

New Licensing Policy for Buckinghamshire Council

Summary of key findings

Survey open: 27 August – 26 September 2021

Targeted to a stakeholder list: 110 responses (set out in detail on the next slide)

Location specific proposals: *(set out in detail on following slides)*

Proposal to remove the cumulative impact policy for Aylesbury: **majority agreement from respondents**

Proposal to remove the special hours policy for Buckingham: **majority agreement from respondents**

New policy proposals: all receiving broad agreement from respondents *(set out in detail on following slides)*

Street drinking

Use of outside areas

Consultation approach

Pub watch network

Public health, safeguarding children, environmental best practice approach

Underpinned by Licensing Objectives:

Preventing crime and disorder

Public safety

Preventing public nuisance

Protecting children from harm

Respondent Profile

There were no demographic questions included in this survey, so this profile focuses purely on the 'role question'

Total number of respondents = 110

Methodology:

Respondents by role: respondents were able to select more than one role option, so there are numerically slightly more responses than respondents. *This approach risks some double counting but was selected as the best representation of respondents' views on the basis of their roles*

Role	Responses
Resident	55
Licensed business	23
Non-licensed business	2
Councillor (Ward, Town or Parish)	18
Responsible Authority	7
Representative of residents	4
Representative of business	1
Other	5
Total	115

Data health warning:

We recommend caution on making assumptions based on these small samples – they are best seen as indicative only

Key Policies and Proposals: summary (1)

	In agreement	Not in agreement	Variations by role: Numbers and %s in agreement
Removal of the cumulative impact policy: Aylesbury	75 respondents, 68.2%	13 respondents 11.8%	Residents in agreement 38 responses, 61.8% Licensed business in agreement 17 responses, 73.9% Councillor group in agreement: 14 responses, 77.8%
Removal of the special hours policy: Buckingham	68 respondents 61.8%	17 respondents 15.5%	Residents in agreement 35 responses, 63.6% Licensed business in agreement 16 responses, 69.6% Councillor group in agreement: 14 responses, 77.8%
Street Drinking policy	89 respondents 80.9%	10 respondents 9.1%	Residents in agreement 47 responses, 85.5% Licensed business in agreement 15 responses, 65.2% Councillor group in agreement: 14 responses, 77.8%
Outside areas/space policy	88 respondents 80%	14 respondents 12.7%	Residents in agreement 12 responses, 81.8% Licensed business in agreement 14 responses, 60.9% Councillor group in agreement: 15 responses, 83.3%
Consultation on license applications	93 respondents 84.5%	3 respondents 2.7%	Residents in agreement 48 responses, 87.3% Licensed business in agreement 15 responses, 65.2% Councillor group in agreement: 17 responses, 94.4%

Key Policies and Proposals: summary (2)

	In agreement	Not in agreement	Variations by role
Pub Watch/Shop Watch policy	105 respondents 95.5%	1 respondent 0.9%	Residents in agreement 53 responses, 96.4% Licensed business in agreement 20 responses, 87% Councillor group in agreement: 16 responses, 94.4%
Safeguarding Children policy	96 respondents 87.3%	5 respondents 4.5%	Residents in agreement 51 responses, 92.7% Licensed business in agreement 15 responses, 65.2% Councillor group in agreement: 17 responses, 88.9%
Public health policy	81 respondents 73.6%	12 respondents 12.9%	Residents in agreement 40 responses, 72.7% Licensed business in agreement 15 responses, 65.2% Councillor group in agreement: 13 responses, 72.2%
Promoting environmental best practice policy	94 respondents 85.5%	2 respondents 1.8%	Residents in agreement 46 responses, 83.6% Licensed business in agreement 15 responses, 78.3% Councillor group in agreement: 15 responses, 83.3%

Notes

The In agreement/not in agreement totals do not sum 100% as “neutral” and “not sure” are not included

Variations by role

Below Survey Average Above Survey Average

Cumulative Impact policy: Aylesbury

This section sets out the proposal to remove the cumulative impact policy for Aylesbury, where there are concentrations of licensed premises so that there would no longer be a presumption to refuse late night licence applications. Applications for licences would still go through consultation and applicants would have to demonstrate how they would meet licensing objectives. The area would be kept under review.

