

Tables of results – Licensing Policy consultation survey

1. Do you think that the licensing policy is sufficient to ensure that the licensing objective will be achieved when the council considers applications?

Prevention of crime & disorder?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	yes	23	60.5
	no	6	15.8
	don't know	8	21.1
	Total	37	97.4
Missing	System	1	2.6
Total		38	100.0

Public safety?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	yes	22	57.9
	no	8	21.1
	don't know	7	18.4
	Total	37	97.4
Missing	System	1	2.6
Total		38	100.0

The prevention of public nuisance?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	yes	21	55.3
	no	12	31.6
	don't know	5	13.2
	Total	38	100.0

The protection of children from harm?

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	yes	26	68.4
	no	5	13.2
	don't know	6	15.8
	Total	37	97.4
Missing	System	1	2.6
Total		38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- Whilst all four objectives are admirable, I would question the possibility of any being 100% attainable. A more realistic objective would be to aim for: a reduction of crime and disorder, improved public safety, a reduction in public nuisance and to aim to protect children from harm. However, I realise that the wording is taken from primary legislation so your hands may be tied on this point
- Not enough information and advertising outside the district
- I feel that the policy will not consider cumulative impact well enough
- On behalf of the Hilton Parish Council, we believe the present situation in St Ives in particular (as our nearest Township) is almost out of control; we do not see from the document how this will be substantially improved by the measures stated
- It is not clear that the rate of noise and danger presently experienced would be reduced only that they might leave place later with consequent great inconvenience.
- With the caveat that it will be effective only if applied with rigor and monitored properly
- Lack of information and insufficient experience of new regulations
- The penalties imposed need to be far stricter

- For premises for the consumption of alcohol, there is a need to discourage large single room premises and encourage multi-room premises, room partitions and separated areas and as well as adequate amounts of seating and tables as these are all features that will support achievement of all four of the licensing objectives
- Longer licensing hours will almost certainly result in nuisance over even longer periods during the day
- There is little provision to restrict under-age drinking at temporary events.
- Public nuisance in the small hours will be encouraged.

2. Do you think the policy should do more to promote tourism in Huntingdonshire?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	8	21.1
no	22	57.9
don't know	7	18.4
Total	37	97.4
missing	1	2.6
	38	100.0

If you have answered yes, please indicate what measures you think should be included in the policy

- I think that the policy should actively encourage the opening of additional premises selling food for on or off premise consumption. i.e. that the presumption should always be that a license WILL be granted for such premises provided they comply with all relevant aspects of the licensing requirements
- More information and advertising outside the district
- Arising out of the new regional tourism strategy produced by EEDA/EETB we feel more could be done within the new policy framework to promote top quality premises
- The provision for small restaurants and teashops to hold a licence should be promoted more in the business sense of tourism
- Your policy assumes that music and drink licences will help tourism. The types of tourists needed are daytime tourists. The bulk of licensed restraints for example are closed during the day
- Notice that the tourism in St Neots is, according to the Civic Trust document, not of a kind that requires late opening. (See pg 16 of the Civic Trust report)
- But ensure the Town is cleaned up and all the gum is removed, better toilet facilities and the access gate in St Germain street be removed. Also ensure that the police stop the skateboarding and cycling in public areas. More police presence on the streets
- Make Huntingdon more attractive for tourists. It needs to be seen to be a safe place to shop and the town centre is in drastic need of upgrading. It is fairly dismal with little or no character
- I think many of the points in the policy will encourage promotion that will attract tourist's anyway e.g. public venue licenses for cultural events.
- For an effective alcohol strategy it is essential that there is partnership working, leadership from the top and a joined up approach it will not work without this. Is there an alcohol strategy in Huntingdonshire linked to the new licensing legislation.

3. Do you think that the council should hold regular open meetings, well publicized amongst local communities, at which the public can express whether the licensing objectives are being met?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	34	89.5
no	3	7.9
don't know	1	2.6
Total	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- Those meetings should be at venues throughout the district
- This would be open to exploitation by a minority of people who wish to object to something or other. Inevitably, as is always the way with such things, the majority who ARE happy with the way things are wouldn't be represented
- Yes, but with the option to send written comments
- We feel this is essential
- The majority of the general public would not be interested in the objectives.

