

1. ANSTON PARISH COUNCIL

From: Michael Gazur [mailto:Michael.Gazur@anston.gov.uk]
Sent: 13 February 2012 14:17
To: Bragg, Deborah
Subject: Proposal to introduce and alcohol Order

Dear Deborah,

Further to your letter dated 6th January 2012 regarding the proposal to introduce an Order under the Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places) Regulations 2001.

The Anston Parish Council would like to voice its full support for such a measure.

Yours sincerely

Michael Gazur
Clerk to the Anston Parish Council
The Parish Hall
15A Ryton Road
North Anston
Sheffield
S25 4DL

2. ASTON-CUM-AUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL

Hello Steve

Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council at its meeting yesterday evening, resolved to fully support the proposed introduction of an Order which will cover an extensive area of the Rotherham Borough, including the whole of the Parish of Aston-cum-Aughton.

I trust this support will be taken into consideration before the final decision is taken.

Regards
Alan J Hodkin
Clerk to Aston-cum-Aughton Parish Council

3. BRITISH TRANSPORT POLICE

From: Bridges, Graham [mailto:graham.bridges@btp.pnn.police.uk]
Sent: 23 January 2012 10:37
To: Licensing
Subject: Proposal to introduce a DPPO within Rotherham Borough

For the attention of Deborah Bragg

I am receipt of your letter regarding the above inviting comments on the proposal. I have also viewed the proposed map of the area subject of the DPPO on your website.

I am pleased to see that Rotherham railway station is included within the proposed area and welcome this order. DPPO's have proved to be effective in other areas and it is important from my point of view that the railway station is included at the outset.

In the past it has proved very difficult to get railway stations included after the order has been granted. If they are not included at the outset there is a danger that they will become a "drinking oasis" within the town centre or proposed area.

Any measure that helps reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti social behaviour at rail stations is welcomed by the British Transport Police.

Regards

Graham Bridges
Sector Inspector
Doncaster
0114 2592033

4. COUNCILLOR BECK – WARD 18 (WALES WARD)

From: Beck, Dominic
Sent: 09 January 2012 17:31
To: Bragg, Deborah
Subject: RE: Consultation on Proposed Designated Public Places Order

Dear Deborah,

I have only a few comments to make which I would like to be fed into the formal consultation. I would be in favour of a borough wide DPPO as it demonstrates consistency in policing and indeed clarifies for residents who may take personal issue with this order, in terms of ensuring that police and PCSO are brought to the attention of potential breaches of the order. We don't want a scenario where residents don't report instances because they are uncertain as to whether the geographical location is actually within the designated zone. Indeed with the best will in the world communicating a fragmented order zone to the public will of course throw up a few challenges.

In the event that a borough wide order is unachievable I would certainly like to see Harthill, in the Wales ward incorporated into this order. Harthill would be regarded as an affluent village with very few problems however on a Friday and Saturday night it is a completely different story. Gangs of youths enter the village, generally from Kiveton Park with alcohol and roam the streets until

silly hours in the early morning. A reason for this is that they perceive Harthill as an easy place to go about their activities and that the police won't find them. I can't emphasise strongly enough how extending the zone in this particular area of the borough would have a positive impact. Displacement of potential problems is the main concern with this order and I would like these few points seriously considering.

Personally I really don't see why he shouldn't/couldn't have a borough wide order. The areas that are not currently in the zone are intrinsically those which have the least propensity of crime, so extending the order to these areas will not over stretch policing resources to the extent that the priority areas will adversely suffer. It will safeguard the authorities against any bad press by having a blanket DPPO and will show as stated previously, consistency, bi-lateral thinking and a one size fits all attitude.

Regards

Dominic

Cllr. Dominic Beck

Rotherham Borough Councillor for Ward 18- Wales Ward

5. DALTON PARISH COUNCIL

From: Sue Lewis [mailto:daltonpc@hotmail.co.uk]

Sent: 28 January 2012 23:49

To: Bragg, Deborah

Subject: Proposal to Introduce an Order on Consumption in Designated Public Places Which Covers an Extensive Area of Rotherham

Hi Deborah,

Your correspondence regarding the above was circulated to Members of Dalton Parish Council at our January meeting and I was instructed to advise you that Dalton Parish Council welcome such an Order.

Regards.

