted even if an application is made within matrix hours. If this is not what the committee proposes, it would be wise to re-word. The adherence to the proposed matrix could lead to Bournemouth stagnating, and perhaps retaining some less desirable operators both because new operators will not be attracted and also because the element of healthy competition often offered by good new operators, and which could lead to a poor operator's cessation, will be absent.

If members genuinely believe that Brighton councillors can mirror their issues and speak for them, then they may also care to take on board some of the more conciliatory approaches to implementing the matrix as well, and revert to Brighton's wording at 7.4.8, being "Favourable consideration will be given to local businesses properly engaged with the Licensing Authority and responsible authorities".

As such extensive parts of the borough are now covered by Cls given following an apparent reduction, the extent of which needs to be declared in the policy document) new operators - including those that the Authority may well wish to see in its area - will be strongly discouraged from coming to Bournemouth as not only does the policy advise that the matrix "would be strictly adhered to" is a step further than its Brighton equivalent by adding that: "a decision on the final hours permitted will always be made to ensure the promotion of the licensing objectives". This appears to be making an applicant's card that even more restrictive hours may be granted even if an application is made within matrix hours. If this is not what the committee proposes, it would be wise to re-word. The adherence to the proposed matrix could lead to Bournemouth stagnating, and perhaps retaining some less desirable operators both because new operators will not be attracted and also because the element of healthy competition often offered by good new operators, and which could lead to a poor operator's cessation, will be absent.

If members genuinely believe that Brighton councillors can mirror their issues and speak for them, then they may also care to take on board some of the more conciliatory approaches to implementing the matrix as well, and revert to Brighton's wording at 7.4.8, being "Favourable consideration will be given to local businesses properly engaged with the Licensing Authority and responsible authorities".

The evidence expected by paragraph 13.23 of Guidance appears to be absent from this draft policy.

Paragraph 13.25 advises that a special policy should never be absolute, and should always allow for the circumstances of each application to be considered properly. The content of 13.37 should also be mixed, as should the advice at 13.38 that special policies should not restrict individual consideration by imposing quotas including those based on the number of premises.

It is accepted that paragraph 13.40 considers measures such as fixed closing times, but nonetheless continues to reiterate the needs for consideration on a case by case basis. If proposed, the authority is expected to justify doing so in its policy, and should make clear that it is a reliable presumption that would be created if an application was submitted that policy - 13.43 is very clear in pointing that licensing authorities "must not impose predetermined opening hours, without giving individual consideration to the merits of each application".

The policy as drafted ("the policy, as represented in the matrix, would be strictly adhered to" and "departure from policy is expected only in exceptional circumstances") appears to contract such guidance.

Bournemouth and District Law Society are fully supportive of any attempt to promote diversity of licensed premises within the town and believe such is essential for a future thriving economy. The "matrix" approach is commendable in an ideal but difficult to uphold and justify when required to consider cases on individual merit.

Restaurants. It is considered that the terminal hour should be midnight even in residential areas. 11.30pm is more restrictive than that was permitted under the Licensing Act 1964 (where restaurants had the benefit of Supper Hour Certificates); restaurants rarely create opportunities for crime and disorder which is the stated purpose of the matrix approach.
This is duplicitous and could be removed

The policy training "expectation" is, with respect, excessively onerous and also fails to have regard to the varied nature of operations likely to
occur on the premises. Therefore, we fail to understand (point 8.2 second paragraph) why attendance on training programmes is an expectation
and not that any adverse impact can be compensated by financial recompense. Allowing authorised officers access to sales accounts is
unacceptable and open to challenge - on what basis are they qualified to make an assessment?

Note on matrix:
Point 6) - the requirement for shatterproof drinking receptacles should be carefully applied - it would not be appropriate as a blanket
criterion in all premises, particularly when high-speed premises should be encouraged in to the town.
Point 10) - "Licensing Authority" typo?