4. Do you think that the council is right in requiring an applicant to carry out risk assessments before preparing an operating schedule and addressing the promotion of the licensing objectives, with special regard to the pool of conditions?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	31	81.6
no	2	5.3
don't know	4	10.5
Total	37	97.4
missing	1	2.6
	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- You are in great danger of losing all the voluntary section by imposing mole work onto an outstretched community who do not get paid
- Makes application process complicated and expensive
- Yes, but this needs a caveat. The pub companies and similar organisations with full commercial resources will have few problems here. I am concerned about the voluntary/community sector who do not have equivalent resources. There is mention in the consultation paper of a light touch administration for community activities. This is an area where HDC could offer a lot of help by producing appropriate light touch guidelines to assist the myriad of small community organisations which could otherwise be seriously restricted by their lack of professional resources, not to mention time and cash.

5. Do you think that there is any other advice that the council can give to the organizer of temporary events in addition to that in paragraph 8.2 to reduce the impact the event and concern to others?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	6	15.8
no	23	60.5
don't know	7	18.4
Total	36	94.7
missing	2	5.3
	38	100.0

If yes, please specify

- You are giving existing licence holders the right to create a monopoly of the area.
- In the case of large outdoor events, it should be obligatory for organisers to pay for police presence 24 hours out of 24
- The measures seem to do little to address the binge drinking culture in St Ives and elsewhere

- Para 8.2 does not mention temporary events. However, since the effect, cumulative or otherwise, of a temporary event is by definition temporary it will need consideration in the normal way
- Open-air events create the greater likelihood of annoyance especially given the power of modern day amplification. Such events should be allowed only in very restricted circumstances
- It would be more effective if this information were easily accessible. Many people are unaware of the changes in licensing
- The paragraph is vague about what the 'certain circumstances' are thus potential organisers may not know that there is this exemption and when and if it applies to them
- Will temporary music events have limited hours to prevent disturbance to local residents
- Church premises/halls are used for social events e.g. wedding receptions, birthday parties. Would these be subject to this cumulative impact approach?

6. Do you agree that shops, stores and supermarkets that sell alcohol should be able to sell alcohol in line with their normal trading hours?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	28	73.7
no	8	21.1
don't know	2	5.3
Total	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- The availability of alcohol throughout outlets, which are not able to control consumption, is too wide already. Normal trading hours can mean 24hrs. The amount of under age selling is unlikely to reduce and already constitutes a serious problem
- Should be limited in the same way as licensed premises
- If stores continue to sell alcohol in their normal trading hours, shops in small villages will find it very difficult to deal with the underage children who badger customers to buy alcohol for them. In our village, most of the underage drinkers obtain their alcohol from the local village shop, which is open quite late
- If shops are only open until around 10pm, I think it is ok – but I don't think alcohol should be available 24 hours per day in supermarkets that may have these opening hours
- The term normal trading hours is too imprecise. It would be appropriate to limit trading at the end of the day to 'say' 7pm or such time, as most licensed premises in the vicinity are open for business.

7. Do you think the council is right in not adopting a policy of cumulative impact?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	20	52.6
no	7	18.4
don't know	10	26.3
Total	37	97.4
missing	1	2.6
	38	100.0

If you answered no, please indicate where you think the cumulative impact should be and explain why you think this is necessary

- If you ignore cumulative impact at the first stage. It is always more difficult to correct it once precedents are established

- 8.7 says there is no evidence. There can be no evidence of conditions which do not yet obtain. In St Neots the effect of all town centre premises adopting later open hours would be cumulative and it would be difficult to refuse anyone application. However people do gather outside off-licences (see 8.4) (also see reply 1)
- Cumulative impact is a very difficult area but one that will have to be faced sooner or later. A draft policy should be prepared now in order to establish a sound basis for the future
- More clarification required
- The cumulative impact statement should be included as in paragraph 8.1 onwards across the board
- We will have to wait and see, but I would have thought the town centre problems in St Ives, for instance, might indicate an emerging need for such a policy
- Excessive concentration of pubs/clubs/sex shops would be detrimental
- As long as planning policy covers this. If not then we feel there should be a cumulative impact policy
- In certain residential parts of towns in the Council area, problems of nuisance have been a result of concentrations of premises that would be regulated by the licensing policy, particularly premises for the late night supply of hot food. There should therefore be the option for cumulative impact policies in such predominantly residential areas, for example the East Street/Quadrant area of St Ives
- It is desirable that a policy is in place to allow changes to the existing licensing conditions attached to premises should negative impacts arise subsequent to issue of the licence.

8. Is the council correct to encourage and promote a broad range of entertainment, particularly live music, dancing theatre and traditional history/plays?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	37	97.4
no	1	2.6
Total	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- But with this policy they will make it very difficult for charity organisations to actually do this
- It is wrong to equate live music with theatre and plays. (I feel that this is being done to fudge the issue of discordant and loud music)
- Will the requirements for double-glazing, air conditioning, closed doors still apply? What enforcement will occur – this is particularly applicable to licensed premises in villages where musical events take place
- What complaints procedure will be available to prevent re-occurrence of unacceptable nuisance on public places given a general license for temporary events?

