

APPENDIX C

1. WIMBLEDON TOWN CENTRE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ZONE

Please tell us to what extent you agree or disagree that the Council should retain its special policy on cumulative impact in Wimbledon Town Centre to include all licence types? 100 respondents		
Response	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Strongly agree	70	70%
Agree	19	19%
Disagree	2	2%
Strongly disagree	4	4%
Don't know	5	5%

Comments	Response
The first comment relates to the Wimbledon Village CIZ so has been moved to that section	
As I don't live in Wimbledon town I feel unqualified to comment	
Before Covid restrictions (from March 2020 onwards) any issues seemed adequately managed.	Noted
Clearly necessary, particularly now that post-lockdown ASB is increasing	Noted
General noise levels in Wimbledon Town Centre have increased greatly in recent years and the evidence on health is that noise is a major cause of increased mortality whether the person affected notices the noise or not.	Noted. People living across the borough are encouraged to contact the Council's noise service if they experience noise nuisance from any premises
I believe this is a vital tool to ensure a fair balance between the interests of the residential and business communities.	Noted
I feel it is imperative to retain the CIZ in Wimbledon Town Centre in order to manage the number of outlets licensed to sell alcohol. I am aware that once a building is granted an alcohol license, the license stays with the building forever even if the tenant of the building changes. This has potentially long term damaging consequences to the Town Centre, especially in the current environment with business going bust due to Covid-19. Licenses maybe granted to a certain type of tenant, however in the years to come the tenant maybe a very different type of licensed establishment.	Once granted a licence can transfer to another operator who may continue to trade on the existing terms of the licence or seek a variation. If a licence lapses, is revoked or is surrendered then a new application must be made when any cumulative impact policy would come in to play, potentially reducing the number of licensed premises in the area
I fully support retaining the Wimbledon Town Centre CIZ; if it is working and improving the area for residents, why remove it?	Noted
I think that a CIZ is an excellent idea	Noted
Important to continue to control the amount of late-night drinking and activity in Wimbledon Town Centre to ensure that residents and other users can go to the cinema or return late in the evening from London without fear or misbehaviour and crime.	Noted
It has worked to reduce noise and incidents relating to late night alcohol consumption such as vandalism and littering.	Noted
It is imperative that the CIZ in Wimbledon Town Centre is retained in order to manage and coordinate the number of premises licensed to sell alcohol, especially late at night.	Noted

APPENDIX C

It is important to retain the special policy on cumulative impact.	Noted
It should remain in status quo	Noted
It works as it is so why review/extend it	The law requires a licensing authority to review its special policy on cumulative impact every three years. Such a policy can only be retained if there is evidence to do so substantive enough to provide a strong basis to refuse an application
It works, don't fix it	See comment above
It's working fine. If it ain't broke don't fix it.	See comment above
Like Wimbledon Town Wimbledon village should keep the present system	See comment above
Limitations to anti-social behaviour, public nuisance and noise abuse need to be kept in place. Littering is a disgrace and should be considered anti-social behaviour.	Noted. Littering does come within the licensing objective of the prevention of public nuisance but only in areas within the direct control of the licensee. However, see proposed amendment to the Policy at Paragraph 13.4 (iv)
No personal comment as I now rarely visit the Town Centre at night. Comments from people I speak to who do go there suggest it is both unruly and in many cases dangerous as a result of widespread alcohol and drugs abuse- exacerbated by minimal on the ground policing.	Noted
Provided that it continues to be monitored closely, I agree.	As required by law the assessment will be reviewed at least every three years although a review can take place more frequently if there appears to be a change in circumstances
The CIZ protection is vital to the town and the village to ensure that late night opening is controlled to minimise undue noise and disruption to residents. Withdrawal of the CIZ could well make the village a 'vibrant night time economy' which would not be in the best interests of a residential community.	Noted. See also main report
The scheme has improved the area especially late at night and at weekends.	Noted
The Town Centre is a busy hub, particularly evenings and weekends, where large numbers of people come into Wimbledon to enjoy and take advantage of the entertainment options. It is essential that, on the one hand, those visitors (and residents) can continue to enjoy those amenities safely without intimidation or harassment. And on the other hand that local residents are not subjected to excessive noise or disruption. Retaining the CIZ here would meet both objectives.	Noted
The Town Centre is a commercial hub surrounded by residential streets mainly occupied by families. It is important that it is a thriving commercial and leisure area and that the pubs and restaurants thrive, but that this occurs within a happily civilised ambiance where the consequences of disorderly and unsociable behaviour is not allowed spoil the quality of life that the CIZ helps to maintain.	Noted
The Wimbledon Town Centre should be fully supported by the Council to protect its residents from crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children.	Noted

APPENDIX C

The zone is important to ensure nuisance and antisocial behaviour is minimised and that residents do not have to suffer undue noise.	Noted
There remains too much anti social behaviour resulting from alcohol in Wimbledon Town Centre and so the CIZ must be retained	Noted
There are a lot of licensed premises and is a substantial gathering ground for young - often drinking - and so needs the protection	Noted
There are already many licensed premises in the town centre and on a Friday and Saturday night there are usually considerably more customers, which often leads to drunken and anti social behaviour. There are many residential roads close to the town centre and increasing the number of licensed premises can only be negative, particularly for the residents and bring down the atmosphere of the town centre as a whole.	Noted
There have been a number of alcohol fuelled disturbances in the town centre recent years. The CPZ assists the control of this.	Noted
This has had a beneficial effect on reducing noise / antisocial behaviour and should be retained	Noted
We do not wish to see a return o drunken and criminal behaviour in the town centre particularly with the continued threat of the COVID-19 pandemic hanging over us now and, I suspect, for a number of years to come.	Noted
We think that a CIZ is a good idea	Noted
Wimbledon Town and Village attracts many people from inside and outside the borough in particular at weekends and Thursday evenings. The inevitable consumption of alcohol, sometimes to excess, leads to antisocial behaviour which affects residents as well as businesses. It is vital we retain the CIZ status	Noted
Wimbledon town centre on a Friday or Saturday night is not a safe place to be. There are too many young people who have drunk more than is good for them and coming out of the cinema or restaurant late can be an unpleasant unsafe experience.	Noted
9 further comments relate to Wimbledon Village and have been moved to that section	