Schedule of responses, evaluation and recommendations to public consultation on proposed Statement of Licensing Policy 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>FG06</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>This paragraph appears to be irrelevant, or written, by the police. This is the Council’s statement of licensing policy. The Council, through its licensing board, is clear how to adjudicate on applications before it and will need to do so in a fair and proper manner, complying with its own procedures, the rules of natural justice and Human Rights legislation.</td>
<td>This is a valid point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>JCP03</td>
<td>Julia Palmer, JCP Law</td>
<td>It is difficult to see how any impartial decision, or one which failed to fall foul of the above requirements, could be reached in the event of a police representation, or police application, when the council have expressed such a clear and partial adoption of police policies and suggestions.</td>
<td>This is a valid point. The proposed sentence softens the approach whilst retaining the requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>FG06</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>Note that elsewhere, the quality of the management of the premises is not a factor to be taken into account here, it is asserted that “the management and supervision of a venue is a key factor….” The police will consider the relevant experience and track record of applicants, objecting to the application where appropriate.” This is contrary to the provisions in the Act itself which require that in relation to a DPS or a transfer application, the police can only object if the exceptional circumstances of the case are such that they consider that the crime prevention objective would be undermined. It is also unfair to say on the one hand that if the applicant is not managing the business well, the Licensing Board will take that into account but on the other, will ignore the fact that an applicant has a good track record and is a responsible operator who can be trusted.</td>
<td>This is a valid point. The proposed sentence softens the approach whilst retaining the Council’s discretion to impose such a requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>BAGS14</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (BDLS)</td>
<td>This paragraph is existing in the current Policy there are views being advanced that such a condition, generally referred to as the “inaudibility condition”, no longer being favoured as the solution to potential noise nuisance issues. There has been much academic and professional challenge in recent times over the use of the word “inaudibility”, its subjectivity, and the currently held view that at least some sound should be acceptable otherwise an unfriendly, unviable town centre will result. Given current trends it may be better to amend the second sentence of this paragraph to read ‘A condition could/may be imposed in such circumstances…” rather than stating that such should normally be imposed.</td>
<td>This is a valid point. That the crime prevention objective would be undermined. It is also unfair to say on the one hand that if the applicant is not managing the business well, the Licensing Board will take that into account but on the other, will ignore the fact that an applicant has a good track record and is a responsible operator who can be trusted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>FG06</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>There is an overlap here with planning and an often requested condition is that a “suitably qualified noise consultant (etc) shall be employed.” Of course, the police, would want 23.00 to be used as a stated time for the use to cease. In some circumstances earlier closing particularly where noise has been complained of, might be required by the responsible authority.</td>
<td>This is a valid point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>JCP04</td>
<td>Julia Palmer, JCP Law</td>
<td>The second part of this paragraph refers to a noise impact assessment. That may be suggested as a result of the “good practice” consultations with the DPS teams, but is not precluded. The term of the second paragraph is to prescribe a very expensive requirement which may not be necessary or appropriate. This is, with impact, inappropriate but to express its expectation, the committee may wish to re-voice as follows: “It is expected that any noise impact assessment required will be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustics consultant...”</td>
<td>This is a valid point. That the crime prevention objective would be undermined. It is also unfair to say on the one hand that if the applicant is not managing the business well, the Licensing Board will take that into account but on the other, will ignore the fact that an applicant has a good track record and is a responsible operator who can be trusted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>SC33</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>Third bullet point from the end should read: “Providing management contact details to concerned residents, putting in place a complaint procedure to enable residents to make a complaint.”</td>
<td>This comment relates to the wording in the existing 2011 policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>N02</td>
<td>Neaveka Randle on behalf of Pollution Control</td>
<td>This paragraph relates to premises where there are substantiated noise complaints relating to the use of smoking areas at the premises. I would want 21.00 to be used as a stated time for the use to cease. In some circumstances earlier closing particularly where noise has been complained of, might be required by the responsible authority.</td>
<td>This is a valid point. The comments and determine whether this paragraph should be changed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>FG07</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>As per my comment above relating to section 7, I wholeheartedly support this emphasis on tenantly premises and would ask that this element of the Policy is robustly enforced (as I am aware of examples in the past where the licensing panel appear to have dismissed objections to such applications).</td>
<td>This is a valid point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>BAGS15</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (BDLS)</td>
<td>First bullet point - it seems unnecessary to insert reference to RIPA authorisation when it is legally what is required in such an event.</td>
<td>This is a valid point.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My (personal) view on Cumulative Impact policies are probably well known to the Licensing Board and I appreciate that in raising my concerns, I am in all probability dinging a dead horse. Nevertheless, I remain very conscious about the evidential basis upon which the Council rules. The statistical evidence provided by the police no longer refers to alcohol related crime. It simply looks at the number of assault taking place. It contains no information about alcohol related anti-social behaviour. I know of two cases that went to appeal; licences having been refused on the grounds of cumulative impact where the Magistrates were critical of the evidence adduced by the police and went on to grant the licences.

