

Consultation Responses - Cumulative Impact Assessment

UserID	Q3. Do you have any views on the findings of the 2020 Cumulative Impact Assessment?	Q33. Are you a...(if two options apply, please choose the one that is most relevant to the answers you provided in the survey):	Entity:	Name:
1	The consideration of the road closures and rerouting of traffic within Westminster will also affect the CIP and was not taken into consideration the plans of Westminster Council themselves with their directives on changing buses, road closures and direction of traffic.	Resident		No information
3	There is no comparison to 5, 10, 20 years ago. Those of us who have been around for a while will remember significantly more night time activity generally, yet on the whole fewer incidents of violence. It is beyond my personal ability to explain the potential reasons for that; however, one hypothesis could be a proportionately higher police (and other enforcement capacity) presence in the areas. For residents among us who know Westminster (and indeed Camden) police officers, we hear first hand how few of them are available at weekends to patrol high activity areas such as Soho, Covent Garden, and so on. Often this is single figures in the central part of the borough. This is of course beyond Westminster Council's power to address, as it is a function of cuts to police (both frontline and back office staff, as now frontline officers have to carry out much more in the way of admin functions than they ever did before) as well as some of the ways the police function these days (I've never met an officer who thinks Mi Investigation benefits victims!). Anyway, yes, back to the comment on the findings it's interesting that the REASONS things are so problematic these days don't seem to have been investigated. We do need a healthy and robust night time economy but we need to take steps to ensure it can be safe as well as healthy and robust	Resident		No information
4	This policy protects the residents and the environment. A recent rise in drug abuse and criminal activity can be controlled through this. The hospitality industry and families in residential areas have opposite interests in the late hours.	Resident		Dr Anami Gour
5	The fact that the rate of incidents per square kilometre observed in the assessment, as well as the rate of licensed premises per square kilometre was approximately 9 times than the borough's average rate is telling. For crimes in particular, the rate was 10-13 times higher between 6pm - 6am compared to the borough average. Again, a significant and worrying statistic. In effect, the licensing policy has increased crime and anti social behaviour.	Resident		Malcolm Turnbull
9	It was mentioned that the work done in evaluating Mayfair was impacted by Covid. Was the work done to analyze Fitzrovia, Paddington, Marylebone/Oxford corridor, etc. also impacted by Covid, or is it felt that there is a good understanding of CIP in those areas? Why was an impact of approx. 4x not considered sufficient to continue to consider Edgware?	Resident		Kimberly Connors
10	Below the level of outright crime are negative impacts on residents such as begging, harrassment, pickpockets that are not reported, etc. The findings that Paddington and Queensway and Edgware Road fall below the CIA thresholds mean the thresholds are set too high. Even the local police have had trouble enforcing orders to reduce ASB in Queensway which has also a lot of neighbouring hostels used by Westminster Council to house young refugees or asylum seekers who are bored and hang out together in large groups in the streets. The combination of all these factors combine to create an environment which leads to problems for residents, even if one single premises alone cannot be identified as the cause. I think you should lower the threshold and also seek police input on where they have been experiencing many complaints, even if not prosecuted crimes.	Amenity/Residents' society	Maitland Court Limited Director	K Norman

12	<p>The findings seem to state that bigger venues are more likely to lead to the type of incidents that are causing concern; however, the implementation of the Cumulative Impact Policy as stated is more likely to lead to smaller venues becoming unviable. For example, anyone wishing to open a comedy or music venue with its own bar not a type of venue listed as being among those to be of significant risk of such incidents, presumably because the presence of entertainment in a venue reduces the sort of circumstances where an incident could occur, but the very type of venue the West End had lost in some number prior to lockdown and is likely to lose further over the coming months would not bother submitting an application because the venue would rarely be able to open to the public before 1900, so a 2100 closing time would be impractical. Yes, a new venue of any sort should be assessed, as they always have been, to determine what cumulative effect they might have upon the surrounding areas and nobody wants a street of pub after club after restaurant after pub but turning down all potential applicants on such draconian terms serves no logical purpose.</p> <p>That said, of course, very high concentrations of licensed premises on individual streets or blocks of streets, worsening crime hotspots, must continue to be considered all over the borough, not just in the West End. I note the comments about Victoria, although a lot of this is down to people from short term lets, hotels and hostels and/or the police's reluctance to deal with the small number of regular individuals repeatedly making people's lives a misery. It is nothing to do with those on a night out or long term residents, nor the concentration of venues. My own view is that Victoria and the surrounding area could do with fewer restaurants, a couple more pubs (or those that close at weekends opening up for local residents, rather than just catering for office workers, civil servants, Parliamentarians etc.), and a wider variety of entertainment venues (i.e. we have theatres and cinemas we cannot afford, but if we want to see a band play we need to go to Camden, an areas where there are way too many of those venues, as well as others). Balance is the key, not density. Blanket licensing for new applicants should therefore be avoided.</p>	Resident		Richard Cray
