

Late Night Levy Consultation Comments

Question:

To what extent do you agree that a Late Night Levy is an appropriate way to fund the work of the Council and the Police to deal with issues caused by the late night economy in the Borough?

| No. | Who | Position | Comment | Officer response |
|-----|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 1. | Canavan's Peckham Pool Club | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>As the owner of a late night club I do agree we should shoulder the cost of extra policing and council staff but in reality I also know the police are stretched beyond their capabilities.</p> <p>I feel giving S.I.A. staff more jurisdiction to intervene if there is a disturbance or nuisance being caused away from the premises would help greatly.</p> <p>It should be part of their licence to wear body worn cameras then the footage can be passed on to the council or police for fines or prosecution.</p> | Comments noted. We agree we should shoulder the cost of extra policing and council staff. |
| 2. | SAMKAL ORIGINAL SUYA CHARCOAL GRILL | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>I SUPPORT WHOLEHEARTEDLY ANY POSITIVE MEASURES THAT WILL HELP KEEP LATE NIGHT BUSINESSES TO CONTINUE DOING THEIR BUSINESS AND AT THE SAME TIME IMPROVING POLICING IN REDUCING CRIME AND ANY FORM OF UNSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE COMMUNITY.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 3. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>Strongly feel that the levy should be higher and or eliminate all sale of alcohol after midnight. The easy access this provides to many alcoholics is too costly and part of a larger problem of drinking in London. I live near these all night places and a betting place with a pub in between. In the mornings children have to walk by bottles and cans left from the night before along with take away rubbish. Often, this isn't cleaned up properly and the rubbish collects again. There has to be better zoning laws to prevent these all night alcohol places from being right next to pubs. It just facilitates binge drinking.</p> | <p>Comments noted, however, the Levy is not designed to restrict access to alcohol, only that access be safe.</p> <p>Comments regarding litter are noted, though the Council appreciates that it can be hard to specify street litter to a particular licensed premises, however, additional street cleaning may be something the appointed Board may wish to consider to spend any excess monies.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 4. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I agree that businesses should be contributing towards policing and cleaning up as they are very much contributing to the reasons it is needed. | As per 1 above. Comment noted. |
| 5. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | This should also apply to the likes of City Cruises who are licensed in the borough. | River vessels that operate after midnight are obliged to pay the Levy. |
| 6. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | This is a great idea, but I would go further and collect from anyone selling alcohol after 9pm, not midnight. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours, the Council cannot bring this forward. |
| 7. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | There is too much noise and dangerous behaviours that are spreading also to not long ago quiet areas. This has to be stopped and controlled by all means. | |
| 8. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | The late night levy is essential to mitigating the impacts of licenced premiers on our community | Comments noted. |
| 9. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I say this as a local resident living in an area where there has been a very noticeable increase in late night businesses and related problems with cleaning, noise and anti-social behaviour. I enjoy elements of the local late night economy but I can see that the cost of policing, enforcement and cleaning up must have grown enormously. I think it is fair that businesses that profit from it (and/or their customers) should contribute to these costs. | Comments noted. |
| 10. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | It is quite right that businesses which contribute to disorderly behaviour or make a neighbourhood feel less safe due to disorderly behaviour should also contribute to the cost of policing those neighbourhoods for safety, health and retaining a pleasant environment for all other users. | Comment noted. |
| 11. | Brunswick Park TRA | Agree/Strongly Agree | As a TRA we have long been concerned about the litter that is generated at the top of Vicarage Grove, along the High St and at the top end of Kimpton Road, associated with KFC. Camberwell Green is awash with detritus on Sunday mornings so if this can't be curbed - and it seems unlikely that the revellers are suddenly going to take their litter home with them - those that are the source of the litter that finds its way onto the streets should make a | Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment (such as food takeaways and this branch of KFC) would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | | contribution to clearing it up. | |
| 12. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I have observed first hand the nuisance caused by late-night drinking - especially as far as noise is concerned. | Comment noted. |
| 13. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>I believe it is important to have a vibrant, safe and well regulated night time economy. This will attract both local residents and people from outside of the Borough to come and enjoy the best of what Southwark and Southwark businesses and place of entertainment (pubs, clubs etc.) have to offer.</p> <p>However, good regulation and policing can not be provided on the cheap and given the current financial situation with regard to local authorities it seems reasonable to ask those premises that are benefiting from being in such an historic and icon centre such as Southwark to contribute towards providing a space where everyone's' health, safety and welfare is protected.</p> <p>A safe environment will greatly assist in attracting customers which will benefit the business.</p> <p>I would also say it is a bit of the polluter pays principle, in that if the places providing entertainment, clubs, pubs etc weren't present, then the additional regulatory activity would not be required</p> | Comments noted. |
| 14. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | they have no control over their customers who litter, cause damage, antisocial behaviour so the companies need to pay from their profits to mitigate all mentioned | Comment noted. |
| 15. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Local residents are plagued by noise and antisocial behaviour from late night inebriated drinkers and our streets are littered with alcohol bottles, glasses and food packaging. Those who create the mess and nuisance should pay for the clean up and additional policing and stewards | Comments noted, though the Council appreciates that it can be hard to specify street litter to a particular licensed premises, however, additional street cleaning may be something the appointed Board may wish to consider to spend any excess monies. |
| 16. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I support measures which reduce the anti-social behaviour associated. with excessive alcohol consumption. This requires extensive resources to | Comments noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | control and clear up the effects of such behaviour and the purveyors of alcohol should help to pay for this. | |
| 17. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | It is right and fair that those that profit from making people drunk and disorderly should pay for the actions of them. | Comment noted. |
| 18. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Perhaps the levy could have a sliding scale of charges for how late the premises open. i.e those that open later, pay more. | Comment noted, however the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale. |
| 19. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | There should be more monitoring on late nights, particularly around Canada Water station which ends up full of drunk people and litter | Comment noted. You can also make a street cleaning request on https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 20. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I live on Union Street, booze related litter etc is a real problem I agree this is a good idea. | Comment noted. You can also make a street cleaning request on https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 21. | A member of the public (previous Southwark Councillor) | Agree/Strongly Agree | As a former Chair of the Licensing Committee, I have always advocated the used this levy, which has been successfully implemented in other authority areas | Comment noted. |
| 22. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I'm a great believer in 'polluter pays'. Litter and mess around Canada Water can be bad after events at Printworks | Comment noted. The Licensing Authority has been working with that particular premise to try to reduce the impact in the locality. |
| 23. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Excellent idea. Borough high is really horrible at weekends because of litter, vandalism and drunken louts. Anything that would reduce that is welcome. | Comment noted. |
| 24. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Canada Water has been suffering as a result of increased late night 'night life' and it seems only fair that a levy be imposed that can pay for some of the clean up and added security needed. | Comment noted. |
| 25. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Venues that contribute to late night drunken behaviour, should be required to contribute towards the safety of neighbourhood. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 26. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Bermondsey street is fast turning into a noise echo chamber during the weekends with a lot of shouting and loud music. People who exit the bars late at mid night and into 1-2AM in the morning stand in the middle of the road, block the narrow pedestrian footpath and smoke heavily. The bars do not have any measures to prevent orderly dispersal. | Comment noted. If you wish to complain about any particular premises, you can do so to licensing@southwark.gov.uk and the premises will receive a visit during night time operations. |
| 27. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I don't think this is the only solution and think there needs to be more support for residents affected by the increase in noise and anti-social behavior. We currently have little recourse. Even evidencing clear breaches of licensing conditions does not seem to impact the behavior of the businesses who customers cause problems. | Please see officer comment to 26 above. . |
| 28. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Living in a busy, but residential part of Peckham I worry also about the noise we already suffer from late licences. A beautiful levy is an excellent plan but not if it colours judgement in the granting of licences. | Comment noted. |
| 29. | Southwark Square Ltd | Agree/Strongly Agree | We have a lot of rubbish turn up on southwark street with abandoned drink glasses and tenants have complained of plants being uprooted and vomit on the pavements directly outside their doorways | Comment noted. You can also make a street cleaning request on https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 30. | LASSCO Ltd. | Agree/Strongly Agree | It sounds fair and proportionate. | Comment noted. |
| 31. | Mountview | Agree/Strongly Agree | The Levy should vary depending on the closing time of the institution. For example a venue closing at 1am should pay less than one closing at 4am. | Comment noted, however the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale. |
| 32. | Dulwich Sports Club | Agree/Strongly Agree | I assume this will not affect us with our limited number of extensions until 1am? | Comment noted. The Licensing Authority is recommending the Council that if it were to adopt the Levy, that community sports centres would be exempt. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 33. | Dulwich College | Agree/Strongly Agree | I agree that this levy makes sense but should be specifically for those venues open to the public on a regular basis and in busy areas. We only open for private events between 12-1am and have never had to call the Police for any public disturbance nor do we have late night street sweepers in this area. Paying a regular levy would make the late licence unworkable for us. | Comment noted, however, irregular late-night use of a licence does not exempt it. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 34. | 805 RESTAURANTS | Agree/Strongly Agree | I AGREE WITH THE ABOVE STATEMENT. IT WILL BENEFIT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY. | Comment Noted. |
| 35. | St. John Group | Agree/Strongly Agree | We have a levy at our bar and restaurant in Islington (we are just on the southern border with The City). We do not operate a late bar (after 11.00 pm.), we do feel unfairly penalised for others. These are difficult times for business and this levy is yet another charge. | Comment noted, however the consultee has notably agreed to the implementation of a Levy, whereas the comment appears negative. Please note that this will only affect premises licensed after midnight. |
| 36. | Dulwich Sports Club Ltd | Agree/Strongly Agree | We have a licence until 11pm with a number of extensions for members only until 1am, we would consider it excessive to be charged for those occasions which we do not believe adds to disorder | Comment noted. The Licensing Authority is recommending the Council that if it were to adopt the Levy, that community sports centres would be exempt. Please note that this will only affect premises licensed after midnight. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 37. | LASSCO Ltd. | Agree/Strongly Agree | I'm not sure late-night licenses are suitable for this area. | Comment noted, however, the consultation is not considering the suitability of any area to host late-night venues. |
| 38. | Personal Licence holder | Agree/Strongly Agree | I have witnessed on numerous occasions the detrimental effects resulting from late-night provision of alcohol. There are considerable and easy financial benefits available to businesses selling alcohol late at night, but this is certainly to the detriment to the public environment from a minority of consumers in terms of the noise experienced by nearby residents, mess created on the streets, and an increased burden on emergency services. It seems fair that an economic contribution is made by the businesses who are benefiting from a licensed activity that is directly causing a burden on the local community. | Comments noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| 39. | Adele Morris Ward Councillor | Agree/Strongly Agree | There are studies which show that there is an increase in alcohol related antisocial behaviour when premises are open later. Public Health recently made a representation against a Southwark licence application stating the following "it has been shown that each additional 1-hour extension to the opening times of premises selling alcohol was associated with a 16% increase in violentcrime (Rossow & Norstrom 2012) and a 34% increase in alcohol-related injuries (de Goeij, Veldhuizen, Buster & Kunst, 2015). | Comment noted. Public Health in their role as a responsible authority have also provided a response to the consultation. |
| 40. | Alison Brittain Southwark Council, Planning as a responsible authority | Agree/Strongly Agree | From time to time, we received complaints that businesses are operating outside of hours specified on planning permissions. This requires night time inspections to be carried out to observe and gather information. Ensuring planning conditions are enforced is an integral part of the planning regime, and any mechanism that generates funds to ensure this service can be offered in a timely way in welcomed. | Comment noted. |
| 41. | Graham Neale Ward Councillor | Agree/Strongly Agree | The alcohol industry costs police and local authorities millions in clean up and care. They should pay their way, like everyone else. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| 42. | Clizia Deidda Southwark Council, Public Health Division as a responsible authority | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>Public Health recognises that Southwark night time economy is a major part of the lively and inclusive atmosphere of the borough. However, and especially if not well managed, the night time economy is also linked to antisocial behaviour, crime and disorder and public nuisance.</p> <p>A substantial body of national and international research has consistently found that increased density of licensed premises is associated with an increase of crime and disorder. Furthermore, a recent evidence review published by Public Health England (The Public Health burden of alcohol: effectiveness and cost effectiveness of Alcohol control policies, 2016) highlights that alcohol-related violent incidences are more likely to occur at specific days and times during the week. Levels of violence are often disproportionately high on weekend nights, where 70% of all violent incidents are alcohol-related compared to 35% on weekdays. Even more relevant to the introduction of a Late Night Levy, 84% of all violent incidents between midnight and 6am are alcohol related, compared to only 23% between midday and 6pm. Many of these assaults involve the use of glass or bottles as weapons.</p> <p>In light of this evidence, Public Health supports the introduction of a Late Night Levy in Southwark to ensure the Police and the Council are better equipped to deal with the negative repercussions of alcohol-fuelled crime and disorder late at night.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 43. | BA LAW | Agree/Strongly Agree | There are clearly some premises trading after Midnight that cause a great deal more in the way of Police and other resources. We would support a levy for clubs, bars and vertical drinking establishments, but do not feel that it is appropriate for hotels or restaurants with restaurant conditions. | Comment noted. Restaurants would not benefit from an exemption, though Licensing is recommending that hotels with no public access be made exempt as their guests would likely have a limited impact on the night time environment. |
| 44. | Farhad Chowdhury Southwark Council, Health | Agree/Strongly Agree | I think it is a good idea if a business wants to open late they should pay for the extra work that is generated from these businesses which stays open late. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | and Safety as a Responsible Authority | | | |
| 45. | The Grange Bermondsey Limited | Neither agree nor disagree | <p>The levy should be precinct-related. I can see the case for a levy (subject to a cost-benefit analysis of the service actually provided) for precincts such as Borough High Street, Bermondsey Street and their ilk.</p> <p>On the other hand, businesses are already struggling and another levy would be generally unwelcome. I would need to be convinced of the value provided by the service, and in turn, any levy to cover that service. At present, I just do not see that value.</p> <p>My pub is in a quiet residential area. My clientele consists of generally neighbours only: it is a destination neighbourhood pub in an area of very limited footfall. It is not subject to any sort of 'entryist' crowd coming into the area from elsewhere. As such, I receive no support from the police or your economy police, nor do I receive any additional service such as rubbish management. This consultation is indeed the first I've heard that council provides anything like the economy police service.</p> | Comments noted. It is intended that the Levy would cover all late-night premises across the Borough. |
| 46. | Bermondsey Social Club | Neither agree nor disagree | <p>Mixed opinions on this purely on the size of the borough and different areas have different problems with alcohol related crimes. On a personal level we've not had many issues with police being called to the club or any crime related offences after one of our events, due to the nature of the use of the space.</p> <p>On the other side, I do understand that there is a need to cover the costs of such issues since the government cuts, but feel like it hits our pockets whilst we pay enough taxes as it is.</p> | Comments noted. Some premises have been the recipient of enforcement action as a result of the work done by the Night Time Economy Team. Other premises have found officers working at night helpful to them. |
| 47. | New Kent Road General store | Neither agree nor disagree | I would just like to inform you that the late night levy would not affect my business because my business does not sell alcohol after midnight. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 48. | A member of the public | Neither agree nor disagree | <p>The key issue here is that alcohol licences have been issued close to or within quiet residential streets. This in turn causes issues related to late evening and night time disturbances, streets littered with broken glass, drug related issues and fouling of front gardens and pavements with vomit and urine. In our area even human excrement has been found in front gardens. Residents in our area (Blenheim Grove, Chadwick Road, Choumert Grove, Choumert Sq, Choumert Grove and Choumert Road) have been in discussion with Southwark Licensing department about Southwark Licensing Saturation Policy for some time as there have been serious ongoing problems related to the late night economy's impact on the quality of residential life for those living near Peckham Rye Station and Rye Lane. There are further planning and licence applications (related to late night drinking establishments) in the pipeline and I would beg Southwark to consider the right to quiet enjoyment that residents who live in these streets are entitled to. Yours sincerely CG</p> <p>NB whether there should be an additional charge payable by those with alcohol licences seems complex to me... where does one draw the line? Would this include restaurants? Pubs? Small quiet cafes that have a licence? or just late night bars and clubs? A levy could very well penalise many who were not contributing to the problem. How would one make sure that the key offenders were paying a levy and not those who were quietly going about their business? And so on...</p> | <p>Comments noted, however, it must also be accepted that the geography of central London lends itself to the close proximity of licensed premises with residential dwellings. The Levy would cover all premises with an alcohol licence after midnight, regardless whether or not it is a restaurant or cafe. Late night premises without an alcohol licence would not be liable.</p> |
| 49. | A member of the public | Neither agree nor disagree | <p>Is this not one of the reasons we all pay Council Taxes? if there is a need for more fund, why not adopt a marginal increase in the council tax, and avoid unnecessary multiplication of administrative activities and bureaucracies which will be costly to fund and maintain.</p> | <p>Comment noted, however with cuts affecting all departments, this Levy is to fill a shortfall in funds to continue the Night Time Economy Team.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|--|--|
| 50. | A member of the public | Neither agree nor disagree | Why only the night time economy? What about football grounds and the police and council involvement being paid for by the clubs such as Dulwich hamlet and Millwall. These events create a huge number of people, that all drink in the grounds and the clean up and policing costs for this should be covered by the clubs. The same principle applies to events, free or ticketed that take place in parks and open spaces such as concerts and fairs. Why should only beyond midnight traders pay when often in the circumstances above there is the same or greater expenditure by the council and police to clean up after... | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours, the Council cannot amend the hours. |
| 51. | A member of the public | Neither agree nor disagree | More money should be spent on the area itself rather than more police. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. Not all additional the additional income would be spent on policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. |
| 52. | A member of the public | Neither agree nor disagree | The levy should not place an additional burden on businesses causing a reduction in night time amenities | Comment noted. |
| 53. | Tower Bridge (City of London Corporation) | Neither agree nor disagree | We are members of the Team London Bridge Business Improvement District to which we already pay a levy to fund additional policing and crime reduction initiatives. | Comment noted, however, the funds paid towards the BID do not cover the late night period. Please note that a detailed response to the Team London Bridge consultation feedback is presented in Appendix H . |
| 54. | Market Taverns Ltd | Neither agree nor disagree | Accepting that councils have extreme pressure on budgets, the night time economy brings wealth and revenue to the area, but a levy penalises the outlets. | Comment noted. |
| 55. | Cherry Garden Development Tenants and Residents Association | Neither agree nor disagree | We think that additional cost on small businesses is not good for our borough | Comment noted. The Council does have an option to offer a reduction of 30% to venues currently on Business Rate Relief, which will be an option available to Members to recommend. |
| 56. | The Miller | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I do not feel that a blanket levy on all businesses serving alcohol after midnight is the most appropriate way to tackle issues caused by late-night economy. The late night economy comes in many forms. A lot of | Comments noted. Some premises have been the recipient of enforcement action as a result of the work done by the Night Time Economy Team. Other premises have found officers working at night helpful to them. Please note that |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>problems we face are not related to customers being inebriated (indeed we are very careful who we serve, and train staff to cut people off at the appropriate point.) Most of the problems we have are related to theft, and when alcohol related are usually due to street drinking by the homeless community and trespass on our property. This is impacted by the availability of cheap alcohol in corner shops and supermarkets, and is not a late-night only problem. We receive invaluable help on both these issues from the police, and Team London Bridge & their dedicated police officer Nick Morant .</p> <p>I feel that encouraging pubs to close at midnight may actually increase problems, as people will be more likely to continue drinking on the street; where no one is there to refuse to serve them, or check on their well-being as they would in a bar or pub.</p> <p>We host birthday parties almost every week, mostly on Saturday nights for local people, who could be having parties in their own homes nearby, and creating noise for their neighbours and drinking outside in residential areas. Pubs can play an active role in responsible alcohol consumption and encouraging their early closure doesn't necessarily mean people will stop drinking alcohol earlier. There is evidence to show that drinking culture is changing; we sell far more alcohol free beverages than ever before as this is constantly increasing. I feel that preventative action can be much more useful, and if the council feels that particular areas have problems with alcohol induced anti-social behaviour they should look at cause and prevention & training, rather than simply asking for local businesses to pay for reactions to crimes. I understand that increased presence of police and wardens / similar is a deterrent to crime, but if the issues are alcohol related then preventative measures are surely still helpful in having less people out in the borough who have over imbibed.</p> | <p>all alcohol premises would be subject to the Levy, including off licenses. The Levy is not designed to encourage venues to close at midnight.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 57. | The Underdog Gallery | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | We already pay a levy of sorts included in our Team London Bridge rates, we also pay for our own collection of rubbish here, like most businesses in the area. I don't think it would be fair for us to have to pay any further, as we are only open until 1am twice per week. | Comment noted, however, the funds paid towards the BID do not cover the late night period. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 58. | The Flying Dutchman | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | While I am not in a position to comment about businesses located in more vibrant areas of the borough, my business is struggling and we are considering closing down and transforming the venue into storage facilities or other permitted use. Any additional tax would be a push towards closure. It is because of the late night license that we support the free community activities (free art exhibition space etc). I strongly hope that the levy will not apply or that it will not apply to the venues located in struggling areas of the borough. Kind regards. | Comments noted. |