More specifically, there is a distinct absence of evidence linking alcohol related crime to alcohol licensed premises situated within the cumulative impact area and much of the same applies to late night takeaways. I would refer the Board to the sort of evidence provided by Thames Valley Police (consulted by Reading Borough Council and Oxford City Council) when considering their cumulative impact policies. The information provided is vastly more detailed and allows a clear evidential link to be drawn between alcohol related crime and the presence, number and nature of licensed premises.

We will conclude this section with three further observations.

Firstly, existing operators lose CA's because they stifle competition. They also stifle innovation and development of new and attractive venues that might otherwise raise standards.

Secondly, it is unlikely that objections to the policy will be forthcoming from those who might at some point in the future look to open premises in Bournemouth – unless they are considering doing so in the immediate future, they would simply not think to respond to this consultation.

15.1 "Cumulative impact" is defined in the Home Office Guidance as the potential impact on the promotion of one or more of the licensing objectives of a significant number of premises licensed to carry on a licensable activity, and which are located in one area. The Council has given careful consideration to the Guidance in its response to the cumulative impact on the promotion of the licensing objectives, and has adopted a special cumulative impact policy to meet concerns about crime, disorder and public nuisance in three areas of the Borough. This policy is set out in 1.7 onwards.

15.2 This concentration can lead to serious problems of nuisance and disorder in a specific area, and even at some distance away. Such problems can arise when a number of drinkers (or the public) gather at the same time, or when queuing at fast food outlets, or when queuing for taxis and public transport. It may not be possible to distinguish individual premises as being the cause, or a contributory cause, to a particular problem. It is the combined effect of a concentration of customers partaking in licensable activities in the same area that can adversely impact upon the promotion of the licensing objectives. The Council has given careful consideration to the Guidance in its response to the cumulative impact on the promotion of the licensing objectives, and has adopted a special cumulative impact policy to meet concerns about crime and disorder and public nuisance in three areas of the Borough. This policy is set out in 1.7 onwards.

15.3 If in response to an application for a licence (or for a variation thereof) a representation raises the issue of cumulative impact, the Licensing Authority will have regard to the problems that might arise in that particular locality if the licence or variation were to be granted.

15.4 Besides having regard to the applicant’s response to the control measures and factors variously set out in this Statement of Licensing Policy, the Licensing Authority will have particular regard to the following (and applicants should address these in their operating schedule, setting out the steps they will take to promote the licensing objectives, and supporting their application with evidence, where appropriate, from risk assessments):

(i) The characteristics of the premises and the nature of the “offer” to customers, bearing in mind that pubs, nightclubs, shops, restaurants, hotels and theatres, may all sell alcohol, serve food and provide entertainment, but with contrasting operational styles (including hours of operation) and characteristics.

(ii) The opening and closing times of the premises, having regard to the opening and closing hours of other licensed premises in the vicinity.

(iii) The premises capacity at different times of night, and the expected concentration of drinkers who would be expected to be leaving premises at different time or similar times.

(iv) The characteristics of the neighborhood, and the proximity of residential premises.

(v) Where alcohol is to be sold for consumption on the premises, the steps taken by the applicant to address the risk to the community from pre-selling (for example, to restrict sales to a maximum ‘tasting’ sales, and from attempts by children to purchase alcohol).

15.5 Where there is no specific cumulative impact policy for the area in which the applicant premises is located, the area will be on the Licensing Board to consider the comments received during consultation and determine whether this paragraph should be included or changed.
In particular is of concern – it asserts that the policy “applies to all premises licences and club premises certificates, for example pubs, restaurants, and of 11.5 p.m. in pubs.”

