

## Appendix C

### Alcohol licensing Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) Consultation July – September 2023

#### 1. Respondents

How are you responding to this survey?		
	n	%
Business operator	28	37%
Brighton & Hove resident	20	27%
Premises licence representative	13	17%
Responsible authority	2	3%
Other (details below)	11	15%
Not answered	1	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>75</b>	

#### Other respondents

- Chair of BHCC Safety Advisory Group
- Brighton marina estates management
- Methodist Church
- Councillor
- Technically we are a business with a premises licence. We are a community benefit society that owns and runs a community hall just north of Seven Dials
- North Laine Community Association
- Chairman of a tennis club
- I live close and spend a lot of my time in Brighton and Hove
- We are acting on behalf of our client Abrdn, who have a significant interest in Brighton City Centre given their ownership of Churchill Square Shopping Centre. Please note that the responses provided to this survey should be read in conjunction with the representations submitted directly to Jim Whitlegg.
- Brunswick Town Association - we represent all the residents associations within the Brunswick Town conservation area.
- We are acting on behalf of our client Abrdn, who have a significant interest in Brighton City Centre given their ownership of Churchill Square Shopping Centre.

## 2. The proposals

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to maintain the special policy on cumulative impact and to maintain the current cumulative impact zone as set out in the draft cumulative impact assessment?														
	All respondents		Local resident		Business operator		Premises licence rep		Responsible authority		Other		Not answered	
Strongly agree	34	45%	13	65%	6	21%	8	62%	1	50%	5	45%	1	100%
Tend to agree	12	16%	1	5%	6	21%	2	15%			3	27%		
Neither agree nor disagree	8	11%	1	5%	7	25%								
Tend to disagree	9	12%	2	10%	4	14%	2	15%	1	50%				
Strongly disagree	12	16%	3	15%	5	18%	1	8%			3	27%		
Total	75		20		28		13		2		11		1	

How are you responding to this survey? As a...	Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to maintain the special policy on cumulative impact and to maintain the current cumulative impact zone as set out in the draft cumulative impact assessment?	Why do you agree or disagree with the proposal?
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	Having worked for over a decade in a red zone area, the effects that spread into the community are sadly clear to see. I fully support the tackling of anti-social behaviour and a reduction in crime related to all forms of substance and alcohol misuse that propel this type of behaviour.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	i agree, i do not feel safe walking in parts of Brighton because of drinkers and aggressive begging, and my family who would be tourists now after living in Hove for most of their lives also would not go into Brighton for the same reason.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	Living in North Laine the alcohol- and drug consumption concentrated to this area has increased noticeably during this year resulting in increased crime, disorder and public nuisance. Having four pubs/alcohol premises on either end of the street naturally increase constant drunken through-traffic of people and attracts non-social behaviour. This proposal is very much needed if central Brighton wants to stay as living residential area and not seasonal outdoor nightclub. It is a grave concern for both visitors and residents.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	Quality of life concerns
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	The cumulative impact zone comprises areas where large numbers of people live. Problems of noise and anti-social behaviour are not confined to the licensed premises themselves, they spill out into the streets, making parts of the town hazardous and threatening for residents and for people coming into town for a meal or cultural event. Neighbourhoods become blighted because of the drunkenness, noise, fighting and urinating. People coming into town for the evening are more likely to want to drive than use public transport, so as to minimise the time they have to spend walking through the streets.

Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly agree	To help towards Brighton & Hove being a safe place for all, help regarding the anti social behaviour and crime in these areas. I believe we should go further and some areas should be designated No Alcohol licence areas.
Brighton & Hove resident	Tend to agree	As a resident it is apparent which premises have old licence agreements and in some cases apply too much flexibility to the interpretation of them, staffing ages, id checks and general venue / operations management. A higher level scrutiny of the city licensed venues , off-licences in the zone in particular ( selling cheap high volume alcohol). NO additional pure off licence venues should be accepted.
Brighton & Hove resident	Tend to disagree	It comes across as lazy. It's not really fixing a problem. It's not really addressing existing bad users of alcohol licences and it's also limiting open trade. It's trying to fix a symptom and not a cause.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly disagree	Scrap it and come up with something better. While i generally agree with the proposal, the fact that CIA is not enforced and alcohol licences continue to be granted within the area means that there is no point to the CIA.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly disagree	The lack of organised policing is the problem.
Brighton & Hove resident	Strongly disagree	You need to be more targeted with business applications as this policy could hold back small business and the development and regeneration of the cities economy.
Business operator	Strongly agree	As a small independent business, anti-social behaviour in the Preston Road area is at an unacceptable level. I feel restricting additional alcohol licences will be useful in helping curb the increase of this issue.
Business operator	Strongly agree	B&H does not need any more new venues, as this dilutes the quality of what we already have
Business operator	Strongly agree	To reduce anti social behaviour.
Business operator	Strongly agree	Too many uncontrollable factors. Consumption is excessive and irresponsible
Business operator	Tend to agree	Based on current analysis and levels of crime / nuisance activity it seems prudent to maintain the current policy and CIZ
Business operator	Tend to agree	I absolutely agree with having controls in place but do not agree with how difficult for instance new premises would find it to gain a licence. They may well offer something great to the zone and promote tourism.
Business operator	Tend to agree	The proposal does go one way to minimise crime and other we complaints, however it is a bit of a blunt tool and does not discriminate between types of licensed premises ie small venues and mass clubs or venues with responsible management.
Business operator	Tend to agree	Working in the area for over 20 years it is apparent that businesses that engage in a considered licence management strategy are a benefit to the city whereas those who are idle with their responsibility contribute to criminal activity and are beacons for bad behaviour. Any model that allows for higher level scrutiny ( within measures ) should be supported and all businesses requested to engage. Historical relaxed licences should be looked into and routinely scrutinised

Business operator	Neither agree nor disagree	Our business is solely a convenience store, part of which sells alcohol for consumption off the premises. We already have store(s) within the zone and do not think the CIA is aimed at such premises. We feel our impact on the issue is minimal, though appreciate some people may purchase alcohol for excessive consumption or "pre-drink" before going out for a late evening
Business operator	Neither agree nor disagree	While I very much agree with the principal of the CIZ and the need for extra care with licensing in these areas, I would like to raise some issues for consideration with the implementation of the policy when it comes to the use/abuse of the system by a highly vocal but very small minority of local stakeholders to air grievances unrelated to the licensing objectives, or that are highly speculative, and/or that pertain to represent local opinions and interests without the mandate of said locals. This especially appears to be the case with the North Laine Community Association, where 2 or 3 members of long standing have taken it upon themselves to object to every licensing application or variation without consulting either their own membership or the local residents that they claim to represent. Their representations therefore appear to command far more weight than maybe they should do.
Business operator	Tend to disagree	An increasing number of nightlife venues are closing and not being replaced. Onerous licensing terms is putting off new nightlife businesses launching. Brighton's nightlife offering is much weaker now than it was pre-pandemic, which affects the appeal of visiting Brighton for this purpose.
Business operator	Tend to disagree	Because a well run licensed establishments are a huge benefit to the City Centre. The CIZ needs to be looked at differently. Plus many licenses have been granted within the CIZ so it seems to depend who you are.
Business operator	Tend to disagree	I believe businesses like Shelter Hall have proved that if responsibly run, companies can improve the area, rather than purely being the domain of the Police.
Business operator	Tend to disagree	<p>While I understand the aim of this policy, I feel it misses addressing the crux of the issue at hand - the pervasive antisocial behaviour manifested through alcohol and drug misuse during the day. The assumption that licensed premises are predominantly to blame, in my observation, is misguided. The root of the problem, as I encounter daily, is the consumption of alcohol in public spaces, often directly from cans.</p> <p>Brighton and Kemptown, in particular, suffer from a noticeable deficiency in law enforcement presence, enabling substance misuse to occur unchecked in the heart of our city. I have seen groups of individuals, thoroughly intoxicated, holding impromptu parties on the sidewalks, even to the extent of setting up barbecues in full public view, in the city centre.</p> <p>This behaviour, to clarify, is not linked to the operation of licensed premises, but rather to the apparent lack of oversight and control from the authorities. Therefore, I believe that the policy should be revised to effectively address these issues and preserve the safety and quality of life within our community.</p>
Business operator	Strongly disagree	I believe all new premises licenses should be given to individuals for the duration of their occupancy and not attached to the

