

Public Forum

Full Licensing Committee

29 February 2024



Statements	
Number	Name
PS01	Mina Manning
PS02	David Mair
PS03	Rosemary Heald
PS04	Tony Walmsley
PS05	Ben Sweet
PS06	Chris Horler
PS07	Andy Killoran
PS08	Rob Nash
PS09	Richard Jones
PS10	Graham Bultitude
PS11	Paul & Wendy Headington
PS12	Lamber Yang
PS13	Alan Carpenter
PS14	Bernice Gollop
PS15	Judith Brant
PS16	Simon Burbidge
PS17	Liz Brealey
PS18	Mamta Narayan
PS19	Ian Carruthers
PS20	Chris Binding
PS21	Councillor Patrick McAllister
PS22	Simon Pepper
PS23	Javier Gutierrez
PS24	Dan Ackroyd
PS25	Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend
PS26	Janet Wilson



Statements

PS01 – Mina Manning

I would like to register my request that the City Centre CIA be retained, for the health and wellbeing of all residents. Getting rid of the City Centre CIA would have a negative impact resulting in significantly increased anti-social behaviour.

PS02 – David Mair

I am writing to you regarding the council's plan to scrap the Cumulative Impact Area in Bristol and the potential effect on local residents.

Living in the city centre, we fight an ongoing battle to protect the character of our local neighbourhoods. Licensing applications occur frequently and require co-ordinated action on our part to enforce some sense of civic responsibility. Otherwise opening hours would be much later, outdoor seating would spill out directly into residential streets late at night and anti-social behaviour would escalate even further.

The CIA manages the number, type and density of licensed premises within the city centre area (including Harbourside where I live). The effect of abolishing the CIA will be that applications for licensed premises are granted automatically, unless there is good reason not to. This will remove an essential protective barrier which helps safeguard residents in the city centre and it will encourage the 'night-time economy' to expand still further at the expense of local communities. It will completely unbalance the system of checks and balances currently established.

The consequence of this is clear. Anti-social behaviour and crime will rise and this will further degrade the area. Avon and Somerset Police have already argued this and support the retention of the CIA. It seems entirely counterintuitive at a time when more and more of the city is being given over to residential accommodation that such a safeguard is being removed. It presents a very real threat to local communities who are already on the back foot when it comes to defending the character of city centre neighbourhoods as family-friendly spaces.

What is equally concerning is the process that seems to be at work here. As you are aware, last year Bristol City Council 'consulted' on whether to continue the Cumulative Impact Area. 191 responses were received with 67% in favour of retaining the CIA.

Having reviewed the information provided by the police, xxx, and the other consultation respondents, the working group somehow did not support the retention of the current CIA, instead recommending that it is scrapped.

The report of the consultation went to the Licensing Committee on 25 January 2024 but residents were not informed. (It is interesting that, even so, only 2 statements were received in support of scrapping the CIA). Bristol Live reported that 'after more than an hour's debate' the Councillors voted along Party lines with 4 in favour of continuing the CIA and 4 against.



Now the report will come back to the Licensing Committee on 29 February for a further debate. Though councillors knew of this date a month ago, it wasn't made public until last Wednesday 21 February. Neither was the City Council civic diary - consulted by various interested Bristolians and the media - updated until last Wednesday. This gives the public just a week's notice to comment. It's almost as if the council wanted to keep residents in the dark about this meeting in order to minimise the window for objections. The optics are not good. To conclude, I object to the proposed abolition of the CIA and support the police, my local councillor and majority of residents in wishing to see this essential safeguard retained. I also object to the seemingly anti-democratic processes being applied to try to ensure this proposal is passed. It looks very murky indeed. I would expect better of my local council. I trust that my views will be taken into account and this statement will be filed appropriately.