### R3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>SCCH</td>
<td>Councillor Stephen Chappell</td>
<td>The reference to the fact that “any variation including minor variations will potentially come within this special policy…” is wholly inappropriate – if the Licensing Officer considers that any minor variation application might if granted undermine the special policy, and the reduction in the size of both the Boscombe and Charminster areas.”</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>BAHAS</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH ACCOMMODATION &amp; HOTEL ASSOCIATION (BAHA)</td>
<td>BAHA are concerned that the deletion of what is paragraph 15.5 and 15.8 of the existing Policy suggests that there are no longer any local initiatives existing to address problems of cumulative impact and that the practice of staggering closing times has been unsuccessful. Can the situation please be clarified?</td>
<td>Existing 15.5: “In addressing cumulative impact, the Licensing Authority cannot impose quotas on premises or licences, or adapt the principle of fixing predetermined hours of operation for a particular area. Longer opening hours may assist in dealing with the issue of cumulative impact by staggering closing times.”</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>FD00</td>
<td>Philip Day, HLS Solicitors</td>
<td>Week-ality date of adoption of special Policy. Existing Policy states this was on 27th February 2007 whereas the draft Policy refers to a date before the Licensing Act 2003 came in to effect. There are concerns about the effect of having a cumulative impact policy in the town centre. To date its effect, and perhaps an unintended consequence, is to make it so difficult for any new premises to be granted a licence (including those which are unlikely to adversely affect the crime and disorder objective such as family establishments, more selective premises such as wine bars for the mature visitor, entertainment venues) that applicants are deterred from even applying and move their entrepreneurial plans to other geographical areas outside the Borough. This is in turn results in a monopoly for those already licensed in the cumulative impact area with no incentive to invest and improve as there is no incoming new competition. The added tendency to close off streets in the area later at night serves to create a “no-go” area for anyone other than the late-night revellers and is having the opposite effect from encouraging diversity of premises and clientele. In our view the whole existence of a cumulative impact policy in the Town Centre should be reviewed as part of a much wider consideration of expanding the evening economy, increasing the vibrancy of the town and providing a diversity of facilities to attract and entertain a wide range of both business and leisure visitors to the town. The cumulative impact policy for the town centre has been in existence now for a</td>
<td>Existing 15.5: “In addressing cumulative impact, the Licensing Authority cannot impose quotas on premises or licences, or adapt the principle of fixing predetermined hours of operation for a particular area. Longer opening hours may assist in dealing with the issue of cumulative impact by staggering closing times.”</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>BAHAS</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (BBDLS)</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (BBDLS)</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are concerned that the deletion of what is paragraph 15.5 and 15.8 of the existing Policy suggests that there are no longer any local initiatives which address these issues. It appears that these may have been removed due to the proposed matrix at paragraph 15.10.

We have considerable concerns about the effect of having a cumulative impact policy in the town centre. To date its effect, and perhaps an unintended consequence, is to make it so difficult for any new premises to be granted a licence (including those that in our view would not adversely affect the crime and disorder objective such as family establishments, more selective premises such as wine bars for the mature clientele, entertainment venues that applicants are deterred from even applying and more entrepreneurial moves to other geographical areas outside the Borough). This in turn results in a monopoly for those already licensed in the cumulative impact area with no incentive to invest and improve as there is no incoming new competition. The added tendency to close off streets in the area earlier at night only serves to create a “no-go” area for anyone other than the late-night revellers and is having the totally opposite effect from encouraging diversity of premises and clientele. In our view the whole existence of a cumulative impact policy in the Town Centre should be reviewed as part of a strategy that allows the Borough to attract and entertain a wide range of tourists and visitors to the town. The cumulative impact policy for the town centre has been in existence since 17.7.03.

This is the current position as once a representation is made the onus is on the applicant to rebut that presumption. The burden of proof is that contained in paragraph 7.4, 4) on page 16 then it may be no surprise that the potential operator prefers to set up premises and clientele. In our view the whole existence of a cumulative impact policy in the Town Centre should be reviewed as part of a strategy that allows the Borough to attract and entertain a wide range of tourists and visitors to the town. The cumulative impact policy for the town centre has been in existence since 17.7.03.

Following on from our opinions as stated above, we entirely agree that an application should be granted if it is unlikely to add adversely to the crime and disorder objective or public nuisance objective, or grant it subject to certain limitations unless the applicant can demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Licensing Authority, in its operating schedule, that there will be no negative cumulative impact either on the crime and disorder objective, or the public nuisance objective.”

This can be deleted as it is covered elsewhere. (Renumbered 15.13) Delete second paragraph.

These are the current positions as once a representation is made the onus is on the applicant to rebut that presumption.

Where such objections are raised by the police on the grounds of crime and disorder then the onus should be on the applicant to present evidence to rebut that presumption. Currently, there is frustration that, rather than such an objection from the police being taken on merit owing to the existence of the CIA, greater burden is being placed on the police to provide further evidence of crime and disorder linked to the premises or area.

Please clarify date of adoption of specific Policy (excluding Policy states this was on 27th February 2007 whereas the draft Policy refers to a date before the Licensing Act 2003 came into force). We are concerned that the deletion of what is paragraph 15.5 and 15.8 of the existing Policy suggests that there are no longer any local initiatives which address these issues. It appears that these may have been removed due to the proposed matrix at paragraph 15.10.