		building. A fit and proper person check should also be carried out.
Business operator	Strongly disagree	The restrictions placed on business means creating a viable business difficult . With the pressure on high street retail and now hospitality business I am not sure what business will replace these units in the CIZ.
Business operator	Strongly disagree	This is absolutely a disgraceful way of handling the situation by punishing new businesses if you think there is a business who contributes this negative impact you should locate the premise and tackle the specific location you cannot just stop new business while they are paying their rent and rates and contributing the community while i do not believe these business especially with food have anything to do with this problem
Business operator	Strongly disagree	You are stifling new enterprise and business which is at the heart of what our wonderful city is famous for and what brings people to us. You are destroying the community, new upstarts, and all around have made Brighton and Hove a worse place to be.
Premises Licence Representative	Strongly agree	cause get better managing alcohol means safer and enjoyable road for everyone, too many drunk people and under age causing noise and trouble on the streets.
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly agree	There clearly are issues and ongoing attention is required.
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly agree	In principal a good thing
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly agree	There clearly are issues and ongoing attention is required.
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly agree	It is important not in risk increasing crime and nuisance levels.
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly agree	The City Centre on weekends and special event days see huge crime levels and a no go area for many. Important for this to be controlled.
Premises Licence Rep	Tend to agree	Agree it may help to limit antisocial behaviour
Premises Licence Rep	Tend to disagree	Whilst there is a need to be vigilant on all applications and potential effect, a blanket policy on refusing to grant licences within the CIZ stifles innovation and investment especially in a touristic destination city such as Brighton. Alcohol consumption is dynamic, tastes, styles, fashion are constantly changing and we need the ability for our centre to showcase that with so many craft and micro breweries and Sussex being the centre of the English sparkling wine industry. Ultimately it is the individuals responsible and education on sensible consumption constantly reiterated, but the policy due to the city's magnet for stag, hen and attracting a younger inexperienced drinker within a concentrated area (and hence absorbing resources) fails to take into account that there may be opportunities for quality niche premises which could enhance the experience of local and tourists alike and should treat each application on its merit.
Premises Licence Rep	Strongly disagree	The individual operators of licenced premises should be responsible and not black mark the area for new responsible operators

Responsible Authority	Strongly agree	Appears to be a common sense approach to achieving the licensing objectives, with the benefit of precedent and supporting empirical data.
Responsible Authority	Tend to disagree	I get that a lot of the issues relate to hospitality and in particular late night bars and clubs, however I feel the onus more is on the Government to properly fund the police to be able to have the resources it needs on the street. From working in the industry for over 15 years, I have noticed that the more police that are about, being proactive, the less issues are faced on the streets. Unfortunately, there will always be idiots who will want to cause trouble or who will get drunk to excess and want to cause issues, however a proactive approach in being able to deal with them and move them on is more contortive to a safer and better nighttime economy.
Other	Strongly agree	Because the constraints set up within the CIZ are based upon extensive, accumulative knowledge and there is evidence that it is helping to mitigate unruly and anti-social behaviour.
Other	Strongly agree	there are more than enough venues in Brighton
Other	Strongly agree	We agree that the concentration of business dispensing alcohol contributes to a well dodgy atmosphere in the city centre at weekends.
Other	Tend to agree	I tend to agree, although the policy is deliberately noncommittal in parts. For example: ".....this special policy is not absolute. Upon receipt of a relevant representation, the licensing authority will always consider the circumstances of each case and whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify departing from its special policy in the light of the individual circumstances of the case. If an application is unlikely to add to the cumulative impact of the area, it may be granted." ALL granted applications add to the cumulative impact, which is a mockery of the special policy. Another example is: "In a residential area for example the concerns of local residents will be relevant when considering applications for off-licences, pubs or cafes, especially if there is evidence of anti-social behaviour, street drinking or underage drinking." YES, they are relevant, yet residents are ignored.
Other	Tend to agree	I think it's a good idea to restrict licensable premises - provided there's evidence said premises are directly or indirectly encouraging alcohol related anti social behaviour.
Other	Tend to agree	I've put 'tend to agree' because, although we are outside the cumulative impact zone and so not directly affected, the policy sounds sensible. As long as it is possible to make an exception for an application that makes a good case for opening a new premises then the policy is not unfair and should be workable. The main difficulty probably lies in the Council's ability to resist pressure from a well-funded, expensively-represented commercial company or group, which could bias the policy against smaller applicants.