| 59. | Camm & Hooper t/a Tanner & Co | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Our business is currently under significant pressures from raised Rent, Business Rates, London Living Wage, Cost of Sales. This additional tax adds further strain on a category that is already seeing dwindling guest spend and visitor numbers. | Comments noted. |
| 60. | Beer Rebellion | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I don't believe my business has ever caused any issues with the police/council. As such, i would feel it unfair, on the responsible late night businesses, that do not cause any extra costs for the council. Rates are already very high having increased massively over the last 5 years. | Comments noted. Some premises have been the recipient of enforcement action as a result of the work done by the Night Time Economy Team. Other premises have found officers working at night helpful to them. |
| 61. | Erico Entertainment Limited | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Licence Premises are already paying astronomical levies, funds and money to the council already in the forms of Business Rates, Licensing Fees (£295.00) and others. Why the council wouldn't take some of those funds to fund whatever they intend to do for the night time economy? More over, we meant to fund a night time team of Police officers in the name of crimes but Police never turn up sometimes when they are called. In addition, most crimes are carried out during the day, not necessarily doing midnight to 06:00am. As there is no hard evidence | Comments noted. The Levy is designed to sponsor antisocial behaviour generated by late night alcohol premises, not daytime. Evidence has been supplied that alcohol-related crime does increase at night. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | to this, only substantive evidence. Levy small business like ourselves would only put us out of business and do the opposite to the reason of the council intentions anyway. | |
| 62. | Rias Altas ltd | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | We are a hotel and 90% of our business is generated by having a late licence for a small bar we provide to our guests though we have licence to sell past midnight we only use for events and rarely go past 1am and a maximum of 130am is our cut off to sell alcohol. My main concern is business rates are already crippling to our business and means already digging deep and work extra hard to cover these high rates of tax to the council an extra burden on a nominal arm of our business of levy costs would most likely force us to relinquish our licence to sell past midnight | Comment noted. Licensing are making a recommendation that hotels that do not have public bars (that only sell alcohol to their bona fide guests) would be exempt. |
| 63. | The Miller Of Mansfield | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The assumption that a large proportion of 'the issues' relates to premises with late licenses is entirely false. The vast majority of crime on licensed premises is committed between 1700-2200. As part of Team London Bridge BID area, we already pay for and receive police support and crime prevention advice. As part of the BID Levy, we also already pay for additional street cleaning services. I must add that a House Of Lords select committee stated that 'we believe on balance that [The LNL] has failed to achieve its objectives, and should be abolished. ' This is galling for us, as we are being asked to pay two additional tax levies, one of which is widely regarded as ineffective. | Comments noted, however, the money paid to the BID does not cover the time period of the Levy, or the later hours of the Night Time Economy Team. |
| 64. | London Bridge Hotel | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Through our Team London Bridge annual Business Improvement District levy to us you are already contributing towards a well-managed night time economy by funding additional policing, crime reduction initiatives and street cleaning in the local area. We want to promote a vibrant night time economy in London Bridge and feel that the Late Night Levy would | Comments noted, however, the money paid to the BID does not cover the time period of the Levy, or the later hours of the Night Time Economy Team. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | stifle this by disincentivising later opening hours. | |
| 65. | The View from The Shard | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | As part of the London Bridge BID, I do not feel that additional charges would be fair or just. | Comment noted. |
| 66. | The Waverley Arms | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>For venues like mine, it is not fair to charge a late night levy as we are local residential area and rarely use the license after midnight, but our guests do appreciate the fact, when booking a party, that we can stay open later if it is justified.</p> <p>Nightclubs and late night bar operators should pay this where all the trouble stems from, not local community pubs.</p> | Comment noted, however, irregular late-night use of a licence does not exempt it. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 67. | Nine Lives | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>The cost of running our business and paying our taxes (inc. local rates) in Central London makes margin a real challenge already.</p> <p>We go to great lengths to ensure our customers enjoy their late nights in Nine Lives and are clear that antisocial behaviour won't be tolerated in or outside of our venue. Excessive drinking and noise is monitored and handled if necessary.</p> <p>The worst of the behaviour occurs before midnight, when afterwork drinkers end there 6 hour session in the pub and are kicked out in time to get their last train home. This does not happen in venues like ours - so called late-night venues. We have a strict door policy not to allow anyone appearing drunk into the venue and we serve expensive crafted cocktails - not the sort of binge-worthy drinks which cause the problem.</p> <p>There must be some realisation that you cannot lump all styles of 'late night' venue into the same pot, it just doesn't work like that and is simply not fair.</p> <p>In addition, these proposed charges are a direct result of funding costs to police and local council - to pass that burden on to small local businesses who are already struggling to turn a profit is very poor form.</p> | Comments noted. It is intended that the Levy would cover all late-night premises across the Borough. The Council does face continued budget constraints, as a non-statutory provision, the Night Time Economy Team could be axed if funding is not found. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 68. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | While there may be certain businesses which cause 'issues' it feels inherently unfair to impose a levy on all relevant licensed businesses. There is a very wide range of licensed premises and a well-managed and diverse late-night economy brings many benefits to the Borough. It is unreasonable to penalise the many responsible businesses rather than target policing and enforcement at the minority of businesses which do not act responsibly in respect of noise, safety, cleanliness, etc. If premises are in breach of licensing conditions (such as noise restrictions), these should be enforced. | Comments noted. It is intended that the Levy would cover all late-night premises across the Borough. If premises are found to be in breach of their licence conditions, they may be subject to either a prosecution and or a review of the licence, which could potentially result in revocation. |
| 69. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | A tax on firms in which the onus is upon Southwark based customers is absurd. The levy would either be directly placed onto the consumer, or the reduction of business hours that operate into the night which could be some late pubs, nearly all cornershops and the few (decent clubs) based within Southwark. The pigovian tax doesn't seem worthwhile since it trades off consumption drastically | Comment noted. |
| 70. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I don't believe that the sort of antisocial behaviour that the council and the police are required to deal with is caused exclusively by venues that are open after midnight. Penalising venues that stay open late and encouraging venues to close at midnight causes more people under the influence of alcohol at the same time which leads to greater antisocial behaviour problems. | Comment noted, though it is not the intention of the Levy to encourage premises to close earlier. |
| 71. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | If the money all goes to the Police it doesn't fund the "work of the council" to alleviate litter in Southwark, so that's misleading to claim this money will go towards "cleaning the streets". | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Additional street cleaning is only one potential option. |
| 72. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I believe this measure would encourage more late night disruption in the area. If the council stands to profit from the scheme surely this would encourage a more relaxed approach to licensing and planning consent. The area is | Comments noted, though there is a concern that the consultee has not fully understood the intention of the Levy, or the use of the funds. The Levy is not designed to encourage or discourage additional drinking establishments. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | becoming over run with drunkenness and disorderly behaviour and I do not believe Se1 should be promoted further as a night life destination. Local residents stand to lose sleep and peace in this situation. I cannot see how, if businesses have to pay a fee they will not endeavour to regain profit on the costs by extending they're ours of operation. While I understand the need to fund the police and council services in order to maintain a safe and clean environment in the area I cannot see how encouraging more drinking establishments serves Is not counter productive an pd somewhat mad. | |
| 73. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I do not think this an appropriate method. Surely it would encourage more businesses to stay open late in order to earn back the costs if the levy. | Comments noted. The Levy is not designed to encourage or discourage additional drinking establishments. |
| 74. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Businesses already pay more than they should through Business Rates and get very little for it. | Comment noted. |
| 75. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>The notion that licensed venues are in some way the root cause of littering and crime is a straw-man argument that forces them to accept responsibility for actions committed away from their premises. The idea that venues can opt out of the levy by closing before midnight is inherently damaging to the well-being of the night time economy in Southwark which contains many world-renowned venues both small and large. A pub in Peckham, for example, should not reasonably be expected to assist with policing costs in London Bridge and therefore makes early closure the more viable option. The ongoing midnight licensing fiasco in Hackney is evident result of mutual distrust between the council, the police, venues and their patrons and is a model that Southwark would do well to avoid emulating.</p> <p>I am concerned that your proposal does not include a statement as to how much the night time economy is worth overall to the borough, merely how much the damaging effects are worth. I draw your attention to two recent news pieces; one highlighting the value of late-night venues to Berlin's overall economy and the other</p> | Comments Noted. It is intended that the Levy would cover all late-night premises across the Borough. Southwark are aware of the situation in Hackney and their lack of spending the monies acquired through the Levy. The essential difference is that Southwark already have an existing contract with the Police to provide a Night Time Economy officers. Southwark are aware of a report from 'London First' which gave figures of the value of London's overall night time value, however, this data was from 2014. We contacted them to ask if they were able to provide a borough-by-borough breakdown of these (or any latest) figures, but received no response. Therefore the current 'worth' is not available to report on and its omission from Committee reports is not intended to unduly influence any party to the consultation. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>quantifying the damage done by Sydney's harsh license and financial restrictions to theirs.</p> <p>https://www.residentadvisor.net/news/43320</p> <p>https://www.news.com.au/finance/money/costs/sydney-is-losing-out-on-16-billion-a-year-due-to-an-underdeveloped-nighttime-economy/news-story/5fab6b8bd90e41bafdab5c7438ba2e3b</p> <p>I urge you not to follow the line of the latter and would expect a greater deal of clarity and honesty in presenting the facts as they are before asking people to weigh in on this decision.</p> | |
| 76. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | More should be done to encourage Southwark's vibrant nighttime economy, not restrict it by levying fees on late night bars/clubs | Comment noted. |
| 77. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | strongly oppose the Night Time Levy. a good meaning plan but ultimately another prohibitive expense to businesses contributing to the nighttime economy which is a fundamental part of living in your borough and London as a whole. | Comment noted. |
| 78. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | This should be taken into consideration and absorbed by the existing fees and taxes. It is penalising businesses that want to provide entertainment and leisure to residents and visitors. | Comment notes, however this is an attempt to fill a funding gap that cannot be maintained through existing financing sources. |
| 79. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Small businesses in East Dulwich are already struggling to cope with business rates and leasehold rent charges. We are constantly losing local small and independent businesses because of this. Not good for the local community and the local economy. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 80. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>Night time economy is bringing huge benefits to the borough - jobs, visitors spending money etc. Lots of those businesses are small independent businesses that will be most at risk from this kind of extra tax. A levy like this is easier for large bland businesses to absorb and harder for small independent businesses that make Peckham an attractive place to live. I also don't trust that the council would use this for anything other than plugging a hole in its budget. Rye Lane is already full of rubbish that isn't collected all day long, which is a hazard on the pavement and looks a mess. If this rubbish can't even be collected now, why should we trust that an extra revenue stream would be spent on the right things?</p> | <p>The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Additional street cleaning is only one potential option. Collation and spending of monies will be audited.</p> |
| 81. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>I work from home and often take a walk early mornings. It's not bottles I'm picking up but always food stuff to put in bins.</p> <p>The levy would really affect our local convenience stores, which we treasure, when it's the late night food places that need to be looked at. Camberwell is infested with rats. That's not down to the odd can or bottle, but down to people discarding their late night KFC or wrap.</p> <p>You really need to rethink this.</p> | <p>Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment (such as KFC) would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future.</p> |
| 82. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>I think this is an absolutely appalling idea and a direct attack on the vibrant culture of this borough. London is not some little village in Shropshire. It is a living city, a global city, a 24 hour city. If any Southwark councillors strongly oppose bars and venues staying open past midnight and wish to penalise and punish them for doing so, then I strongly recommend they leave London promptly instead of trying to ruin it for everyone else. Apart from anything else, the law is based on a false premise: that closing venues for the containment of late night drinking would lead to a curtailment of late night drinking or a curtailment of alcohol consumption tout court. This is an entirely groundless assumption, however, and countless studies have already shown that</p> | <p>Comments noted, though the Levy is not intended to curtail or close down premises.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Britain's draconian licensing laws actually encourage binge drinking by creating a "last orders rush" to consume as much as possible before the early pub closing. As we have seen with the rise in knife crime in areas where youth centres have been shut down, analogously, closing down late night drinking establishments will only force more people onto the streets. | |
| 83. | Maris Interiors LLP | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | It won't make any difference. Better to find another way that wont annoy people | Comment noted. |
| 84. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | A Late Night Levy proposes to deal with the symptoms of a problem (issues caused by the late night economy) rather than tackle the problem itself. It implies that antisocial behaviour, litter etc. are inevitable and therefore we must spend money to deal with the consequences of them rather than put effort into reducing the occurrence of this sort of behavior. I do not think it is fair for businesses that sell alcohol to a huge range of individuals, should bear the costs of issues created by a small number of those individuals. It also risks not targeting the right people / businesses - my experience as a resident of the area is that a significant amount of antisocial behaviour and litter is caused my people drinking on the street, who could very easily have bought their alcohol from shops that close before midnight. | Comments noted. The remaining 30% of monies could be used for a range of options. This could potentially include a Public Health-led initiative addressing the causes of excessive alcohol consumption/ |
| 85. | Maris Interiors LLP | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The Levy doesn't guarantee a correlation between added police presence and funds to deal with any issues caused by the late night economy. This is just a stealth Tax and a con. | Comments noted, however, the Levy would support a continued Police and Council presence. The expenditure of monies gathered by the Levy is ring-fenced and will be audited. |
| 86. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | It's just another tax, the government cuts should not be passed on to business people who are already struggling in a tough environment. Showing lack of thought for business people will kill the local economy for smaller businesses especially. Also, why are alcohol sellers discriminated against when fast food outlets cause alot more rubbish to be strewn across the streets? Small businesses will close because of this. | Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future. The ability to apply the Levy to these premises already appears in the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 has not yet been enacted. Should this come to fruition, Southwark will again consult on potential implementation. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 87. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Commercial businesses already pay above and beyond for licence, business rates, security. It will either raise the cost of going out or places will close. This is a way of making more money for the council. Already charging extra for garden waste removal, parking in parks. What next | Comments noted. |
| 88. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I think it is inherently unfair to tax the alcohol sellers when the entire community is benefiting from their sales in other ways. It will gentrify the area and push out people who can't afford the higher costs when these establishments pass these costs onto the public. | Comments noted. |
| 89. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The night economy is taxed enough and you will simply end up passing a tax onto the public | Comment noted. |
| 90. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Yet another money grabbing austerity tax by the council. You will be charging for air next. Stop destroying any fun people have. This has nothing to do with rubbish collection. It is 100% designed to squeeze every penny you can out of people. And you moan about this government's policies. | Comments noted. |
| 91. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The additional money won't improve the quality of living in the area. If the area is filled with late night bars and destination drinkers, how are local residents expected to enjoy the benefits of the scheme, especially when they are constantly disrupted in the middle of the night, thus depriving them of the rest that they would need to enjoy the so-called improved area. In my opinion the night levy is a money-making scheme for Southwark Council at the expense of the local residents, disguised as a scheme to help the community and should not be allowed! | Residents would not be subject to the Levy. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol-licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 92. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | absolute tosh | Comment noted. |
| 93. | | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The business rates etc should be more than enough to cover the cost. | Comment noted. Unfortunately this doesn't cover the cost of the Night Time Economy Team. |
| 94. | Maris Interiors LLP | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | It is the responsibility of the council to manage these things. We all pay our Council Tax. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 95. | Kings College London Students' Union | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | From our point of view our student's don't cause any issues from our business side. | Comment noted. |
| 96. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I think this proposal is outrageous, because small businesses are already paying enough taxes as it is; I'd like to asked what are you doing with ours business rate contribution? I think extra taxes will bring small businesses to closure and Southwark will end up with big chain businesses and it will be a borough without a heart... deprived of live attractiveness and diversity. | Comments noted. For further information on how your Business Rates are spent, please see: https://forms.southwark.gov.uk/ShowForm.asp?fm_fid=747 |
| 97. | Boot and Flogger | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | the LNL will ultimately be another tax that will increase disproportionality each year and will result in unique and interesting bars and restaurants not being able to afford the taxes, thus resulting in business closures and the area losing its diversity, with a long term effect of the area going into decline and other areas of London become more attractive for nightlife. additionally the % of crime related to alcohol is minimal and should not be used as a way of collecting taxes on a situation that doesn't exist. reference figures by the late night Czar and the mayor of London. | Comments noted. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 sets the rate at which the Levy can charge, this is not set by the Council. The Night Czar has provided a response to the consultation. |
| 98. | River Supermarket | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I dont think this late night levy is fair. There is alot of competition in the area anyway and the fact that big competitors such as sainsburys being open to 11pm only gives my small business 2 hours of less competition to make a little more money which i will then use to pay for the late night levy. I already work with the police and council to help safety of the community and do kot wish to pay anymore. My business is open to 1am and so that extra 1 hour im trying to earn a little bit more to feed my family is being requested for. Iam not happy and disagree with the late night levy! | Comments noted. |
| 99. | Utobeer (The Rake) | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | 1. There are a number of BIDS within the area of the proposed levy area and while it is suggested those in BID areas would not pay there is no confirmation is available to date. 2, Should there be a decision to apply this levy then it is possible that business will feel that along with rates, BID | There is no confirmation that premises within a BID area would either not pay, or receive a reduction. The Licensing Committee will make a recommendation for the full assembly to decide, if the Levy is to be implemented. Monies paid to BIDs do not cover the late night period. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | costs and levy then they will decide enough is enough and vote against bids. 3 Better Bankside BID will spend £428,000 in 2019/20 on Safety, Security and Resilience so to generate £280,000 Borough wide you will risk £428,000!!!! DOES NOT MAKES SENSE. | |
| 100. | Any other licensed business | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Costs for businesses i the hospitality industry are going up relentlessly. This is another tax on the industry & soon there will be no more venues left. | Comment noted. |
| 101. | barrow bot and banker | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I feel that a licenced premises we pay already a premium in forms of tax, business rates as well as the cost of door staff. we also have better bankside set up in this area and the police | Comment noted, however, monies paid to BIDs to not cover the late night period. |
| 102. | Fish! Kitchen Ltd | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I believe we are paying more than enough via our Business Rates where the rateable value has increased more than 300% in the last 2 years | Comment noted. |
| 103. | Unwin and Friary Tenants and Residents Association | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | We believe that the cost in terms of the damage and breakdown of our community outweigh the monetary benefit that the council will gain. For example, the amount of money it will cost to tackle mental health and anti-social issues related to alcohol outweigh what will be gained. Alcohol licence should be limited to 11pm to allow residents in affected areas at least have peaceful nights. | Comment noted, however, it appears that you wish to strictly limit all late night premises to close daily at 23:00. The Council look to encourage a diverse mix of late night venues, but also limit any negative impact those attending these venues, have on the wider community. |
| 104. | Taxi Driver | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The business already pay business rates, why should they be discriminated against because they provide a service outside normal hours. The council should be encouraging the night time economy not penalising it. | Comment noted. |
| 105. | Shepherd Neame | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The Late Night Levy is a blunt instrument of taxation Pubs are already taxed on their turnover between Midnight & 6.00am since this turnover is included within FMT on which rating assessment is based Many pubs are located in BIDs resulting in payment of supplemental rates The Late Night Levy would amount to triple taxation for public houses in BIDs | Comments noted, however, monies paid to BODs to not cover the late night period. |

| | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 106. | Team London Bridge | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>We have submitted a full written response , however our response is essentially that any businesses within a Business Improvement District should be exempt from the Late Night Levy. This is in light of the fact that those businesses already contribute financially towards measure that mitigate the impact of the night time economy, delivered through the BID. Importantly, these measures are specifically tailored and proportionate to the issues within the locale; the Late Night Levy however is not and we fail to see how it will have a positive impact on the London Bridge BID area.</p> | <p>It is noted that Team London Bridge have submitted a detailed supporting document, that will be addressed later in this report. The Licensing Committee will make a recommendation for the full assembly to decide, if the Levy is to be implemented. Monies paid to BIDs do not cover the late night period.</p> |
| 107. | British Beer and Pub Association | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>The British Beer & Pub Association is the UK's leading organisation representing the brewing and pub sector. Its members account for 90 per cent of the beer brewed in the UK and own around 20,000 of Britain's pubs. The pub sector contributes over £23 billion to the economy and supports in the region of 900,000 people. Over 80% of pubs are small businesses which are independently managed or run by self-employed licensees.</p> <p>In Southwark specifically, there are 222 pubs and 18 breweries. The beer and pub sector contributes around £149 million to the economy, providing 4,436 jobs (with over 40% of those employed under the age of 25) and £14.9 million in investment. As a sector within Southwark it pays £58.6 million in taxes.</p> <p>Opposition to the introduction of a Late-Night Levy (LNL): We would strongly urge the Licensing Authority and the Council to rethink its position and to take note of the concerns of both local businesses and Government. The BBPA is opposed to the LNL, which is merely a direct and punitive tax on local businesses. More importantly, the current LNL framework does not work effectively to address local alcohol-related issues, does not address problematic individuals and how they behave and generally does not have the support of businesses. Indeed, we strongly believe there are far more effective</p> | <p>Comments noted, however monies paid to BIDs do not cover the late night period. Cheltenham is the only Council to have reversed the implementation of a Levy, we are not aware of any other Authority which has 'rejected' the Levy.</p> |

local partnership methods through which to address such issues. Other local councils have realised that businesses are vital partners when looking to reduce alcohol related issues. A growing number of councils are rejecting the LNL and Cheltenham Council was the first to repeal a LNL in favour of a Business Improvement District (BID), which includes businesses as key stakeholders in the management of the night-time economy.

Most importantly, these flaws are now widely recognised, not just by businesses and other local councils but also by the House of Lords through an independent inquiry. The 2017 House of Lords committee report regarding the Licensing Act 2003 looked at all aspects of licensing in detail, including LNLs. The independent committee heard extensive evidence from all parties involved in the licensing system and concluded that 'given the weight of evidence criticising the late night levy..., we believe on balance it has failed to achieve its objectives and should be abolished.'

In its response to the report, the Government said that it would be commencing the provisions of the Policing and Crime Act 2017, notably Section 142 and Schedule 18, which would reform the LNL by:

- allowing licensing authorities to target specific geographical locations within their areas;
- extending the levy to include late night refreshment outlets; and
- requiring licensing authorities to publish information about how funds raised by the levy are spent.

However, to date Section 142 and Schedule 18 are not yet in force.

In light of the strong criticism by the House of Lords Committee, and the fact that changes to the LNL are envisaged by Government, a proposal to implement a LNL at this time ignores the clear failings of the current

framework and scope of the LNL. However we do acknowledge and support the proposal to use 100% of the levy monies to specifically address alcohol-related crime and disorder within the Borough.

Late Night Economy in London - recent findings:

“London at night: an evidence base for a 24-hour city - Executive report”

This report was published by the Mayor of London’s office in November 2018. In its consideration of how best to support a safe and thriving night-time economy in London, the report notes that:

- “This report highlights that you are actually no more likely to be a victim of crime at night than during the day.”
- “Londoners are drinking alcohol less regularly too. The number of people who drank alcohol in the last week in England has dropped from 67 per cent in 1998 to 58 per cent in 2016. Proportionately fewer Londoners consume alcohol than people across Britain.”

We also note and support a particular recommendation that before considering the introduction of a Late Night Levy, the Licensing Authority should explore alternative options for the development and management of its night time economy via London’s Night Czar’s Night Time Borough Champions Network.

“Think Night: London’s Neighbourhoods From 6pm to 6am”.

This report was published by the London Night Time Commission in January 2019. It sets out a number of recommendations that form a strategy for developing London’s night-time economy; introducing a LNL would naturally restrict the night time economy and therefore

work against this strategy. Suggested initiatives, such as Night Time Enterprise Zones offer a model for growing a Borough's night time economy, and specifically seeks to avoid the need for a LNL.

The report notes that - "We must adopt a partnership approach to managing town centres at night with visible policing alongside other authority figures, like the Soho Angels project. As police budgets are challenged, many areas have found success by funding greeters and ambassadors through Business Improvement Districts. Such partnerships have been far better at bringing long-term benefits than imposing, for example, the Late Night Levy. We believe the levy should only ever be a last resort. Partnership should be the priority."

The report also includes two statistics about the prevalence of alcohol-related crime at night:

- There has been a 51% drop in night time offences involving alcohol from 2010 to 2017;
- 4.3% of all crimes at night are alcohol-related offences.

These two figures underline that the need for a LNL to tackle alcohol-related night-time crime is over-estimated. These figures show that not only is the level of alcohol-related crime falling dramatically, but that as a proportion of night-time crime, it is very small.

These two recent reports cite a number of possible alternative approaches that could be adopted by the Borough before it considers introducing a LNL and we would therefore encourage the Licensing Authority to explore these first as a means of implementing a strategy that fosters its night time economy rather than restricts it.

The London-wide statistics noted above are not inconsistent with the with the data analysis undertaken

by the Borough (“LB Southwark Late Night Levy Data Analysis – August 2018” Appendix 6 of the supporting documents for “London Borough - Late Night Levy Consultation” report dated 7 November 2018). Looking closer at the data analysis we note that:

- The Local Alcohol Profile that illustrates hospital admissions does not have a breakdown by hour, and therefore it is not possible to use this as evidence for a specific problem in the period from midnight to 6.00am;
- The Crime Summary – Alcohol Related Violence: the statistics provided from the Crime Survey of England Wales are not only national figures (rather than Borough-specific) but do not cover the period from midnight to 6.00am;
- The Assault with Injury Offences data clearly shows that offences are actually much higher in the period before midnight, and that the number of offences after midnight are not only lower but show a clear reducing trend. Using this data to support a LNL would seem to result in penalising late-licences business for the activity earlier in the day. This is clearly unfair and unsupported.
- London Ambulance Service Callout Summary data also clearly shows a steep decline in alcohol-related callouts from midnight. Again this undermines the case for applying a levy on late-licensed business when clearly the greater number of callouts are occurring during the day and in the build up to midnight. If there is an issue with alcohol-related crime and behaviour in Southwark, this data would suggest it is at its greatest prior to midnight and therefore cannot be attributed to late-licensed businesses.

Management of the levy:
We would suggest that the management of levy income should be undertaken by a newly created “local management board”. We expect any such board to include a range of affected stakeholders, including local business owners such as pub landlords or their

| | | | | |
|------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | | representatives. | |
| 108. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>Fuller's has nine pubs in the Borough of Southwark - of which six would be impacted by the LNL if it is introduced. Of these five, three are managed houses - owned by Fuller's and run by a manager who is a salaried employee. The other two are tenanted pubs, which are run by a tenant as their own business.</p> <p>We do not believe that a late night levy is the best way to deal with the issues of the late night economy. A late night levy is a blunt instrument that is merely an additional tax on an already heavily taxed sector of the community. At Fuller's we already participate in, and support, initiatives and partnerships that we think are better ways of dealing with the problems such as PubWatch and street pastors.</p> <p>Our third main concern with the proposed LNL is the blanket approach which would lead to pubs that only open past midnight, for an hour or two, a few times a year paying the same as a club in the same rateable value band, which opens until 6am, three nights every week. This does not seem like a level playing field.</p> <p>Even the House of Lords has rejected the Late Night Levy when reviewing the licensing system, saying that it had failed to achieve its objectives and should be abolished. In addition, The London Night Czar has a Borough Champions Network which has considered a range of options in tackling issues resulting from a late night economy and we would urge Southwark to investigate these options rather than impose a LNL.</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Licensing Authority and Police already encourages partnership working with the hospitality industry, by attending business forums and PubWatches. The existing Night Time Economy Team furthers that link with late-night premises. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale. The Night Czar has provided a response to this consultation which is available later on in this report.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 109. | UKHospitality | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | <p>UKHospitality (UKH) is the voice of hospitality across the UK, representing a sector spanning restaurants, pubs, coffee shops, contract catering, hotels, nightclubs, bars and visitor attractions. The sector is a major contributor to the UK economy, employing 2.9 million people and generating £130bn in economic activity, while paying £38bn in taxation to fund important local and national services. Hospitality is the 3rd largest private sector employer in the UK; double the size of financial services and bigger than automotive, pharmaceuticals and aerospace combined.</p> <p>Hospitality plays a key role in London's economy, employment and culture. The sector is also important in our communities, and creating great experiences for both the capital's residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>We are strongly against the introduction of a Levy in Southwark, for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>UKHospitality is very much against the introduction of a late-night levy in Southwark. Late-night levies are highly ineffectual and have a significant cost for businesses. Levies have been shown to have a very limited benefit in terms of improved safety or reductions in crime and disorder. To improve security for London's late-night economy, the focus should be on partnership working between with the hospitality sector, boroughs, police and other stakeholders to create welcoming, safe and vibrant public spaces at night - as opposed to imposing greater burdens on businesses.</p> <p>The night-time sector (defined by the report recently commissioned by the Mayor as being between 6am and 6pm) is already overburdened with costs and adding another to the industry would be detrimental to its health. Increasing costs of property, rents and business rates are already hitting the sector hard. London-wide there has been a 3.3% decline in drinks led businesses since 2013 according to the Market Growth Monitor. Overburdening the late-night sector in Southwark will</p> | <p>Comments noted. The Licensing Authority and Police already encourages partnership working with the hospitality industry, by attending business forums and PubWatches. The existing Night Time Economy Team furthers that link with late-night premises. Some premises have been the recipient of enforcement action as a result of the work done by the Night Time Economy Team. Other premises have found officers working at night helpful to them. The response here is incomplete and end with "As the report states, Southwark has"...</p> |
|------|---------------|----------------------------|---|--|

lead to closures, prohibit new openings and is out of step with the Mayor's commitment to make London a 24-hour city.

This also cuts across Southwark's own Economic Wellbeing strategy 2017-22, the core aim of which is to help the council remove barriers to growth for businesses. As the report states, Southwark has worked hard to broaden its night time offer through the use of street food areas, building on the popularity of Borough Market and the mass appeal along Bankside and Embankment of a mix of cultural offerings (theatres, museums, galleries, street entertainments, food and music). The introduction of a Levy would undermine this, and cut across successful partnership working already in place between licensed premises, the council, policy and other stakeholders.

The Economic Wellbeing strategy states that:

"Every day we are demonstrating that we are a borough that is open for business and will promote and support economic wellbeing. Southwark should be the place of choice to start and grow a business".