12 (cont)	<p>There is also, perhaps, a need to stop building new residential developments in noisier areas generally, be they in high density entertainment, shopping and leisure areas, or close to transport hubs, railway lines, road interchanges, petrol stations etc. Every new build I've seen has been in an area that I would not consider residential. Also, I would venture that many of those who live in the areas most of concern have more than enough money to choose to move elsewhere if conditions are not to their liking or worsen in future there still seems to be plenty of people prepared to trade off the considerable reduction in quality of life for a West End address but I see no point in increasing residential capacity in an entertainment district and then complaining that there are too many entertainment venues for the number of residential units in the area. Those in areas with fewer venues who suffer exactly the same disruption or worse, either from local venues or caused by people making their way to or from the West End, often cannot afford to move. That is not to say that I do not have sympathy with those living in the West End zones undoubtedly those who've lived in the area since the 1950s or 1960s have seen a number of changes, both positive and negative but ultimately many have plenty more options than those of us on estates two miles or so from the West End.</p> <p>It is also important to look at whether the aesthetics or overall layout of a street, a block, an alleyway etc. are factors in the sort of disorder reported in the assessment. Approach the layout of the West End like you would a no go housing estate suffering the same problems. This seemed to be the approach 20 30 years ago, particularly when Soho was being "cleaned up" and then, all of a sudden, was abandoned, to the point where the West End is even more cluttered than it was in the 1970s.</p>			
17	are the findings that there are more crimes recorded in areas where there are more licensed premises? if so it does not necessarily mean that one caused the other the cause of the higher crime could be gangs, beggars being drawn to the high (wealthy) population density for example	Resident		Paul Head
18	Better policing and security from the estates would bring down unsocial behaviour. Police and local enforcement teams should operate on a more preventative matter.	Organisation		No information
23	Please see comments above. In addition I welcome the fact that the CIA is so thorough and that the underlying evidence is made clear.	Resident		Matthew Bennett
25	Basically my concern is, have you factored how businesses have been effected during the pandemic, and the continued survival to them.	Affiliated with a licensed business or employed within a licensed premise in Westminster	Constant Leisure LTD	Maria Constantinou

26	<p>We welcome the extensive study which has been undertaken. As stated above, we would welcome additional information and data about the impact identified between different uses if they are remain in a single premises licence category under the new policy – for example the different impact between alcohol-led premises and those which provide fast food.</p> <p>Furthermore, as with other BIDs, we are also concerned that the Assessment and how it informs the approach to policies is based upon data which does not consider wider issues such as rough-sleeping or issues around transport hubs.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the findings around crime are out of context. Acquisitive crime in a tourist and business hotspot such as the West End is always going to be higher and requires the correct resources from the police, local authority and BID's to mitigate against it. The reduction of dedicated police resources in Leicester Square and surrounding areas has led to an increase in theft from the person and robbery offences despite the best efforts of responsible operators.</p>	BID	Heart of London Business Alliance	Matt Arnold
27	We are broadly in agreement with the findings.	Amenity/Residents' society	The Knightsbridge Association	Paul Meitner
28	<p>We welcome the extensive study which has been undertaken. As stated above, we would nonetheless welcome additional information and data about the impact identified between different uses if they are remain in a single premises licence category under the new policy – for example the different impact between alcohol-led premises and those which provide fast food and ask the local authority to consider additional incentives for well-run premises to expand their operations in the future. In addition to our concerns outlined above about the timeliness of the data, we are also concerned about the fact that footfall is not overlaid when assessing Cumulative Impact.</p> <p>Within this context, our most significant concern is that the Assessment does not take into account other factors beyond licensable premises which may impact upon the findings and ultimately lead to areas such as the Strand and Victoria being designated as within Special Consideration Zones. In both of these areas, there is high footfall and major travel hubs which are used by people departing the West End Cumulative Impact Zone and which also experience issues, such as rough-sleeping and soup-runs that in turn impact upon the findings of the Assessment. Similarly there is no recognition given to vice and prostitution (cards are put in telephone boxes on a more than daily basis) and we know that such activity is related to violent crime and drug offences in a much more significant way than to licensed premises. There is no mention of vice or prostitution in the CIA report.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to Edgware Road, we know that the area experiences gang related crime that spills over from north of the Marylebone Road and recorded incidents both here an on Oxford Street can also be attributed to events in Hyde Park.</p> <p>As a result, we would ask the authority to consider these wider issues, as it is otherwise unfair that licensed premises face additional restrictions in these areas.</p>	BID	Westminster BIDs	Simon Gartshore
33	The findings of the 2020 CI Assessment are of limited relevance in the wake of the COVID 19 epidemic. COVID is not simply a transient issue that will be gone in a matter of months leaving things as they were. It has already had a profound and substantial effect on the leisure and hospitality industry. The damage done will already take years to repair and COVID is still with us; only three days ago a second national lockdown was announced, with no sign of the curfew or social distancing requirements being lifted anytime after. Many businesses have already closed and with these new measures, many more will follow before we even reach the end of 2020. Given the annual ebb and flow of trade in L&H, any surviving businesses may well cease to be financially viable in the first three months of 2021.	Licensing Solicitor or Agent		Mr Marcus Lavell