Other	Strongly disagree	<p>The matrix approach categorises premises types, which when first conceived, reflected relevant types of uses and occupiers. However, an increasing number of premises, particularly those considered to be more premium offers are providing an experience-based offer that does not neatly fit into the categories listed in the matrix. In our view, the uses set out in the matrix do not suitability define premises that provide high-end experience destinations in heavily managed locations that do not focus on consuming large quantities of alcohol.</p> <p>As a result, we believe that some uses may be subject to unnecessary restrictions on the basis of being considered to fall within a category that is not truly reflective of their operation, business model or the environment in which they wish to be located. The current approach permits limited flexibility, with departure from the matrix approach allowed only in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Given that the approach fails to reflect offers that do not neatly fit into the categories/ premises lists, we believe this approach imposes unnecessary restrictions upon take-up of new uses within key destinations across the city which would otherwise contribute positively to the city.</p> <p>As such the CIZ coverage is very broad and effectively encompasses all of the city centre, within which a blanket approach to assessing cumulative is employed for each application falling within this defined area. As the approach to special policy is consistent across the CIZ, it simply is not possible for it to be reflective of the characteristics of different areas within the city which would benefit from different approaches when managing the expansion of F&amp;B and leisure uses.</p> <p>The limitations of the existing matrix approach also relate to the spatial context of different locations within the CIZ. More specifically, given the consistent application of policy across the defined CIZ, it fails to reflect the dynamic nature of evolving town and city centres and the influx of F&amp;B/ leisure premises brought about by changing consumer demands which are not dominated by bars which take up a disproportionate amount of police resources.</p> <p>On this basis, we feel that areas such as Churchill Square Shopping Centre are currently being restricted from accommodating a more diverse F&amp;B offering and as a key focal point within the City and as a major attraction for visitors and local residents, should benefit from a more bespoke approach to attract premium premises that deliver experience-led destinations, with a very different offering to typical pub, bar and restaurant uses.</p> <p>The approach also means that it is virtually impossible to create modern hybrid formats that combine some alcohol sales, specialty retailing and other services.</p> <p>We would suggest consideration be held on the following amendments to the current approach to assessing Cumulative</p>
-------	-------------------	--