PS03 – Rosemary Heald

I am most concerned by the possible removal of the CIA in the centre of Bristol which I understand will be considered on 29th Feb. I only found out about the meeting last week on 21st Feb, (only a week before the meeting) and it feels like notice of the meeting was deliberately withheld so that not many people could attend or would object. The CIA gives some protection to people who live in its area.

Over the last few years there has been a proliferation of late-night bars around harbourside which is a mixed residential area and this has changed the character of the area considerably. This increase has led to increased nuisance to residents in terms of noise nuisance making it hard to sleep, general mess in the area including vomit and general refuse. Residents simply don't feel safe when there are lots of drunk people around late at night and in the early hours which has led to increased crime and anti-social behaviour.

The police themselves say that they want the CIA to remain in place as they will struggle to police the area if there are more late-night drinking venues. I also understand that in the public consultation exercise two thirds of the public wanted to retain the restrictions.

Without the CIA it would be down to residents to fight a rear-guard action every time a new licencing application is made. This is simply unfair on residents who don't have the time and energy to pursue them all. Thank you for taking my view into consideration.

PS04 – Tony Walmsley

I was deeply concerned about the proposal to remove the Cumulative Impact Area which I understand ensures scrutiny over licensing applications. Cathedral Walk is a residential area and protection needs to ensure that people are not disturbed during the night. I would urge all licensing decision makers to use the 'would I agree if it was close to my home' test. Working people have a right to peace and quiet and avoid late night outside drinking and noisy egress from licensed properties in or adjacent to residential areas.

PS05 – Ben Sweet

I am writing about the council's proposal to remove to Cumulative Impact Assessment area. The removal of the CIA would take away a whole level of scrutiny when it comes to licensing applications.



Currently the CIA manages the number, type and density of licensed premises within the city centre area (including Harbourside). Without it, applications would be green-lit automatically, without any oversight. Even more than now, it would come down to residents to try to control the spread of bars, late night license applications, and all the problems that come from this in terms of crime and antisocial behaviour. The police have already reported this back to the council. Given the previous feedback to the council in which two thirds of respondents opposed the abolition of the CIA I suggest the council needs to look at the evidence again and listen to its constituents.

PS06 – Chris Horler

I believe the council is intending to remove the CIA for the city centre and Harbourside. I am a resident of Harbourside living near to the bars the licencing committee have allowed to open in recent years. Brewdog being the closest. I strongly object to the removal of the CIA. And, I believe stronger controls and a default position of favouring residential preferences is required.

In my view the controls on licencing are not strong enough (today). They are having a detrimental effect on the community and safety in the area. I want to see places for residents to engage, not for non-residents to party, and then walk to the Travelodge making ruckus through the residential area, or making circuits in their cars /motorbikes around Canon's way, revving engines or boom boxes at the traffic lights at 02h00! I did not buy a property here with the understanding that the nighttime economy would be a focus for Bristol City Council over residential services and community activities.

Where are the new council owned or private collaborations we were promised when selling off property such as leisure centres. Where is the centralised recycling facilities for the area (planning permission for the building years ago favoured space for commercial units over adequate facilities for residents - now we all have to stockpile rubbish because there is a constant inadequacy of collection frequency or capacity).

Further, where's the overall planning/ orchestration. For example - 7 days a week we now have Tesco deliveries and commercial bin collections from 05h00 down the side road of the building. Originally the supermarket was planned towards Millennium Square, where there is a dedicated loading dock behind, and no residential units! And, what about noise controls for businesses operating in the area? (HG mobile shredding daily about 11am, commercial waste collection before 05h00?...). Our building has no noise insulation. Please keep the CIA and make dedicated efforts to engage with local residents.

PS07 – Andy Killoran

Please retain the CIA. Thousands of people live on Harbourside and neighbouring areas and more accommodation is being built. The night time economy businesses are a part of our community too, but we have to coexist. Untrammelled bars, noise, antisocial behaviour etc is incompatible with a peaceful life and a good nights sleep. The behaviour of some people when drunk can make them intimidating to area residents and if there are unrestricted numbers of people in an uncontrolled number of bars, this will be compounded.