Sue

Sue Lewis

Clerk to Dalton Parish Council

(01709) 702348

6. HARTHILL & WOODALL PARISH COUNCIL

From: Les Wheatley [mailto:les.wheatley@btinternet.com]

Sent: 13 January 2012 11:59

To: Bragg, Deborah

Subject: Fw: Consultation on Proposed Designated Public Places Order

Hello Deborah

This matter was discussed at the Harthill with Woodall Parish Council meeting earlier this week following the exchange of correspondence between Cllr. Beck and yourself.

The Parish Council fully agrees with Cllr. Beck's analysis and very much hopes that the village of Harthill can be included in the DPPO when it is established for the reasons stated in Cllr. Beck's submission.

The Council would be grateful if its views could be included in the consultation process. I am happy to discuss further if you wish.

Kind regards
Les Wheatley
Clerk to Harthill with Woodall Parish Council
Tel 01246 434908

7. Laughton-en-le-Morthen Parish Council (Incorporating Brookhouse, Carr, Slade Hooton and Newhall)

Deborah Bragg
Licensing Manager
Reresby House
Bow Bridge Close
Rotherham
S60 1BY



2nd February 2012

Dear Ms Bragg

Re: Proposal to introduce an order covering parts of Rotherham Borough

Further to our e-mail correspondence, Councillors have asked me to comment on the proposal which will designate certain areas where restrictions on public drinking will be applied. As a Parish Council, we are aware of the concerns our parishioners have in relation to the problems caused by people drinking in public places. We fully support the Borough Council's proposal, but would ask that our parish area is also covered by the regulations.

We have had reports of anti-social behaviour and public nuisance, largely associated with alcohol usage. Furthermore, there are parts of the parish where our ditches and verges are littered with empty lager cans which are often cleared up by local residents. We would welcome the order which would allow people to be prevented from consuming alcohol in these areas.

Our parish area covers Laughton-en-le-Morthen village along with the hamlets of Brookhouse, Carr, Slade Hooton and Newhall. We ask that all our areas are covered by the proposed regulation, as our surrounding areas are

included in your list: Laughton Common, Dinnington, Maltby, Thurcroft and Hellaby. If we are to be excluded, this could cause further problems for us as a parish if word gets round that our area allows the consumption of alcohol away from licensed premises.

I hope you take our concerns into account when making your decision on the proposal, which we feel is necessary for the whole borough. We are happy to meet with representatives of the council to discuss our concerns and reasons for inclusion further.

I look forward to hearing from you once the proposal has been revised.

Yours sincerely

Samantha Brooks
Clerk to the Council

8. Maltby Environmental Group Maltby Wood Lee Common and Craggs Meadow Steering Group

Dear Mr Richmond,

Re Public Notice Published Friday 6th January 2012 Regarding Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places) Regulations 2007

I write at the request of **Maltby Environmental Group** and also at the request of the **Maltby Wood Lee Common and Craggs Meadow Steering Group** (of which I am also Honorary Secretary) to submit comment with regard to the boundary of the proposed DPPO area in Maltby.

Maltby Wood Lee Common and Craggs Meadow Steering Group discussed the matter at its meeting held on Wednesday 25th January. Comment was minuted at item 9 and is reported below.

***9.Framing Comment on Maltby's DPPO Boundaries** The group looked at the boundaries in the Maltby area and commented (1) that the boundary immediately south of Hooton Levitt was undefined on the ground and (2) that in view of likely 'displacement', the whole of the Maltby Commons Local Nature Reserve including the Low Common SSSI should be included within the DPPO area. Possibilities were (a) a boundary running down Stoney Well Lane and along the watercourse or (b) extending the boundary from Stoney Well Lane down the western edge of Long Plantation to end on the A634 on the Maltby side of Stone. (c) Including all of Maltby Ward within the boundary*

After the meeting, further detailed work was undertaken on these suggestions which were then passed on for the consideration of Maltby Environmental Group.

Maltby Environmental Group met on Wednesday 1st February. In the light of the above suggestions, the group spent a considerable time looking at printed copies of a section of the ROAM system DPPO map in association with OS maps. Members also contributed of their intimate knowledge of the areas in Maltby which are vulnerable to alcohol fuelled anti-social behaviour. Additionally, and as a result of my research on this matter via reports on a number of local authority websites nationally, I was able to identify to members that 'displacement' issues were the overwhelming risks to be guarded against by those defining DPPO areas. The group's unanimous decision was to reject suggested boundaries a and c (above) and unequivocally to support suggested boundary b. which I now define in further detail and which I am happy to draw on a map for you.