We fully support the aim outlined above by the Council, but feel the introduction of a Levy would seriously undermine this. The strategy goes on to state that council decision-making should take full account of business needs, interests and opportunities, seeking advice from partners such as the Business Forum on emerging issues including the localisation of business rates and emerging issues associated with the UK's withdrawal from the EU. However as above, the introduction of a Levy would cut across this and damage businesses within the Borough. We are also disappointed the scheduled public meeting to discuss the Levy and its major impact was cancelled by the Council, as this would have been a key forum to hear the views of local businesses and other stakeholders.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>The levy will discourage inward investment from hospitality businesses which risks making Southwark less attractive for visitors and local residents alike. Southwark's strategy also states that it "will continue to facilitate effective BIDS and town centre networks, bringing together those with an interest in successful town centres". As the Mayor's recent Night Time Commission report highlighted and we have seen in other levy areas, late night levies undermine BIDs and successful partnership networks such as Pubwatches, Best Bar None, Purple Flag etc.</p> <p>There are a number of statements in Southwark's Economic Wellbeing strategy that appear to either be contradicted by our at least undermined by the introduction of a levy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Support thriving business communities in our town centres by protecting business space"• "Invest in our town centres, high streets, retail parades and markets through initiatives such as High Street Challenge and other targeted programmes that improve local retail environments"• "Support the development of new BIDS and work with existing BIDS and other town centre networks to enable them to improve their local areas"• "Invest in and support a strong cultural offer that enhances the economic diversity and vitality of our town centres and high streets". <p>During the time they have been an option, levies have been criticised heavily, notably by the House of Lords Committee that investigated the Licensing Act 2003. The conclusion that the Committee drew was late-night levies had 'failed to achieve its objectives and that it should be abolished.' Already, we have seen Cheltenham Council remove their levy after a short period of time because of its cost and detrimental impact on local businesses, with little impact on reducing disorder compared to voluntary partnership schemes. Other councils like Gloucester and</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Milton Keynes have rejected the proposal to introduce one.</p> <p>We welcome the Mayor of London's commitment to make London a 24-hour city and the decision to create the Night Time Commission, which has now reported with a serious of recommendations. This body is committed to strengthening London's night time economy and recognises the challenges that are currently present. UKHospitality has been instrumental in this and chaired the Commission.</p> <p>Introducing a late-night levy in Southwark would harm the many businesses within the ward boundaries that are legally permitted to sell alcohol between 12:00pm and 6:00am. The vast majority of these are law-abiding businesses, and if there are issues the Licensing Act allows them to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Such a levy would undoubtedly impact the number of businesses that would open in the area (with the subsequent impact on jobs and investment) and could also limit consumer choice.</p> <p>The lack of evidence presented, or business impact assessment, is also very concerning for such a serious proposal.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Comments:

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most respondents agree that the Levy is a suitable way to finance the work of the Night Time Economy Team • Many of those disagreeing, used the comments to state their objection to the Levy in its entirety |
|--|

Question:

Do you agree that the joint relationship between the Police and Council Enforcement Officers plays a role in ensuring a safe night time economy?

| No. | Who | Position | Comment | Officer response |
|-----|-----|----------|---------|------------------|
|-----|-----|----------|---------|------------------|

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 110. | Kino Bermondsey | Agree/Strongly Agree | I personally feel that engaging more with licenced premises in a pro active way rather than simply a reactive way would do a lot to further ensure a safe late night economy. | The Licensing Authority and Police already encourage partnership working with the hospitality industry, by attending business forums and PubWatches. The existing Night Time Economy Team furthers that link with late-night premises. |
| 111. | Canavan's Peckham Pool Club | Agree/Strongly Agree | as above. an example; Caught a guy dealing drugs on my premises , rang 999. we held the guy for 30 minutes but operator told us the police would be a further 45 minutes but could not guarantee. I could not keep two of my security watching this guy so had to let him go. something needs to be done to support us more or give us more powers. | Comments noted. |
| 112. | Camm & Hooper t/a Tanner & Co | Agree/Strongly Agree | We are best practice in licencing conditions with costs incurred to ensure we have a little environmental impact as possible. | Comment noted. |
| 113. | Nine Lives | Agree/Strongly Agree | State funded law enforcement is important, of course. | Comment noted. |
| 114. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | As above. | N/A |
| 115. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Council should work with police AND local businesses. Is there a Peckham business forum for example? | The Licensing Authority and Police already encourages partnership working with the hospitality industry, by attending business forums and PubWatches (of which there is already a Peckham PubWatch). The existing Night Time Economy Team furthers that link with late-night premises. |
| 116. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | This would seem to be obvious. Both parties have a role to play, but one cannot succeed without the other. | Comment noted. |
| 117. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Close and effective co-operation could help to make the area better and safer for business, workers, visitors and residents | Comment noted. |
| 118. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | This couldn't be more obvious. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 119. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | People who use the bars during the weekends which starts from friday evening - get drunk heavily, break bottles on the road, shout at high pitch, vomit in doorways, urinate in the railway arches, courtyards. This has increased quite alot in the past two years or so. There seems to be absolutely no measures taken by the local authority, police or bar owners to tackles these problems. | Comment noted, however the Night Time Economy Team will investigate any complaints you have about specific premises. We would welcome to hear from your further. |
| 120. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | It is important that the enforcement teams work together and cooperate with sharing information and expertise. | Comment noted. |
| 121. | Brunswick Park TRA | Agree/Strongly Agree | The job of enforcement isn't made easier by the constant reduction in police numbers . The closure of Camberwell Police station to be turned into flats is shameful. | Comment noted. |
| 122. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | When i go out in Peckham at night i don't see any police. | Comment noted. |
| 123. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | I do like and support this new Levy initiative and look forward seeing its positive effects that will keep our communities safer. | Comment noted. |
| 124. | A member of the public | Agree/Strongly Agree | Anti social behaviour is a police issue. Clean up after anti social behaviour falls to the council. The cause of problems is often excessive drinking. I cannot see how encouraging a party zone in Bermondsey village helps anyone. | It appears that the consultee has misunderstood the intentions of the Levy. At no point is the Council encouraging a 'party zone' in any part of the Borough. |
| 125. | LASSCO Ltd. | Agree/Strongly Agree | We would strongly support all joint communication. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 126. | Utobeer (The Rake) | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>You and MPS established the Joint Enforcement Teams which led to a massive increase in the relationship between all elements in policing both council and MPS. These have now been dissolved.</p> <p>So from a successful NTE policing model which you and MPS could have developed you allowed MOPAC to reorganize our policing and now you have come up with some other scheme that tries replace a consensus based model to one that is based on a legal statute that you can apply to businesses that do not have a constitutional vote and will be resented.</p> | Comment noted. |
| 127. | Adele Morris Ward Councillor | Agree/Strongly Agree | It is essential that all the different partners from licensing and enforcement (inside and outside the council) work together to tackle issues | Comment noted. |
| 128. | Taxi Driver | Agree/Strongly Agree | Its very important that they have a joined up approach. | Comment noted. |
| 129. | Graham Neale Ward Councillor | Agree/Strongly Agree | see above | N/A |
| 130. | British Beer and Pub Association | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>We do agree that effective partnerships in general are essential to making a safe and flourishing late night economy. However we would urge the Council to consider other business-led partnerships as better solutions than implementing a LNL.</p> <p>Business Improvement Districts and Partnership Schemes: Most pubs are open during the evening and some even later, forming an important part of the wider late-night economy. Some pubs choose to take advantage of longer opening hours at weekends or for special occasions. Yet many local authorities and police acknowledge that where problems exist, they are not caused by the majority of licensed premises, especially traditional pubs or those offering late night entertainment in a well-managed and responsible environment.</p> | The Licensing Authority and Police already encourages partnership working with the hospitality industry, by attending business forums and PubWatches.. The existing Night Time Economy Team furthers that link with late-night premises. Additional comments are noted. |

Despite this, there remains a responsibility for all stakeholders to ensure a safe and well-managed night-time economy for all to enjoy, and the pub sector is fully engaged through a wide variety of partnership working schemes which lead the way in the good management of public spaces. These schemes include, but are not limited to, Pubwatch, Best Bar None, Street Pastors, Purple Flag, Community Alcohol Partnerships, the Proof of Age Standards Scheme (PASS) and Business Improvement Districts (BIDs). The BBPA is supportive of all of these schemes.

It is widely agreed that partnerships with the trade are by far the best way to tackle any problems in the night-time economy, with closer working between venues, councils and the police. This approach provides local solutions to local issues. Addressing alcohol-related issues at the expense of responsible businesses is neither an effective nor equitable approach. A safe, diverse and vibrant local night-time economy is in the interest of all stakeholders and co-operation is key.

We would recommend that additional Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are established instead of a borough-wide LNL and alongside other local partnership initiatives. A BID is undoubtedly fairer as it spreads the financial burden across businesses of all types within the night-time economy and allows for a more targeted, collaborative and business-led allocation of funds. BIDs have been operating across the UK for over a decade and there are hundreds of BIDs now established around the country, a testament to their success. They allow for local solutions to local problems faced by local businesses. In contrast, the LNL is, in effect, a direct tax on local businesses and one which unfairly disadvantages pubs. Many pubs are small, independently-run businesses and the additional cost

burden is relatively significant, especially when these businesses contribute positively to the night-time economy yet the funds collected by a LNL are not reinvested to tackle any particular problems that these small businesses face.

BID levy money is ring-fenced and can be used for improvements to the area as well as promotion of its attractions, which can lead to increased footfall and trade. Most importantly, businesses become active stakeholders in creating a safe, diverse and vibrant night-time economy. Central to this theme is partnership working between all stakeholders. Many local councils have already recognised that such partnership working, in the form of a BID, is the way forward:

- Cheltenham Council was the first to repeal an established LNL in favour of a BID. It follows recognition from the council that a BID will raise more revenue than a LNL whilst involving businesses as key stakeholders, and that businesses should not be burdened by two levies.
- A 2013 report by Bristol City Council's Licensing Policy Scrutiny Board concluded that a BID scheme would provide for more targeted spending of funds and include businesses and stakeholders in efforts to manage the night-time economy.
- Leeds City Council also rejected a Levy in 2013, with a report by the Scrutiny Board labelling the legislation 'fundamentally flawed, particularly in terms of flexibility and unfair costs for some licensed premises. The same report stated the Executive Board's support for a city centre BID scheme instead, which has since been set up. It also recommended further work with the licensed trade to improve existing partnership schemes.

Furthermore, a BID is one scheme that operates effectively within a wider framework of local partnership

working. As noted above, there is a range of partnership schemes which are either business-led or have significant input from businesses as key stakeholders. Pubs are particularly engaged with these schemes and actively seek to contribute towards a safer and more vibrant night-time economy. Whilst each scheme has a different area of focus, a combination of different schemes can often be extremely effective in helping to address any problems that an area might face, creating a safer and more appealing space for all. Partnership schemes have been recognised as beneficial by other local councils:

- In October 2012 Havant Borough Council's Licensing Committee rejected a LNL, citing falling levels of alcohol crime and disorder which the police had partly attributed to the successful local Pubwatch scheme.
- Weymouth & Portland Borough Council Licensing Committee rejected a LNL in 2015, due to a lack of evidence to support the scheme. In a report providing evidence to the council, Dorset police highlighted that a BID was already in place and it was supporting the local Best Bar None scheme.
- A Best Bar None scheme was launched by Northampton Pubwatch with support from the Police and local Community Safety Partnership, to help create a safer town and recognise the pubs, bars and clubs that are working hard to reduce alcohol-related disorder and promote responsible drinking. The Northampton Scheme goes from strength to strength, and recently played an important role in Northampton being awarded a Purple Flag status.
- Kent County Council has worked to develop a county-wide Community Alcohol Partnership (CAP) scheme across Kent covering Canterbury City Centre, Westwood Cross, Thanet and Edenbridge. An independent evaluation by Kent University showed significant reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour as a result of the CAP.

| | | | | |
|------|---|-------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 131. | Clizia Deidda Southwark Council, Public Health Division as a responsible authority | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>The synergy between the Police and the Council Enforcement Officers plays a vital role in ensuring a safe night time economy. Sharing resources and information allows for a more efficient response to incidents, not only in terms of rapidly intervening when things go wrong, but also in terms of playing a more proactive role in reducing the likelihood of crime and antisocial behaviour in the first place.</p> <p>By conducting joint visits, sharing local knowledge and getting involved with businesses at the application stage, the Council and the Police can identify poorly managed premises and irresponsible operators before they can cause more serious issues.</p> <p>I would also like to highlight that the partnership with the Police doesn't only involve the Council's Enforcement team, but also a number of other Council divisions that act as Responsible Authorities, including Public Health.</p> <p>The strength of Public Health lies in its ability to provide meaningful evidence and intelligence to support the other responsible authorities. In order to improve this process, accurate and reliable data on crime, antisocial behaviour and other alcohol-related incidents must be collected. A proportion of the proposed Late Night Levy could be used to strengthen the Council's and the Police's ability to collect data and share them more efficiently.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 132. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>We definitely agree that a partnership approach is essential in delivering a successful and safe leisure economy. Fuller's is very involved in a number of partnerships and initiatives and building a network that works together is better for everybody than a punitive tax. We are long time supporters of PubWatch and we support street pastors in Ealing and Portsmouth. Street Pastors have worked very well in other areas - Soho for instance - and as well as targeting the minority that need help, it can reduce pressure on emergency services. Programmes such as PubWatch have the added</p> | Comments noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | benefit of including all premises that serve alcohol regardless of trading times. | |
| 133. | UKHospitality | Agree/Strongly Agree | <p>A Levy will undermine partnership working such as this. We believe that a levy should not be introduced, for the reasons outlined above. This view is supported not only by the findings of a House of Lords Committee and the Mayor's Night Time Commissions - but is also reflected in the small number of councils across England and Wales that have introduced such a tax, despite having the option to do so.</p> <p>The introduction of a late-night levy in Southwark would be completely at odds with the needs of the sector in Southwark and will have a negative impact on the local economy. There are existing pressures that challenge that late-night sector and the introduction of a levy would exacerbate the challenges that the sector faces. UKHospitality supports the Night Time Commission's focus to put the late-night economy at the heart of London policymaking. To ensure the health of the night time sector, UKHospitality supports the introduction of a 'Night Test' for all new policies to rate their impact on London's culture, sociability, wellbeing and economy at night.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 134. | The Grange Bermondsey Limited | Neither agree nor disagree | In theory, yes; but I have never seen evidence of such a joint relationship. | Comment noted. |
| 135. | Beer Rebellion | Neither agree nor disagree | never seen or heard of a council enforcement officer. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------------------|--|--|
| 136. | Erico Entertainment Limited | Neither agree nor disagree | Police funding meant to come from the central government not small businesses. Like I said, for the record most crimes are carried out mostly during the hours from 10:00am to midnight. Yes, their are crimes perpetrated during midnight but not in proportion of crimes perpetrated doing the day time. | Comments noted. |
| 137. | The Miller Of Mansfield | Neither agree nor disagree | It is difficult to comment on that. We are a well run pub serving professional people wanting some social time. We run comedy improv nights that require a later opening time. We are a community arts hub. We have our own licensed security staff. We never require Police support and we do not get any complaints about noise or anti social behaviour or anything else. And again, we already pay for additional police support as part of the BID. | Comments noted. |
| 138. | | Neither agree nor disagree | I do not sufficiently understand the joint relationship between the Police and Council Enforcement Officers to answer this question. | N/A |
| 139. | Maris Interiors LLP | Neither agree nor disagree | If implemented correctly then yes, but this Levy shows no clear schedule of how this will be achieved. | Comment noted. |
| 140. | barrow bot and banker | Neither agree nor disagree | all the business in the area need to act responsibly. this need to be in line with laws that govern our business. we also need and like to have contact and co operation with the police. we talk with the local police with regards to football activity especially on Saturdays as many football fans come through the area. is can cause issues. The pub watch appears to have fallen by the way side over the last year or so. This is disappointing. | Comment noted. If you would like to initiate a PubWatch in your area, we would be happy to attend. |
| 141. | Unwin and Friary Tenants and Residents Association | Neither agree nor disagree | At present, the cut back in police resources is not helping with crime reduction. To now increase the risk of crime by extending alcohol licence is like adding petrol to fire. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 142. | Team London Bridge | Neither agree nor disagree | Whilst this relationship would initially seem to play a role in safety, we haven't seen evidence of this in London Bridge - our premises are responsibly run and the licensing resources are diverted to more troublesome areas of the borough. | Comment noted. |
| 143. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | This is an odd question. Ensuring a safe night time economy is not just a two-way relationship; it involves other agencies and organisations (such as the BIDs), as well as the many individual businesses which already contribute (not just financially) towards this objective. | Comment noted. |
| 144. | Rias Altas ltd | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Council officers in my experience are not very effective - whether it be anti so ıla behaviour, noise or smell problems in general my experience of any council officer with regards to a safe night has been very poor. Police are overstretched and under funded and a partnership with an already castrated council team of officers would be useless. Example if we experience anri so ial behaviour council do little , similarly noise issues sound issues council are very lack responsive- they are overstretched and tied up in red tape that has little effect. My experience os a letter to local mpnos the only way of actioning anything | Comment noted. If you wish to make a complaint regarding Council officers or services provided, please follow the Council's corporate complaints procedure, so that your enquiry can be investigated in a fair and transparent manner. https://www.southwark.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/complaints-comments-and-compliments/making-a-complaint |
| 145. | Maris Interiors LLP | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | I don't know anything about it and I rarely see officers on the streets. But I don't feel unsafe working and living in Southwark. In fact I feel safer knowing licensed premises are open later | Comment noted. |
| 146. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | This is policing on the cheap. | Comment noted. |
| 147. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The council enforcement officers - noisy neighbours especially, are not open when we need them. Closed during the night - bizarre! | Please note that the Council's Noise Team is available 24 hours-a-day from 07:00 on Fridays to 02:20 on Tuesdays. |
| 148. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | The police are responsible to prevent breaches of the peace, protect people from crime etc. Council workers only enforce regulations relative to a business activity mainly. Let the police do their job. Let the council do their job. Police are not council. Council are not police. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| 149. | A member of the public | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Council enforcement officers have little powers | Comment noted. |
| 150. | Maris Interiors LLP | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | CEOs have limited power to support the Police in ensuring a safe night time economy. As they should. | Comment noted. |
| 151. | River Supermarket | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | No i dont agree and understand relationship | N/A |
| 152. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | Strongly Disagree/Disagree | Because the police is doing a great job until now. Instead perhaps the government can reconsider not to cut bugget for the police force | Comment noted. |

Comments

- The majority of respondents (including those for and against the introduction of the Levy) agree that the working relationship between the Police and the Local Authority is essential to ensure safety within the night time economy
- Some respondents believe that a Levy would undermine the existing working relationship
- Some respondents have misunderstood the question, or believe it to be misleading