The CIA is a valuable tool to help look at the overall impact. The point is certainly not to stop new businesses moving in, it is simply to ensure that the 'big picture' view is taken into account.



PS08 – Rob Nash

I vote to keep the above CIA in place as this can only be a Good process to have. It's beyond me why anyone would consider doing without this. We need to protect the Harbourside and those living in the area from public nuisance from late drinking so the CIA must remain in place.

PS09 – Richard Jones

I am writing to object to the removal of the CIA which will inevitably result in a lack of scrutiny in terms of appropriateness of licensed applications and lead to excess noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour which is already a big problem. Waverley House at the Harbourside is in a mixed-use area but with a high number of residential flats and the quality of life of these residents needs to be respected with a robust process for decision making of potential uses to reduce the current concerns rather than increase them.

PS10 Graham Bultitude

I write to object to the proposed abolition of the Bristol City Centre Cumulative Impact Area policy, a decision on which is due to take place in your meeting at 12.00 noon on Wednesday 28th February 2024.

My understanding is that in the recent public consultation, two-thirds of responders wanted to retain the CIA restrictions as did Avon & Somerset Police, who have to police this area and deal with its crime & anti-social behaviour.

Again, my understanding is that the removal of the CIA will remove an entire layer of scrutiny when it comes to Licencing Applications - currently the CIA manages the number, type and density of licensed premises within the city centre area (including Harbourside). Without it, applications would be green-lit automatically, without any oversight. Even more than now, it would come down to residents & landlords to try to fight a rearguard action, when it comes to trying to control the spread of bars, late night license applications and all the problems that come from this in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour, not to mention the changing character of our neighbourhood.

Please do not remove the CIA. Finally, and not wishing to be too cynical, but the processes here do appear to be rather cloudy & murky with the date of next week's meeting information being withheld until last Wednesday 21st February 2024 - it is almost as if you wanted to minimise the window available for objections. Please can you advise why so little notice was given - many thanks!!

PS11 Paul & Wendy Headington

I am writing because I have just been informed that the council is considering the removal of the CIA in Bristol city centre. I would like to object to this and urge you to continue your adopt the CIA. I support new businesses but I think there must be an amount of regulation and oversight in the awarding of late night licenses otherwise businesses will have a green light on late night opening to do pretty much as they please. The area around my apartment has had numerous anti-social incidents due to drunkenness including the vandalism off my car and these incidents are becoming more frequent.

Thank you for your consideration.



PS12 – Lamber Yang

I am writing today to urge the council to consider keeping the Cumulative Impact Assessment in some form, as I believe it is a vital tool in determining whether or not a license application is appropriate for the community at large. I am not wholesale against the provision of new licenses, but I strongly believe that oversight and case-by-case scrutiny is necessary. I do not believe that if, as a report claims, the same assessment process will be kept after the CIA is scrapped, campaigners would be so adamant on scrapping the policy - it is clearly anticipated that licensing conditions will lax if it does.

PS13 – Alan Carpenter

I have read the committee papers carefully and understand your need to review its continuation- and that there are strong arguments on both sides of this issue. For simplicity- I would like to make just 10 points, if I may:

1. Nearly half of respondents were bothered by venue, passing and general noise related to licensed premises. This is much worse after 2am.
2. Between 59 and 66% of respondents saw the threat of assault, ASB or vandalism as a real worry. I believe a lot goes unreported.
3. In terms of numbers of bars- 74% said that there should be NO more. That indicates a feeling of saturation.
4. There is a strong thread around wanting more late-night protection. If police numbers cannot support that- that should be considered when deciding on this issue.
5. As should the police view that the CIA should continue. This should have major weight. I know that the on-the-ground police presence is miniscule.
6. I very much support a lively night -time economy- but one built not just on bars and night clubs opening very late- but with more music venues, restaurants and mixed venues. And more separation and less concentration.
7. I notice very regularly all sorts of horrible behaviour around my flat between midnight and 4am- when essentially people are really, really drunk- and do really drunk things. That doesn't add up to a healthy night economy. It's unsafe, unhealthy, bad for the police and terrible for ambulances and the BRI's ED.
8. So- I think the CIA should remain in place until a replacement (as TLT say) is developed, which:
9. (a) Focuses more geographically on the real hotspots with Leeds type zones and (b) limits drinking venues but not music and eating.
10. In summary, a thriving night- time economy isn't just letting very drunk people causing bother between midnight and 4am at weekends! It needs complementary music and eating venues and a recognition that (as the police imply) drinking venues may be at saturation in some bits of the CIA (but not all). Remember also the now many thousands of people who lives in this area and want more peace and, especially, safety, after midnight (or 2am)!!

PS14 – Bernice Gollop

I welcome this opportunity to make a Statement to the Licensing Committee in favour of retention of the Cumulative Impact Area.



I thank the members of the Licensing Committee who deferred a decision in January on such an important matter. This is especially relevant when local residents living within the CIA did not know that meeting was taking place, although a Councillor and a Solicitor DID know and were able to make statements for consideration.

Last year, the Council carried out a consultation on the CIA, 67% responded in favour of retention of the CIA; over a third of respondents live in Hotwells & Harbourside or Central wards, ie within the CIA.

In the last few years, I have spoken at several Licensing meetings on behalf of residents from Balmoral and Waverley House, Harbourside, regarding businesses applying for late night alcohol licences. Councillors have listened to the concerns of residents and taken these into account, sometimes adding conditions when granting licences. There is no doubt that alcohol-led establishments contribute to a late-night culture that conflicts with people living locally and their quality of life. It is important to remember that the City Centre is a residential area as well as having a thriving commercial and night-time economy. The CIA gives the chance for neighbours to comment on licence applications that may affect them.

Retention of the CIA is also supported by the Police, who have to deal with the results of the night-time economy.

An interesting statement in Appendix 3c: Public Health does not hold a view in favour or against the removal of the current Cumulative Impact Assessment, in respect of the city centre of Bristol. However, we do ask that the ... high rate of alcohol admissions in the city, be taken into consideration by the Licensing Committee when making their decision in this matter.

I note that the major difference between the January and February meetings. In January, the recommendation was That the Licensing Committee agree to:
The removal of the current Cumulative Impact Assessment, in respect of the city centre of Bristol,

At this meeting, when further evidence has been sourced, the recommendation is:
That the Licensing Committee determine: Whether to retain or remove the current Cumulative Impact Assessment, in respect of the city centre of Bristol.

I urge members of the licensing committee to acknowledge that Bristol City Centre remains at saturation point for alcohol led late-night venues and retain the CIA.

PS15 – Judith Brant

The residents at Harbourside are being subjected to more and more abominable noise and anti social behaviour. It is unacceptable to do away with the CIA which is the only thing stopping a beautiful area from becoming a complete dive.

Either you continue to control this or you risk losing the asset completely with a strip mining approach of just giving into the bars.

Oversight MUST be maintained, regulation MUST be and the residents given the opportunity to voice properly against the already ridiculous level of late night bars.



PS16 – Simon Burbidge

I am writing in response to the proposed removal of the CIA (Cumulative Impact Area) process for licensing premises. This process is essential in order to keep the mixed nature of the city centre with residential and commercial and entertainment premises in a balanced mix. Abolition of the CIA would remove the safeguards and checks on applications and allow uncontrolled expansion of noisy premises, open late at night and thus create noise and social nuisance on a large scale.

I strongly oppose the abolition of the CIA and urge the council to maintain it.

