

ANNEX B

| Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about the existing Licensing Policy (2016-2021). | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|
| (a) The existing Licensing Policy is clear and easy to understand 13 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 30.77% |
| Agree | 5 | 38.46% |
| Disagree | 2 | 15.38% |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 7.69% |
| Don't know | 1 | 7.69% |
| (b) Applicants find it easy to use the existing Licensing Policy 12 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 3 | 25% |
| Agree | 2 | 16.67% |
| Disagree | 3 | 25% |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 8.33% |
| Don't know | 3 | 25% |
| (c) Overall the existing licensing policy is fit for purpose 13 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 3 | 23.08% |
| Agree | 7 | 53.85% |
| Disagree | 0 | |
| Strongly disagree | 2 | 15.38% |
| Don't know | 1 | 7.69% |

| Comments | Response |
|--|--|
| I believe the existing Policy has worked in its intention to reduce noise and anti-social behaviour; but littering is still a disgusting and huge problem. | Accepted, see proposed amendment to the Policy at Paragraph 13.4 (iv) |
| I believe the policy has worked well in preventing unacceptable noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour. I would however mention that it needs to be policed. The level of noise, anti-social behaviour and atrocious littering has been increasing dramatically on Wimbledon common during the lockdown. it is totally unreasonable to expect locals who already pay for the upkeep of the Common to come out every day and clear up the litter left by mainly youngsters often from outside the area. | Noted. However, this comment relates primarily to particular problems associated with illegal activities during the Covid 19 pandemic. However, the issue relating to littering from licensed premises is accepted and a proposed amendment has been made to the Policy at Paragraph 13.4 (iv) |
| It does not consider environmental damage or impact and we are in a climate emergency. Negative environmental including disturbance of wildlife should be included! | See proposed amendment to the Policy at Paragraph 13.4 (iv). However, the Policy can only address the four licensing objectives and consequently cannot take into account wider environmental considerations |
| It reduces poor behaviour in a quiet residential area | Noted |

ANNEX B

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <p>The CIZ adopted for Wimbledon Village Ward has helped to reduce - although not eliminated - the adverse effect of noisy, drunken behaviour in the village caused mostly by young visitors with no connection with the village. Before its introduction the situation was much worse and the CIZ must be maintained in its present form or strengthened to further reduce this behaviour which has an adverse effect on the village and its residents</p> | <p>See Section xxx of the report</p> |
| <p>The existing policy with regard to Wimbledon Village is a fair balance between business needs and the needs of the local community and should not be changed.</p> | <p>See Section xxx of the report</p> |
| <p>The Licensing policy relies on the amount of violence and police calls outs rather than the wider areas of impact on residents lives. For example, we live in Homefield road and have 3 Licensed premises nearby. We live with a constant stream of refuse collections at all hours of the night, day and weekends. Our road is in a constant state of collapse by trucks flouting the 7.5 tonne notice at the entrance of Homefield Road, most refuse trucks weigh 26 tonnes gross. We have a constant stream food and wine trucks leaving the engines running and refrigeration units running in the early hours of the morning. We have moped deliveries night and day. We suffer an unacceptable amount of litter from parked cars having a drink and sandwich from Tesco and throwing the plastic packaging in the street. The access alleyways at the rear of our house is rat infested with discarded food waste. The residents fought hard in the past to stop the late night drinking bar SW19 to gain a late license with little support from the Merton Council, in fact, the Council sided with the bar SW19 against the residents when the decision making was handed from the magistrates to the council. The only reason why this situation hasn't got worse is that the CIZ has been in place. Lifting this restriction takes no account of the long suffering residents in Homefield Road. The council would do better to Listen to the impact on residents lives Rather than just focusing on incidents.</p> | <p>See Section xxx of the report</p> |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following changes to the Licensing Policy set out in our new draft version?</p> | | |
| <p>(a) Removing sections that were repeating legislation and instead providing links to online resources 10 respondents</p> | | |
| <p>Response</p> | <p>Number of respondents</p> | <p>% of respondents</p> |
| <p>Strongly agree</p> | <p>0</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Agree</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>30%</p> |
| <p>Disagree</p> | <p>4</p> | <p>40%</p> |
| <p>Strongly disagree</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>10%</p> |
| <p>Don't know</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>20%</p> |
| <p>(b) A new Glossary that explains the terminology 10 respondents</p> | | |
| <p>Response</p> | <p>Number of respondents</p> | <p>% of respondents</p> |
| <p>Strongly agree</p> | <p>4</p> | <p>40%</p> |
| <p>Agree</p> | <p>5</p> | <p>50%</p> |
| <p>Disagree</p> | <p>0</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Strongly disagree</p> | <p>0</p> | <p></p> |
| <p>Don't know</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>10%</p> |