		<p>impact.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reconsider the extent of the CIZ boundary and amend to exclude areas less susceptible to cumulative impact.</li> <li>2. Proposed Zonal Approach to distinguish different areas of the City.</li> <li>3. Proposed criteria-based approach to better account for nuances between F&amp;B uses.</li> </ol> <p>Ultimately, we feel this consultation represents a real opportunity to create a more well-rounded cumulative impact policy through an integrated approach and as a result resolve cumulative impact more effectively.</p> <p>We recognise the importance of managing cumulative impacts across the City, however as Brighton and Hove are characterised by a number of different areas, the approach should be balanced and not inadvertently create significant barriers to diversification which is integral to the continued success of the City’s major shopping centre.</p> <p>Our view is that the current approach is inadvertently protecting and giving more value to existing drinking establishments which are having a negative impact.</p>
Other	Strongly disagree	<p>The matrix approach categorises premises types, which when first conceived, reflected relevant types of uses and occupiers. However, an increasing number of premises, particularly those considered to be more premium offers are providing an experience-based offer that does not neatly fit into the categories listed in the matrix. In our view, the uses set out in the matrix do not suitability define premises that provide high-end experience destinations in heavily managed locations that do not focus on consuming large quantities of alcohol.</p> <p>As a result, we believe that some uses may be subject to unnecessary restrictions on the basis of being considered to fall within a category that is not truly reflective of their operation, business model or the environment in which they wish to be located. The current approach permits limited flexibility, with departure from the matrix approach allowed only in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Given that the approach fails to reflect offers that do not neatly fit into the categories/ premises lists, we believe this approach imposes unnecessary restrictions upon take-up of new uses within key destinations across the city which would otherwise contribute positively to the city.</p> <p>As such the CIZ coverage is very broad and effectively encompasses all of the city centre, within which a blanket approach to assessing cumulative is employed for each application falling within this defined area. As the approach to special policy is consistent across the CIZ, it simply is not possible for it to be reflective of the characteristics of different areas within the city which would benefit from different approaches</p>



		<p>when managing the expansion of F&amp;B and leisure uses.</p> <p>The limitations of the existing matrix approach also relate to the spatial context of different locations within the CIZ. More specifically, given the consistent application of policy across the defined CIZ, it fails to reflect the dynamic nature of evolving town and city centres and the influx of F&amp;B/ leisure premises brought about by changing consumer demands which are not dominated by bars which take up a disproportionate amount of police resources.</p> <p>On this basis, we feel that areas such as Churchill Square Shopping Centre are currently being restricted from accommodating a more diverse F&amp;B offering and as a key focal point within the City and as a major attraction for visitors and local residents, should benefit from a more bespoke approach to attract premium premises that deliver experience-led destinations, with a very different offering to typical pub, bar and restaurant uses.</p> <p>The approach also means that it is virtually impossible to create modern hybrid formats that combine some alcohol sales, speciality retailing and other services.</p> <p>We would suggest consideration be held on the following amendments to the current approach to assessing Cumulative impact.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reconsider the extent of the CIZ boundary and amend to exclude areas less susceptible to cumulative impact.</li> <li>2. Proposed Zonal Approach to distinguish different areas of the City.</li> <li>3. Proposed criteria-based approach to better account for nuances between F&amp;B uses.</li> </ol> <p>Ultimately, we feel this consultation represents a real opportunity to create a more well-rounded cumulative impact policy through an integrated approach and as a result resolve cumulative impact more effectively.</p> <p>We recognise the importance of managing cumulative impacts across the City, however as Brighton and Hove are characterised by a number of different areas, the approach should be balanced and not inadvertently create significant barriers to diversification which is integral to the continued success of the City's major shopping centre.</p> <p>Our view is that the current approach is inadvertently protecting and giving more value to existing drinking establishments which are having a negative impact.</p>
Other	Strongly disagree	It's is blindly discriminatory and will lead to the potential of monopolies on the type of entertainment and clubs as the larger developers and businesses use their clout to muscle out the smaller more fringe venues.

Not Answered	Strongly agree	Lansdowne Area Residents Association, LARA strongly supports the proposal but suggests the area is extended to, thus including palmyra Square and Adelaide crescent which has problems of asb with which the police are dealing. This would be a policy reflecting joined up thinking.
--------------	----------------	--