2. MITCHAM TOWN CENTRE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ZONE

Please tell us to what extend you agree or disagree that the Council should retain its special policy on cumulative impact in Mitcham Town Centre to include only off license premises?		
95 respondents		
Response	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Strongly agree	23	24.21%
Agree	10	10.53%
Disagree	5	5.26%
Strongly disagree	5	5.26%
Don't know	52	54.74%

APPENDIX C

To what extent do you agree or disagree that the Mitcham Town Centre cumulative impact zone should be extended to other license types?		
92 respondents		
Response	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Strongly agree	18	19.57%
Agree	10	10.87%
Disagree	2	2.17%
Strongly disagree	3	3.26%
Don't know	59	64.13%

If you would like the cumulative impact zone in Mitcham town centre to cover different license type please tell us which licenses you think it should cover and what evidence do you have for this? (Free text)
Comments
All licensed businesses in order to guarantee a holistic framework.
All on and off licenses as there is too much anti -social behaviour in Mitcham which is alcohol related
should include restaurants etc.
It needs to include all premises selling alcohol, not just off licenses.
Mitcham Town Centre should be fully supported by the Council to protect its residents from crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children.
Residents' rights to peaceful, crime-free neighbourhoods, vomit-free pavements, should take precedence over people's rights to drink late into the night, commit noise, litter the environment, etc.
There was a history of street drinking and disturbance in Mitchell town centre and the CPZ in this area is essential to control antisocial behaviour. There is a need to restrict the number of shops selling alcohol above 5% proof

Please tell us if you have any comments about the Mitcham town centre Cumulative Impact Zone? (Free text)	
Comments	Response
I am supportive of it , it should be retained and it should be widen to cover all licences	See main report
No comments other than that I support it fully.	Noted
There is a need to restrict the number of shops selling alcohol above 5% proof	The retention of the Special Policy on Cumulative Impact in Mitcham Town Centre is aimed at seeing a reduction in the numbers of off-licences in the area as licences are surrendered, revoked or lapse and new licences are not granted. A condition on existing licences regarding strength of alcohol can be added following Review if there is good evidence to do so.

APPENDIX C

3. WIMBLEDON VILLAGE CUMULATIVE IMPACT ZONE

To what extent do you agree or disagree that there is insufficient evidence to retain the special policy on cumulative impact for Wimbledon Village? 88 respondents		
Response	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Strongly agree	11	12.5%
Agree		
Disagree	4	4.55%
Strongly disagree	73	82.95%
Don't know		