PS17 – Liz Brealey

I understand that the council is considering removing the Cumulative Impact Area in the Harbourside area, against the advice of police and the wishes of the majority of residents surveyed. As a Harbourside resident myself, I strongly oppose this plan. Abolishing the CIA would almost certainly result in an increase in approved licences for late-night establishments which have a negative impact on local residents. This would lead to a rise in anti-social behaviour - excessive noise, fights, public intoxication, public urination - which isn't something that anyone wants on their doorstep.

Noise at street level on Cathedral Walk or Millennium Parade travels surprising far, due to how the buildings are positioned and the material used. I believe the council should invest in noise-reduction strategies to mitigate this.

The businesses which create the most noise pollution and anti-social behaviour are bars/drink establishments, as they are open late (and drunk people are noisy). Whilst I can see how these would be profitable and beneficial to the local economy, these types of businesses are struggling due to cost of living and changing attitudes towards drinking culture, especially amongst young people. How many licences would be granted to new bars which subsequently fail and close down, only for another bar to move in and start the cycle again?

I'm aware that living so close to the city centre means that some of these issues are inevitable, which is something I was willing to accept in order to get on the property ladder. But the flats around the Harbourside are in a residential zone, and where that borders a commercial zone, there should be measures to protect local residents from harm. It's the difference between a commercial lot on a residential street being used for a corner shop vs a nightclub - the needs of local residents need to be prioritised. I ask that the council reconsider their plan to abolish the CIA.

PS18 – Mamta Narayan

I write with great concern about the news of the Bristol City Centre CIA potentially being abolished. I feel that this would have a detrimental affect on the voice of residents in Bristol city centre. I am also concerned - that in light of the Public Forum scheduled for Thursday 29th February, these details have not been made public. I would urge you to consider the public voice and maintain future safety of the City and residents.



PS19 - Ian Carruthers

Over the last 6-7 years, other local residents and I have noticed a steep decline in the feeling of safety, been subjected to anti-social behaviour fuelled by excess alcohol, illegal drugs being consumed throughout the city centre ASP are stretched to their limits, unable to arrive at even grade 2 calls within an acceptable time frame, leading to more unreported incidents across the area. There is no effective enforcement of either the Public Order Act nor the Misuse of Drugs Act and licensed premises where door staff are present, appear to be more inclined to allow clients to become uncontrollably drunk because of competitive pressures. I consider the Licensing Committee to be a critical pivot in the balance of maintaining a vibrant night-time economy with due respect for the lawful residents of the city by imposing strictly enforced conditions on licensed premises as clearly they cannot police this themselves. Examples of alcohol fuelled, illegal drug fuelled anti-social behaviour I have personally seen and been subjected to in the city centre over a period of c. 5 months, end of September 2023 until today: Drove of drunken and offensive individuals being disgorged from trains at Temple Meads, entering the city centre by the side of the canal. Offensive language, outraging public decency and this is before they attend and gain entry to licensed premises exacerbating an already febrile situation. This is a weekly occurrence. On 3 separate occasions, with my wife, we have witnessed club attendees near the Esplanade, using Class A Drugs, sniffing, snorting and have been subjected to offensive language, undertones of violence on multiple occasions aside from this. ASP did not attend and the Sainsbury's local opposite the Hippodrome have told us more than once, ASP do not attend, despite this being a UK Government priority and the level of offensive, violent disorder fuelled by alcohol when clubs open from c. 9pm has dramatically increased. The noise levels of clubs, let alone the mass illegal, disruptive behaviour such as xxx, in an emerging residential area is unacceptable and throughout the CIA this trend is prevalent where residents who have a right to live in a peaceful environment, irrespective of the location of their home, are ignored. 5 occasions - physical violence near the Cenotaph, continuing all the way to Park Street. Numerous occasions in the Old City, one particularly concerning incident upon leaving an Italian restaurant, 15 drunk individuals acting like a cabal, (fuelled by illegal drugs and copious amounts of alcohol) causing havoc in complete breach of the Public Order Act. Criminal damage - too numerous to mention. We refuse to use, or indeed walk through Castle Park because of the likelihood of violence, ASB, drugs and alcohol prior to these attendees' entering clubs. The Licensing Department is perceived by many of us not balancing the need, concerns and issues of residents and appear unable to effectively balance their role. We believe the unit needs to be overhauled. These are just SOME of our experiences over a limited timeframe. Add in numerous cases of incidents not reported to ASP, many residents having lost faith in the licensing unit to effectively investigate concerns and report back within published timeframes, leads to no interaction between the council and residents. This also means, the issues are magnified way beyond what the data held by BCC and ASP indicates. We have in fact pulled out of a home purchase because of this worsening situation. Drunken violent antisocial behaviour at all hours of the night does not equate to an all-encompassing, inclusive, vibrant night-time economy! I urge BCC to not only maintain the CIA but to make it more robust - not to throttle the night-time economy, but to allow it to flourish with appropriate regard for all of us who are proud to call Bristol our home, with an effective impartial licensing unit at the forefront. Bristol is a beautiful, diverse city with much to offer us all. It is not just for drunken louts, thrashing noise without mitigation or effective premises insulation and appalling illegal behaviour fuelled by excessive alcohol consumption and blatant illegal drugs use right up until dawn.