### 3. General comments

How are you responding to this survey? As a...	Do you have any comments to make about the draft Cumulative Impact Assessment and supporting evidence?
Brighton & Hove resident	It is deflecting from the actual cause and problems of those abusing alcohol often in broad daylight but definitely in known places.
Brighton & Hove resident	Scrap it and come up with something better and enforce it.
Brighton & Hove resident	The number of problems arising from drunkenness, noise, fighting and urinating are likely to be much more numerous than shown in the complaints made to police, because residents feel it's a waste of time repeatedly reporting the same problems.
Brighton & Hove resident	The supporting evidence is a reflection of the daily life trading environment that businesses operate within.
Brighton & Hove resident	You may need to think about revoking current alcohol licenses to stop the impact business that are currently an issue and a risk to continue trading.
Brighton & Hove resident	A higher concentration of licensing will probably not increase the reports of antisocial behaviour and crime. Blanket rules never work. An in depth case by case attitude to licensing would be better. Maybe look at what each establishment sells. If they sell three shots for a fiver then they're probably gonna have more crime than a place that sells a cocktail for twenty quid.
Brighton & Hove resident	Although North Laine have several alcohol premises, high spot for complaints due to crime, disorder and public nuisance, recently yet another premise (on Trafalgar Street) was granted alcohol licence, so unfortunately I think this CIA will be toothless.
Business Operator	I do not agree that this information really supports the CIA - in some areas it actually states that crime has diminished over the stated timescale.
Business Operator	I have a big issue with the extent of 'off licences only' in the area and question the understanding and delivery of legal checks within these. Businesses who have teams trained and educated in Licensing, abiding by the rules and regulations with extra security measures for peak / high volume periods are delivering a far better experience for the city and economic strategy, i would question the contribution pure off licenses make or the responsibility they take.
Business Operator	I would want to look at problem premises specifically and not an overall as that seems counter intuitive.
Business Operator	Please see answer above
Business Operator	The combined financial pressures on hospitality business means a flexible approach to licensing will allow business to survive . The increased amount of unused units within the central part of the city gives evidence that the current structure could result in city losing its heart.
Business Operator	The current policy has not been supported by the councillors sitting on the licensing committee. They recently approved a licence for a huge new pub in Churchill Square. The CIZ policy specifically refers to 'exceptional circumstances', for example a new theatre that would need a licence for limited alcohol sales. The large capacity venue in Churchill Square simply stated that selling cocktails was 'exceptional'. This was a total disregard of the existing policies and make a mockery of the whole process, the councillors in question were taken in by the applicants persuasive barrister, and said that they would enjoy visiting the new bar themselves, which is not a reason to grant a new premises licence to a venue for hundreds of people in the CIZ area.

Business Operator	You can control crime and nuisance without destroying new business and night life. No one we talk feels the city is what it was, and it's harder than ever for young business people to do great things that have made the city so vibrant for years.
Business Operator	You should tackle the drugs and late time operating clubs and pubs which creates the problem you cannot just come up with a solution of not allowing new premises with licence its utter disgrace and cheap way of tackling the problem
Not Answered	See above. We welcome the evidence.
Other, please give details below	Is there a plan to further increase the CIZ, and incorporate other areas of Brighton & Hove?
Other, please give details below	Please extend the zone on the western boundary to St Johns Road, Hove. The western boundary is currently Holland Road and an extension to St Johns Road will include the shops between Holland Road and St Johns Road. That should help to reduce alcohol related anti-social behaviour in the gardens of Palmeira and Adelaide.
Other, please give details below	The draft is a sledgehammer policy that would not dare be used on say a number of places of worship placing undue stress on the local area because of parking etc
Other, please give details below	We believe the evidence base has evolved positively since the last consultation, incorporating a greater range of data sets obtained from a more granular level. We consider each of the data sets to be useful in isolation however would encourage further analysis to cross-reference the distribution of premises against occurrences of crime and disturbances to understand any connection that may exist. We feel this exercise would be useful to identify less vulnerable areas across the Cumulative Impact Zone where restrictions imposed by policy could be relaxed to promote opportunities to introduce more diverse uses. Following this consultation, we would welcome a publication from the Council that sets out how the data has been interrogated and how analysis has fed into any amendments to the cumulative impact policy. We feel that it is important for any changes to the policy position to be informed by a combination of consultation responses and clear trends in empirical data.
Other, please give details below	We believe the evidence base has evolved positively since the last consultation, incorporating a greater range of data sets obtained from a more granular level. We consider each of the data sets to be useful in isolation however would encourage further analysis to cross-reference the distribution of premises against occurrences of crime and disturbances to understand any connection that may exist. We feel this exercise would be useful to identify less vulnerable areas across the Cumulative Impact Zone where restrictions imposed by policy could be relaxed to promote opportunities to introduce more diverse uses. Following this consultation, we would welcome a publication from the Council that sets out how the data has been interrogated and how analysis has fed into any amendments to the cumulative impact policy. We feel that it is important for any changes to the policy position to be informed by a combination of consultation responses and clear trends in empirical data.
Other, please give details below	When looking at applications, and attending Hearings, an applicant has never been able to show that their applications will have no negative Cumulative Impact. It's subjective, isn't it? Also, what are 'Exceptional Circumstances'? What is listed is very weak. For instance, a plate of olives and a few crisps now amount to what is a 'substantial meal' waited at tables to obtain a Licence. Every applicant can say they are 'exceptional' and it is never questioned simply because it cannot be equated.
Premises Licence Representative	Happy with current CIA in place.
Premises Licence Representative	It's commendably thorough.
Premises Licence Representative	Some shops such as my own have the license mainly to sell cooking wine which doesn't impact on the community