35	<p>We welcome the commitment of WCC to review the Cumulative Impact Policy earlier than the statutory 3 year requirement. Our view is that it should be revisited no later than one year from now, give the impact of the health crisis on hospitality businesses. We also welcome the decision of WCC not to expand its current Cumulative Impact Zones in the current climate.</p> <p>We acknowledge the evidence presented for retaining Cumulative Impact Zones in the West End for the time being, but as recognised in the Assessment, the health crisis has had a dramatic impact on levels of crime in the area since March 2020. While it is likely that crime will increase in due course as we eventually emerge from the height of the crisis, it may not return to Covid-19 levels immediately, and as highlighted above, there is an opportunity for our Safer WestEnd BCRP to work in partnership with businesses, the Police and the Council to ensure that perhaps it never does. The role of Cumulative Impact Policies in the aftermath of the crisis should be reviewed so that that they do not hamper business recovery.</p>	Organisation	Safer Business Network	Rita King

41	<p>There is not even any distinct analysis of SEVS (strip clubs) or other sex venues - SEVs are clubbed together under 'other'. Why? Clearly these are hot spots for drugs, sexual assaults (of lap dancers and women more generally), prostitution (on premises and fuelling it elsewhere), financial fraud and other crime - they are little more than a shop front for organised crime, as outlined above as has been shown many times in your own SEVs that you continue to relicense.</p> <p>The fact that this assessment does not look distinctly at venues that are clearly hotspots for breach of the PSED could in itself be seen as an unlawful breach of the PSED</p> <p>They also help create 'no go' zones - where women feel uncomfortable to go about their every day business - particularly when there is such a high concentration in such a small Soho area. This too is a breach of the council's legally binding public sector equality duty.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the council's duties. We have taken two successful High Court cases against Sheffield City Council for breach of the PSED in relation to its pro sex industry stance. Westminster is even more open to Judicial Review.</p>	Organisation	Not Buying It	Dr Sasha Rakoff
44	<p>We have the following views on the findings in regard to Victoria's designation as a Special Consideration Zone (SCZ):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The evidence base presented in the Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) underpinning Victoria's designation as a SCZ is inconclusive and its interpretation put forward in the consultation document is open to question. Indeed, the CIA itself expresses concerns about the applicability of its data and findings to Victoria whilst Victoria's designation as a SCZ is contradictory with the data within the CIA. - Views of service experts and city inspectors suggest many of the patterns of incidents occurring in Victoria are attributable to travelling revellers coming into Victoria despite the increase in the number of licensed premises in Victoria in the last several years. - The CIA and consultation document also suggest the link between licensed premises and incidents in Victoria – which has not been designated as a Cumulative Impact Zone before – is weaker than in other areas. 	BID	Victoria BID and Victoria Westminster BID	David Beamont
45	<p>The findings of the 2020 CI Assessment are of limited relevance in the wake of the COVID 19 epidemic. COVID is not simply a transient issue that will be gone in a matter of months leaving things as they were. It has already had a profound and substantial effect on the leisure and hospitality industry. The damage done will already take years to repair and COVID is still with us; only three days ago a second national lockdown was announced, with no sign of the curfew or social distancing requirements being lifted anytime after. Many businesses have already closed and with these new measures, many more will follow before we even reach the end of 2020. Given the annual ebb and flow of trade in L&H, any surviving businesses may well cease to be financially viable in the first three months of 2021. Further the Data relies heavily on assumptions on existing data collection methods and it not fully accurate. Moving forward - better data collection methods should be implemented, reviewed regularly and improved.</p>	Licensing Solicitor or Agent		Mr Marcus Lavell
47	<p>The findings are very useful. No objection to Edgware Road and Queensway / Bayswater being removed from the CI, but useful to know what causing some of the incidents if not related to licencing, and who is then responsible for looking into these aspects to try and address what could be an underlying problem. Also presumably data will continue to be collected to see if there is a need to change the approach.</p>	Individual/No information		No information
49	<p>are they findings? in light of covid-19, the year 2020 is not an ideal benchmark or a basis to form an opinion.</p>	Individual/No information		No information

50	<p>Cumulative Impact Assessment</p> <p>I welcome the very thorough and informative Cumulative Impact Assessment, but I am concerned that the crime data lacks context in places. There have been significant reductions in Police numbers and a reorganisation of the borough policing team into a tri borough unit and a reduction in DWO numbers over the study period. All of these would be likely to contribute to rising crime. Specifically, for Edgware Road our concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We know that vice and prostitution is prevalent throughout the area (cards are put in telephone boxes on a more than daily basis) and we know that such activity is related to violent crime and drug offences in a much more significant way than to licensed premises. There is no mention of vice or prostitution in the assessment. 2. The area experiences gang related crime that spills over from north of the Marylebone Road. 3. At the southern end of our area, the report does acknowledge that crime may be related to commercial activities in the neighbouring area (e.g. Oxford Street) but no mention is made of the impact of major events in Hyde Park that happen throughout the year and regular protests and marches that assemble at Marble Arch. These inevitably attract the attention of pick pockets, distraction thefts, cycle-enabled thefts and similar criminal behaviour unrelated to licensed premises. 4. Edgware Road experiences high levels of rough sleeping, both from genuine homeless people and foreign nationals in the UK for a short period of time that beg, some of whom are often aggressive and are involved in organised crime. These crimes which should not be linked to licensed premises. 5. There are several traffic accidents resulting in 999 calls which may not be attributed to licensed premises. Edgware Road is part of the Inner Ring Road and experiences high levels of traffic, and vehicles being driven at high speed. We have witnessed the results of vehicles being driven (accidentally) into licensed premises. <p>I am pleased to read that the study as a whole acknowledges that there is only a weak link between anti-social behaviour and licensed premises (p76) but this should be carried forward into the Statement of Licensing Policy and the policies, and ultimately decisions, need to reflect this fact.</p>	BID	Marble Arch London	Mike Fairmaner