There was a strong majority across all groups in favour of removing the policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
24 (21.8%)	51 (46.4%)	21 (19.1%)	7 (6.4%)	6 (5.5%)	1 (0.9%)

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	69.1%	14.5%	16.4%
Licensed Business (23)	73.9%	17.4%	4.3%
Non Licensed Business (2)	50%	0%	50%
Councillor (18)	77.8%	16.7%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	71.4%	14.3%	14.3%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	0%	100%	0%
Other (5)	20%	80%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury and Aylesbury Vale (42)	73.6%	19%	7.1%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	61.3%	19.4%	16.1%
Wycombe (18)	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%

Comments

Themes:

- Concern for residents where licensed premises are in residential areas
- That each application should be judged on its own merits rather than a blanket approach
- That the public realm should be well kept, with regular removal of litter

Selective licencing permitted based on type of establishment.
Not all licenced premises are the same

Removing the Cumulative Impact Policy, would likely increase the impact on residential properties within the town centre.

Aylesbury needs venues that offer various services, quiet drinking space, weekend entertainment and nightclubs for young people!

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Special hours policy: Buckingham

This question focused on the special hours policy for Buckingham town centre which was put in place following late night noise disturbance from late opening alcohol led premises and the student population. Applications to open beyond 12 midnight would normally be refused and all applications after 1.30am would be refused. Since the policy was introduced the nature of Buckingham has reportedly changed and the proposal is now to remove the policy.

There was a clear majority in favour of removing the policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
15 (13.6%)	53 (48.2%)	21 (19.1%)	11 (10%)	6 (5.5%)	4 (3.6%)

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	63.6%	14.5%	16.4%
Licensed Business (23)	69.6%	17.4%	4.3%
Non Licensed Business (2)	50%	0%	50%
Councillor (18)	77.8%	16.7%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%
Resident Rep (4)	75%	0%	25%
Business Rep (1)	1%	100%	0%
Other (5)	20%	60%	20%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Buckingham (6)	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Aylesbury Vale excl Buckingham(36)	75%	11.1%	11.1%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	41.9%	32.3%	19.4%

Special hours policy in Buckingham: Comments by themes

- The need for economic support for businesses at the current time
- Concern for the impact on residents where premises are in residential areas
- The need to monitor also licensed premises outside of the town centres

Special hours policies in general in Buckinghamshire Council area: comments by themes

- To keep the option for special hours policies but only implement if needed
- Judge applications on a case by case area, noting the context, in particular rural areas
- The need for consultation with local residents

Removing the special hours policy in Buckingham is a good idea and will encourage the economy

Removing a policy which protected residents may lead to opportunist business opening later and then having to reintroduce the policy

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Street drinking policy

This question focused on a proposal to place restrictions on off licences in areas which have Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs). Restrictions would include not selling cans and bottles in single cans and discouraging the sale of alcohol to known street drinkers. There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
49 (44.5%)	40 (36.4%)	8 (7.3%)	4 (3.6%)	6 (5.5%)	3 (2.7%)

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	85.5%	3.6%	9.1%
Licensed Business (23)	65.2%	13%	17.4%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	77.8%	11.1%	11.1%
Responsible Authority (7)	85.7%	0%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	0%	100%	0%
Other (5)	100%	0%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	81.0%	7.1%	7.1%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	71%	12.9%	12.9%
Wycombe (18)	83.3%	5.6%	11.1%

Comments

Themes:

- The need for visible monitoring and enforcement of this policy
- Concerns about the state of the public realm and the need to clear up litter
- That those acting responsibly may also be penalised by this policy
- The importance of tackling the causes of street drinking as well as the result and impact

practical steps designed to reduce street consumption of alcohol should be tested and applied - and licencees must play their part

shops that open late should take some responsibility for clearing up glasses and cans

Not sure how you can police this and people can still bring stronger strength alcohol from further afield.