SUGGESTED BOUNDARY REVISION

From GR SK 565930 (the point where the mineral line serving Maltby Colliery crosses the RMBC Boundary) our proposed boundary would run SW (as presently defined) only as far as the A631. There, instead of following the mineral line, it would turn east to follow the A631 for the short distance to its junction with Stoney Well Lane. The proposed boundary would then follow Stoney Well Lane SSE to Sandbeck Lodge then pick up the field boundary S of the pond and go W/N/W and S to skirt the northern section of Long Plantation. It would then continue S to follow Long Plantation's western edge and that of Rough Park before rejoining your proposed DPPO boundary on the A634 just west of Stone.

This boundary offers enormous advantages in operational terms. It encloses within a clearly defined and shorter boundary the Maltby Commons Local Nature Reserve including the Low Common SSSI Pieces Holt, Hell Wood and adjacent land all of which is known to be vulnerable to ASB emanating (via over- bridges and the level crossing) from Maltby Colliery Spoil Heap, Tickhill Road, White City/'Abbey Reach', Birks Holt and Blyth Road. Its adoption would offer an enhanced envelope of DPPO protection to the whole of eastern Maltby and hugely simplify enforcement.

Your comments on this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Alice Rodgers

9. MALTBY TOWN COUNCIL

From: Ann Stewart [mailto:maltby.town@btconnect.com]

Sent: 07 February 2012 16:40

To: Licensing

Subject: Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places

For the Attention of Deborah Bragg – Licensing Manager

Dear Deborah

The letter sent outlining the proposal to introduce an order which covers an extensive area of the Rotherham Borough was presented to Maltby Town Council on Thursday 3rd February.

The Town Council wholeheartedly support the proposal. On investigation it was found that the proposal does not cover the Craggs or the low common area of Maltby. These two places suffer the most from alcohol related anti-social behaviour. Therefore, we would respectfully request that the above mentioned sites are included in the proposal.

We look forward to hearing about any further developments and trust the proposal will go through with little or no delay.

Yours sincerely
Ann Stewart
Clerk and RFO
MALTBY TOWN COUNCIL
The Edward Dunn Memorial Hall
Tickhill Rd, Maltby S66 7NQ

Tel: 01709 814060

10. MASONS ARMS – WICKERSLEY

From: Neil Moore [mailto:neil.j.moore@btinternet.com]
Sent: 13 January 2012 19:01
To: Licensing
Subject: Alcohol Orders (Effect on Masons Arms Wickersley)

Hi Deborah

Just thought I would reply to the letter received informing us about restrictions to public places.

We at Masons Arms Wickersley fully support the proposed order.

It is a constant battle that we perform daily to stop people walking off the premises with open vessel alcohol. Not only is it a financial cost to the business but a nuisance to local people because they end up with the glasses/bottles in their gardens etc.

The effectiveness of the order will depend on enforcement. Sorry to say but I do not feel other licensees in my local area will proactively manage the policy which just makes my job harder.

I would want to see an effective information campaign & simple signage program to introduce the new order & help in enforcing the policy for the first few weeks.

Other ideas that may help:

All SIA door team will get an endorsement on their license if they are not active in enforcing the order.

All license holders to receive warnings (second warning requires investigation by licensing team) if found to not be enforcing the policy.

All taxi drivers will have their taxi permit revoked if they allow open vessel alcohol to be taken into or consumed in their taxi.

Regards

Neil Moore
Masons Arms Wickersley

11. **'DAVE' - NEGATIVE RESPONSE**

From: dave [mailto:ukspreads@blueyonder.co.uk]