50 cont	<p>Turning to Edgware Road specifically, page 123 of the Cumulative Impact Assessment 2020 summarises the findings for Edgware Road which say: "This suggests that alcohol-consumption and licensed premises activities may not be the main driver of crime in this area." It also says that for the area as a whole that the "evidence... cannot be described as conclusive." This is welcomed, along with the removal of the Stress Area designation, but I would suggest needs to be carried forward and more robustly reflected in the Statement of Licensing Policy.</p> <p>On the same page it states that "Records of enforcement visits over the last three years indicate that there are numerous problematic businesses in the area known to the City Council. This suggests that issues in the area may not be attributable to a saturation or type of licensed premises in the borough but linked to specific businesses." This reflects some of my concerns over the crime figures, and I would suggest the Council should not adopt a blanket approach to the area. Instead I would propose that the Council should be encouraging more licensed premises into the area, which can be better regulated, and grant extensions to those premises that have a good track record of responsible behaviour, in order to create competition against those problematic businesses, and encourage them to resolve their problems. I am therefore concerned that the current concluding sentence on page 123 which states "careful scrutiny of licence applications should be considered in this area to ensure it is not once more characterised by cumulative impact" is not an accurate reflection of the findings of the assessment for Edgware Road. Rather, careful consideration is required for those problematic premises, but that applications for new licences from responsible operators should be encouraged and allowed to compete on an equal footing with existing premises in the area.</p>			
82	<p>We have the following views on the findings in regard to Victoria's designation as a Special Consideration Zone (SCZ):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The evidence base presented in the Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) underpinning Victoria's designation as a SCZ is inconclusive and its interpretation put forward in the consultation document is open to question. Indeed, the CIA itself expresses concerns about the applicability of its data and findings to Victoria whilst Victoria's designation as a SCZ is contradictory with the data within the CIA. - Views of service experts and city inspectors suggest many of the patterns of incidents occurring in Victoria are attributable to travelling revellers coming into Victoria despite the increase in the number of licensed premises in Victoria in the last several years. - The CIA and consultation document also suggest the link between licensed premises and incidents in Victoria – which has not been designated as a Cumulative Impact Zone before – is weaker than in other areas. 	BID	Victoria BID and Victoria Westminster BID	David Beamont

84	<p>We welcome the commitment of WCC to review the Cumulative Impact Policy and we also welcome the decision of WCC not to expand its current Cumulative Impact Zones in the current climate. Cumulative Impact Policies should be reviewed at a suitable time so that that they do not hamper the recovery of business and the hospitality.</p> <p>Both zone 1 and 2 are busy connections for rail, underground and bus routes so attract a higher proportion of people to them. The cause of incidents are driven by people travelling to the transport hubs and interchanges.</p> <p>The good transport links themselves, can attract issues and crime as it provides efficient and easy access and dispersal for those wishing to attaining drugs, which leads to other anti-social behaviour. This can be seen by the hotspots at Charing Cross Station and Embankment Station.</p>	BID	The Northbank BID	Alison Gregory
85	<p>We live in Berkeley street. The designation of Special Consideration Zone is a positive step for residents, although we are of the view it should be a cumulative impact area in its own right. The Hadfield Study in 2016 which suggested designation as a cumulative impact area for Berkeley street, had considerably more observational data.</p>	Resident		Jaleh Zand
86	<p>We live in Berkeley street. The designation of Special Consideration Zone is a positive step for residents, although we are of the view it should be a cumulative impact area in its own right. The Hadfield Study in 2016 which suggested designation as a cumulative impact area for Berkeley street, had considerably more observational data.</p>	Resident		Ulrich Brandt-Pollmann
87	<p>The findings around crime are out of context. Acquisitive crime in a tourist and business hotspot such as the west end is always going to be higher and requires the correct resources from the police, local authority and BID's to mitigate against it. The withdrawal of dedicated police resources in Leicester Square and surrounding areas has led to an increase in theft from the person and robbery offences. CAG and other businesses have provided additional financial support to fund private security patrols. Due to lack of police resources private prosecutions have increased led by My Local Bobby the private security provider.</p>	Organisation	Capital Arches Group t/a McDonald's	Tim Molden
88	<p>It is difficult to see how the findings relating to analysis done between 2017 and 2019 pre Covid19 can be relevant going forward without further research to include the effects that Covid 19 have had. These may well be long term effects.</p>	Affiliated with a licensed business or employed within a licensed premise in Westminster	Randall & Aubin Soho Limited	Jamie Poulton