9. Do you think the council is right in not fixing pre-determined closing times by zoning areas or engineering staggered closing hours?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	26	68.4
no	5	13.2
don't know	5	13.2
Total	36	94.7
missing	2	5.3
	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- The council should zone areas
- Closing times should be fixed especially in built up areas where there is housing
- In residential village situations – where homes are close to licensed premises a zoning scheme or a final closing hour would be preferable to residents
- Late night opening hours and hours during which amplified music is permitted should be restricted for premises in predominantly residential areas in order to prevent nuisance. Zones should be defined in certain residential areas with limits on the latest times for amplified music and trading (say 11pm) in order to avoid adverse impacts on the licensing objectives
- Unless pre-determined times are specified, no effective control is available to avoid nuisance outside the premises
- It is to the public good that the licence reflects the need to minimise anti-social behaviour e.g. limiting extended drinking patterns by individuals.

10. Is the council right in not limiting access by children to premises unless it is necessary for the prevention of physical, moral or psychological harm to them?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	31	81.6
no	4	10.5
don't know	2	5.3
Total	37	97.4
missing	1	2.6
	38	100.0

If you have answered no, it would be helpful if you could say why

- The prevention of harm to children cannot be policed once permission has been given. It would place an impossible burden on anyone giving permission for them to a) know whether harm is reoccurring b) whether they are drinking alcohol. Under-age drinking in St Neots is rife as the police know well
- The licensing act is too blunt a tool in that it lumps all children under the age of 16 together. There is a need to consider younger children and whether they should be allowed on premises at any time accompanied or otherwise
- Yes, but! This will need careful monitoring. If allowing children onto premises helps to promote a more responsible culture, then well and good. However, if it introduces children to a hard drinking culture, then they have been put at hazard
- Children should be protected from smoke (Now not waiting for possible new legislation) especially when attending for lengthy periods such as watching live soccer matches
- Different parts of premises should be available for use by children with responsible adults e.g. within restaurant area, but not at the bar. The license should reflect that position.

11. Do you think that there are any other alternatives to those in paragraph 14.4 which can limit the access of children to licensed premises to prevent harm to them?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	5	13.2
no	25	65.8
don't know	6	15.8
Total	36	94.7
Missing	2	5.3
	38	100.0

If you have answered yes, it would be helpful if you say why

- There should be defined responsibilities for accompanying adults and these should be displayed. There should be age banding for young people under 18. The term 'children' is too vague. What 15 year old would admit to being a child?
- Licensed premises should provide alternative entertainment for children which is away from the bar area
- Any premises where smoking is permitted
- There must be physical delineation of the different areas e.g. doors, partitions to avoid children being subject to unacceptable behaviour.

12. Do you think that the policy strikes the right balance between greater freedom and flexibility for licensed premises and their activities with the protection of residents and other business interests?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	15	39.5
no	10	26.3
don't know	11	28.9
Total	36	94.7
missing	2	5.3
	38	100.0

If you have answered yes, it would be helpful if you say why

- I think the policy covers all aspects involved in having a licensed premise and benefits all who can gain from it
- Not enough information and advertising outside the district
- Policy seems in line with the new regional tourism strategy produced by EEDA and EETB (East of England Tourist Board)
- As this is a new enterprise the outlining draft policy is as good as it can be
- It does give licensed premises flexibility, but what flexibility is given to local residents!
- The trouble is that we do not know what will happen. Commercial pressure will very likely make single licences open later than they would wish, to the detriment of their lifestyles. Can Sandy not be protected in the same way?
- Yes as long as the staff and other resources are available to monitor and enforce it
- The policy has appeared to allow longer licensed hours to suit today's lifestyle without the current sudden close shop, yet the needs of local residents that do not necessarily attend are maintained by the controlling, policing and even licensing authorities
- No, we retain some concerns about the protection of residents in a village environment
- Yes in so far as commercial activities are concerned, but I remain concerned about the consideration of how to enable such amateur activities, which are frequently the mainstay of community fundraising activities, without undue cost, limitation or loss of existing flexibility
- Hopefully it strikes the balance of policy. We will only know when it's up and running.
- There should be clearer definitions relating to Town/City premises when compared with village premises
- The Council should have the discretion to impose conditions where appropriate to promote the licensing objectives. Section 13.2 only allows conditions to be imposed if representations have been received. This places an inappropriate burden on residents particularly to scrutinise and respond to applications, and an inappropriate balance in favour of applicants as well as an undue reliance on them to regulate themselves – the need for a fair risk assessment and appropriate conditions in support of the licensing objectives are likely to conflict with their commercial objectives

- The policy has to attempt to be all things for all people. It should be possible (with consultation) to protect residents without restraining business to the extent that activities become impractical
- The policy is biased towards the enhancement of commercial interests, and not towards the protection of residents. The liberation will exacerbate the problems of unacceptable behaviour that exists at present.