Comments
<p>Most licensed premises in Wimbledon Village are surrounded by residential roads and there are also flats above many of the shops and cafes the High Street and Church Road. Many residents are vulnerable to the noise, disturbance, nuisance and other alcohol related issues caused by the behaviour of customers of licensed premises. Given the density of licensed premises the risks of these incidents occurring will continue and may escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. The Council's case refers to low levels of recorded incident data in Village Ward but the data cited references incidents which are primarily examples of crime and disorder. This low incidence is not surprising because the Village CIZ was designated in response to issues of nuisance and antisocial behaviour rather than crime and disorder. The majority of nuisance etc. incidents, by their nature, tend not to be reported to the police or the Council but they are still legitimate concerns for protection in a Licensing Policy. Withdrawing CIZ protection in the Village whilst retaining it for the Town Centre also risks promoting the Village as a destination where late night drinking is encouraged. There are empty shops in the High Street which could attract yet more restaurants rather than shops; without CIZ protection we could see more licences being granted as well as late night extensions for alcohol sales to boost trade. This would materially change the character of the Village for the worse and to the detriment of residents. An important proposal of this nature should be supported by survey evidence from residents in the affected area. No such survey has been undertaken; instead the Council is relying upon responses to questions about general perceptions of safety obtained from a 2019 borough wide sample survey which included only a very small number of Village Ward residents and was not representative</p>
<p>• The CIZ has worked effectively in the Village; this is a justification for its retention, not its removal. • The commercial premises in Wimbledon Village are surrounded by residential roads and there are also flats above many of the units in the High Street and Church Road. As was the case in 2005 there are many residents who are vulnerable to the noise, disturbance, nuisance and other alcohol related issues caused by the behaviour of customers of licensed premises. Given the density of licensed premises the risks of these incidents occurring will continue and may escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. • The Council's case refers to low levels of recorded incident data in Village Ward but the data cited references incidents which are primarily examples of crime and disorder. This low incidence is not surprising because the Village CIZ was designated in response to issues of nuisance and antisocial behaviour rather than crime and disorder. The majority of nuisance etc. incidents, by their nature, tend not to be reported to the police or the Council but they are still legitimate concerns for protection in a Licensing Policy. • Withdrawing CIZ protection in the Village whilst retaining it for the Town Centre also risks promoting the Village as a destination where late night drinking is encouraged. There are empty units in the High Street which could attract yet more restaurants rather than shops; without CIZ protection we could see more licences being granted as well as late night extensions for alcohol sales to boost trade. This would materially change the character of the Village for the worse and to the detriment of residents. • An important proposal of this nature should be supported by survey evidence from residents in the affected area. No such survey has been undertaken; instead the Council is relying upon responses to questions about general perceptions of safety obtained from a 2019 borough wide sample survey which included only a very small number</p>
<p>1. The question is very poorly phrased and potentially misleading. Why the double negative?? 2. My take on the evidence is that the CIZ is working well, and that it should be retained. There is no evidence that if the policy were not retained, the level of nuisance and anti-social behaviour would not go up. Perhaps there is evidence from other areas in the borough or from other boroughs what happens if such policy is reversed in a heavily residential area.</p>
<p>1. The CIZ has worked effectively in the Village; this is justification for retention, not removal. 2. The commercial premises in Wimbledon Village are surrounded by residential roads and there are flats above many units in the High Street & Church Road. As in 2005, many residents are vulnerable to noise, disturbance, nuisance and other alcohol related issues caused by customers of licensed premises. Given the density of licensed premises, the risks of incidents occurring will continue and escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. 3. The Council's case refers to low levels of recorded incidents in Village Ward but the data cites incidents which are primarily examples of crime &</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>disorder. This low incidence is not surprising because the Village CIZ was designed in response to issues of nuisance & antisocial behaviour rather than crime & disorder. Most incidents tend not to be reported to police or the Council but are still legitimate concerns for protection in a Licensing Policy. 4. Withdrawing CIZ protection in the Village whilst retaining it for the Town Centre risks promoting the Village as a destination for late night drinking. Empty units in the High Street may attract yet more restaurants rather than shops; without CIZ protection, more licences will be granted as well as late night extensions for alcohol sales. This will change the character of the Village for the worse, to the detriment of residents. 5. Such an important proposal should be supported by survey evidence from residents. No survey has been undertaken; instead the Council is relying on responses about perceptions of safety from a 2019 borough survey which included a very small number of Village residents & made no reference to proposed changes in Licensing Policy. 6. An emerging issue is the frequency of noisy, late night gatherings on Rushmere Common where alcohol is consumed & huge amounts of litter is left. This is no time to relax Licensing Policy!</p>
<p>All alcohol licenses should be included. Since the CIZ in the Village has been in place there has been no significant antisocial behaviour whilst the amenities of the Village have been maintained.</p>
<p>All alcohol licenses. It has been effective so this is reason to keep it, not remove it. People will move from the town to the village to take advantage of the different licenses. There have been alcohol related gatherings on the Common at the Village end causing considerable negative issues.</p>
<p>All restaurants, bars, pubs and hotels within Wimbledon Village to be licensed on proviso of good standards of management of the premises and of clientele within the premises and/or in streets and pavements within Wimbledon Village area.</p>
<p>Any establishment selling alcohol should be subject to this license. The recent lockdown showed us that Wimbledon Village and the area on the Common directly behind the Village attracted large numbers of youngsters - as well as groups of adults between 20-30 years of age-drinking excessively. Bottles of alcohol were being bought in the Village - and people then went on to Southside Common/Rushmere pond bringing loud music with them and organising mini raves. This field is already frequented by drug dealers at the end of Wimbledon Tennis Championships when all the helpers of the tennis tournament have their "end of championships party"- as some of the children have told me- and now we are advertised as a rave place. It is only a matter of time when we do not only have alcohol as well as drugs related crime issues. On one occasion in June during lockdown, there were 3 ambulances, several police vans with dogs to break up the festivities on a weekday night. If we do not continue to have the CIZ licensing, this will get further out of control as "word is out" about the fields behind the Village and local residents as well as businesses will suffer.</p>
<p>Anything that involves licensed premises which by their nature involves alcohol and which frequently is the cause of anti-social disturbances both in the village and on the common. I am not a licensing expert but anything that changes the balance of the existing village community without clear evidence should not be carried out.</p>
<p>Before the CIZ in Wimbledon Village was introduced there was a growing problem with anti-social behaviour especially during evenings and late at night as increasing numbers of bars and restaurants opened, some with late licences. In the years since the CIZ has been in place the level of anti social behaviour has been less although some still occurs, usually late in the evening. However there is a growing issue with drinking on the common around Rushmore pond in the evenings. The large groups of (mainly young) people are noisy and can be intimidating. The litter left behind is unsightly and a danger to dogs and wildlife, as well as requiring picking up. It would be a severely retrograde step to do anything which might encourage this drinking on the common. In addition, Wimbledon Village is a residential area with many families with young children. It should not be allowed to become a destination for late night activities with all the problems of noise and anti social behaviour that this would bring with it. The current CIZ achieves an acceptable balance of bars and restaurants with residential interests. It is important that it is retained.</p>
<p>CIZ for Wimbledon Village should cover all licenses. The number of premises and the hours they can sell alcohol are directly related to the amount of public nuisance that residents in an area will be exposed to.</p>
<p>I am no expert on licences but what licences are in place now work! The CIZ is needed to keep nuisance under control, that nuisance (noise, disturbance, littering, parking issues) still occurs, mostly at weekends, and that removal will change the character of the Village for the worse. In recent years have also noticed a lot more drinking etc on the Common</p>
<p>I believe strongly there should be a good balance between the amount of restaurants and small shops offered to the public in such a small area . At the moment thus is unbalanced , with too many restaurants and pubs compared to the amount of unique shops available which keeps the village alive. Crimes does also increase with the amount of restaurants and pubs .present.</p>