Sent: 13 January 2012 13:59

To: Licensing

Subject: more freedoms dissolved

There are more 'statutes & legislation' than there are people in the UK! This control rush...is it a disease? I and my family have lived in Rotherham from generation to generation and we have seen horrific changes. It will soon be against the law to speak to someone in the street for fear of them 'collaborating to overthrow the government' I take my dog for a walk around late evening (from 11pm – 1am) I have been watched by a police helicopter from afar just in case I forget to pick up his 'accidents' or could it be that I am a suspect? It really is becoming unbearable to live in this country (or any other for that fact) if our ancestors could see what you've done I am certain they would haunt you for the rest of your lives. It is beyond insane; and that is putting it mildly to say the least. So it is now on the table for drinkers to be stripped of their property and fined...why oh why am I not surprised? Any more laws you'd like to bring in? Such as; running on the pavement, breathing onto someone, wearing the wrong clothes, looking suspicious (already implemented), driving a dirty car, kissing in public, filming the police (oops, already sorted), looking at children, using a mobile phone whilst walking, looking at women and vice versa, staring into a shop window (already spreading from the south) and all the other things that we normally do on a daily basis. Let's face it, what you are looking for is a completely subservient society that can be 'told' what to do, how to do it and when to do it! You do realise that this is a disease of the mind? Why control? Why power? Why money? As human beings we are made from infinitesimal pieces of energy called 'atoms' these atoms NEVER die, they are simply converted into something else (a spirit for example) now considering this, do you think that control, power and lust will change anything? Sorry for the astral lesson but you are in a word 'pathetic' we as a human race are equipped naturally to create a far better 'freer' world, if only those with diseased minds could see this...

Regards
David.

12. ORGREAVE PARISH COUNCIL

From: orgreavepc@tiscali.co.uk [<mailto:orgreavepc@tiscali.co.uk>]
Sent: 25 January 2012 13:03
To: Licensing
Cc: Swift, John; Julie Jackson
Subject: Alcohol Consumption In Designated Public Places - Orgreave

For the attention of Deborah Bragg,

We are in receipt of your letter dated 6th January 2012 regarding the Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption In Designated Public Places) Regulations 2011.

This consultation was an agenda item at our January Parish Council meeting.

It was noted by the Parish Councillors that Orgreave has been omitted from the land designated by description. We can confirm that we have an ongoing problem with youths drinking on our playground/playing field and we therefore request that Orgreave is considered to be added to the designated area.

I am sure that Julie Jackson, our local Police Community Support Officer will offer her support in our request.

Should you need to discuss this, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Debbie Morris
Clerk/Finance Officer
451 Retford Road
Sheffield
S13 9WB
Tel: 0114 2696381

13. RMBC GREEN SPACES

From: Lee, Andy
Sent: 20 January 2012 14:09
To: Licensing
Subject: FW: Alcohol Consumption Order Consultation

Deborah

Thank you for your letter of 6th January setting out the proposal to introduce an order relating to the restriction of alcohol consumption in designated public places. I believe this proposal will be beneficial to the majority of users of Parks, Recreation Grounds and Public open space within the designated areas you propose. It will help reduce both anti-social behaviour that is encountered by green space users and the fear of anti-social behaviour which can otherwise prevent the proper enjoyment of these places by the majority.

While not all alcohol consumption within parks has a negative impact, eg a bottle of wine with a picnic or alcohol consumed sensibly during specific events, the proposed order will give us and partner agencies a tool that can be used to mitigate against the worst effects of inappropriate alcohol consumption and persistent perpetrators of ASB.

I would suggest including the whole of Ulley Country Park in the designated area as one side of the park is in the area and one side not and is an area where alcohol is consumed by illegal swimmers during the summer. I would also suggest that Firsby Reservoirs, near Ravenfield are included in the designation as this also attracts swimmers and alcohol is often a contributory factor to the ASB that is encountered by staff.

Regards

Andy Lee
Urban Green Spaces Manager
Streetpride
Environment & Development Services
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

**14. Rother Valley South Pub Watch Dinnington, N & S Anston,
Woodsetts, Laughton Common, Kiveton & Wales C/o The Gallows
Public House, Hangsman Lane, Laughton Common S25 3PF**

Fao: Deborah Bragg

Dear Ms Bragg,

Re: Local Authorities (Alcohol Consumption in Designated Public Places)
Regulations 2001

Proposal to introduce an order which covers an extensive area o the
Rotherham Borough

As a Pub Watch we welcome any exercise to help to combat anti social behaviour. Being in the licensing trade we have all at some point experienced anti social behaviour in some form or other.

We have a few concerns and queries regarding the order which are as follows:

- **Why does the order not include all the Rother Valley South? E.g.:
Laughton En Le Morthen, Brookhouse, Harthill?** These are areas the Pub Watch and police cover.