ANNEX B

| (c)Expanding the section profiling the borough 9 respondents | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 44.44% |
| Agree | 4 | 44.44% |
| Disagree | 0 | |
| Strongly disagree | 0 | |
| Don't know | 1 | 11.11% |
| (d) Expanding the matters that applicants are urged to consider when drawing up their operating schedules 10 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 2 | 20% |
| Agree | 4 | 40% |
| Disagree | 1 | 10% |
| Strongly disagree | 0 | |
| Don't know | 3 | 30% |
| (e)Adding a new Appendix confirming delegations of licensing decisions and functions 10 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 1 | 10% |
| Agree | 6 | 60% |
| Disagree | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 10% |
| Don't know | 2 | 20% |
| (f)Referring to the development of a set of model conditions that will be published on the Council's website 10 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 1 | 10% |
| Agree | 5 | 50% |
| Disagree | | |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 10% |
| Don't know | 3 | 30% |

| To what extent do you agree or disagree with the two additions proposed in the draft Licensing Policy? | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|
| (a) To allow a film to be classified by the Council rather than the British Board of Film Classification in exceptional cases 10 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | | |
| Agree | 1 | 10% |
| Disagree | 3 | 30% |
| Strongly disagree | 3 | 30% |
| Don't know | 3 | 30% |

ANNEX B

| (b)To urge applicants to apply for a Temporary Event Notice at least two months in advance of the event | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10 respondents | | |
| Response | Number of respondents | % of respondents |
| Strongly agree | 4 | 40% |
| Agree | 5 | 50% |
| Disagree | | |
| Strongly disagree | | |
| Don't know | 1 | 10% |

| Comments | Response |
|---|---|
| Apart from the above, the policy should not be changed. | Noted |
| As a resident in Wimbledon Village I am writing to object to the proposed withdrawal of CIZ licensing status for the Village area, especially in comparison to preserving such status in neighbouring Wimbledon Town Centre. Such a proposal is obviously likely to shift late night drinking and carousing, with all its associated anti-social repercussions, towards the Village area. Why should we Village residents bear the brunt and suffer accordingly? What right has the Council to force such a change upon us? If your response is that our local businesses need such a relaxation in order to flourish then I would counter that these are not desirable local businesses to have in such a residential area as ours, and would be no loss to the Village if they closed down. If anything, we need tighter regulations of these types of business, not looser. We already suffer from late night noise from the likes of Hemingways et al. Their clientele is not comprised of locals making use of a local amenity, but people from outside the area who have no regard for those living here. I make no excuses for having what could be seen as a NIMBY attitude towards this subject. There are areas of London where late night activity and noise is the norm, where the majority of the population is young and keen to participate in such activity - Wimbledon Village isn't one of them. If you want to relax the licensing policy you should arrange to rent a flat in the High Street, or next door to Hemingways, and live there for a while so as to experience what you've inflicted on the Village. | See Section xxx of the report |
| I would like the current Licensing Policy for Wimbledon Village environs to be continued and not reduced. | See Section xxx of the report |
| It is a mistake to cancel the Wimbledon Village CIZ designation which has been effective for the residents. The area is still residential and does not require a looser licencing policy. | See Section xxx of the report |
| It would be useful if the proposed Licensing document was actually provided rather than providing the old 2016 document behind the link to the proposal. #BusinessLike #BestLondonCouncil? | Unfortunately the wrong document was posted on the first day of consultation but this was rectified within 24 hours |

Eight people responding stated that they were residents of the borough and were responding on their own behalf. Of these 2 lived in the SM postcode area ,4 in SW19 and 2 in SW20. The remainder of those responding did not provide details of where they lived.