<p>I believe the CIZ for Wimbledon Village should apply to all licensed premises. The evidence to retain the policy is that it is working as is apparent due to the reduction in incidence reports since it was implemented.</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>I believe the status quo should be retained. The statistics of emergencies and complaints may be comparatively low, but I believe that is because of the effectiveness of the CIZ. Licences to sell alcohol in shops should clearly not be increased seeing the effect of the crowds meeting on the common nearby and leaving their rubbish. But no change is required, and the Village needs protecting to continue to be unique place it is.</p>
<p>I believe this should cover all existing licenses and that there should be very little scope for expansion of more premises. The village is already a destination for socialising - you only have to witness a weekend evening outside Hemingways. The fact that we do not have a significant problem of antisocial behaviour is already evidence of the efficacy of the existing CIZ. PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE IT!</p>
<p>I have lived in the Village area for over 30 years and am involved in owning 12 commercial properties in the Village itself. I am a great supporter of a vibrant and active community spirit for both visitors and residents alike and believe that High Streets must change and adapt to survive. We currently have a wide mix of pubs-5, restaurants-18 and off licences -5 and NO more are necessary to adequately supply all conceivable and rational demand. The current mix of types of licenses is fine.</p>
<p>I have lived in the village for over twenty years. We already have a lot of licensed premises in the village itself and on the common and in the Summer it's extremely busy already. The fact there is 'insufficient evidence' of crimes etc..suggests the CIZ status is working does it not? We have already lost much of the character of the village with most independent shops being forced to close due to doubling of business rates etc.. and now, post-covid, this is set to worsen as many chains have also had to move out.</p>
<p>I live in the Village Ward, roughly half-way between Southside Common and Ridgway. I have lived here for nearly 16 years. My sense is that incidents of nuisance and anti-social behaviour have, if anything, increased in the last few years. In particular, the area of the Common around Rushmere Pond has become a magnet for groups of people who are, or have been, drinking. The volume of litter they leave has grown significantly, despite the efforts of the Conservators and local residents to remove it. Noise levels have also grown, particularly on Friday and Saturday nights. Over the last few months alone, I have seen 8-10 men openly urinating on the Common and one vomiting. On each occasion, I was walking with my 12-year-old daughter during daylight hours. All of these incidents were unpleasant, but none merited a call to the police or a report to the Council. Cancelling the Village's status as a "Cumulative Impact Zone" will inevitably increase - possibly significantly - the incidence of this type of anti-social behaviour. All the more so if the CIZ in Wimbledon Town is retained (which will push drinkers up the hill to the Village) and if some of the vacant premises in the Village become (yet more) restaurants and bars. I would therefore be grateful if the CIZ in its current form is retained.</p>
<p>I think that Pubs, bars and restaurant licences permitting the sale of alcohol and other licensable activities should be covered by the CIZ in the Wimbledon Village area. There has been a noticeable increase in young people congregating on Wimbledon Common and the surrounding pubs leading to increased noise levels and dubious characters hanging around!</p>
<p>I think that the council should maintain the CIZ to cover all types of licence. Since its initiation we have only had comparatively minor breaches of the peace and anti-social behaviour</p>
<p>I think the CIZ should cover all premises selling alcohol including shops, off licenses, bars, restaurants and nightclubs.</p>
<p>I think the licences should be retained for all public houses and restaurants. There are many flats above these premises in the High Street and it is a densely populated residential area. The number of restaurants and bars has grown incrementally over the last few years and there is a huge influx of visitors from other boroughs at the weekend.</p>
<p>I understand that the reason for withdrawing the CIZ status for Wimbledon Village is the lack of evidence that justifies its existence - surely this lack of "evidence" (which presumably is in the form of complaints/police involvement in disturbances or criminal behaviour) is a result of the effectiveness of the current CIZ status? What reason would there be then, to withdraw that status in the knowledge that it would almost certainly lead over time to an increase in these incidents? It seems a strange approach. The village is a very special and pleasant environment in the evenings - it is usually quite busy and vibrant but the CIZ status means that we will not get even more licensed premises and late night licensing which would certainly threaten to destroy this lovely environment. The village attracts visitors from all over the world and is quite unique in feeling like a "country village" whilst still so close to central London. Let us preserve this please? I don't think that withdrawing the CIZ status can be justified, it can only lead to detrimental changes which will disturb and upset residents, place more demands on police time and resources and possibly put off visitors, particularly young families and the elderly. The village thrives so well as it is - don't change something which works so well!</p>
<p>In line with other similar areas where there are concentrations of licensed premises I strongly feel the Cumulative Impact Scheme should be retained to maintain the current improved situation.</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>in my view, there is a big difference between a town centre (Wimbledon town centre) and Wimbledon Village. Wimbledon Village and the adjacent Rushmere / Wimbledon Common is a fantastic environment for families. For this area there should be an adjudicated balance between residents and businesses. I am all for business in the Village, but where this might tip over is with possible anti-social behaviour which we are starting see with young adults (age unknown) having a few too many drinks on Rushmere. If at all possible, it would good to keep the CIZ please - the Village is not a town</p>
<p>It is simply not true that there is insufficient evidence here. The fact is that the CIZ has been very effective in the Village for years, and that is a strong justification for its retention. Removal of this protection for residents would result in the Village being the destination for late night entertainment, leading to particular noise and disruption for residents - and indeed to visitors, attracted to the Village's particularly environment. And it is that environment, which this proposal would seriously damage. All Merton residents should have the right to enjoy their local amenities, and share them with others, without fear of excessive noise, disruption, harassment, or intimidation. Opening up the Village to late night licensing and other amenities that fit badly in residential areas undermines that right. This is particularly wrong at a time when we are seeing increased groups gathering late at night on the Common, with music and alcohol, leaving large amounts of litter behind. Relaxed licensing in the Village will only exacerbate this problem.</p>
<p>It should cover all alcohol licenses. Wimbledon Village is a highly residential area and before the application of the Cumulative Impact Zone there was far more Anti-Social Behaviour late in the evening from customers from pubs and restaurants. There are already more than enough licensed premises in Wimbledon Village.</p>
<p>It should remain as it is now !</p>
<p>It should remain as it is. Absence of evidence of noise and behaviour nuisance as a result of the current CIZ is not evidence of absence. Reverting to no CIZ to gather such evidence is nonsensical. Alcohol consumption by large, probably illegal, gatherings on the common around the pond are evidence of nuisance and massive littering over the last few months. Please keep the village clean and free from anti social behaviour of all kinds by abandoning the notion that the CIZ can be removed. It is a very bad idea.</p>
<p>It should review the licenses to sell alcohol of all premises as there is a cumulative effect on the Village if the number of licensed premises increases given the size of the Village High Street.</p>
<p>It would be good to have a few late night places open in the village</p>
<p>Keep as present licensing</p>
<p>Late night alcohol licensing extensions should be covered. There is ample evidence that late night alcohol licensing leads to problems of undue noise, disturbance and nuisance for residents.</p>
<p>Late night drinking in the Village near the common. I don't want litter to increase.</p>
<p>Licence cover within Wimbledon Village is already more than adequate. Further extension/addition to licensed premises risk unwelcome consequences & damage to the social wellbeing of residents. One should also bear in mind the overspill effects onto Wimbledon Common & possible anti-social activities of drinkers who have been known to leave behind evidence of drug taking & smoking. This is not in the interests of families & children walking on the Common. Given the proliferation of licensed premises in the nearby Town Centre further outlets in the Village itself would be superfluous.</p>
<p>Licences relevant to businesses operating in Wimbledon Village - all of them as far as relevant!</p>
<p>I believe it is vital that the Council should retain the Cumulative Impact Zone for Wimbledon Village. My house and bedroom back on to the Dog and Fox and if their licensing hours were to increase it would have a huge impact on noise in the early hours of the morning, loud music, loud voices, visitors returning to their cars which are often parked in Homefield Rd. I have lived in the Village for 33 years and before the CIZ was imposed, there were many occasions when alcohol related incidents occurred and disturbed the residents' safety and sleep. I strongly urge you to retain the CIZ for Wimbledon Village.</p>
<p>Our view is that the lack of recorded data of incidents in Wimbledon Village is a sign of the success of Merton's previous policy. The Village is a highly residential area; the stability in number of licensed premises/hours of operation has allowed restaurants and pubs to co-exist (mostly) happily alongside the domestic aspect of the area. Changing the weighting of licensed establishments will change the character of the area substantially - something which is already at risk, given the high rates mean that "normal" businesses are priced out. There has already been a very heightened level of issues this summer with Covid, following big open air gatherings on the Common. Many of these may not reach recorded status, but involve e.g. young women being followed or cat-called on routes back from the station; urination</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>on streets/bushes; audible noise late into the night from the activities on the Common. Part of what makes Wimbledon work is the variety of its different areas. Merton has done a brilliant job of managing this diversity up till now. Please enable us to maintain something that is working well!</p>