Question:

If you have a late night business affected by the proposed Levy, please indicate how likely would it be that you would apply to vary your opening hours to avoid paying the Levy?

| No. | Who | Position | Comment | Officer response |
|------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|
| 153. | Hop King Ltd | Likely/Very Likely | We have a second business that is licensed up to 00:30 on Fridays and Saturdays. We would almost certainly apply to reduce these hours by 30 mins rather than pay the levy. | Comment noted. |
| 154. | Dulwich College | Likely/Very Likely | The levy would make the late licence unworkable as we use it irregularly as it is. | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 155. | The Waverley Arms | Likely/Very Likely | I would definitely amend my license if the levy is introduced. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|---|
| 156. | Parched | Likely/Very Likely | <p>We currently only open past midnight on a Friday at The Trinity so would review this.</p> <p>All our other sites in Southwark close at 1 am Fridays and Saturdays, this would also be reviewed.</p> | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 157. | Fish! Kitchen Ltd | Likely/Very Likely | We will definitely vary our licence so that we do not have to pay this unfair levy. The consequence of this levy will be a reduction in businesses operating after midnight which in turn will adversely effect the night time economy which so many workers rely on. | Comment noted. |
| 158. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | Likely/Very Likely | It's unclear whether all not-for-profit organisations such as ours would be exempt from the levy. Our licence only permits the sale of alcohol after midnight (until 00.30) on Fridays and Saturdays; in addition, alcohol is not served every day as the number of events permitted is limited under a planning consent to a fixed number of days each year, and in practice, all events end by 11.p.m. The circumstances are very different from all-night supermarkets or pubs/clubs operating into the early hours, so we would not expect to be treated in the same way. As above, the proposal is inherently unfair. | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. Non-profit organisations are not automatically exempt, but may be considered on a case-by-case basis in some instances, such as with cultural or sport-led venues. It must be noted that the planning and licencing regimes are distinctly separate and do not rely upon one another, although planning is a responsible authority in terms of licence application consultations. A licence that grants later hours does not negate any hours imposed by planning, therefore an offence may be committed under planning legislation if those hours are exceeded. |
| 159. | Kino Bermondsey | Likely/Very Likely | I've yet to see the document that outlines the proposed levy cost for my particular business, but as I rarely serve alcohol after midnight, even where my license permits it, I don't currently see any scenario where paying the levy would be worth the additional licenced hours | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. The cost of the Levy depends on the rateable value of the premises. These costs are freely available on the Council's website. |
| 160. | Shakespeare's Globe | Likely/Very Likely | We are a working theatre and a charity, we wouldn't be able to vary our licence without it making a detrimental impact on the work we do and the associated income. | The Licensing Authority will be making a recommendation to Council that theatres be exempt from the Levy. |
| 161. | Camm & Hooper t/a Tanner & Co | Likely/Very Likely | To avoid the levy there is every possibility that we would not use the hours that we inherited with our licence when it was transferred to us when we purchased the business. | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 162. | BA LAW | Likely/Very Likely | Again, we feel that the levy is not appropriate for seated restaurants and that they should not have to reduce their hours as a consequence. Seated restaurants are rarely the cause of late night Police resources. | Comment noted. At this time, there is not an option to make restaurants exempt. |
| 163. | The Miller Of Mansfield | Likely/Very Likely | By forcing licensed premises to close earlier, we will go back to the days when bars and pubs all closed at the same time, sending customers onto the street where they become a potentially unmanageable problem for police. Not only will it destroy the night-time vibrancy of the area, but it will create more problems than it resolves. It will be a huge step in wrong direction in our opinion. | Comments noted, however the intention of the Levy is not to force any establishment to close earlier. |
| 164. | Browns | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 165. | Crown & Greyhound | Likely/Very Likely | - If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------|--------------------|--|----------|
| 166. | Alleyns Head | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 167. | Alleyns Head | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 168. | Plough | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------|--------------------|--|----------|
| 169. | Mudlark | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 170. | Southwark Tavern | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 171. | Phoenix | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|----------------|
| 172. | Hornimans at Hay | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 173. | Mitchells and Butlers | Likely/Very Likely | If a Late Night Levy is introduced, it is certain that many of the premises will vary their Premises Licence to reduce the hours they sell alcohol. For many businesses who only trade for an hour after midnight, it would not be financially viable to pay the Levy. This will have the effect of severely limiting the choice of customers where they can go to enjoy an evening out with friends after midnight, and may result in customers going to other Boroughs to continue their evening. With a reduced choice of licensed premises open after midnight in Southwark, this will also put considerable pressure on those who do continue to trade in the area. | As above |
| 174. | Nine Lives | Likely/Very Likely | We might have to change our entire business model and focus more on food than drink | Comment noted. |
| 175. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | Neither likely nor unlikely | Because is not a choice it will be an arbitrary impose. | Comment noted. |
| 176. | barrow bot and banker | Neither likely nor unlikely | This is something that is being discussed at the moment. | Comment noted. |
| 177. | The Grange Bermondsey Limited | Unlikely/Very unlikely | Again, my pub is in a quiet area with very limited footfall. People come to it as a destination, not to a precinct. | Comment noted. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| 178. | SAMKAL ORIGINAL SUYA CHARCOAL GRILL | Unlikely/Very unlikely | THE SERVICES OFFERED BY MY BUSINESS RELIES MORE ON PATRONISING CUSTOMERS WHO TEND TO RELAX AND SOCIALISE LATE INTO THE EARLY MORNING, AS MY SERVICE DELIVERY BENEFITS MORE FROM LATE NIGHT PATRONAGE. | Comment noted. |
| 179. | Southwark Square Ltd | Unlikely/Very unlikely | We have one or two licensed tenants who would choose to pay I think | Comment noted. |
| 180. | The Miller | Unlikely/Very unlikely | <p>It would be a difficult decision to change our opening hours to avoid the levy. We are open until 1am on Fridays and Saturdays, and feel that a lot of people are drawn to us as somewhere they know they can spend their whole evening.</p> <p>While the majority of our customers don't stay until closing, we know that people like to have the option of being there until 1am - one way we know this informs their choice is that it's a key reason cited by people making private party & table bookings with us.</p> <p>Therefore we risk losing a lot of customers if we change our hours.</p> <p>We are a small business - we do not have the guaranteed custom of a large chain such as Weatherspoons who can change their hours and still expect to be full, and can also absorb losses through their other pubs.</p> | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |

| | | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| 181. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | Unlikely/Very unlikely | <p>The application of a LNL as proposed is incredibly unfair as it applies equally to pubs that only open past midnight, for an hour or two, a few times a year and a club in the same rateable value band, which opens until 6am, three nights every week. This does not seem like a level playing field.</p> <p>All three of our impacted managed pubs in the Borough, currently state their trading times very clearly on their websites - and in all three cases, these trading times do not go past Midnight. However, retaining the flexibility to open later is very important to us. We are a customer-focused business and if we are hosting a wedding, a 40th birthday party or a silver wedding anniversary - and our customer wishes to continue past midnight, we want to be in a position to accommodate that. The application of a LNL is an absolute charge on businesses with no recognition of the actual operation of that specific business. A partnership approach involving all business in the local area that operate in the evening / late night economy would be preferable and fairer. Pubs are community hubs and should be protected as such - and that includes allowing those that have the licence to do so, to allow the community a later finish on those celebrations. As a bare minimum, if the council is insistent on implement a LNL, it should be for a shorter timeframe to avoid such a disproportionate effect.</p> | <p>Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale.</p> |
| 182. | Kings College London Students' Union | Unlikely/Very unlikely | <p>We're just licensed till 2am in the morning and we go till that time either on Wednesday Night or sometime on Friday Nights. If we try to vary our hours we will lose considerable business which we're already struggling with due to declining market.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| 183. | The Flying Dutchman | Not applicable | <p>Without late license we would be immediately out of business.</p> | <p>Comment noted.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 184. | Canavan's Peckham Pool Club | Not applicable | I feel this would be great for the area and a lot of licencees will take up the offer. It is great to read the council is even considering this option for our businesses . I am the owner of Canavan,s peckham pool club and whelans free house in rotherhide old road. do i need to fill one of these again? | Comment noted. If you do not wish to make amendments to your licence to avoid the Levy, you need not do anything. |
| 185. | Aquarius Golf Club | Not applicable | While we have a late night licence, we have only used it once on the millennium Eve 2000. | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. |
| 186. | A member of the public | Not applicable | I live on a cut-through street and do not like the idea of a residential area being spoilt by disorderly behaviour. I imagine this could apply to many other residents / residential areas. | Comment noted. |
| 187. | St. John Group | Not applicable | If we considered a change in our licensing this would take account of the levy and we would avoid being liable. | Comment noted. |
| 188. | Taxi Driver | Not applicable | It is that just the business in question that is affected but all the supporting businesses. | Comment noted. |
| 189. | A member of the public | Not applicable | If I have a late night business, I would understand that this proposed levy is for the greater good. | Comment noted. |
| 190. | British Beer and Pub Association | Not applicable | As a trade organisation, we cannot offer a view on this question as it is phrased. However, we would suggest a shorter time period that does not penalise businesses that are only licensed for a small proportion of the full six-hour night-time supply period, for example, excluding those that are only licensed until 1.00am. If the full six-hour period is selected by the Licensing Authority, the Levy would be applicable equally, whether a business is licensed for only a short period between midnight and 6.00am (e.g. an extension to 12.30am) or licensed for the full six-hour period. This causes a disproportionate impact on those venues, such as pubs, whose licensed hours are more likely to extend marginally into the late-night supply period. The late-night supply period does not need to cover the entire six-hour period; | Comment noted. A premises wishing to avoid the Levy could apply for a free minor variation to reduce hours. Temporary Events Notices may be applied for additional occasional extensions in hours. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------|----------------|---|----------------|
| | | | the Licensing Authority should choose a shorter timeframe and avoid a disproportionate effect. | |
| 191. | UKHospitality | Not applicable | As outlined above we are against the introduction of a levy. If one is to be introduced, it is essential that it is for the shortest possible time period. A late-night levy is a widely discredited mechanism that is not only highly ineffectual but has a significant cost for businesses. It has been criticised from a wide range of stakeholders – including Parliament and the Mayor’s office - and has also been shown to have a very limited benefit in terms of improved safety. Introducing it in Southwark would have a significant impact on businesses in the region and would likely act as a barrier to more late-night businesses moving to the area. | Comment noted. |

Comments

- If a Levy were introduced, it is clear that some premises would apply for a free minor variation to reduce their hours, but not all.

Question

There is the option to apply a 30% discount for businesses in certain categories. How do you think this discount should be applied?

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|-----|
| No discount for any business selling alcohol late at night | 63 | 154 |
| A discount for businesses receiving small business rate relief | 78 | 139 |
| A discount for businesses already paying a levy due to their location within a business improvement district | 97 | 120 |

| No. | Who? | Comment | Officer Response |
|------|------------|---|---|
| 192. | Nine Lives | Cocktail bars have no impact on anti-social behaviour - quite the opposite. They don't generate waste, and they don't encourage excessive drinking. The levy must be applied to establishments that contribute directly to antisocial behaviour | Comment noted, however cocktail venues are not available for exemption. |

| | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| 193. | The Miller | <p>I feel that the businesses paying a BID should be completely exempt from the levy if it goes forward. I am also in favour of discount for small business.</p> <p>Issues related to alcohol misuse such as violent crime for example are not as prevalent in our area (London Bridge) as in others (such as Peckham & Camberwell).</p> <p>Being part of a BID district with Team London Bridge it is frustrating to have to pay twice for a service which we already receive.</p> <p>As noted in the first section we feel that TLB give a great level of assistance with the problems we do face here, and already undertake much of the work that Southwark Council will fund through the Levy. They pay for example, for a special police officer Nick - who has worked with us to resolve a number of issues we have faced here.</p> <p>It seems likely from what we heard at the consultation that the levy will be collected and then dispersed to the areas with the highest levels of crime during evening hours - ie. not where we are. It feels likely that we will be effectively be paying twice for similar services but probably not seeing much of the resources funded by the levy as we have lesser need for them in London Bridge.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Potential discounts will be considered by the Council. Hotspot mapping has demonstrated that alcohol-related crime takes place throughout the Borough. The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. All premises subject to the Levy will be expected to pay, regardless of their individual need.</p> |
| 194. | Canavan's Peckham Pool Club | <p>the owners of licences should have to pay for policing and council services.</p> <p>may be treat it like insurance. if you get points on your licence you pay more.</p> <p>owners should be held responsible for what happens on their premises.</p> <p>If a noise issue is proven they get points.</p> <p>if the S.I.A. inspection is bad they get points.</p> <p>If the police are not happy with the way a situation is dealt with they get points.</p> <p>this means they pay more the next year. points last 3 years.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 195. | The Miller Of Mansfield | At the very least, the discount of 30% must be applied. But I would hope that BID members be exempted altogether., as we are clearly being taxed for the same thing twice. There is no justification for this. Businesses like ours are already struggling with increasing costs across the board, and this could be the final straw for some. | Comment noted, however the monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 196. | Kino Bermondsey | I believe the levy should also be calculated based on how many days the premises is licensed past midnight, and how many hours past midnight they are licensed for. For example; i feel that a premises that is licenced until 3am 6-7 days a week should pay more than a premises that is licenced until 1am 2-3 days a week | Comment noted, however the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. The Act does not provide scope to introduce such a sliding scale. |
| 197. | The Underdog Gallery | We should not pay a levy based on this fact. | Comment noted. |
| 198. | Shakespeare's Globe | The solution is not to continue to push financial charges on to businesses. This will impact on small businesses and not major corporations who will be able to easily cover the charges. | Comment noted. |
| 199. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | Again, the question isn't the right one. I don't think there should be an across-the-board discount at all; small businesses, not-for-profit organisations/registered charities/community benefit societies (e.g. the Ivy House pub in Nunhead), BID members, etc. should be exempt from the charge as it is not appropriate in many cases. | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 200. | A member of the public | Venues in BID areas are not immune to antisocial behaviour, it would be absurd to suggest so. If a venue is already receiving rate relief, there will be reason for doing so (it's not handed out lightly) so should get a discount. | Comment noted. |
| 201. | Maris Interiors LLB | Weighted question, I feel like none of the business should pay a levy unless a clear schedule can be displayed on how late night crime and nuisance will be reduced and where the money is spent. Then if there was a levy it should be paid for by a percentage of their grossing business income. | Comment noted. |
| 202. | A member of the public | Independent businesses should be exempt | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members, however simply being 'independent' is not a category for consideration. |
| 203. | A member of the public | Smaller independent venues are vital for music culture to be fostered | Comment noted. |
| 204. | A member of the public | If alcohol is not sold then no levy therefore no discount | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|--|
| | | should apply as alcohol can stop being sold. | |
| 205. | A member of the public | How about reduced or cancelled levy charges "if" the business shows that it thoroughly cleans outside it's premises and affected areas on a regular basis? I.e jet washing weekly... Get business owners to work as a team to clean their streets and get good rate reductions. It would encourage them to do clean and save Southern Council alot of money. | Comment noted, however, a premises that maintains the cleanliness of their property's external area is not a category for exemption or reduction. |
| 206. | A member of the public | I'm sure that any extra costs they occur will be put on to their customers, therefore I do not think any of them should receive a reduction. if they are struggling then maybe they shouldn't open during these hours. | Comment noted. |
| 207. | A member of the public | A discount should be offered to those Licensed Premises that can be shown to be acting in conformity to Southwark's Licensing Policy through membership of a scheme to encourage good behavior. | Comment noted. Reductions (discounts) will be considered by Members - this could include those belonging to a 'best practice' scheme. |
| 208. | A member of the public | I don't know. | N/A |
| 209. | A member of the public | Well this levy (cough *tax* cough) should not be enforced. | Comment noted. |
| 210. | A member of the public | Don't bother with discount, lower your rates | Comment noted. |
| 211. | A member of the public | I think bars and restaurants need to be supported in Southwark. I'd be happy with off-licences having to pay a surcharge. | Comment noted. |
| 212. | A member of the public | I think if a business has a revenue of X or over, it should pay but if it's under then it shouldn't. The busiest places will probably make the most money and also create more of the problems and trash. Make a policy against use of single-use plastics in the borough, especially from take aways and plastic cups. Add more bins, recycling and rubbish. A kebab shop next to a bar will end of creating more rubbish than the bar, and it's not fair for the alcohol selling business to suffer without the kebab shop also paying. | Comment noted, however, the cost of the Levy per premises is based on the rateable value, rather than the income of the business. The Southwark Statement of Licensing Policy is considering making an amendment to encourage discontinued use of single-use plastics as part of its upcoming consultation for the Policy to run from 2020-2024. |
| 213. | Brunswick Park TRA | Can't answer the above question. Don't know who the biggest culprits are. i.e. who sells the most alcohol and with what effect. Ideally one would like to see see the most popular outlets penalised the most. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 214. | A member of the public | <p>I think any business contributing to extended drinking should be liable for the levy.</p> <p>On Druid Street we as residents often see customers who start their "beer mile" journey at 11am, still there at midnight but by that time they are urinating in the street and shouting. Any business contributes to this needs to be responsible.</p> | Comment noted. |
| 215. | | Please include an option for 'no levy' as this does not currently present a fair spectrum of options | We accept that there is not an option for 'no levy' at this section and has seen consultees respond with a 'no' to all questions, which may have produced distorted results. |
| 216. | A member of the public | No levy | Comment noted. |
| 217. | Southwark Square Ltd | I think a discount for small businesses where the alcohol sale is not their primary business would be fair | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 218. | The Hill Bakery & Deli | It all depends on the rate at which the levy is set. As a small business owner (unaffected by the proposed change), I can see that £5.85/week would be affordable, but £85 would not. I don't think this would happen in Camberwell, but I'd hate to see any small business having to close because of the extra financial pressure. | Comment noted. |
| 219. | Fish! Kitchen Ltd | We are already paying a BID levy and a second levy will be grossly unfair. | The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 220. | barrow bot and banker | we are already paying a levy for better bankside?? so why pay another levy. | The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 221. | Tower Bridge (City of London Corporation) | If businesses are already paying a levy as part of the business improvement district it is unfair to expect to pay any further levies even if discounted. | The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 222. | boot and flogger | no relevant answer as don't agreed with the levy | Comment noted. |
| 223. | Dulwich College | Also the option for some businesses to pay only on dates that the late licence is used. | The Levy will become due on the date that the annual licence fee is due, which is a year after the licence was issued. |
| 224. | Utobeer (The Rake) | See comment above. Your are going to end up losing business support - this is a matter of principle. | Comment noted. |
| 225. | River Supermarket | Smaller businesses shouldnt be charged | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 226. | Kings College London Students' Union | From our perspective Kings College London already pays business rates which are paid annually. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| 227. | Adele Morris Ward Councillor | Only those levy paying businesses should receive a discount, and that should be on the basis that the BID is using some of the levy it collects to manage the late night economy (BIDS should provide evidence to show how they are contributing to the management of the night time economy | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 228. | British Beer and Pub Association | <p>If the decision is taken to introduce a LNL then we strongly recommend that the Licensing Authority should grant exemptions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Year’s Eve. It would be wholly disproportionate to apply the annual levy fee to any business that only operated beyond midnight on that one day of the year. • Businesses that are within a Business Improvement District (BID). <p>There are currently five BIDs already in place within Southwark. Any pubs that are part of those BIDs will, in effect, incur a triple-taxation for late-night trading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turnover generated after midnight is included in Fair Maintainable Turnover for Rateable Value assessment and then taxed through Business Rates; • A rating supplement is also payable by businesses within a BID; • A Late Night Levy – this would be we the third tax applied to a late-night business within a BID, unless an exemption was applied. <p>With regards to reductions, we agree with both of the proposals. We would strongly recommend that businesses that participate in any of the following recognised schemes should be granted a reduction: National Pubwatch, Best Bar None, Street Pastors, Purple Flag, Community Alcohol Partnerships, the Proof of Age Standards Scheme (PASS) and BIDs (if not already granted a full exemption). All of these partnership initiatives have proven their worth in tackling alcohol-related issues.</p> <p>It is worth noting that if a reduction is applied for businesses within BIDs rather than a full exemption, this could well</p> | Premises with hours beyond midnight only on New Year's Eve have been recommended for exemption. Any further exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| | | <p>result in some businesses campaigning to remove the BID as they may not be able to afford both the BID costs and a 70% LNL.</p> <p>We also strongly recommend that any pubs that are in receipt of Small Business Rate Relief are granted a reduction. These businesses are small and independent, often relying on tight margins for success. A LNL would incur a disproportionate burden on such businesses who often encourage and operate extremely responsible drinking environments.</p> | |
| 229. | Shepherd Neame Brewery | I can see no reason why businesses already enjoying SBRR should benefit at the expense of businesses already paying substantial rates | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 230. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | <p>There should definitely be an exemption for New Year's Eve - and we believe there should be a change</p> <p>There should also be a full exemption for any venues that only serve to residents post midnight. We have two hotels that would be subject to the LNL as laid out in this consultation - including one where the only sales post Midnight would be to residents through a minibar in their room. This seems totally ludicrous.</p> | Premises with hours beyond midnight only on New Year's Eve have been recommended for exemption, as have hotels selling alcohol to bona fide guests. Any further exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 231. | Graham Neale Ward Councillor | Anyone who sells alcohol should have to pay | Comment noted. |
| 232. | Team London Bridge | Businesses within a Business Improvement District should receive a 100% discount. | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 233. | UKHospitality | As above, we disagree with the concept of a levy outright. However, if it is to be introduced, there should be a discount for businesses receiving small business rate relief and a discount for businesses already paying a levy due to their location within a business improvement district. | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members. |
| 234. | BA LAW | <p>None of the above are appropriate.</p> <p>There should be a 100% discount for seated restaurants and hotels</p> <p>Perhaps a staged discount dependent upon capacity.</p> | Comment noted, any exemptions or discounts will be considered and decided by Members, though restaurants will not be included in those options. the cost of the Levy per premises is based on the rateable value, not capacity. |
| 235. | Cherry Garden Development Tenants and Residents Association | <p>Southwark have to find a balance, if they have to apply a late night levy. We need to support and try and keep the existing businesses here. Is this another form of tax?</p> <p>It is wrong for the Council to charge for these services again. Southwark have already increased Council and business taxes and this should be used to cover the services within the community. For antisocial behaviour businesses should be encouraged to employ more security officers if needed.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 236. | Personal Licence Holder | The fees suggested seem small compared to the financial gains available from late licensing. | Comments noted. |