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Outside areas policy

This question focused on controlling the use of outside areas. The pavement licence scheme introduced in response to Covid has made it easier for businesses to sell food and drink on the public highway subject to certain control measures. The Council wants to encourage the same control measures in all outside areas used by licensed premises. There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
38 (34.5%)	50 (45.5%)	8 (7.3%)	8 (7.3%)	6 (5.5%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	81.8%	5.5%	12.7%
Licensed Business (23)	60.9%	13%	26%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	83.3%	11.1%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	100%	0%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	75%	0%	25%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (5)	80%	0%	20%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	78.6%	7.1%	14.3%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	74.2%	9.7%	16.1%
Wycombe (18)	83.3%	5.6%	11.1%

Comments

Themes:

- Concern for residents where licensed premises may be in residential areas
- The importance of clearing litter from the public realm and the need for premises to take responsibility for this
- The need for businesses to be able to re-establish as Covid restrictions are eased so keeping limitations to a minimum
- The need for enforcement of the policy

External drinking / dining creates if managed well a great atmosphere in towns and supports the economy and vibrancy of an area

if it happens to be in a residential area then it is a nightmare for those residents night after night

welcome the increase in availability of outdoor spaces. The pub and restaurant owners have done a great job making such spaces dry and warm.

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Application consultation policy

This question set out the policy proposal that all notifications of new and variation applications are sent to local ward councillors and to the local town or parish Council as well as the existing requirements for applications to be published on the Council websites, notices to be served to statutory authorities and newspaper advertising. There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
45 (40.9%)	48 (43.6%)	14 (12.7%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (1.8%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	87.3%	9.1%	3.6%
Licensed Business (23)	65.2%	30.4%	4.3%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	94.4%	0%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	85.7%	14.3%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (5)	100%	0%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	88.1%	9.5%	2.4%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	74.2%	19.4%	6.5%
Wycombe (18)	83.3%	16.7%	0%

Comments

Themes:

- Strong support for wider consultation and engagement, in particular with those who know the local area
- Concern over the cost of advertising, in particular newspaper advertising

This is a really good proposal which facilitates greater awareness and scrutiny of all new applications

When parish councils are aware they can let residents know in advance

Is placing an advert in a newspaper still a suitable method of informing people? The cost of placing this type of advert is very high.

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Pub watch & Shop watch policy

This question focused on the proposal to encourage licence holders to take part in local pub watch and shop watch schemes, providing a network for licenced businesses to work together. There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
55 (50%)	50 (45.5%)	4 (3.6%)	--	1 (0.9%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	96.4%	1.8%	1.8%
Licensed Business (23)	87%	13%	0%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	94.4%	0%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	100%	0%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (5)	100%	0%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	95.2%	4.8%	0%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	96.8%	0%	3.2%
Wycombe (18)	94.4%	5.6%	0%

Comments

Themes:

- The importance of collaboration between Council departments and partners
- The great value that these schemes bring
- Whether it would be possible to make participation in these schemes mandatory
- Concern that this would bring additional bureaucracy

All licensees should be strongly encouraged to partake of these schemes as they do work and they foster communications between outlets and help reduce crime

Active participation in schemes should be compulsory..... the Council should be proactive in setting up collaborative mechanisms

There is a danger of mission creep and what starts as an 'encouragement' will become a criteria in assessment and then a requirement

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Safeguarding children policy

This question focused on the proposal to encourage operators of licensed premises to put in place a safeguarding policy. Operators of high risk premises would be expected to have a written policy and procedures including records of staff training. There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
54 (49.1%)	42 (38.2%)	9 (8.2%)	3 (2.7%)	2 (1.8%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	92.7%	3.6%	3.6%
Licensed Business (23)	62.5%	26.1%	8.7%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	88.9%	0%	11.1%
Responsible Authority (7)	100%	0%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (5)	80%	20%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	83.3%	9.5%	7.1%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	87.1%	6.5%	6.5%
Wycombe (18)	88.9%	11.1%	0%

Comments

Themes:

- The need for clear guidance from the Council in this area and sharing of good policies and practice
- Staff training would be important
- The policy should be carefully monitored and enforced
- Concern over additional bureaucracy

Safeguarding training for Licensed premises will help to protect people vulnerable to crime and exploitation.