I have lived in central areas of Toronto, Paris and NW London - I have never felt as unsafe and under-represented than I do today. A huge part of this is down to the lack of an effectively balanced and



rigorously enforced night-time economy code of conduct. I ask the Licensing Committee to consider all residents of Bristol and tighten the CIA let alone dismantle it.

PS20 Chris Binding

I am very concerned to hear that BCC is proposing to abandon its Cumulative Impact Area policy. I am not party to the effectiveness or not of the current scheme but to abandon it with no substitute policy in hand would surely be detrimental to the overall balance and viability of a sustainable and balanced inner city environment. Better surely to make the current CIA fit for purpose thereby serving the interests of both residents and traders. I look forward to hearing the outcome of the debate in this matter in due course.

PS21 Councillor Patrick McAllister

I urge the Licensing Committee to vote to retain the Cumulative Impact Area that is currently in place across much of the city centre and harbourside region. This is the best way to help reduce crime, uphold the results of the Council's own consultation, and strike the balance between residential amenity and the nighttime economy. Firstly, and possibly most consequentially, Avon & Somerset Police are in favour of retaining the CIA, submitting evidence demonstrating that central Bristol "remains at saturation point and the area, which has a significant concentration of alcohol led late night venues, witnesses a high number of assaults and other related crime and disorder including public nuisance and risk to public safety". Scrolling through the police's submission at Appendix 2b, I was struck by the clear trend it outlined: the majority of crime heatmaps showed a hot spot around the Canons Marsh area, and often the other areas of the city centre covered by the CIA had substantial levels of crime as well. From drink spiking and sexual assault, to grievous bodily harm and public order disruption, to anti-social behaviour and nuisance – the area covered by the CIA is visible in the heatmaps without needing to be labelled: a clear geographical trend. From a crime perspective this is a region that surely needs more regulation and protection, not less. The Council's own EQIA report also makes clear that the CIA helps to reduce alcohol-related violence and drink-induced crimes and warns that "if the Cumulative Impact Area is removed there could be an increase in crime including hate crime". Surely these considerations by themselves should be enough to make clear that the CIA must stay? But there is more. A supermajority – 67% – of those who responded to the Council's own consultation on the CIA support retaining it. Given the low level of public trust in Bristol Council at the moment, it is more important than ever to give due weight to the feelings of people in these consultations. Additionally, the overwhelming majority of Hotwells & Harbourside residents I have spoken to on the issue are in favour of retaining the CIA; residents of my ward were the plurality of responses to the survey with by far the highest response rate of any ward. Residents have told me of the impact on their personal lives from the growth of the nighttime economy in the area: disrupted sleep, crime and antisocial behaviour, the crowding out of family-friendly businesses. The nighttime economy brings many benefits to Bristol, nobody denies that. But we must strike the balance and, in the area covered by the present CIA that balance has tipped too far away from residential amenity.