89	<p>We believe that the spatial analysis of the existing datasets is well explained and of a high standard. However there is a gap between the data arising from reporting and the experience of residents on the ground. Observational studies serve to fill this gap but this was, unfortunately, not possible for this assessment. This matters particularly in the case of public nuisance, especially noise from people in the street, as the rate at which this is reported will be low. This is because there is an understanding from residents that reporting it does not result in any action to stop it. As a result the Cumulative Impact Assessment reflects the Cumulative Impact on the Crime and Disorder Licensing Objective but NOT the Cumulative Impact on Public Nuisance.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	Covent Garden Community Association	David Kaner
90	<p>It clearly demonstrates the year on year increase in CI in the West End, the key finding being that incidents between 6pm and 6am were 9x higher than the borough average, it has higher rates of all incidents, serious violent crime, robberies, theft, drug offences etc. Residents in Soho will not be surprised by these results, we are aware of how dangerous the area is especially at night. I agree with the statements that the granting of licences or variations would be inconsistent with their duty to promote the licensing objectives or their duty under the Licensing Act 2003.</p>	Resident		Marina Tempia
92	<p>The findings of the 2020 CI Assessment are of limited relevance in the wake of the COVID 19 epidemic. COVID is not simply a transient issue that will be gone in a matter of months leaving things as they were. It has already had a profound and substantial effect on the leisure and hospitality industry. The damage done will already take years to repair and COVID is still with us; only three days ago a second national lockdown was announced, with no sign of the curfew or social distancing requirements being lifted anytime after. Many businesses have already closed and with these new measures, many more will follow before we even reach the end of 2020. Given the annual ebb and flow of trade in L&H, any surviving businesses may well cease to be financially viable in the first three months of 2021. Further the Data relies heavily on assumptions on existing data collection methods and it not fully accurate. Moving forward - better data collection methods should be implemented, reviewed regularly and improved.</p>	Licensing Solicitor or Agent		Mr Marcus Lavell, Mr Andrew Wong and Mr Darren O'leary

93	<p>We welcome the commitment of WCC to review the Cumulative Impact Policy earlier than the statutory 3 year requirement. Our view is that it should be revisited no later than one year from now, give the impact of the health crisis on hospitality businesses. We also welcome the decision of WCC not to expand its current Cumulative Impact Zones in the current climate.</p> <p>We acknowledge the evidence presented for retaining Cumulative Impact Zones in the West End for the time being, but as recognised in the Assessment, the health crisis has had a dramatic impact on levels of crime in the area since March 2020. While it is likely that crime will increase in due course as we eventually emerge from the height of the crisis, it may not return to Covid-19 levels immediately, and as highlighted above, there is an opportunity for our Safer WestEnd BCRP to work in partnership with businesses, the Police and the Council to ensure that perhaps it never does. The role of Cumulative Impact Policies in the aftermath of the crisis should be reviewed so that that they do not hamper business recovery. Overall, a more permissive approach to licensing, in the context of regeneration and growth, is needed over the next couple of years in order to retain existing businesses and also encourage new hospitality business start ups, which will be vital to the future of the industry and the provision of employment.</p> <p>In terms of the data, we would highlight that most crime and anti-social behaviour cannot be attributed to specific licensed premises. Reduced police resources also has a bearing on crime levels as a whole. The role of organisations such as Safer Business Network/Safer WestEnd and BIDs in making public spaces safer should also be recognised.</p>	Organisation	Safer Business Network	Rita King
94	<p>It is impossible to review data without similar data for other central city locations, and especially in respect of Noise related complaints for on licensed premises whether these simply recorded or if there substantiated by qualified persons and whether if is the result of poor residential planning modelling.</p>	Organisation	Music venue trust	Niall forde
95	<p>We agree with the comments analysis made by the Soho Society. This Assessment is a damning report on the Council's failure to control cumulative impact. We cannot see that the revised policies are intended to deal with this situation, indeed in some respects the reverse appears to be the case. We would welcome a statement from the Council as to how the revised policies are aimed at reversing the many negative statistics in this Assessment.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	Meard & Dean Street RA.	David Bieda
96	<p>The findings in relation to crime are alarming and show that there are too many premises in the area, combined with not enough police and council enforcement, leading to safety problems, particularly for those who are vulnerable, for whatever reason.</p>	Resident		Jane Doyle
97	<p>The findings are not conclusive and although there is a correlation between crime and the concentration of licensed premises these data are not detailed enough to conclude that licensed premises are the cause of crime. It is beyond question that a vibrant night-time economy drives footfall to an area, otherwise, it would not be by definition, vibrant. With that increased footfall comes an opportunity for increased criminal activity. More detailed analysis is required before simple conclusions can be made.</p>	Licensing Solicitor or Agent		Richard Vivian
98	<p>I certainly feel the Queensway and Bayswater and other Impact Zones should be maintained till we know actually the long-term impact on the Central London economy and jobs is felt after the pandemic.</p>	Resident		Murad Qureshi