Comments

- The comments received on this question make it clear that the question was not asked in the correct format. Those whom disagree with the Levy in any way have marked 'no' for all answers as they simply do not want it brought in, regardless of any potential discounts. This has therefore distorted the feedback. Retrospectively, there should have been an option for 'no Levy' too;

- Businesses within BID areas that have responded, have predominately requested that a 30% discount be applied, in the event that the Levy is introduced;
- In the event of the introduction of the Levy, the most popular choice would be to offer a discount to those already receiving Business Rate Relief.

Question:

What is your preferred option for the allocation of potential money received through the Levy?

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|-----|
| 70% to Met Police and 30% to Council | 65 | 152 |
| 100% to Council (with 70% to be spent on local policing) | 98 | 119 |
| Other (to be written in comments) | 40 | 177 |

| No. | Who? | Comment | Officer Response |
|------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| 237. | Kino Bermondsey | 100% to the council with funds being split between local policing, social outreach, community engagement, and youth projects | Comment noted. |
| 238. | The Flying Dutchman | I am not in a position to comment on this. | N/A |
| 239. | Canavan's Peckham Pool Club | I think this should be decided by the people in charge. the licencees dont really know the ins and outs of who dose more police or council most people i speak to are happy to hear that the council may be improving night life in the area. you will have family people who will not like the idea but if people are mindful of where they move to and the clubs and bars in the area it should not be a problem. Again going back to S.I.A staff having more responsibilities, Training and then authority. | Comment noted. |
| 240. | The Grange Bermondsey Limited | I think the levy might have a better chance of success with local policing. From experience, the Met is vastly underfunded and overstretched, and any contribution to the Met from a mooted levy would just disappear into Met consolidated revenue, with precious discernible local benefit. | Comment noted. |
| 241. | citizenM hotel | We no specific opinion on this. Though we agree it makes sense to share between the Police and Council. | Comment noted. |
| 242. | Rias Altas ltd | If a levy was raised should be spent on inspiring programmes for the youth - entrepreneurship programmes local programmes of encourangong youth against crime knofe crime education - | Any monies raised through a Levy are to be spent on preventing antisocial behaviour in the night time economy, that has been caused by alcohol-led premises. The monies would be spent on |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--|---|
| | | inspiring the young not blown on the police or a council who already have little ability to do anything with regards to anti social behaviour | policing this, not combating knife crime, though it is accepted that this is a pertinent issue. |
| 243. | The Miller Of Mansfield | This is irrelevant. We already pay for additional local policing and cleaning services as part of the BID. | The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 244. | The View from The Shard | Already paying for this through the BID | The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. |
| 245. | Browns | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic affect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|--|-----------|
| 246. | Crown & Greyhound | <p>- An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |
| 247. | Alleyns Head | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | |

| | | | |
|------|--------------|--|-----------|
| 248. | Alleyns Head | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |
| 249. | Plough | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--|-----------|
| 250. | Mudlark | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |
| 251. | Southwark Tavern | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--|-----------|
| 252. | Phoenix | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |
| 253. | Hornimans at Hay | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | As above. |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|---|
| 254. | Nine Lives | 50% to Council (70% of that on policing) & 50% returned to venues as an incentive for those who have a positive impact on society, as opposed to encouraging anti-social behaviour | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the split between Councils and the Police and cannot be changed by the Council. |
| 255. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | No preferred option, as the economics are unclear; this seems like a simplistic choice without other options being considered. | Comment noted. |
| 256. | A member of the public | If you do decide to do this, the process of which is wasting more of my money, I would suggest that you give the money back to residents and businesses that pay rates in Southwark. You can't just keep finding more ways to take more money from us! | Comment noted, though you have responded as a member of the public, unaffected by the Levy, therefore you would not be subject to it. |
| 257. | A member of the public | Each borough should have its own income source. Why should money from one borough be used in another? | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 258. | A member of the public | The monies should be spent on other Council key priorities - A place to call home o A place to belong o A greener borough o A full employment borough o A healthier life o A great start in life o A safer community o A vibrant Southwark | Comment noted. |
| 259. | A member of the public | This is not a yes or no answer. Police intervention in the night-time economy is a nuanced issue and one that has been critically exposed many times in London throughout recent years. I would support a proportionally greater allocation to the council as I believe that is where money can be spent on the means to prevent the anti-social behaviour which I believe you're alluding to (though it isn't specified) such as vandalism, littering and public urination. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the split between Councils and the Police and cannot be changed by the Council. |
| 260. | STAMP (Shad Thames Area Management Partnership) | We would need cast iron guarantees and full transparency from the Council about the 70% to be spent on local policing | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 261. | A member of the public | No levy. | Comment noted. |
| 262. | A member of the public | Not applicable as I don't agree with this policy. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|--|
| 263. | A member of the public | I don't understand enough about how it would be covered, the implications but do think there should be a split. | Comment noted. |
| 264. | A member of the public | If there is a charge it should go directly to the police | Comment noted. |
| 265. | Brunswick Park TRA | Money paid to the police (1st option) won't be ring -fenced. | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 266. | A member of the public | I prefer the council to control the funding as it is more responsive to local residents | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 267. | A member of the public | If you absolutely must go ahead with this idiotic proposal, then instead of spending the money on the police, it should be used as a fund to subsidise independent culture in the borough in the form of grants for live music, arts venues, and other curatorial organisations. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the split between Councils and the Police and cannot be changed by the Council. |
| 268. | A member of the public | Police are already paid for in separate council tax so council should campaign for more money for police from Govt and keep there money to fund council services. get rid of the tory govt and restore govt funding for police. The council is not a police force, or part of it. | Comment noted. |
| 269. | A member of the public | assessment should be made of the issues then funds allocated | Comment noted, this will be a decision made by Board members. |
| 270. | Travel | 100% to the Police | Comment noted. |
| 271. | Maris Interiors LLP | Providing all the spending is made public and clear statistics can be presented on how crime and nuisance has been reduced. If no reduction the Levy should be rebated back. | Comment noted. |
| 272. | A member of the public | This extra revenue must be clearly accounted for by the Police and the way it is used agreed with the Council. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Additional street cleaning is only one potential option. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 273. | A member of the public | 100% toward cleaning services only. Business pay for policing and other public services through taxation already. It should NOT go into the council coffers to be spent anywhere else other than cleaning services. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the split between Councils and the Police and cannot be changed by the Council. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|---|
| 274. | A member of the public | Local policing in my opinion would help a lot with controlling the behaviour of some of the more troublesome late night nightclub leavers. | Comment noted. |
| 275. | A member of the public | Police funding should be coming from elsewhere and the pressure needs to be put from the council onto the right people to make that happen, not punish local business owners. The majority of money spent to clean up after the night time economy should be focused on the rubbish and the environment. If you're going to do a percent split, it should be 70 on public toilets, infrastructure, rubbish collection and bins, and 30 on police, if anything. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the split between Councils and the Police and cannot be changed by the Council. |
| 276. | A member of the public | No levy | Comment noted. |
| 277. | A member of the public | The spend going to the council should be dedicated to clean up of drinking related items only and a report sent to residents annually showing this. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 278. | A member of the public | As much money as possible should be put into systems encouraging safe transport, programmes like Ask for Angela promoting safety inside venues and for good quality training for door staff | Comment noted. |
| 279. | A member of the public | No levy | Comment noted. |
| 280. | A member of the public | Returned to the business who gave the money in the first place you greedy people. | Comment noted. |
| 281. | A member of the public | <p>Money to be spent on cleaning the streets during the day time. Peckham highstreet is a mess everyday after the traders and butchers have dumped all their commercial waste on the street, seemingly immune from being requested to put it in a bin.</p> <p>Perhaps some money could be spent moving policing Peckham square in front of the library where "anti-social" alcoholics sit all day swearing at passes by, drinking special brew, with no police interest whatsoever.</p> | Comments noted, however, monies earned via the Levy must be spent of night time economy issues, not clearing up detritus from unlicensed daytime businesses. You can make a street cleaning request here: https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 282. | A member of the public | 0% to the council | Comment noted. |
| 283. | A member of the public | 100% to Met police | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| 284. | A member of the public | Police should be the enforcement | Comment noted. |
| 285. | A member of the public | there Wouk shave to be more transparency in where the money goes. Could it not directly benefit the local area? | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 286. | Southwark Square Ltd | However best works | Comment noted. |
| 287. | The Hill Bakery & Deli | The closure/relocation of Camberwell police to Peckham is problematic. So I'd like to see the money raised going to truly local policing, rather than being spread across the borough. | Comment noted. |
| 288. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | No levy should be apply | Comment noted. |
| 289. | boot and flogger | the levy (if in place) should be split 50/50 and detailed reports of allocations and how the levy was spent should be produced in a similar vain as service charge for a building, other wise the tax will get siphoned off to other causes and the area will not get the spending or attention it has paid for. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 290. | Utobeer (The Rake) | 100% to MPS - apparently this is all because they are short of resources so give them the money. Must be spent in the policing area. | Comment noted. |
| 291. | barrow bot and banker | I don't agree with the levy it think we pay enough costs for our businesses. | Comment noted. |
| 292. | Fish! Kitchen Ltd | I cannot answer fully to that question other than to the organisation that tackles late night crime the best. | Comment noted. |
| 293. | BA LAW | Police carry the heavy load in terms of call outs etc. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 294. | Mitchells and Butlers | <p>An additional consequence of introducing a Late Night Levy is the significant reduction in employment hours lost from those premises who decide to vary their licences, impacting on the hundreds of local people who work in those premises, as their income reduces. If the number of visitors to Southwark declines, many non licensed businesses will also suffer, not least the food outlets and taxi drivers. I urge you to consider the detrimental economic effect on local businesses and local working people.</p> <p>Regarding the benefits of the Licensing Act 2003, its introduction removed the pinch point times of customers leaving premises and has generally been welcomed by the Police, as fixed closing times caused them more issues of crime and disorder. The introduction of the Late Night in Southwark would bring a return to that problem with everyone on the street at around midnight and then trying to migrate to the premises that open later. The Levy may actually increase the cost of policing between midnight and 1am.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 295. | Humaira Ali Ward Councillor | We need to work to agree with the team and the police what is going to be the best mix of spend. The levy should be 100% spent on governance and management of the night time economy and the knock on impacts. | Comment noted. |
| 296. | Farhad Chowdhury Southwark Council, Health and Safety as a Responsible Authority | the council should receive all the money, as they do majority of the work. | Comment noted. |
| 297. | Bill Legassick, Southwark Local Authority Officer (Environmental Protection) | The money received through the Levy to be ring - fenced to the work of the Night-time Economy Team and any alcohol awareness and prevention projects. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies, which potentially include a Public Health-led alcohol awareness project. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 298. | Paul Newman Southwark Council, Environmental Protection as a Responsible Authority | <p>After top slicing the expenses to Southwark of administering the scheme;</p> <p>100% to the Police, with a commitment by the Police through MOPAC to spend the revenue on the impacts of the late night</p> | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| | | economy in Southwark, in accordance with the recommendations of a partnership arrangement to include businesses, the Police, the Licensing Authority, and representatives of local residents. | |
| 299. | Earl Legister, Southwark Local Authority Officer (Food Safety) | Local Authority administered and through dialogue with the Police, determine the resources needed from both organisations, quantify the input and determine related costs then apportion the money accordingly. | Comment noted. |
| 300. | British Beer and Pub Association | <p>Levy revenue and Levy hours:</p> <p>It is questionable that businesses paying the LNL experience any direct benefits and it is clear that in such instances the LNL is merely a direct tax. The BBPA is aware that the newly proposed changes to the LNL in the Policing and Crime bill will require local authorities to publish data on how funds are spent and, if a LNL is introduced, the BBPA is supportive of this transparency. However, the change does not detract from the fact that the spending is not business-led and sets no boundaries as to how the funds must be spent. We would therefore advocate a BID as a better alternative to a LNL.</p> <p>In regard to the hours in which the LNL operates, we would recommend that, if a LNL is to be implemented, it should be issued from the latest possible time so as not to unfairly punish small responsible operators such as pubs. If pubs decide to reduce their licensed hours as a result of the LNL they will lose out on weekend trading hours whilst large operators such as nightclubs can easily afford to pay the LNL, even though they may often be the cause of a significant proportion of alcohol-related issues. Pubs form a critical part of a diverse and vibrant night-time economy and many local authorities and police acknowledge that where problems exist, they are not caused by the majority of licensed premises, especially traditional pubs or those offering late night entertainment in a well-managed and responsible environment.</p> <p>Pubs, in which a responsible drinking environment exists, are therefore punished and this is to the detriment of the local night-</p> | Comments noted, however, monies The monies currently paid to BIDs do not cover the late-night economy period covered by the Levy. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>time economy if pubs choose to close earlier to avoid the Levy. Indeed, all of the councils currently administering a LNL have seen many businesses enacting minor variations to scale back opening hours in order to avoid payments. Not only will this impact upon diversity in the local night-time economy, it will also create significant problems for LNL revenue, which has often fallen short of predictions as a result. Indeed, several councils have chosen to reject the LNL on the grounds that net revenue will be insignificant when factoring in administration and implementation costs. Cheltenham, for example, raised less than 39% of the £199,000 figure that had been predicted in the first year. It became the first local council to repeal the LNL in favour of a BID. A number of other councils have rejected the Levy on similar grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Milton Keynes, despite a consultation and approval from the Licensing Committee, a LNL was rejected by the full council for a number of reasons, including that members saw the potential of high administrative costs for minimal financial gain. In the final analysis, figures showed that the potential net profit for the council from the Levy could have been as low as £9,500. • Warwick District Council officers produced a report in 2015 which recommended that a LNL should not be introduced due to limited revenue return following the time and cost of implementation. • Norwich City Council’s Licensing Committee cited similar reasoning when it decided against a Levy in 2012, after estimating that the revenue before administrative costs would be just £35,000. • Liverpool City Council rejected the implementation of a Levy in March 2016. One key reason was that other areas with a Levy in place had not seen the financial benefits that were anticipated. Furthermore, businesses were likely to reduce opening hours to avoid paying the Levy and potential new businesses may be discouraged from entering the night-time economy. | |
| 301. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | We would support a transparent system that shows how the money raised is spent - but overall we feel there are far better ways of partnership working between the industry, the emergency services, the local authority and supporting | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|---|
| | | organisations and we would prefer to be involved in that way. | decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 302. | UKHospitality | As stated above, we are against the introduction of a levy in principle. If it does go ahead, all money raised should be spent in the Borough on areas relevant to late night operations, and there should be full transparency on how funds are managed and spent. | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 303. | Clizia Deidda Southwark Council, Public Health Division as a responsible authority | This would help to ensure that all the monies collected in Southwark is spent in Southwark. | The Council is seeking an agreement from MOPAC that 100% of the monies be spent in Southwark alone. |
| 304. | Renata Hamvas Ward Councillor | All of the Late Night Economy Team to be funded with any excess raised to be spent within the night time economy in Southwark | Comment noted. |