<p>Poor behaviour has decreased since the introduction of the CIZ. We do not need to repeat the experiment</p>
<p>Resident in Church Road, SW19 Small incidents we don't usually report. Before Covid these were frequent. Things like leaving beer glasses or bottles, sometimes with drink left in, on the wall in foliage, say twice a month. Leaving bottles and glasses down by wall too, where people also sit to have a drink on the street side of our wall but actually still on our property. This is now happening again. I usually remove such things as quickly as possible before they attract similar dumping. Recently, I got the council to remove some beer bottles because of the Covid risk. With the easing of lockdown it is apparent that the later it is the louder the singing is in the street. It is usually one person but sometimes more. That happens about 3 times a week at the moment. The same volume increase happens when groups are getting in to cars, the later it is the more they shout. It happened before Covid too, but there seems more noise now.</p>
<p>Retain existing licenses only</p>
<p>Sale of alcohol. The CIZ has had a positive effect in maintaining a good sense of respect for resident neighbours. Any change that causes this to deteriorate will be unacceptable to those who live in the Village Ward.</p>
<p>Same licenses as are covered now</p>
<p>The CIZ for Wimbledon Village must be retained. There is a lot of late night nuisance.</p>
<p>The CIZ for Wimbledon Village should continue to cover all licenses. The Village is a very popular recreational area and the proliferation of eating and drinking establishments is as many as the area can tolerate. In my view there are probably too many. The CIZ has kept late night rowdiness in check but there is still plenty of it. If the CIZ is removed for the Village but retained for the Town the Village will, by default, be promoted as a late night drinking destination. This would be a disaster for what is, after all, primarily a residential neighbourhood.</p>
<p>The CIZ has been very effective in reducing noise and antisocial behaviour in Wimbledon Village and I am very strongly in favour of retaining it.</p>
<p>The CIZ has worked effectively in the Village; this is a justification for its retention, not its removal. The Council's case refers to low levels of recorded incident data in Village Ward but the data cited references incidents which are primarily examples of crime and disorder. This low incidence is not surprising because the Village CIZ was designated in response to issues of nuisance and antisocial behaviour rather than crime and disorder. The majority of nuisance etc. incidents, by their nature, tend not to be reported to the police or the Council but they are still legitimate concerns for protection in a Licensing Policy.</p>
<p>The CIZ has worked effectively in the Village; this is a justification for its retention, not its removal. · The commercial premises in Wimbledon Village are surrounded by residential roads and there are also flats above many of the units in the High Street and Church Road. As was the case in 2005 there are many residents who are vulnerable to the noise, disturbance, nuisance and other alcohol related issues caused by the behaviour of customers of licensed premises. Given the density of licensed premises the risks of these incidents occurring will continue and may escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. · The Council's case refers to low levels of recorded incident data in Village Ward but the data cited references incidents which are primarily examples of crime and disorder. This low incidence is not surprising because the Village CIZ was designated in response to issues of nuisance and antisocial behaviour rather than crime and disorder. The majority of nuisance etc. incidents, by their nature, tend not to be reported to the police or the Council but they are still legitimate concerns for protection in a Licensing Policy. · Withdrawing CIZ protection in the Village whilst retaining it for the Town Centre also risks promoting the Village as a destination where late night drinking is encouraged. There are empty units in the High Street which could attract yet more restaurants rather than shops; without CIZ protection we could see more licences being granted as well as late night extensions for alcohol sales to boost trade. This would materially change the character of the Village for the worse and to the detriment of residents. · An important proposal of this nature should be supported by survey evidence from residents in the affected area. No such survey has been undertaken; instead the Council is relying upon responses to questions about general perceptions of safety obtained from a 2019 borough wide sample survey wh</p>
<p>The CIZ in Wimbledon Village appears to be working well. The lack of evidence to the contrary suggests that it should not be changed. The High St does not need more restaurants or drinking establishments and changing the CIZ status is likely to encourage those kinds of applications. There is not currently a licensing or problem in the Village - so if it's working, why change it?</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>The CIZ should continue to cover off licences and restaurants/pubs/bars with off sales licences. There is significant residential concern over public nuisance incidents such as noise and anti-social behaviour and that this will only increase if the CIZ is changed.</p>
<p>The council should be taking steps to prevent any further letting of premises for restaurants and bars and do everything possible to encourage the regeneration of the Village High Street for retail and small independent businesses.</p>
<p>The council should obtain proper survey evidence from the residents before contemplating any change to the current CIZ. Existing premises already properly licensed should retain their status but there should be no more licenses granted.</p>
<p>the Cumulative Impact Zoning for Wimbledon Village has worked well to reduce anti-social behaviour, noise and public disturbance since it was established in 2016; I believe that to retain the rules of the CIZ is necessary and will benefit the Village.</p>
<p>The current CIZ for Wimbledon Village should remain. The proposal is based on insufficient evidence of crime & disorder but this ignores the potential nuisance and anti social behaviour which could have a very detrimental impact on residents. No survey has been done of residents in the Village Ward to inform this proposal and there is a real danger that the Village will become a hub in Wimbledon for late night drinking and associated nuisance behaviour. There is already an increasing problem of young people gathering around Rushmore pond in large crowds in the evening for underage drinking and without regard to any social distancing with no enforcement action by the police or local authority.</p>
<p>The current CIZ has been a success and should be retained. Its success is no grounds for removal. The village already has a high proportion of licensed premises and if the CIZ was lifted while the Wimbledon Town Centre CIZ remains it would encourage late night drinkers to gravitate from town to village. There are also a number of empty premises in the village which could attract yet more restaurants seeking drink licences with late night extensions. In any event no change should be made without a proper survey of Village residents. I only heard about this consultation because a neighbour told me.</p>
<p>The current CIZ has protected the quality of life of residents living in and around the Village, maintaining a fair balance between the interests of businesses and residents. There is no upside to removing this special policy in my view for residents. Because it has worked, it is vital that it is retained.</p>
<p>The current licensing system works. The current CIZ status ensures there is due respect for residents. There is no need for further licences to be granted in the area. There is no parking, immediate public transport is restricted to buses and the pavements are not particularly wide. Encouraging more people to come to this area already is irresponsible particularly at this time.</p>
<p>The current position must be retained. The fact that there is limited alcohol related anti social behaviour (although this summer there have been huge issues on the Common- we live nearby) is not a reason to retain the CIZ of the Village. It is a testament to its success. It would be crazy to do away with it because it is working - you will only have to re introduce it when the situation deteriorates again which it will inevitably do</p>
<p>The current supply of both on and off licensed premises should not be increased, in particular the off licensed premises. The impact on local residents is bearable at the moment, however during the summer off license sales seemed responsible for a large increase in litter and noise etc... The nearby stretch of common round Rushmere pond was a magnet, and the cost to the Common Conservators and irritation to local residents extreme. Restaurants will come and go, and the impact on their survival will not be helped by increasing their number. 3 restaurants seem to have closed since March and before that over the last 10-15 years one pub as closed completely and two changed to restaurants and a third became a coffee venue. As a Village Ward resident, the current supply of licensed premises seems acceptable, although at times noisy and intimidating. I also get the unpleasant smell of cooking as I am behind the High Street. The pavements in the High street are narrow in some places and when busy in the evenings do make it hard to get about, especially for the disabled. The parking for evening visitors also affects residents parking and ease of pavement access.</p>
<p>The fact that there has been little evidence is surely a way of stating that the policy is working. With the empty properties in Wimbledon village new socialising establishments may be developed. With the town retaining the impact zone Wimbledon village will be badly effected. It should be the same as the town.</p>
<p>The licensed premises in the village lie in close proximity to a great many residential properties. There are already a large number of such premises, with associated noise, disruption, rubbish and nuisance. There is no need to increase their number and a CIZ protects this in law.</p>