- A designated public place – is this to include beer gardens in public houses?
- If a customer is outside and not in the beer garden, e.g.: smoking or near the doors is this classed as a public place?
- The late night levy seems to be aiming at public houses? Why?
- The levy if introduced does not include late night licensed premises such as supermarkets and restaurants?
- People leaving licensed premises, will they be an easy target for this order to be enforced?
- It would be best to target anti social behaviour from the misuse and sale of alcohol from off sales premises i.e.: supermarkets, off licences etc, this does not seem to be addressed in the order? All day venues i.e.: supermarkets and garages with licences from 8am to 10pm or even 24 hours being able to sell alcohol, RMBC are the one's issuing these licences?
- Public houses are a controlled place for drinking and socialising, all day venues as above are not monitored as in a public house
- Where will the money come from to police this order?
- Pub watch struggle to have a police representative attend meetings to help with issues that are mostly anti social related, where will the resources come from to enforce the order?
- As publicans we experience anti social behaviour from people 'Pre Loading' at home before coming out, how will the order address this issue?
- Drugs are now more related to crime/ anti social behaviour than alcohol how will this be addressed?

It is with great concern that we feel this order does not seem to address the main problem which causes the majority of anti social behaviour, being able to purchase large quantities of alcohol at cheap or even below cost at any time of the day or night. **No policing** can stop people drinking at home and 'pre loading'. This order will not stop the bigger issue.

Public Houses are a controlled and social part of drinking, the police have less calls and trouble from public houses, because people are drinking responsible, but they experience excessive calls which are alcohol and increasingly drug related, from the street, homes and gardens resulting from people purchasing cheap below cost alcohol.

Please remember Public Houses have strict rules that we enforce to keep our environment as safe as possible and we work closely with the police to keep it

that way. In conclusion we feel this order is just putting a 'band aid' over a much bigger issue that needs to be addressed with urgency. We can be contacted on 07896359958, the above address or return email if you would like to discuss the issue further.

Yours Faithfully
For and on behalf of Rother Valley South Pub Watch
Rother Valley South Pub Watch Committee

15. ROTHER VALLEY WEST AREA ASSEMBLY

Neighbourhoods and Adult Services

Rother Valley West Area Assembly Office
Aston Customer Service Centre
Worksop Road
Swallownest
Sheffield S26 4WD
Tel: 01709 254253
Email: andrea.peers@rotherham.gov.uk



My Reference: KT **Your Reference:** **Contact:**
Andrea Peers.

Steve Parry
Neighbourhood Crime & Justice Manager
Community Safety Team

13th February, 2012.

Dear Steve,

Designated Public Place Order Consultation Formal response from Rother Valley West Area Assembly Monday 16th January 2012

At the meeting of the Rother Valley West Area Assembly it was resolved that:

Rother Valley West Area Assembly fully support the introduction of the Designated Public Place Order (DPPO) and request that:

A) Consideration be given to extending the boundary of the DPPO to the Borough boundary.

B) If this is not possible that Ulley, Orgreave and the whole of Ulley Country Park be included in any Order.

Yours sincerely,

J. Swift
Councillor John Swift

Wentworth Valley Area Assembly fully support the introduction of the Designated Public Place Order (DPPO) and request that:

- a) Consideration be given to extending the boundary of the DPPO to the Borough boundary
- b) If this is not possible that Maltby Low and Far Commons and the adjacent area of Local Nature Reserve be included
- c) Consideration be given to extending the powers of Police Community Support Officers to allow these officers to enforce the DPPO.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Sue Ellis
Chair, Wentworth Valley Area Assembly

18. WOODSETTS PARISH COUNCIL

From: WOODSETTS PARISH COUNCIL [mailto:woodsettspc@btinternet.com]
Sent: 30 January 2012 12:42
To: Licensing
Cc: Richard Swann; Monica Carroll
Subject: Designated Places Prohibition Consultation

Further to your letter of 6th January 2012 advising of the proposed Order, this was discussed by the Parish Council at its Meeting on 25th January 2012. The PC resolved to support the proposal to include Woodsetts in the designated area of the Order.

Gordon Smith
Clerk to Woodsetts Parish Council

20 Storth Avenue
SHEFFIELD
S10 3HL
Tel. 0114 2306130