Comments

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some answers above a repeated. There has been no obvious technical fault with the consultation; it is possible that some premises have been provided with 'model' answers for the consultation The majority of respondents believe that 100% of the monies gained by a potential Levy should come to the Council, with 70% to be spent on local policing during the hours of the late night economy, rather than the money going to MOPAC to be potentially spent across London |
|--|

Question:

Do you think that the introduction of a levy would be unfair to any particular group of people?

| No. | Who? | Comment | Officer response |
|------|----------------------------|---|------------------|
| 305. | A member of the public | No. It would be a relief to many families, partners, children who won't have to worry about their drunk relative getting easy access to more alcohol. Face it, after midnight drinking is binge drinking. | Comment noted. |
| 306. | The Charlotte Public House | I believe that the rates, VAT & duty generated by the leisure sector is already too much | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 307. | Hop King Ltd | See above comments regarding our venue that only opens until 00:30. In addition to the proposed levy, we have already seen our rates increase recently, as well as having to pay an additional license fee to have outdoor furniture. We feel that any further charges would not be fair, and would result in us losing trade by being forced to reduce our licensed hours by 30 mins. | Comments in relation to rises in Business Rates and rents are noted throughout all responses below. |
| 308. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 309. | Kino Bermondsey | No | N/a |
| 310. | A member of the public | Everyone | Comment noted. |
| 311. | A member of the public | Very small businesses not making a/much profit | Comment noted. |
| 312. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 313. | LASSCO Ltd. | No | N/a |
| 314. | A member of the public | No, although I do think exceptions for very small businesses / pop ups etc would be sensible. Those small enterprises drive cultural development and should be encouraged. | Comment noted. |
| 315. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | Yes it will be for all the business | Comment noted. |
| 316. | A member of the public | No - if small local businesses are protected | Comment noted, the Licensing Authority is making a recommendation that venues operating under Business Rates Relief receive a 30% discount. |
| 317. | TOSY LONDON LTD | I believe that a levy against my business would be unfair. Our license allows us to sell alcohol till 1am and we stop serving at 12:30am. Therefore it's 100% more levy than someone selling until 12am. The requirement for policing and litter is not just the responsibility of those serving alcohol between 12am and 6am. It can be argued that the general business selling food throughout the day and late night cause more rubbish than the places selling alcohol. Also the venues that accept guests after 12am are usually not the first venue that the guest has visited in the evening. If there is a Levy it should be paid by all businesses. | Comments noted. At this time, there is not a sliding scale in relation to the opening hours between midnight and 06:00. Premises providing late night refreshment are not currently caught by the LNL, but this may change in the future. |
| 318. | South of the Border Holdings Ltd | Not really | N/a |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|---|
| 319. | CORPORATION PONCE'S LTD BAR RESTAURANTE | NO,ITS FAIR TO EVERYONE | Comment noted. |
| 320. | Personal Licence Holder | No. | N/a |
| 321. | A member of the public | This tax isn't going to radically change the behaviour of people who typically go out on weekends, but more so the less frequent weekend revellers | Comment noted, but further explanation would be required as to how the less frequent 'revellers' would be affected negatively. |
| 322. | Costenito | No I think this way we as a community can feel safe. | Comment noted. |
| 323. | The Flying Dutchman | The Flying Dutchman is one of very few LGBTQ+ friendly venues in the borough. A tax that would potentially make the venue shut down would be unfair to the LGBTQ+ community. | The LNL is not intended to discourage any premises from remaining, and certainly not against the LGBTQI+ community. This is further addressed in the Equalities Analysis in Appendix K . |
| 324. | A member of the public | This would be damaging to many people in a number of ways; venues are facing increased rent year on year additional expenditures are threatening to their wellbeing. Raising the price of drinks, food or entry will negatively impact patrons and will ultimately deter people from going out past midnight. The borough stands to lose, rather than benefit from venues closing down and contributes to London as a whole becomes more litigious and less interesting. | Comment noted, see above. |
| 325. | A member of the public | Absolutely not. | N/a |
| 326. | Canavan's peckham pool club | N/A | N/a |
| 327. | A member of the public | A levy would not be unfair. The impact of businesses selling alcohol are already unfair on the people who must put up with it. | Comment noted. |
| 328. | Shakespeare's Globe | Yes. Small business owners, businesses such as ours (charity, theatre, education) | The Licensing Authority is making a recommendation that venues on Business Rates Relief receive a discount. Smaller premises would likely be less affected as there is a sliding scale based on rateable value. There is a proposition to discount cultural venues, including theatres. |
| 329. | A member of the public | Small businesses, young adults, the arts industry | Comment noted, see comment above. |
| 330. | Dulwich College | Only as previously stated. | N/a |
| 331. | A member of the public | Yes, ignores the importance of a huge swath of residents who's lives revolve around the night time economy. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 332. | boot and flogger | smaller less funded business, will be affected and will move from the area | Comment noted, though the LNL is not intended to discourage businesses from remaining in the Borough. |
| 333. | Camm & Hooper t/a Tanner & Co | I think this additional levy punishes business operators already suffering in a challenging commercial environment. | Comment noted. |
| 334. | A member of the public | To existing business who rely on the revenue generated by late night sales. | Comment noted. |
| 335. | A member of the public | Unfair to local businesses and local people. | Comment noted. |
| 336. | The nags head | I think it's unfair to the small operator of a community local , I think for the actual night clubs it's a great idea but not pubs that are closing around 12/1 anyway | Comment noted, see above. |
| 337. | River Supermarket | Yes very unfair to all small businesses! | Comment noted, see above. |
| 338. | citizenM hotel | No. | N/a |
| 339. | BA LAW | Yes. See above | Comment noted. |
| 340. | Beer Rebellion | people who operate just into the late license hours (we only operate till 12:30) Surely we shouldn't be charged the same as a night club open all night? It also effects responsible residents and drinkers. More people will stay at home, which will negatively impact the already declining highstreet. | In relation to hours, please see above. |
| 341. | A member of the public | No. In our neighborhood businesses have had ample opportunity to employ security staff who can count the number of outside drinkers causing breaches or read and work to enforce the licensing conditions and time and time again they let breaches pass. | Comment noted. |
| 342. | Utobeer (The Rake) | Any business | Comment noted. |
| 343. | A member of the public | Yes small business owners | Comment noted. |
| 344. | Erico Entertainment Limited | Any form of levy would be unfair to any business for that matter. Businesses are already paying enough tax,levy and some form of payments to government and council already. Where are they gonna get all those monies for taxes and levies from | Comment noted. |
| 345. | Brunswick Park TRA | Don't know enough about local businesses to say. | N/a |
| 346. | Esq Grill and Bar | I THINK A LEVY BENEFITS ALL GROUPS OF PEOPLE WITHIN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY | Comment noted. |
| 347. | 805 RESTAURANTS | A LEVY WILL BENEFIT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND EVERY GROUP IN IT. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 348. | Lickin Fingers | Yes, the introduction of the levy is unfair for business that are struggling | Comment noted. |
| 349. | Rias Altas ltd | Yes businesses on high biz rates also business such as myself a boutique hotel who adds value and culture to the area who employs a huge team of staff is made to pay a levy when the licence helps add value to the business model that is already burdened by high biz rate taxes. We are not selling cans of super tenant beer at 80p like the late night off licences in the area | Comment noted – if the premises is a hotel that only provides alcohol to bona fide guests after midnight, the Licensing Authority is making a recommendation that the premises be exempt from the LNL. |
| 350. | The Miller Of Mansfield | We think it will be unfair to almost everyone in the area. As someone who has observed the transformation of the area over the last twenty years into a vibrant and exciting part of our great City where tourists and workers mingle peacefully, I think this idea is folly of the highest order. I repeat, it will solve very few problems and will create plenty of new ones, while sucking the life out of the area. | Comments noted. |
| 351. | St. John Group | In certain circumstances, say a hotel or catering business this could be an unnecessarily weighted charge. | Comment noted, see above in relation to hotels. |
| 352. | A member of the public | as above | N/a |
| 353. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 354. | The Concerto Group/OXO2 | <p>Dependent on the how much the levy is, this could have an impact on our sales if we deem it necessary to avoid operating post-midnight due to the levy being greater than the return.</p> <p>OXO2 only operate a handful of events post-midnight so the levy could potentially be disproportionate for a venue that operates as a private events space. There is little, or any crime, antisocial behavior, litter and people in need of support associated to our events due to the fact the client pays for particular services to be included within the venue hire such as venue security.</p> | <p>The cost of the LNL is based on the rateable value of the premises, the fees are available in this report.</p> <p>You may wish consider having a minor variation to reduce the hours and apply for Temporary Events Notices if the space is used irregularly.</p> |
| 355. | SAMKAL ORIGINAL SUYA CHARCOAL GRILL | IF THE LEVY IS AIMED AT CONTROLLING CRIME AND UNSOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ESPECIALLY DURING LATE HOURS, I BELIEVE THAT AS LONG AS THE LEVY IS NOT GOING TO IMPACT THE BUSINESS IN TERMS OF REDUCING PROFIT AND DISCOURAGING CLIENTELE , THEN I AM IN FAVOUR OF IT. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|---|
| 356. | A member of the public | No I don't think it would be unfair to anyone. | Comment noted. |
| 357. | Browns | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | Comments noted. All premises would be required to pay, regardless as to whether or not they are a 'responsible' venue. Premises providing late night refreshment may be liable in the future. Current costs of business rates are understood. |
| 358. | Crown & Greyhound | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 359. | Alleyns Head | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and | See above. |