APPENDIX C

The reason that there is little recorded incident data is evidence that the Village CIZ is working effectively. The argument to the contrary (that because there is little incident data, a CIZ is unnecessary) is disingenuous and a false dilemma. Without a CIZ, it is entirely likely that antisocial behaviour, noise and late night disturbance will increase, to the detriment of the residents. Wimbledon Village already has many pub's, bars and restaurants. Without CIZ protection we will see yet more being established with all the associated problems that the village has sought protection from. This is the very reason that a CIZ exists. The village is a village, a place for residents and shops that residents would like to see, not a drinking destination

The reason there would appear to be insufficient evidence is that the current system is working well. Given the numbers of licensed premises in the Village, the risks of late night noise, nuisance and antisocial behaviour will continue and may escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. An important change of this nature should be supported by survey evidence from residents in the affected area. No such survey has been undertaken to my knowledge

The proposal to drop the CIZ for Wimbledon Village is ill-conceived Council's proposal is ill-conceived: • The lack of recorded incident data is unsurprising; the Village CIZ was designated in response to nuisance and antisocial behaviour issues, many of which, by their nature, are not reported to the police or the Council but they are still legitimate concerns for protection in a licensing policy. (The "Prevention of Public Nuisance" is one of the stated Objectives in Licensing legislation.) • In any event, lack of recorded data is more likely to be a reflection of the effectiveness of the CIZ. Given the numbers of licensed premises in the Village, the risks of late night noise, nuisance and antisocial behaviour will continue and may escalate unless properly controlled by CIZ protection. • Withdrawing CIZ protection risks bringing unwelcome change to the Village. There are empty units in the High Street which could attract yet more restaurants rather than shops; without CIZ protection we could see more licences being granted as well as late night extensions for alcohol sales to boost trade. Do we want the Village to have a "vibrant night time economy" - which is how Wimbledon Town Centre's late night alcohol related problems are frequently, if somewhat euphemistically, described? • An important change of this nature should be supported by survey evidence from residents in the affected area. No such survey has been undertaken; instead the Council is relying upon responses to questions about general perceptions of safety obtained from a 2019 borough wide sample survey which included only a very small number of Village Ward residents and made no reference to proposed changes in licensing policy . The COVID-19 pandemic is likely to be with us for many years to come. Removing the CIZ from Wimbledon Village will substantially increase the risks of a pandemic outbreak in the area

The restrictions on late night opening for bars, restaurants, clubs etc should be retained and, if anything, made even tighter than at present. Residents in the Village expect to have quiet and peace at night and frequently complain about the levels of noise caused by people using late night venues. Even where the noise may be contained within the venue whilst the customers are inside, ie if they are not actually sitting or standing outside the venue, then such people tend to cause excessive noise when they leave the venues and walk to wherever their cars etc are parked. This is because they frequently stand around their cars talking in loud voices before finally leaving. At night time, when there's very little other ambient noise, such late night conversations are themselves a major disturbance to the nearby residents, never mind any noise coming from the venues themselves (which is itself a disturbance, especially when they open their doors in fine weather). All of this excessive noise leads to disturbed sleep patterns, and stress, amongst residents. There are more than enough causes of mental health issues today without your policies needing to add to them. On the other side of the equation there is absolutely no justification for any loosening of the licensing restrictions on these businesses. They can not argue that they need to stay open ever later in order to survive, because they started out under the current licensing rules. But if you relax the licensing rules then it's a dead cert that the likes of Hemingways and the Fire Stables will take advantage of this and stay open later, causing regular disturbance. But further, we then run the serious risk of the Village appearing attractive to more such businesses, potentially turning the Village into a noted night time spot. I don't need to spell out the consequences of this for you

The Village is a honey pot for people arriving from outside the area to enjoy the pubs and restaurants and that is good for businesses and supported by the community. However, despite the CIZ, we still suffer late night noise as people leave the pubs, people urinating and throwing rubbish and cans in the gardens along the roads off the High street eg Church Road, Lancaster Gardens. There is increasing disturbance from underage youngsters gathering on Rushmere, drinking into the night and there is increasing drug use in the area. The CIZ offers some protection against this very much residential area being blighted by increasing out of hours disturbance. Alcohol licensing hours and late night outdoor area drinking and eating should continue to be covered by the CIZ. It's not perfect, but it's a useful safeguard and maintains a decent balance. Why trash the Village brand?