This can be deleted as it is covered elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>PO11</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>It would be helpful if the policy included something about summary reviews and the Board’s approach to whether or not licence holders should be notified of any “interim steps hearings” – I am mindful of one case in particular where, had the premises licence holder been made aware of the application and been able to attend the hearing, it is almost a certainty that the decision to suspend the licence would not have been taken.</td>
<td>Valid point</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comments and determine whether a new paragraph should be included</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>BBG158</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>This sentence - surely the following the grant of a licence the management and supervision of premises will be monitored so far as it impacts on all four of the licensing objectives, not just crime and disorder?</td>
<td>This is a valid comment. Suggest changing the paragraph to reflect this position</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested changes to paragraph made in track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>B&amp;AH35</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH ACCOMMODATION &amp; HOTEL ASSOCIATION (B&amp;AHA)</td>
<td>This sentence - surely the following the grant of a licence the management and supervision of premises will be monitored so far as it impacts on all four of the licensing objectives, not just crime and disorder?</td>
<td>See reference B&amp;DLS above</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested changes to paragraph made in track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>SC18</td>
<td>Councillor Douglas Chappell</td>
<td>Note TEN’s – Applicants can apply … before the event, and can apply …</td>
<td>This ensures the paragraph is consistent with the style throughout the policy</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested changes to paragraph made in track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>BBG159</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>It’s considered that the insertion of full details of the TEN’s limits is considerably helpful for applicants and it’s insertion is to be commended.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>PO12</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>Objectives to TEN’s – this is out of date – police and the EHO can object now on the basis of any of the licensing objectives.</td>
<td>This comment is correct. Suggest changing the paragraph to reflect the correct position</td>
<td>Licensing Board to agree amendment to paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested changes to paragraph made in track changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>BBG130</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH &amp; DISTRICT LAW SOCIETY (B&amp;DLS)</td>
<td>It is unclear why it is proposed to delete existing paragraph 18.7 of the Policy, which was intended to ensure proper integration of the impact of licensing matters with the Council’s planning policies.</td>
<td>Editing paragraph 16.7 states. To ensure proper integration with the Council’s planning policies, the Licensing Board will provide reports from time to time to the Planning Board on the situation with regards to licensed premises in the Town, including the general impact of alcohol related crime and disorder. This will assist the Planning Board to give due consideration to such matters when making decisions.</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment received during consultation and determine whether this paragraph should be included in this policy for 2015.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>B&amp;AH37</td>
<td>Sandra Graham on behalf of BOURNEMOUTH ACCOMMODATION &amp; HOTEL ASSOCIATION (B&amp;AHA)</td>
<td>The role includes consideration of planning policies as they affect their members and the operation of hotels and tourism in the Town. As such it is concerned to see the proposed deletion of existing paragraph 18.7 which was intended to ensure proper integration of the impact of licensing matters with the Council’s planning policies.</td>
<td>See evaluation in reference number B&amp;DLS20 above</td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider the comment received during consultation and determine whether these paragraph should be included in this policy for 2015.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>PO13</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>The further amendments to the Live Music Act exemptions will come into force on 6th April 2015 and should be referred to. As mentioned above, certain parts of the policy should more specifically take into account these exemptions. Note also the provisions relating to hospitals, schools and local authorities holding events on their own premises and the provisions relating to community venues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>PO14</td>
<td>Phillip Day, HLF Solicitors</td>
<td>Delegation – I deal with Licensing Authorities in all manner of places. Bournemouth is the only Council that I know of that has a scheme of delegation that effectively provides that any application for a new licence, variation or review written any of the CIA’s will be dealt with by the full Board as opposed to a sub-committee. I have never understood the logic for this. From the council taxpayer perspective, it simply increases the cost of arranging and holding hearings. From my perspective, it inevitably means that hearing take far longer, cost less because (I am afraid to say) members do not always listen to what others have said or asked and that results in repetition. On occasions, it does appear that members simply want to be seen “to make a point” and are not asking questions but making their (personal) views clear. Please therefore look again at the scheme of delegation as I firmly believe that sub-committees of 3 members could and would operate far more efficiently and make perfectly good (if not better) decisions – as was once said, a camel is a horse designed by a committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Licensing Board to consider this comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>