

Appendix 4

Summary of Consultation responses

Breakdown of consultation responses

Online Survey:

- Members of the public: 38
- Landlord/ licence holder: 2
- Member of staff within a licensed premise: 4
- Total: 44

The Council received responses from the following groups:

- Health and Wellbeing Board
- Licensing Committee
- Public Health
- South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue

Three drop-in sessions were planned across the borough for licensees and members of the public. Three licensees attended these meetings to ask specific questions about the impact of the new policy on their licence. No comments were received on the changes to the policy itself.

The following sections outline the response to the consultation for each question asked on the online consultation. A brief summary of the written responses is then outline below.

1. Cumulative Impact

The consultation asked for a response to the statement:

There is a need for Cumulative Impact Assessments in a part, or parts, of the borough

Row Labels	Need for CIA	%
Strongly agree	24	55
Agree	9	20
Disagree	1	2
Strongly disagree	3	7
Unsure	7	16
Grand Total	44	100

If a respondent agreed, or strongly agreed, the consultation asked for a further response to the following question:

Which area, or areas, of the borough would benefit from a Cumulative Impact Assessment?

Area	Total	%
Anston and Woodsetts	1	3
Boston Castle	2	6
Brinsworth and Catcliffe	2	6
Rotherham East	1	3
Rotherham West	1	3
Sitwell	1	3
Wath	1	3
Wickersley	23	72
Total	32	100

All respondents were asked the following statement:

The number of licensed premises in Wickersley have a negative impact on the area, including higher levels of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

Row Labels	Count	%
Strongly agree	15	36%
Agree	7	17%
Disagree	10	24%
Strongly disagree	5	12%
Don't know	5	12%
Total	42	100%

Public Health: With respect to whether Wickersley would benefit from a Cumulative Impact Assessment, it appears clear that residents have raised significant concerns particularly in respect to public nuisance and crime and disorder that require addressing. I support a Cumulative Impact Zone covering the appropriate area and continued work with existing license holders to try to resolve the issues raised by residents.

In addition, whilst I acknowledge that a Cumulative Impact Zone might hinder the desired redevelopment of the Town Centre, given the high risk rating of this area flagged by the Alcohol tool, I suggest that some consideration is given to the process by which Town Centre license applications are considered. This should include consideration about whether the venue type is in-keeping with the desired vision for the Town Centre.

Finally, although other localities of concern have not been raised by residents to the same extent as Wickersley, it is important to be mindful of the impact of alcohol harms on health inequalities. Lower socioeconomic status is associated with higher mortality for alcohol related causes, despite lower socioeconomic groups often reporting lower levels of alcohol consumption. This is described as the alcohol harm paradox. Given a number of studies have found areas of greater deprivation to have greater concentrations of alcohol outlets, it will be important to keep open the option of further Cumulative Impact Zones in areas of higher deprivation so as to reduce the potential to further exacerbate alcohol-related harm in deprived neighbourhoods.

Health and Wellbeing Board: One of the biggest priorities of the Health and Wellbeing Board is reducing health inequalities between our most and least deprived neighbourhoods. The board would therefore, support health inequalities being taken into consideration as part of the cumulative impact assessment process.

Licensing Committee: The Committee were in favour of such an inclusion in the Statement to prevent certain areas being adversely affected and any new applications needing to be proactive in providing supporting information. The Committee were mindful this would not mean new applications in a Cumulative Impact Zone would be refused, but any valid objections considered. They supported Wickersley being a designated Cumulative Impact Zone. As this is a new initiative the Committee will seek training about this issue. The Committee welcomed further guidance around the issue and asked that further training be provided.

2. Additional Model Conditions

Respondents were asked to respond to the following statements:

Public Health issues such as alcohol-related harms and obesity are important when making licensing decisions

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	12
Agree	15
Disagree	7
Strongly disagree	5
Unsure	4
Grand Total	43

Licensing Committee: The Committee welcomed the idea of a 'Public Health Licensing Toolkit, as this would enable Licensing Officers to assess the prevalence of alcohol related problems in local areas and to advise Licensing Committee as to the potential health impacts of a licensing decision on a local area. The Committee were in full support of using the Public Health toolkit.

Public Health: I am pleased to note that the Council are proposing some new requirements through this policy such as using public health data to assess licensing decisions, and expanding the Council's model conditions to include the prevention of single can sales in some areas, accredited training for door staff and annual training for licensees and employees.

I can confirm that a Public Health Alcohol Licensing tool will be available on the Rotherham Data Hub site as part of the Rotherham Joint Strategic Needs Assessment¹. This tool will be annually updated with any data more recently available and expanded should further indicators become available.

Licensing officers should assess the prevalence of alcohol related problems (such as crime and disorder, noise, antisocial behaviour, etc.) in a community when considering an alcohol-related licensing application

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	21
Agree	18
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	2
Grand Total	43

In sensitive locations, granting further licences might have a negative impact on the area

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	19
Agree	14
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	4
Unsure	3
Grand Total	44

Restricting the sale of single cans of alcohol would reduce related harm and nuisance

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	8
Agree	13
Disagree	3
Strongly disagree	6
Unsure	13
Grand Total	43

Public Health: As well as restricting sales of single cans, I suggest that other best practice model conditions could be suggested for license holders who would like to demonstrate their intent to promote responsible drinking, such as through commitments to not promote reduced price drinks, offer a good range of low alcohol and alcohol-free drinks, and to discretely provide details of local alcohol support services.

Licence holders, door supervisors and staff should undertake training such as counter-terrorism, protecting vulnerable people from harm and children's safeguarding

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	24
Agree	11
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1
Unsure	6
Grand Total	44

Safeguarding measures relevant to the premises should be required for license holders and staff, such as criminal record checks any appropriate training

Row Labels	Count
Strongly agree	25
Agree	16
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1
Grand Total	44

Health and Wellbeing Board: The board are particularly supportive of:

- Greater use of public health data to inform licensing decisions;
- The prevention of single can sales of alcohol and the acknowledgment that this may contribute towards alcohol-related harm, particularly for children and young people;
- That persons employed on licensed premises receive appropriate training covering safeguarding of children and vulnerable adults and, if appropriate, have the necessary DBS checks.