Even within the CIA, we are seeing established venues stop serving food and pivoting solely to drinks and music: license creep by stealth, further damaging the services that families want to see in the area. I do note the xxx submission, and I recognise the good intentions behind it, but ultimately, I found it unconvincing. Their own "good example" of a traffic light CIA system as in Leeds would surely place much of the area currently covered by the present CIA in Bristol into the "Red Area".



The CIA is a demonstration that Bristol Council is trying to mitigate the impacts of the nighttime economy on residents, that it is trying to find the right balance and not just sacrifice residential amenity to enable the perpetual expansion of bars and clubs. As the report's EQIA appendix makes clear, a well-managed nighttime economy is a benefit to everyone. The CIA is presently how we can manage the nighttime economy. The nighttime economy is a vibrant and essential part of Bristol's culture and provides immense benefits to our city. I appreciate that there are legitimate concerns over how the CIA can hinder the legitimate expansion and operation of nighttime economy venues, and I would be supportive of efforts to draw up a replacement scheme that would serve the needs of local residents and of businesses. My colleague, Councillor Stafford-Townsend of Central ward, has proposed extending the CIA and reforming it to enable greater resident participation. I would be supportive of this change. However, barring this eventuality, the CIA should stay so as not to leave an absence of protections for residents. Therefore, regarding the current proposals, I urge the Licensing Committee to vote to retain the CIA.

PS22 Simon Pepper

As a Harbourside resident I'm writing to register my concern about the council's plan to abolish the city centre CIA/Cumulative Impact Area. This is a mixed area with significant residential blocks so care needs to be taken when considering further licensed and especially late-night premises due to noise and antisocial behaviour. The CIA is important in making that consideration happen. I'd also like to register my concern about the minimal notice and information given about this upcoming decision.

PS23 Javier Gutierrez

I object to the removal of the CIA in the strongest possible terms.

The city centre should be a place for everyone to enjoy, including families, children, and people of all ages, not only drunken revellers. The city centre should be a place with a nice mix of uses, not a place saturated with drinking establishments. This is not a novel idea, it is what you see in most cities in Europe. City centres are not meant to be large drinking zones for revellers to let loose and behave anti-socially, nor party zones that are open till the early hours, nor places where it is acceptable to have high crime rates. City centres are places where many people live, many people work, many people go to with their children in the weekend, many people visit to see their heritage and cultural sites. This is the what the Council should be working to, rather than promoting more late-night drinking establishments.

Even with the current CIA in place, all licensing applications in our neighbourhood get approved by the Council, including some where there have been 150+ objections from residents. Even with the current CIA in place, there is very little consideration given to residents' rights and concerns, and the interests of these venues are always prioritised. New late-night bars have been opened in places that previously had daytime uses, with minimal concessions to residents in terms of closing times or prevention of anti-social behaviour.

Abolishing the CIA would make things even worse, and those minimal conditions to protect residents would become zero.



The Council has been proposing in recent years more and more residential developments in the city centre, and says the plan is to create mixed-use neighbourhoods with compatible commercial uses. For this to work, it is essential to maintain the CIA and promote daytime uses that are not focused on drinking and partying, in order to make the city centre a place where everyone can live, work and enjoy.

PS24 Dan Ackroyd

I was shocked to hear in the last meeting that the consultation had been carried out in a way where the answers couldn't provide 'evidence'. I would have thought if the council is required to carry a consultation, then it needs to be done in a way that allows for a usable result.

Given that the results of the consultation include things like:

- * Concern about criminal damage - 88%
- * Fear of personal injury/assault - 83%
- * Noise of people travelling through residential areas to get to or from licensed premises - 73%

I find it hard to imagine exactly what the public were meant to say to justify keeping the CIA.