There are already several large licensed properties in Wimbledon Village. The CIZ has protected this area from excessive development and should be retained. It seems disingenuous to use 'insufficient evidence' as an excuse to eliminate the policy just because it has had the desired effect of protecting the village. As is well known there is a lack of parking in the

APPENDIX C

<p>village so creation of more large licensed premises would further increase the nuisance of hired cabs and noisy crowds at 'closing time'.</p>
<p>There are many residential street around the High Street and the scheme works very well at the moment. Why change something that's not broken</p>
<p>There is a proliferation of F&B outlets in Wimbledon High Street and along the Ridgway but the area is primarily residential, with many flats and houses all the way above and opposite the licenced premises. The existing CIZ has worked well and as a result there has been until recently little disruption and disturbance in the area, with the exception of the 2 weeks per year of the AELTC Tennis Championships. The apparent need for statistical evidence of disturbance and disruption caused by licenced premises is at odds with the success of the CIZ, as by definition this successful CIZ has eliminated trouble of the sort it set out to eliminate, at least until the recent era when drinking has been pushed outside. Furthermore, residents are acutely aware of the limited resources of the Council and Police and are reluctant to waste Council or Police time unless there is a major disturbance. No thorough survey has been undertaken by the Council of these issues and until such a survey is undertaken it is arguable that a decision not to renew the CIZ could be challenged by judicial review, which would certainly result in considerable extra expense to the Council. In addition, there have been a statistically significant number of incidents since lockdown was lifted, including an estimated 900 youths partying by Rushmere Pond, victualled by alcohol and pizzas sold by Village F&B outlets and necessitating the presence of nearly 200 policemen to break up this event. The Commons Conservators as well as the police have also had to step in to disperse a number of similar events. The area around the Crooked Billet has also recently suffered from disturbances of a similar nature. This is surely not the time to be removing CIZ protection from Wimbledon Village.</p>
<p>There is every indication that the current CIZ Licences arrangement is working to protect the well being of residents in the locality against undue nuisance, crime, to protect children and to safeguard others availing themselves of the current facilities in the village. Recent experience on the common has demonstrated behaviour that is not acceptable and at times lawful. and well and keeps nuisance and noise under control t To remove the CIZ would spoil the Village and surrounding area. In summary the CIZ has contributed to a conducive environment in the village and the CIZ should be maintained to continue to protect the neighbourhood in the future. There is no evidence to suggest that the CIZ should be removed. To do so would add to a further demand on the overstretched emergency services in the area and would fly in the face of the responsibilities of the local authority whose remit is to protect its residents and to prevent harm as set out in the Care Act 2014. Merton Council is barely able to cope with the alcohol and substance abuse and all that is associated with this within the borough and to encourage more would doubtless increase demand and encourage yet more damage to people's lives.</p>
<p>There is little evident demand for any change from local residents who prefer the current arrangements which maintain the character and individuality of the village.</p>
<p>This is crazy logic. The CIZ clearly works in Wimbledon Village so should be retained. Also the Council seems to base their decision on no supporting data which surely must be open to challenge. How can the Council expects residents to produce evidence supporting retention when they have none supporting removal.</p>
<p>We have been very pleased with a reduction in anti-social behaviour during the period of the CIZ. We are very concerned that The removal of the CIZ during what we foresee as a forthcoming period of social unrest is an issue of great concern</p>
<p>Whilst it is important to be able to balance the interest of residents and businesses, Wimbledon Village is a home to many families and it is therefore important that the level of late night activity on the high street is carefully controlled to ensure that residents can live and sleep without the nuisance of noise from people and cars. That there is insufficient evidence of crime and disorder incidents, alcohol-related ambulance call outs or complaints to environmental health services etc does not mean that a CIZ is no longer needed, surely it is evidence that the CIZ has worked to achieve a proper balance between the competing interests of business and residents. By proposing the removal of the CIZ the council risks undoing all the good achieved since 2005. Why must there be evidence of bad things happening in order to support the maintenance of this order. Why doesn't the council congratulate itself on a job well done and keep things as they are. The licenses that the CIZ should cover are those for all restaurant and pub/winebars within Wimbledon Village.</p>
<p>Why does the council expect a resident to come up with "evidence" in support of a proposal? The simple fact is that there was clearly originally a problem and this was addressed by the imposition of the CIZ. So what evidence does the council have that this initiative has failed? What evidence has the council provided showing that a majority of residents are against the continuation of this policy? I suspect there is none. The existing arrangements are a fair balance between the needs of businesses to operate, the desires of residents to have places to socialise and the rights of residents to live in a relatively peaceful environment. What evidence is there to show that this balance is out of line? Wimbledon Village attracts a lot of people, with high proportions of young people, and has a lot of premises serving or selling alcohol. To retain the Village as a pleasant place to live, it is important that there is strong control. If the town</p>