99	<p>Mayfair has a unique character and mix of residential streets, internationally renowned shopping, hotels, dining and entertainment. It is a small dense area and has licensed premises and transport nodes on all sides which lead to visitors often walking from one side to the other. Licensed uses have been on the increase in the area for many years and it has been identified in this and other reports that they are having a cumulative impact.</p> <p>Whilst statistics for all of Westminster have been collected, the area analysed is not the whole of Mayfair and the licensed premises in the area you study have an impact on the wider area of Mayfair. The neighbouring residential streets to the area of study are also bounded by a number of other clusters of licenses, still within Mayfair, which add to the cumulative impact already experienced. We are also next to the West End Cumulative Impact Area which inevitably has an impact on Mayfair due to its close proximity and mix of similar uses.</p> <p>With the creation of the new Planning Use Class E, and the resultant loss of local control over the balance of uses, Licensing is now the only control mechanism for Local Authorities. This loss of control of use classes and the decline in retail could lead to a significant increase in the number of licensed premises in Mayfair.</p> <p>There is now a very strong argument for Cumulative Impact Area status for the Berkeley Street/Sq - Dover St area.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	Residents' Society of Mayfair & St James's	Richard Cutt
135	<p>we appreciated seeing the cumulative impact assessment report, detailing for the first time a whole host of anti-social behaviour, nuisance levels and criminal activities record in the West End.</p> <p>In reality, the impact of anti-social behaviour and noise pollution is much larger, but unrecorded, as residents do not always report those incidents to WCC 'noise team' hotline.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association	Yoram Blumann
138	<p>We agree with the proposal to include a summary of the 2020 Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA). We do have some further comments of the efficacy of the dataset produced. Whilst very thorough – a major drawback when concluding that the data does not 'conclusively' link incidents to licensed premises is the absence of observational data.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	South East Bayswater Residents' Association	John Zamit
139	<p>We agree with the proposal to include a summary of the 2020 Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA). We do have some further comments of the efficacy of the dataset produced. Whilst very thorough – a major drawback when concluding that the data does not 'conclusively' link incidents to licensed premises is the absence of observational data.</p>	Amenity/Residents' society	Queensway Residents' Association	William Kennedy
142	<p>We agree with the proposal to include a summary of the 2020 Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA). We do have some further comments of the efficacy of the dataset produced. Whilst very thorough – a major drawback when concluding that the data does not 'conclusively' link incidents to licensed premises is the absence of observational data.</p>	Political entity (Cllr, Mayor's Office)		Cllr Maggie Carman

148	<p>Westminster’s plan to largely retain the previous licensing policy will hopefully bring some certainty to businesses. However, I would encourage Westminster to keep the licensing policy under frequent review, as the real impact of the pandemic becomes clear over the coming months. This may require adjusting the policy support the recovery of local high streets as well as the West End.</p> <p>I encourage Westminster to refer to ‘London At Night – An Evidence Base for a 24 Hour City’. Key findings from that report are relevant as evidence for this licensing policy review.</p> <p>The revised policy does not acknowledge the scale of the night time workforce and their needs. There is a reference to the evening economy allowing people to “wind down after work”. However, 1.6 million people (one-third of London’s employees) usually work between 6pm and 6am. These workers need to be able to access goods and services outside their normal working hours, including being able to eat, drink or socialise before or after their working day. Westminster is uniquely placed to cater for the needs of this workforce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I urge caution in assuming that the economy costs more to police and manage at night that it does in the day. It is important to look closely at the data and to put it into context. For example, to understand crime and ambulance data, it must be reported as a percentage of the population in an area at the time. 20 ambulance callouts may be high for a place with few people in it, but comparatively low for a busy location. • The Summary of Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) findings refers to ‘rates of incidents’ but doesn’t describe what is classed as an incident. This data is key to understanding how the decision to recommend the removal or retention of a Cumulative Impact Zone has been arrived at. • The CIA findings describe rates of incidents as “9 times above the borough average”. However, it doesn’t state the population of that area compared to the borough average. If the population is ten times the borough average, that would indicate that incidents per head of the population are lower than the borough average. • Assumptions are often made that crime at night is a direct result of night time businesses. This assumption is less frequently made for daytime businesses. And yet peaks in crime happen at all times of the day in places where people gather in large numbers, for example there is a spike in thefts in the afternoon driven by daytime economic activity, and this too creates a cost to policing. • It should also be noted that alcohol related crime fell 51% between 2010 and 2017 and only 4.3% of all crimes at night are ‘alcohol related’. In terms of the call on the NHS, you are more likely to go to hospital with a sports injury at night than an alcohol related injury. 	Political entity (Cllr, Mayor's Office)	Mayor of London's Office	Amy Lamé
148 cont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The narrative of the licensing policy is currently heavily focused on crime and antisocial behaviour being linked to the hospitality sector. I would encourage a more balanced narrative that recognises that crime happens around the clock and that the hospitality sector makes a huge contribution to Londoners’ wellbeing, as well as a major contribution to London’s economy. • As you note, the Cumulative Impact Assessment uses pre-COVID-19 data. This does not reflect the situation that licensed premises are now in, or the issues they are likely to face over the coming two years. Covid-19 will have a long and lasting impact on licensed premises. It has increased their debt levels considerably and many are in the most precarious of positions. It is unclear when consumer demand will recover and what lasting changes COVID-19 will have on the trade. For example, we may see changing business models, increased demand for outdoor eating and drinking, or the need for longer opening hours. Local authorities will need flexibility in their licensing policies to support and accommodate these changes in a safe and sustainable way. 			