The police appear to be saying that the current CIA covers an area where a large number of serious sexual crimes against women are being committed. Given that the criminal justice system is being stretched, both on the policing side, and on the prosecuting side, I would have thought that would be enough evidence to justify keeping the CIA.

If there are problems being caused by the CIA, and it is quite easy for me to imagine problems caused by a discretionary power being given to the police, I would have expected people to list those problems, and for there to be a discussion about them.

PS25 Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend

The culture of Bristol, our creativity and our music scene, coupled with a diverse and vibrant night time economy is what draws many to live, work or study in Bristol. A vibrant and safe night time economy working in collaboratively in conjunction with resident groups is possible, and the night time economy requires support to thrive. We need more dance venues in Bristol, and more venues catering to a range of clientele. As a result of Covid and the following financial recession, we have less venues now that we have had for some time. The night time economy is one of the major economic sectors in the city, and those within largely it strive hard to create a safe surrounding for customers and residents.

The CIA as it currently functions does not help the night time economy to thrive and hinders the opening of new and dynamic venues. Representatives from the night time economy, venues and prospective venues have provided much evidence and date of their struggles to open new venues under the CIA.

The CIA also does not meet the needs of city centre, it's narrow method of being triggered results in it not providing the protections needed for those living in close proximity. This results in licencing



applications that have truly detrimental impacts not being considered for what they are and licenced as a result.

I don't disagree with the officers wishing to scrap the current form of the CIA as it is not fit for purpose. However I don't believe a void is the answer we're looking for either. I would urge the committee to consider extending the CIA for 6 months, during which time the methods to trigger the CIA are expanded to include resident associations and other stakeholders as well as relooking at the restrictions for venues. Considering how the scope and footprint of the nighttime economy is growing and developing, significant consideration should be given to expanding the CIA area. Through true collaboration with the communities most impacted by the CIA, both the night time economy and residents, we can implement a CIA that supports the city to thrive.

PS26 Janet Wilson

I first heard about this important meeting just yesterday as we residents in our part of Bristol right in the centre were never informed of this before e.g. I would have expected at the very least a poster put up on Queen Square, one of the areas MOST impacted by the anti-social behaviours and of groups of drunken yobs keeping hard working residents, families and business people NOT involved in what is euphemistically called 'the night time economy' awake throughout the night. This 'night time economy' USED TO provide for the wider socio-economic range and diverse population of Bristol but many of those premises have closed and given way to louder more rowdy establishments to suit predominantly the late-night drinking habits of groups of younger males who show little or no respect for residents nearby.

As a result of the short notice for this meeting and statement, I have had limited time to read the hundreds of pages provided as Appendices with your agenda this morning, but I have browsed a lot of it and it seems to me that a VERY COMPELLING CASE has been made ALREADY by the residents of Bristol (those that knew about it to take part in consultations and other meetings already that is), all SUPPORTED by Avon and Somerset Police through their hands-on experiences as well as their well analysed crime statistics over the years, to KEEP the Cumulative Impact Zone in place, though hopefully to have this strengthened to have a more meaningful effect on the ground and operationally with BETTER LEADERSHIP AND COMMITMENT from both the Council and Police to support it. I also have large reports written on the behalf of residents and businesses on Queen Square and Welshback and circulated to BCC and the Police up to 2019, pre COVID, of the ASB and other negative effects on residents and businesses on Queen Square associated with licensed events on Queen Square, though in recent years we have been happy that events on Queen Square were limited to FAMILY FRIENDLY ONLY events, managed by LOCAL PEOPLE ALSO WITH FAMILY AND RESIDENT INTERESTS IN MIND, all negotiated through direct consultations with the local event organisers concerned and the Council Head of Culture, though we understand there is NO ONE in this position at the moment.

xxx

MEANWHILE, THERE IS NO DOUBT, SUPPORTED BY THE POLICE THAT WE MUST HAVE A CIA IN PLACE FROM 2024 ON AND STRENGTHEN IT FURTHER.