APPENDIX C

<p>remains as a CIZ (as it should) and the Village is not, that will put extra pressure on the Village. Village drinking seems to spill over onto the Common and an ability to keep control of that is important.</p>
<p>Wimbledon Village CIZ has been effective in reducing incidents of antisocial behaviour relating to late night alcohol consumption. The fact Council are citing fewer incidents as a reason to withdraw CIZ status is completely illogical. It is not a big city centre full of commercial properties - Many people now live in the village and shouldn't be expected to put up with loud drunken behaviour. And in the age of coronavirus why would you want to encourage it.</p>
<p>Wimbledon Village has a considerable quantity of residential accommodation, and the volume of entertainment activities, and especially licensed premises already impacts negatively on the noise and litter levels of the area throughout the year. Any relaxation of the current policy will be detrimental. The status quo should remain, and all licensed premises should have limited opening hours to preserve a degree of night time quiet.</p>
<p>Wimbledon Village is both a retail and residential community. What we have now creates a balance between the two. There is little late night anti social behaviour/ alcohol related crime but that, I feel, is because of the CIZ. If you remove these protections, then Wimbledon Village could revert to what it was before and more like what Wimbledon Town is like now. There are lots of empty shops in Wimbledon Village. We need a balance between daytime retail and restaurants. There already are enough restaurants. Removing the CIZ could lead to more restaurants / alcohol sales in the area.</p>
<p>Wimbledon Village should be fully supported by the Council to protect its residents from crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children.</p>
<p>1. CIZ designation for Wimbledon Village since 2006 has had a beneficial effect in preventing an increase in the number of licensed premises in the Zone and in ensuring that residents' concerns about controlling nuisance etc. are properly addressed in licensing applications. (Most applicants apply speculatively at first for late night opening every night). Removal of the designation will reverse these benefits and will have a long lasting and detrimental impact upon the character of the Village (eg Open Season on new applications for late night opening, new premises opening etc, etc.) 2. The Cumulative Impact Assessment upon which the recommendation is based relies heavily upon an analysis of data relating to Crime and Disorder incidents. These are not relevant to the Wimbledon Village CIZ which was designated in response to incidents of Public Nuisance. The Prevention of Crime and Disorder and the Prevention of Public Nuisance are separate but distinct Licensing Objectives which are of equal value when considering a CIZ designation. They have not been given equal weight in the Assessment. 3. The survey evidence cited in the assessment reporting residents' views on perception of crime, personal safety and other considerations was from a 2019 sample survey across the Borough. It gives neither a representative view in the Village Ward (the sample was too small) nor is it relevant in the context of Village CIZ licensing matters as respondents weren't asked about licensing related issues including their experience of nuisance incidents. 4. By their nature, incidents of Public Nuisance (such as noise and antisocial behaviour) tend not to be reported by residents nor require intervention by the police or other authorities so the absence of incident data should not justify an assumption that there have been no nuisance issues. Residents living in and around the Village say that they do experience ongoing nuisance issues (eg late night</p>
<p>The Council should not make any change to the current CIZ. This would be particularly damaging in the Village as there are already quite enough licensed premises. Any reduction in the existing CIZ would increase noise and disturbance to local residents.</p>
<p>Should include Wimbledon village</p>
<p>The cumulative impact zone (CIZ) is essential to protect the village from becoming a late night drinking/eating destination. Whilst it is essential for any high street to have a vibrant bar and restaurant scene, if licensing of late night venues is allowed, the incidence of noise, crime and nuisance will increase and safety will be compromised. I have no doubt that these matters have been kept under control to date because of the CIZ being in place. I also believe that if the CIZ is removed, more bars and restaurants will be attracted to the area, forcing out other shops (which will upset the balance of the types of proprietors on the high street) and making the village a destination for late night revellers.</p>
<p>The existing policy has worked well and should not be changed . The suggestion that policy should be relaxed because there have been relatively few adverse incidents In Wimbledon village is wrong in principle. The reason why there have been few incidents is precisely because the area is designed as a CIZ . If this status is removed the effects for residents will be a significant increase in nuisance , alcohol related incidents and noise related disturbance.</p>
<p>the improvement noted in nuisance and rowdy behaviour is probably the result of the CIZ. Moving the village out of the CIZ seems perverse.</p>

APPENDIX C

To cancel a policy for insufficient evidence seems perverse. Is that because of the successfulness of the policy or because of the majority of these incidences don't get reported because they are nuisance or anti-social? The Village is generally a successful place and it seems illogical to change something that works when there is no reason for doing it.

W'don Town centre may be well suited to the current CIZ but to cancel the Village's is illogical. Quite clearly there are little Incidents reported because of its CIZ ! To remove it will create incidents that our overstretched police will have to deal with

Wimbledon town and village is changing rapidly from being a charming place where people could stroll and buy different things, have lunch, coffee and enjoy the atmosphere. NOW , it is all about drinking culture to kill this charm. Inappropriate social behaviour late at night, drugs and alcohol is now the attraction and what Local the inhabitants Have to endure . It is so sad to see the deterioration of Wimbledon village . Visitors of pubs and Restaurants urinate at night by our gate etc.

Wimbledon Village and the adjacent Rushmere / Wimbledon Common are special to families and businesses alike. It would be wrong lose the fair balance between residence and local businesses that I understand CIZ provides. if it is not too onerous to keep the CIZ in place, it would be better to keep the CIZ in place. I would not like to see Wimbledon Village degraded

4. INTRODUCING A SPECIAL POLICY ON CUMULATIVE IMPACT IN ANOTHER AREA OF THE BOROUGH

Do you believe that there is evidence to support the introduction of a special policy on cumulative impact in any other area of the borough?

86 respondents

Response	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Yes	5	5.81%
No	6	6.98%
Don't know	75	87.21%

Please tell us where you think new cumulative impacts zones should be and what evidence you think there is for this?

(Free text)

Comments

I believe that there is no evidence to support that there should not be a CIZ in all areas.

Merton is principally a residential borough that nonetheless benefits from good and traditional entertainment amenities, including theatre, pubs and restaurants. All residents and visitors to the borough have the right to enjoy those amenities safely and without risk. Merton is not central London, it is not a late-night-life area or known for its late night amenities. There is no reason to change that, or change the character of the different parts of the borough.

Raynes Park would benefit from a cumulative impact zone, on both sides of the railway bridge. I believe that due to the current CIZs in Wimbledon Town Centre and Wimbledon Village, which I hope will continue, anti-social behaviour, noise abuse and public nuisance as well as littering will expand into areas where there is no CIZ in place. Due to the trains servicing Raynes Park until well into the night it would produce a safe(r) environment for travellers were it to be covered by a CIZ.

Should be introduced in Wimbledon Town Centre as well as Raynes Park and retained in Mitcham.

RESPONSE STATISTICS

98% of those that answered stated that they lived in the borough (84 respondents)

14.29% of those that answered stated that they were replying on behalf of a resident or

APPENDIX C

community organisation (12 respondents).

No responses were received from a business or commercial organisation

This page is intentionally left blank