150	<p>We agree with the important findings of the Cumulative Impact Assessment which presents overwhelming evidence of the year on year increase in cumulative impact in the West End Zone 1. Although we welcome the retention of the existing West End Cumulative Impact Zone 1, we disagree with the council's proposal to go against the evidence of the CIA to support further policy restrictions. In its conclusion the document states: 'After consideration of the cumulative impact assessment it is the Licensing Authority's view that the number of premises are such that it is likely granting further types of licenses or varying existing licenses would be inconsistent with the authority's duty to promote the licensing objectives.' (p.19) 'The granting of licences for certain types of operation that are likely to add to the cumulative impact within these areas would not be consistent with the licensing authorities duty under the Licensing Act 2003.' (p.19)</p> <p>The CIA defined as: 'The principle of cumulative impact is to identify which areas are saturated with a significant number, type or composition of licensed premises, causing the benefits provided by alcohol outlets to be outweighed by public nuisance, crime, disorder and other costs of excessive alcohol consumption.' (p.8) presents a number of key findings identifying the high level of cumulative impact in the West End as detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West End Zone 1: on just 3% of the borough's footprint, which held 25% of all unique licence locations as of February 2020, 943 unique licences were issued to 766 unique locations. Over 3200 residential households. (p.9) • Public realm crimes: (serious violence, robberies, theft and drug offences), alcohol-related callouts incidents, anti-social behaviour and demands on services were prevalent in Westminster between 2017 and 2019, among the highest in London and the country. All incidents observed concentrated in the West End many occurring in the evening and at night as well as weekends. (p.8) • For crimes West End Zone 1, the rate was 10 - 13 times higher between 6pm - 6am compared to the borough average. (p.9) • Total incident type 2017-2019: serious violent crimes Night, 795 - proportion of Borough's incidents (31%). Robberies Night, 2237 (33%). Theft and Handling Night, 24,407 (33%). Drug Offences Night, 1529 (40%). Noise Complaints Night, 1389 (16%). Reactive Waste Management, 6630 (10%). Ambulance call outs to locations of licensed premises, 5353 (22%). Anti-Social behaviour on transport Night, 592 (13%), Anti-Social behaviour MPS, 9662 (16%). Total = 50,594. Compared to West End Zone 2 the second highest incident rate at 3.86 totals 35,584, significant comparisons being, Serious violent crimes, 388 (15%), Robberies (21%), Drug Offences 487 (13%). (p.9) • Data description of incidents in 2017-2019 found all incident categories observed varied both in space and time. Many occurred in the evening and at night and on weekends when alcohol related activities typically peak. Incidents were primarily concentrated in the West End where licensed premises are disproportionately concentrated. (p.28) 			
150 cont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robberies: clustered within the West End, Charing Cross, Oxford Street in the evening and night. (p.40) • Serious violent crimes: recorded between 6pm and 6am concentrated overwhelmingly in the West End. (p.44) • Drug related crimes: Westminster recorded the highest volume of drug offences of any borough between 2017-2019. Half of crimes were reported (48%) in the evening and night time. Drug related crimes between 6pm - 6am were significantly clustered in and around the west end to varying degrees. (p.46) • Theft and Handling: most common crime type in the borough, in the evening and night they are particularly concentrated in the West End and along Oxford Street. (p.37) • On average, for every additional unique licence location (proxy for premises) in an area 200m2 in size) reported incidents were likely to increase by factor of 1.06 - 1.17, depending on the premises type, incident type and time of day. (p.8) • Among specific premises types assessed, pubs and wine bars, restaurants, shops and stores, and hotels and hostels were most significantly aligned with incidents in their proximity. This is a damning indictment of the failure of the current process, we require policies to be robustly applied by councillors sitting on licensing sub-committees. A review of the Society's representations in 2019/20 shows the sub-committee approved 2 additional 3am night club/performance venues (capacity 420), 1 bar extension until 1am (capacity 80) and time limited until 30 /9/21. 1 x new 1am restaurant (capacity 300) and 3 extensions of existing restaurant licences until 00:30 (capacities 156), 1 x removal of restaurant condition (allowing alcohol sales without food) until 10pm, time limited 30/9/21, all of which will continue to add to cumulative impact in the area. 	Amenity/Residents' society	Soho Society	Tim Lord

150 cont	<p>We note the issue of capacities has not been mentioned within the consultation or within the CIA 2020 it is a key factor in cumulative impact. As the 2016 SLP 2.4. states: 'The extent of crime and disorder and public nuisance in the Cumulative Impact Areas arises from the number of people there late at night; a considerable number of them being intoxicated, especially in the West End Cumulative Impact Area.' We consider this to be a weakness in the assessment. We reviewed all licences in Soho for capacities and found that of the 114 licences from 01:00 to 06:00 capacity information was available for premises 98 (86%) with a total capacity of 20,483. This is a huge number, and it is therefore unsurprising that cumulative impact is so high in the area. We ask that capacity information is recorded as standard practice on every new licence, and this information is also included as routine in the sub-committee reports alongside the list of licensed premises in the vicinity and including the street of the application.</p> <p>There is also the need to further strengthen the premises use policies. In particular we propose under 'other premises types' as mentioned in 4.7 that the council includes restaurants, with stricter parameters for either new licences or extensions beyond core, or both. A study in Mayfair in 2016 recommended that Berkeley Street had the characteristics of a stress area such that the 'presumption to refuse' should be extended to certain type of restaurant application.</p> <p>The majority of new licences granted in Soho are for restaurants. We make further comments on the proposed changes to premises types at No. 26.</p> <p>In relation to COVID-19 we will not support any relaxation of policy to facilitate the extension of existing licences or to grant new late night licences in the area. Whilst we are aware that the Council has found exceptions on a case by case basis where a licence is time-limited, we have concerns as to the public health implications of more people drinking later at night, in addition to public nuisance and crime and disorder implications. We would like reassurance from the Council about their general approach to applications which are not for time limited licences/ variations, and their general approach to applications which seek to make permanent the time limited changes which may have been granted. We remain strongly opposed to any weakening of the policy in this regard.</p> <p>The Society has received counsel's advice to the effect that the breach of COVID restrictions which may take place when large numbers of customers are intoxicated is a public safety, public nuisance and prevention of crime issue. None of this is addressed in the report even though the economic impacts of the restrictions is used to justify ignoring the evidence of increasing cumulative impact. Surely if COVID is a relevant factor for the Council's decision it has to be both in regard to economic impact AND safety issues.</p>			