Premises Licence Representative	The CIA /Z has good ideologies and principles in theory and the evidence the work and operations of the police seem to have a positive impact on antisocial behaviour related to alcohol misuse.
Responsible Authority	The evidence is clear that there is a lot happening within the Cumulative Impact Zone. I believe it to be unfair to in a way hold premises to account when licences have been granted over and over again. There are many pubs, bars and clubs who have restrictions on their licences to which others, like off licences etc don't have. Maybe they should have resources as part of there agreements like SIA registered staff working or closing later. I also believe some of the issues have stemmed from pubs being allowed to open later and have later licences. I do not know the data from before the late licences for pubs was introduced, however if pubs had to close earlier then there would be more people in smaller areas, which I believe in turn would help reduce the areas where resources would be needed as it would be more contained and then teams of say police could work in smaller areas and be more of a presence when necessary.

#### 4. Profile of Brighton & Hove residents who responded.

Postcode
BN2 3HT
BN1 4AR
BN3 7FR
BN1 2FJ
BN1 4AB
BN1 6PE
BN1 7HB
BN1 8NA
BN2 0EJ
BN2 1HP
BN2 1QE
BN2 3PJ
BN2 4TP
BN2 5JS
BN2 5YU
BN3 1NJ (x2)
BN3 5HJ
BN3 6FT
No response (x1)

How old are you?		
25 to 44 years old	4	20%
45 to 64 years old	9	45%
65 or older	3	15%
No response	4	20%
Total	20	100%

What gender are you?		
Female	7	35%
Male	8	40%
Other	1	5%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
Total	20	100%

<b>Do you identify as the sex you were assigned at birth?</b>		
Yes	13	65%
No	1	5%
Not Answered	2	10%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
Total	20	100%

<b>How would you describe your ethnic origin?</b>		
Asian or Asian British: Indian	1	5%
Mixed: Black Caribbean & White	1	5%
White: Any other White background	1	5%
White: UK/British	11	55%
White: Irish	1	5%
Not Answered	1	5%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
Total	20	100%

<b>Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?</b>		
Bisexual	2	10%
Gay	3	15%
Heterosexual/'Straight'	9	45%
Not Answered	1	5%
Prefer not to say	5	25%
Total	20	100%

<b>What is your religion or belief?</b>		
Agnostic	1	5%
Atheist	1	5%
Christian	5	25%
I have no particular religion	8	40%
Not Answered	2	10%
Prefer not to say	3	15%
Total	20	100%

<b>Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?</b>		
Yes a little	2	10%
No	13	65%
Not Answered	1	5%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
Total	20	100%

<b>Are you a carer?</b>		
No	14	70%
Not Answered	2	10%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
Total	20	100%

<b>Are you currently serving in the UK Armed Forces?</b>		
No	14	70%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
No response	2	10%
Total	20	100%

<b>Have you ever served in the UK Armed Forces?</b>		
No	14	70%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
No response	2	10%
Total	20	100%

<b>Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/household?</b>		
No	14	70%
Prefer not to say	4	20%
No response	2	10%
Total	20	100%