13. Do you have any additional comments about the Statement of Licensing Policy?

- I find the provisions in section 8, especially section 8.3 to be potentially damaging to every town centre. Every town centre has its share of problems at the weekends and could potentially be designated an area of cumulative impact. If the presumption then became that the applications for new licenses were rebutted, it would stifle the provision of new facilities for the public, restrict competition and thus at the same time reward the owners of the existing premises that have contributed to the original problem. I therefore particularly welcome the statement in 8.7
- It is very difficult to see from the statement how the policy is going to deal with the present occasional licence, which is the backbone to entertainment in the rural areas of the district. This area needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. You do even include public halls in Q.1.6
- Although much is sound, I do feel that an overall HDC policy of doing anything to fill premises up and increase revenue will hold sway
- I fear that the result of the new provisions will be more drinking and more noise during the night hours. Increased choice always impacts on others. In particular something needs to be included about open-air events, transport provisions, toilets, increased costs (see page 14 of the civic trust report)
- It is vital that town and parish councils play an active part in the licensing process. We suggest that town councils are consulted in much the same way as they are over planning applications and be given the opportunity to recommend approval or refusal of a licence application
- Well balanced, if it can be policed adequately
- The status of village halls needs to be clarified and also needing clarification is whether the performance of live music on private premises for village parties will need a temporary event licence
- More willing to make a more informed response in 6 months time when the policy has been seen in action
- I believe the policy should be reviewed after the first 6 months and annually thereafter for the first three years in order to 'fix' any unforeseen problems without undue delay.
- I understand the haste with which the consultation document has had to be prepared and the fact that it is primarily aimed at the commercial sector. However, the lack of information about how community groups will be treated is concerning and, as time permits, we would be most appreciative of insight into your thinking in these areas.
- All applications should be clearly advertised where all residents know where to find them in order to register objections to applications
- Does the supply of alcohol (6.1 7.1) mean for sale only?
- Do voluntary organisations holding wine and cheese fund raising events for example have to be licensed?
- Para 10.3 - how will interested parties be notified of applications? – Not all have access to computers (10.6)
- The businesses should be given a certain amount of leeway if the activities attempt to benefit the majority
- This policy is wholly dependent on effective enforcement, regulations and monitoring. Have the necessary resources to do this been made available prior to commencement of the policy? Who will be responsible for carrying out these three duties?
- The licensing policy is well laid out for covering business organisations but not for the small community halls/clubs. It is appreciated that strict rules are required, but these

would deter small community halls/clubs from organising entertainment/functions for the public.

14. Are you?

	Frequency	Percent
rep or member of licensed trade	3	7.9
local business	1	2.6
local community group	13	34.2
resident	8	21.1
other	7	18.4
Total	32	84.2
missing	6	15.8
	38	100.0

15. Are you?

	Frequency	Percent
A resident of Huntingdon, Ramsey, St Neot's or ST Ives	8	21.1
resident elsewhere	5	13.2
live within 1 mile of a town centre	1	2.6
live within 1-5 miles of a town centre	6	15.8
work but do not live in district	3	7.9
Total	23	60.5
missing	15	39.5
	38	100.0

16. The type of premises you regularly use

	Frequency	Percent
public house without entertainment	1	2.6
public house with entertainment	2	5.3
theatre	1	2.6
Total	4	10.5
missing	34	89.5
	38	100.0

17. Gender

	Frequency	Percent
male	18	47.4
female	5	13.2
Total	23	60.5
missing	15	39.5
	38	100.0

18. Age

	Frequency	Percent
18-24	1	2.6
25-29	1	2.6
30-39	4	10.5
45-59	13	34.2
60-74	4	10.5
Total	23	60.5
missing	15	39.5
	38	100.0

19. Do you have a disability?

	Frequency	Percent
yes	1	2.6
no	22	57.9
Total	23	60.5
missing	15	39.5
	38	100.0

20. What is your ethnic group?

	Frequency	Percent
British	21	55.3
Other White	1	2.6
African	1	2.6
Total	23	60.5
missing	15	39.5
	38	100.0

- I fail to see the relevance of this question to this questionnaire