| | | | |
|------|--------------|--|------------|
| | | community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | |
| 360. | Alleyns Head | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 361. | Plough | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--|------------|
| 362. | Mudlark | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 363. | Southwark Tavern | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 364. | Phoenix | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the | See above. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | cost of policing. | |
| 365. | Hornimans at Hay | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 366. | Mitchells and Butlers | This area has a diverse mix of licensed premises offering customers a wide choice of hospitality on a night out. A Late Night Levy takes no account of this diversity. It is manifestly unfair in that it requires all licensed premises selling alcohol after midnight to pay the Levy, even if they are a responsible operator and are not a premise from which any crime or disorder emanates. The fact that late night food takeaway outlets are not subject to the Levy, yet often require considerable police resource, further demonstrates how unfair the Levy is. There is also a reasonable expectation among businesses and local residents that the business rates and community charge they already pay, are sufficient to fund the cost of policing. | See above. |
| 367. | A member of the public | Yes, all residents! | Comment noted, though the respondent may not have fully understood the intention of the LNL. |
| 368. | Southwark Square Ltd | Small businesses | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|---|---|--|
| 369. | Any other licensed business | Yes - all businesses in question | Comment noted. |
| 370. | A member of the public | Yes – night owls, young people, already two of the groups in British society most at risk of mental health problems. | It would have been useful if the respondent could have expanded on how those at current risk of mental health issues, may be negatively impacted by the introduction of a LNL. |
| 371. | Tower Bridge (City of London Corporation) | Yes those businesses who already pay a levy as part of their business improvement district. | Comment noted, however, the monies paid to the BIDs do not cover the night time period covered by the Levy. |
| 372. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 373. | The Waverley Arms | Venues like ours would have no alternative but to amend the license which only affects those people living nearby who use it as their local. | Comment noted. |
| 374. | Cherry Garden Development Tenants and Residents Association | An introduction would be unfair to start-up businesses, small businesses and businesses that are struggling to survive. New businesses may look elsewhere that do not have a late night levy. With Brexit this is NOT the right time to be asking businesses for extra funds. | Comment noted, however, the LNL is not intended to discourage new businesses. |
| 375. | Sarah Newman, Southwark Council - Commercial Services Unit | No | N/A |
| 376. | A member of the public | No, because all types of people that sell alcohol past midnight reflect the make up of Southwark's population. | Comment noted. |
| 377. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 378. | A member of the public | Only those who are greedy and want to make profits and not pay for the issues resulting | Comment noted. |
| 379. | Unwin and Friary Tenants and Residents Association | Introduction of a levy should not even be considered. Period. Alcohol licence should be limited to 11pm. Full stop. | There is no proposal to limit licensed premises in such a way. |
| 380. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 381. | Town Centre Inns Ltd | Our Publicans struggle to make ends meet now. A further tax will not help them. The majority do have an option to open after midnight, however this is rarely exercised. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 382. | Nine Lives | <p>Owners of venues who do quite the opposite of what the late night levy claims that late night venues cause.</p> <p>Staff who lose well paid hours because of venues reducing trading hours.</p> <p>Customers without late night venues to go to - the exact reason London changed it's licensing laws previously to avoid mass pub exodus and the huge anti-social problems that caused</p> | Comments noted. |
| 383. | Kings College London Students' Union | <p>Yes specially to Students who can't afford already with their studies fees so high.</p> <p>Students' unions already subsidising heavily for our students.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 384. | Market Taverns Ltd | <p>Certain areas of the Borough (eg. Borough Market) are not part of the night time economy. They already pay an additional levy for street cleaning, security etc. as they are within the Business Improvement District and should not be subject to additional charges.</p> | Premises not involved in the licensing of the night time economy would not be liable to the Levy. |
| 385. | Albert Barnes House TRA | No; it seems very fair | N/a |
| 386. | Travel | Unfair to small businesses. I would propose a Levy on night clubs only. | Comment noted. |
| 387. | Maris Interiors LLP | The bar/restaurant owners, the people that work in the area, the tourists that come here | Comment noted. |
| 388. | A member of the public | It would unfairly impact on people who live and socialise in the area who would either experience businesses closing earlier to avoid the levy, or would experience an increase in the price of alcohol due to the levy (in an area that is already expensive). | Comment noted, though the Levy is not an attempt to reduce late night businesses. |
| 389. | Maris | All parties if no guarantee of improvement. | Comment noted. |
| 390. | Environmental Finance | It will reduce the attractiveness of the area to young people as businesses are likely to pass on the price of a levy to customers, continuing to increase London prices. I have one worry about this, which is that in consequence of this may result in less people in the streets overall and increase risk of crimes. | The Levy is not intended to negatively impact any particular group of people. In relation to 'young' people, please see the Equalities Analysisist in Appendix K . |
| 391. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 392. | A member of the public | Not unfair because they expect to add to their profits by late night sales | Comment noted. |
| 393. | A member of the public | It is important to establish a partnership between the Police and the Council to address this issue effectively | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|---|
| 394. | A member of the public | yes | The respondent did not expand further. |
| 395. | The Miller | <p>As already outlined I believe this would be unfair to pubs and bars in London Bridge already paying towards BID.</p> <p>I also feel that it is obvious that the problem is a lack of funding, rather than an issue with pubs. Lots of late night establishments work hard to avoid crime and create a good atmosphere in the local community where everyone can feel comfortable. It feels insulting to be asked to pay towards a bid improvement district AND a late levy. If the council views businesses to be a problem it would be appreciated to be asked to work together, or notified of what we can do to help, rather than have a levy imposed because there is a lack of funding.</p> | Comments noted. See above in relation to premise paying into a BID. |
| 396. | A member of the public | The businesses will have to pass on costs to there customers making a late night out more expensive. So will penalise people who work in the evenings. | Comment noted. |
| 397. | Hoppen, Graça & Co Ltd | No | N/a |
| 398. | A member of the public | Yes, small business owners and pub owners that are not in busy areas like Borough Market etc. Margins are tight already as can be seen by all the century old pubs that are now borded-up, developed into flats, or demolished thanks to rising costs through taxation, rates, and rents. More century old business premises will close forever, our heritage and identity. | Comments noted, please see above in relation to small businesses. |
| 399. | A member of the public | Not at all. I am sure the operators will easily get the money back by charging a little more for their services. | Comment noted. |
| 400. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 401. | A member of the public | Yes- the smallest business owners which might already be struggling. | Comment noted. |
| 402. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 403. | A member of the public | Independents | Comment noted. |
| 404. | A member of the public | Unfair towards alcoholics in need of alcohol, but that's probably not a bad thing. | N/a |
| 405. | A member of the public | Yes, small businesses | Comment noted. |
| 406. | A member of the public | Everyone bar the police and council. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 407. | A member of the public - no business | No - I think it would be fair to residents and council tax payers. In Canada Water, Printworks and Hawker House are late comers to a primarily residential area | Comment noted. |
| 408. | A member of the public | Yes, small businesses, entrepreneurs and the general public | Comment noted. |
| 409. | A member of the public | Yes. Small businesses. | Comment noted. |
| 410. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 411. | London Bridge & West Bermondsey Ward | No | N/a |
| 412. | A member of the public | It would be unfair on people who run bars in Southwark, whose customers enjoy themselves indoors. As opposed to those who sit around every hour of the day in the open drinking special brew swearing at passers by. | Comment noted, though please note that off licenses would also be liable to the Levy. |
| 413. | A member of the public | I see complete fairness in the levy. | N/a |
| 414. | Farhad Chowdhury, Southwark Council Health and Safety | maybe small corner off licence. | Comment noted. |
| 415. | Shepherd Neame | As above the levy would in my view represent an unfair addition burden of taxation on public houses | Comment noted. |
| 416. | Team London Bridge | Yes - levy paying businesses within a BID. | Comment noted, see above. |
| 417. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 418. | A member of the public | Of course it is. The licensee will just pass the extra cost to their customers, who will be priced out of yet another tradition which is being killed by over zealous money grabbing councils | Comment noted. |
| 419. | The Underdog Gallery | Small business trading late up until 3am | Comment noted. |
| 420. | A member of the public | Yes the residents, as this would lead to further disruption to local residents, promoting a far more excessive nightlife than we currently have and as some streets around London Bridge already have and this is really not a nice environment! | Comment noted, though the respondent may have misunderstood the intention of the consultation. |
| 421. | Nick Johnson, Ward Councillor, Southwark Council | Smaller businesses need to have a discounted rate in order to ensure the continued viability of the business | Comment noted. |
| 422. | Sailesh Chudasama, Southwark Council, Health and Safety | Possible. I am mindful that we do not drive businesses away. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| 423. | Graham Neale, Ward Councillor, Southwark Council | no, the businesses and users should pay | N/a |
| 424. | Earl Legister, Southwark Council, Food Safety | Yes, some struggling businesses would be worse affected and could lead to the closure of the business if relief is not provided. | Comment noted. |
| 425. | Fish! Kitchen Ltd | It will be unfair to all licensed premises that operate within the law and implement strict policies to reduce drunkenness and anti social behaviour, in particular restaurants like ours. | Comment noted. |
| 426. | British Beer and Pub Association | <p>For the reasons set out above, we feel that it is unfair to well-run and responsible businesses, such as the majority of pubs, who as SMEs are already feeling the brunt of an onerous tax regime and increasing overheads. We note that the consultation text describes the levy as a “small charge” but against a context in which many small businesses are suffering, the charge will not be insignificant. We would also highlight the fact that because LNL is based on rateable value of the premises, this results in pubs paying a disproportionate share of the levy in comparison to other venues, and yet they are likely to be some of the most responsible premises in the Borough.</p> <p>The nature of the levy (i.e. it is Borough-wide), the basis for its banding (business rates) and the proposal to apply the levy for the entire six-hour late-night supply period would hit many pubs very hard.</p> | <p>Comments noted, please see above response in relation to well-run premises.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> |
| 427. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | As set out above, the proposal is unfair as it does not consider individual circumstances. People/organisations who contribute responsibly to ensuring a vibrant and safe late night economy should not be penalised for this. In particular, arts and cultural organisations, not-for-profits, charities, community organisations and members of BIDS (who already contribute to policing and cleaning) should not be subject to this levy. | Comment noted, please see above in relation to ‘cultural’ venues. Please note that monies paid to BIDs do not cover the Levy period. |
| 428. | The Dulwich Society | No | N/a |
| 429. | A member of the public | No | N/a |
| 430. | A member of the public | Any that are non-profit or charitable organisations | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| 431. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | <p>I reiterate my earlier point.</p> <p>The application of a LNL as proposed is incredibly unfair as it applies equally to pubs that only open past midnight, for an hour or two, a few times a year and a club in the same rateable value band, which opens until 6am, three nights every week. This does not seem like a level playing field. We would strongly urge that if a LNL is applied, it should start at a far later time.</p> <p>In addition, as per a previous answer, the LNL would be incredibly unfair on venues that only serve to residents post midnight. We have two hotels that would be subject to the LNL as laid out in this consultation - including one where the only sales post Midnight would be to residents through a minibar in their room. This seems totally ludicrous.</p> | <p>Comments noted, though there is currently no sliding scale for premises operating at different times throughout the Levy period.</p> <p>As above, a recommendation is being made that hotels supplying alcohol to bona fide guests after midnight, be exempt.</p> |
| 432. | A member of the public | You're just trying to get more money out of businesses so the council doesn't have to pay. A liberty | Comment noted. |
| 433. | UKHospitality | Yes. Affected businesses in Southwark, for the reasons outlined above. | Comment noted. |
| 434. | Clizia Deidda, Southwark Council, Public Health Division | <p>The levy is set nationally but is proportionate to the rateable value of the licensed premises, so this should ensure that small venues are not disproportionately impacted. A further 30% discount for those premises already paying a Business Improvement District levy would avoid that these premises be overcharged and would reduce the risk of unfairness.</p> <p>Public Health is aware that the Council is keen to offer a free minor variation to those businesses who intend to slightly amend their operating hours to avoid the levy. In order to ensure fairness, this option should be widely publicized and the Council should provide extra support to those operators who would like to take advantage of this offer but need some help in filling out the necessary forms.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 435. | A member of the public | All business but especially small. | Comment noted. |
| 436. | A member of the public | Local residents. The benefits of the levy would be hard to appreciate without the suffering and disruption caused by the or more late night establishments. | Comment noted. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|---|----------------|
| 437. | A member of the public | Local residents and people who work in the area. Long suffering would only suffer more. | Comment noted. |
|------|------------------------|---|----------------|

Comments

- Any potential equalities issues are addressed in the Equalities Analysis in **Appendix K**.
- Many respondents against the Levy believe that it will be unfair toward businesses already being affected by rises in business rates and rents.
- There is a concern that implementation of the Levy may discourage new businesses, or negatively impact the diversity of existing businesses.
- Respondents in existing BID areas continue to believe that they should be exempt. Advice has been provided in the report as to why the Licensing Authority believes this to be incorrect, simply because monies paid to the BIDs do not cover the late night period covered by the Levy.

Question:

Do you have any other comments or suggestions not already covered by the questions above?

| No. | Who? | Comment | Officer response |
|------|-------------------------|---|--|
| 438. | Aquarius Golf Club | If s levy comes in, as we never stay open after midnight, we would request our licence is changed to close at midnight. | Comment noted. |
| 439. | citizenM hotel | We offer overnight accommodation and we do not serve non-residents after 11pm, as far as we are aware premises like us are exempt from the Levy. We still wanted to complete the survey to clarify if we would be impacted. | Licensing is recommending that hotels with no public access be made exempt as their guests would likely have a limited impact on the night time environment. Hotels will be looked at on a case-by-case basis to ensure that there is no public access after midnight. |
| 440. | The Miller Of Mansfield | This is simply brazen attempt to raise tax revenue by targeting local businesses who don't have the resources to fight against it. Not only is it morally indefensible, it will not be effective. It may even cause more problems for the reasons I have explained above. This clearly needs a rethink as it is difficult to see how The LNL, which will also cost significant amounts to administrate , is anything other than a dangerous white elephant. Places like ours, which bring civilised and well behaved people from outside the area, as well as serving our local community, will suffer and gradually disappear. Small comedy and arts venues like ours will be replaced by giant super-pubs feeding people cheap alcohol in vast quantities, | Comments noted. |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | not contributing anything positive to the area, and creating widespread social and criminal issues. | |
| 441. | The View from The Shard | <p>We want to promote a vibrant night time economy in London Bridge and feel that the Late Night Levy would stifle this by disincentivising later opening hours.</p> <p>Our crime statistics show that the majority of crime in London Bridge is theft, which is not attributable to the sale of alcohol between the hours of midnight and 6am. Violence associated with licensed premises here is also extremely rare. Through the Late Night Levy, licensed premises in London Bridge would effectively be charged for addressing crime and disorder created in other parts of the Borough, which we don't feel is fair.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 442. | BORO BISTRO | Instead of asking more money to the existing businesses who already pay business rates it would be better not granted new premises licence with late opening. | Comments noted, though the Levy is not designed to prevent new premises licence applications. |
| 443. | The Underdog Gallery | <p>I just feel this is another tax which will impact on increasingly over stretched small businesses and bars/pubs</p> <p>I feel that late night clubs are a different matter and maybe if they are trading into the small hours past 3am then this may apply but it's not a fair levy on small businesses trading up until 3am.</p> | Comments noted. |
| 444. | Potters Fields Park Management Trust | The proposed introduction of this is questionable. The case is not supported by hard evidence that serving alcohol after midnight contributes to crime; the economics are also unclear. In addition, a House of Lords Select Committee reviewed the Late Night Levy in 2017 and concluded that it | Comments noted, however the Home Office have issued a briefing note counteracting the recommendation of the House of Lords. |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | had failed to achieve its objectives; their view was that BIDs were better equipped and better accepted by businesses. | |
| 445. | A member of the public | Don't do it. | Comment noted. |
| 446. | A member of the public | Stats and figures to be shared publicly | Comment noted. |
| 447. | A member of the public | Need to ensure city cruises is covered as they operate materially in the borough and are very visible to those of us who live nearby their 24hr operations base on Bermondsey Wall East | Comment noted. |
| 448. | A member of the public | na. | N/A |
| 449. | A member of the public | The levy should apply to businesses operating earlier in the evening. I would suggest 21:00 onwards | Comment noted. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. |
| 450. | A member of the public | I think there needs to be more direct community engagement. There are many residents, particularly vulnerable ones, who are impacted by the nighttime economy but don't have the resources or access points to engage or challenge the current arrangements. | The consultation for the Levy has provided the public an opportunity to feedback. In addition, any member of the public aggrieved by a particular premises are able to make complaints to the Local Authority to investigate and can further initiate their own review of that premises if they are able to evidence the premises being run in breach of their granted licence conditions. |
| 451. | A member of the public | Please clear up the rubbish in Rye Lane. It gives such a terrible impression of Peckham for first time visitors when they leave the station. Khans is brilliant but their awning is awful, it shouldnt be allowed to be kept in that state | This consultation is not the appropriate platform to raise this complaint. Please go to: https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 452. | Brunswick Park TRA | It isn't just shops that sell alcohol that are a potential nuisance. Fast food outlets are major culprits in generating litter and should also be made to pay something - all the more as they are part of chains who have more money and cna afford it perhaps more than local small businesses | Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future. |
| 453. | A member of the public | as above | N/A |

| | | | |
|------|------------------------|--|---|
| 454. | A member of the public | I do think that a complete ban on sales of alcohol from midnight until 11am would be appropriate for Southwark. A lot people live in the borough, many of whom are fortunate enough to have jobs, and they / we need their/our sleep! It would also be better for children not to see or hear older people rolling around drunk. We have a serious alcohol abuse problem in the borough - and in the rest of London and the UK. This would go some of the way to reducing it I think. | This consultation is not seeking views on banning alcohol sales at any time. Southwark is committed to supporting a vibrant night time economy and seek to encourage responsible alcohol consumption. |
| 455. | A member of the public | The council should withdrawal current funding from the police and use it for its own council services instead of cutting them. The govt need to fund the police adequately and not rely on the council. | Comment noted. |
| 456. | A member of the public | I would like to know what the £280,000 the council currently spends on this issue would be spent on instead if this were to be covered by income from the levy instead. | The funding is intended to be withdrawn, therefore if the Levy is not accomplished, the Night Time Economy Team may be disbanded. |
| 457. | A member of the public | Local residents in Bankside are entitled to have quiet enjoyment of their homes, free of noise and other nuisance, litter and antisocial behaviour. | Comment noted. |
| 458. | London Taxi | any funding to cover policing should come from existing taxes already in place. | Comment noted. |
| 459. | A member of the public | I think its a great idea. | Comment noted. |
| 460. | A member of the public | If a night time economy levy is necessary it should be raised against all licensed venues according to their rateable value, public houses that close before can cause a considerable amount of problems that late night music focused venues wouldn't. | Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future. |
| 461. | A member of the public | You should impose a levy on late night fast food takeaways. The litter & grease on pavements caused by these is plain to see. Camberwell Church Street is a case in point. These businesses should be made to daily clean up the area in front of their shops. | Comments are noted, however, at this time, premises that do not sell alcohol and only provide late night refreshment would not be liable to the Levy, though this may change in the future. |
| 462. | A member of the public | The mess and litter in Peckham is not due to the night time economy. It is due to the day-time economy of traders and butchers who seemingly are not required to put their waste in bins, and are free to dump it on the street. | This consultation is not the appropriate platform to raise this complaint. Please go to: https://www.southwark.gov.uk/street-care/litter-on-streets-and-estates |
| 463. | A member of the public | None | N/A |

| | | | |
|------|---|--|---|
| 464. | A member of the public | The current disruption caused by nightlife can last until 2am, with a late night levy we will see disruption going even later into the early hours of the morning. I have to work a lot and need my sleep during the night, so I could not sleep anymore with more noise. I don't support support turning our neighbourhood into a party strip for destination drinkers. Bermondsey street cannot become a party strip, destination drinking location where bars can operate till early hours of the am, regardless of residents, as long as bar owners are prepared to pay for it. London already has enough dangerous party areas with people out of control, wasting streets and harassing residents. | The consultee in this instance appears to misunderstand the intention of the Levy. During the consultation, two similar enquiries were made by residents around Bermondsey Street appearing to believe that the Council was offering alcohol licenses to all premises to stay open until 06:00hrs. This is not the case, nor is the Council looking to promote any areas of the Borough as a 'party strip'. |
| 465. | A member of the public | I cannot see how the levy would not encourage more disruption long term. I am also dubious as to how these funds would be managed. | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates that at least 70% must go towards policing. If the Levy were introduced, a Board would be set up to decide how to spend the remaining monies. Collation and spending of monies will be audited. |
| 466. | Costa azul Mexican Bar& Grilled | N/A | N/A |
| 467. | Kings College London Students' Union | We think Students' Unions should be exempt from this levy. | Comment noted, however, a Students' Union is not listed as an option for an exemption. |
| 468. | Cherry Garden Development Tenants and Residents Association | We would like the council to consider the following charges if it is extremely necessary: 1. £2.50 starting range for small businesses 2. £42.00 for the largest businesses | The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 which allows the Council to raise revenue on alcohol licensed premises by way of a Levy dictates the hours to which the Levy would apply. Those fees cannot be altered by the Council. |
| 469. | Sarah Newman Southark Council - Commercial Services Unit | None | N/A |
| 470. | Unwin and Friary Tenants and Residents Association | The council really need to look at the real issues that alcohol related crimes cause communities; Streets are littered with broken bottles, faeces, vomit and all sorts. Families wake up to this everyday. Children going to school witness this. How exactly does that help build the community? Stop alcohol licence beyond 11pm. Full stop. | This consultation is not seeking views on banning alcohol sales at any time. Southwark is committed to supporting a vibrant night time economy and seek to encourage responsible alcohol consumption. |

| | | | |
|------|----------------------------------|---|----------------|
| 471. | Humaira Ali Ward Councillor | The licensing team and police do a fantastic job. They do need additional funding however we should let a joint group of officers and the police propose whether the current governance and enforcement is fit or whether there are alternative ways to achieve the same goals. | Comment noted. |
| 472. | British Beer and Pub Association | To conclude, the BBPA heavily opposes the introduction of a LNL in Southwark. It does not have the support of businesses and is a punitive tax that remains ineffective in dealing with local alcohol-related issues. Instead the BBPA advocates the facilitation of a BID, alongside other local partnership initiatives, as a more effective approach. | Comment noted. |
| 473. | Fuller, Smith & Turner PLC | To conclude - we are heavily opposed to the introduction of LNL, instead preferring to look at alternative partnership schemes. In addition, we support the submission of our Trade Association - The British Beer and Pub Association - which includes more detailed recommendations. | Comment noted. |
| 474. | UKHospitality | A late-night levy is a widely discredited mechanism that is not only highly ineffectual but has a significant cost for businesses. It has been criticised from a wide range of stakeholders – including Parliament and the Mayor’s office - and has also been shown to have a very limited benefit in terms of improved safety. Introducing it in Southwark would have a significant impact on businesses in the region and would likely act as a barrier to growth and employment. | Comment noted. |

Comments

- Some answers above a repeated. There has been no obvious technical fault with the consultation; it is possible that some premises have been provided with ‘model’ answers for the consultation
- The majority of respondents agree that the Levy is a suitable way to finance the work of the Night Time Economy Team.