Safety of children is paramount and any policy should be robust and monitored

This is a unnecessary burden on the premises, what evidence is there that this will in any way impact what is being targeted?

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Public health policy

This question focused on the proposal for licence applicants to consider the health impacts of alcohol and adopt measures to mitigate the risk to health including potentially staff training around the responsible sale of alcohol and avoiding promotions which encourage people to drink more.

There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
33 (30%)	48 (43.6%)	17 (15.5%)	8 (7.3%)	4 (3.6%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	72.7%	14.5%	12.7%
Licensed Business (23)	65.2%	26.1%	8.7%
Non Licensed Business (n)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	72.2%	16.7%	11.1%
Responsible Authority (7)	85.7%	14.3%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (n)	60%	0%	40%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	69%	16.7%	14.3%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	67.7%	19.4%	12.9%
Wycombe (18)	83.3%	11.1%	5.6%

Comments

Themes:

- That social drinking is a benefit to mental health and community, the emphasis here should be on not serving those already inebriated and under age drinkers
- Staff training would be important in this area and recommended for licensed premises to consider
- That the policy should be a requirement rather than encouragement
- That this policy goes beyond the scope of licensing

social drinking is a benefit to mental health and the community.....Drinking in moderation should not become a social wrong

Applicants should be mandated - rather than simply encouraged - to consider the health impacts.

it is not the role of the licencing department to manage health measures or seek to impact these through their licencing activity.

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

Environmental best practice policy

This question focused on the proposal to encourage operators of licensed premises to contribute to creating a greener and cleaner environment, by adopting environmental best practice measures such as minimising waste, improving energy efficiency and reducing traffic on the road.
There was a clear majority in support of the proposed policy.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
44 (40%)	50 (45.5%)	13 (11.8%)	1 (0.9%)	2 (1.8%)	--

Role

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Resident (55)	83.6%	12.7%	3.6%
Licensed Business (23)	78.3%	17.4%	4.3%
Non Licensed Business (2)	100%	0%	0%
Councillor (18)	83.3%	11.1%	5.6%
Responsible Authority (7)	85.7%	14.3%	0%
Resident Rep (4)	100%	0%	0%
Business Rep (1)	100%	0%	0%
Other (5)	100%	0%	0%

Location

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Aylesbury Vale (42)	81%	16.7%	2.4%
Chiltern & South Bucks (31)	83.9%	9.7%	3.2%
Wycombe (18)	94.4%	5.6%	0%

Comments

Themes:

- The importance of ensuring that litter is cleared from around licensed premises
- That there would need to be monitoring and enforcement of this policy approach to ensure that it was implemented consistently
- Not all environmental issues can/should be the responsibility of the operators of licensed premises

If there are ways for licensed premises to reduce traffic that is welcome, but I wouldn't consider it the duty of the operators of the licensed premises to do this

Consider implementing fines, enforcement for premises impacting areas with waste, nuisance more thoroughly

It's hard enough running a business without having to deal with additional burdens.

Supporting the Policy

Against the Policy

How easy were the policy and the survey to understand?

Respondents were asked if the policy and the survey were easy to understand and suggestions for making them easier to understand

Policy

Very easy	Quite easy	OK	Quite difficult	Very difficult	No comment
20 (18.2%)	43 (39.1%)	36 (32.7%)	5 (4.5%)	2 (1.8%)	4 (3.6%)

Themes:

- Highlight key aspects of the policy in summary
- Consider use of case study best practice examples
- More use of bullet points & diagrams

More bullet points instead of long sentences. More pictures/ diagrams. More examples.

easy to read summaries focused on the individual types of people who wish to use the policy

Survey

Very easy	Quite easy	OK	Quite difficult	Very difficult	No comment
41 (37.3%)	35 (31.8%)	30 (27.3%)	3 (2.7%)	1 (0.9%)	--

Themes:

- Restate the policy after providing the context
- Highlight key changes

it is not always clear what you are asking respondents to agree/disagree with. Restate the policy before asking this question, after context has been provided,

Good to have a survey that explains in detail.