151	<p>Our first concern relates to the Cumulative Impact Assessment and the data which has been used to inform the subsequent policy proposals. Whilst welcoming the data-driven approach provided by the policy, we are however concerned that the data used to justify the decisions and changes in the draft policies has a number of significant issues and deficiencies. Firstly, much of the data around crime and anti-social behavior cannot be attributed to individual licensed premises. In addition to this, footfall has not been overlaid to provide an appropriate context to the data. We are also concerned that the data does not take into account the reduction in Metropolitan Police Service resources and officers allocated to the respective areas, and that much of the data is as also too old to be relevant to decisions being taken today.</p>	BID	New West End Company	Available
156	<p>The Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment is an impressive and ground-breaking piece of research. However, a greater capacity to interrogate it for those outside of the council, such as through vector mapping that allows the user to drill down to street level, would make a huge difference to the ability to interpret its findings.</p>	Affiliated with a licensed business or employed within a licensed premise in Westminster	CAPCO	Andrew Hicks

<p>159</p> <p>West End</p> <p>159 cont</p>	<p>•The evidence in respect of the West End CIZ seems to be extremely robust. Indeed, it appears that there is evidence for an expansion of the West End CIZ and/or a widening of its scope, although the conclusion that the impact of Covid-19 mitigates against any such changes at this time is difficult to impeach.</p> <p>•Appendix 12 of the current (2016) Policy states that there were 1,002 licensed premises within the West End CIZ at that time. The consultation document states at para 1.2 on page 2 that there are 1304 licensed premises in the West End CIZ - an increase of 30%. However, the CI Assessment states on page 15 that there are 1169 'unique licence locations' in the West End CIZ – which, if the term 'unique licence locations' is analogous to 'licensed premises' is an increase of 17%.</p> <p>We are unclear which figure is correct, but in any event even the lower figure shows a very significant increase in licensed premises since 2016. It would be helpful to have a view from the authority as to whether there is a link between the increase in licensed premises (or 'unique licence locations') and the data from which it is concluded that 'the results conclusively characterised two parts of the West End as burdened by cumulative impact between 2017 and 2019, to varying degrees.'</p> <p>•It is noted that at para 4.7. on page 6 of the consultation document, the authority finds that 'the evidence collected...supported further policy restrictions on applications, as they would likely add to cumulative impact.'</p> <p>•The presence or absence of a causal link is important in considering the efficacy of the current Policy, because it is appreciated that the majority and perhaps even the vast majority of these licences will have been granted as 'restaurants' under policy RNT2. The current Policy approach is that an application 'will be granted' if it can be demonstrated that they do not 'add to cumulative impact' (to 'core hours') and is subject to a further consideration 'on their merits' subject to various criteria, outside 'core hours'.</p> <p>If it is the case that the increase in the number of licensed premises has materially impacted on the data in the CI assessment which points to an increase in cumulative impact in the West End CIZ, then it is appropriate to question the efficacy of the current approach to determining whether or not any particular application will add to cumulative impact.</p> <p>•It has been disappointing to the Soho Society, for example, that the police routinely withdraw representations in the CIZ, because the Soho Society have felt that this has undermined their view that 'cumulative impact' has increased. The data in the CI assessment appears to bear out this view. The CI assessment suggests that the current CIP and/or the way it is implemented has not succeeded in resolving issues of cumulative impact in the West End.</p> <p>•That said, there is a widespread sympathy with licensed operators due to Covid-19 and an acceptance that Covid-19 has changed the licensing picture in the short term in the manner suggested in the CI assessment in the context of potential changes to the West End CIZ.</p> <p>Queensway/Bayswater and Edgware Road</p> <p>•We are aware that amenity societies disagree with the removal of the Bayswater/Queensway and Edgware Road CIZs, and we question whether the data in the CI assessment in respect of these areas justifies the removal of these areas in the context of inter alia the conclusion at para 4.16 on page 16 of the CI assessment and the provisions of s5A of the 2003 Act.</p>	<p>Organisation</p>	<p>Westminster Citizens Advice</p>	<p>Richard Brown</p>
<p>160</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Affiliated with a licensed business or employed within a licensed premise in Westminster</p>	<p>Kuit Steinart Levy LLP</p>	<p>Rebecca Ingram</p>

161	<p>Westminster Council states that you have “reviewed our policy approach in light of the findings from the CIA and the implication of changing our policy in light of COVID”. We believe that it is at odds with promoting the licensing objectives in that it is based on historic pre-COVID evidence and there is no balanced post-COVID evidence, or planning for a post-COVID environment. Where the prevention of crime and disorder, Public safety, the prevention of public nuisance are all likely to look significantly different due to reduced footfall and the number of operational businesses.</p> <p>☒ In 3.3c it states that “had a high concentration of licensed premises” but it does not directly link those premises with crime or disorder, it’s just a statement that they exist. There is a need to directly link crime and disorder with the premises to justify having a CIP.</p>	<p>Affiliated with a licensed business or employed within a licensed premise in Westminster</p>	<p>McDonalds</p>	
-----	--	---	------------------	--