

# Statement of Licensing Policy 2026–2031 Consultation Report

---

## Introduction

Brighton & Hove City Council conducted a public consultation on the draft Statement of Licensing Policy for 2026–2031. The consultation aimed to gather views from residents, businesses, and stakeholders on proposed changes to the city’s licensing policy. This report summarises the findings of the consultation, including headline results, methodology, detailed results, themed comments, and demographic insights.

## Headline Results

Total responses received: 70

### Support for replacing the Cumulative Impact Zone with a City Safety Area:

- Support: 22 responses (31.4%)
- Strongly support: 16 responses (22.9%)  
**Support total (54.3%)**
- Neither support nor oppose: 12 responses (17.1%)
- Strongly oppose: 9 responses (12.9%)
- Oppose: 7 responses (10.0%)  
**Opposed total (22.9%)**

### Support for introducing a Good Operator Policy

- Support: 16 responses (22.9%)
- Strongly support: 28 responses (40%)  
**Support total (62.9%)**
- Neither support nor oppose: 6 responses (8.6%)
- No answer 2 responses (2.9%)
- Strongly oppose: 14 responses (20%)
- Oppose: 4 responses (5.7%)  
**Opposed total (25.7%)**

### **Safety First door policies**

- Support: 13 responses (18.6%)
- Strongly support: 44 responses (62.9%)  
**Support total (81.5%)**
- Neither support nor oppose. No answer, Don't Know 12 responses (17.2%)
- Oppose: 1 response (1.4%)  
**Opposed total (1.4 %)**

### **How much do you support or oppose the Late-Night takeaway category**

- Support: 17 responses (24.3.%)
- Strongly support: 12 responses (17.1%)  
**Support total (41.4%)**
- Neither support nor oppose. No answer, Don't Know, 16 responses (22.9%)
- Oppose: 7 response (10 %)
- Strongly opposed; 18 responses (25.7)
- Opposed total (35.7 %)**

### **How important is it to you that licensed venues in Brighton & Hove actively promote equality, diversity, and inclusion?**

- Very Important: 37 responses (52.9%)
- Somewhat Important: 15 responses (21.4%)  
**Support total (74.3%)**
- Neither support nor oppose: 12 responses (17.1%)
- No Answer: 5 responses (7.1%)
- Not sure: 3 responses (4.3%)
- Not Important at all: 6 responses (8.6%)
- Not very important: 4 responses (5.7%)  
**Opposed total (14.1%)**

### Do you support or oppose the enhanced focus on stopping violence against women and girls?

- Strongly Support: 58 responses (82.9%)
- Support: 9 responses (12.9%)  
**Support total (95.8%)**
- Neither support nor opposed: 1 responses (1.4 %)
- Don't Known: 2 responses (2.9%)

### Methodology

The consultation was conducted online via the council's consultation platform. Participants were invited through various channels including the council website, social media, direct emails, and community outreach. The consultation was open from 4 August to 1 November 2025. Responses were collected anonymously and included both quantitative and qualitative feedback.

### Statement of Licensing Policy Consultation Results

#### How are you responding to this survey?

Response	Number	%
Local resident	47	67.1
Licensed premises operator	7	10.0
Other	6	8.6
Community group representative	4	5.7
Local business owner (non licensed)	2	2.9
Licensed premises employee	2	2.9
Student	1	1.4
No answer	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

#### Stakeholder

Response	Number	%
No answer	64	91.4

Councillor / resident	1	1.4
local resident	1	1.4
Brighton & Hove Police Licensing	1	1.4
National charity representing grassroots music venues	1	1.4
Agent on behalf of landowner	1	1.4
Local Councillor	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose the proposal to replace the current Cumulative Impact Zone (CIZ) with a City Safety Area (CSA)?**

Response	Number	%
Support	22	31.4
Strongly support	16	22.9
Neither support or oppose	12	17.1
Strongly oppose	9	12.9
Oppose	7	10.0
No answer	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**Do you have any other comments about replacing the CIZ with a CSA?**

Response	Number	%
No	20	29 %
Music Venue Trust (MVT) supports this safety-based approach where there will no longer be a blanket presumption of refusal but working towards scrutiny of the merits of the application and the framework of the Matrix. It is an approach which recognises that the consumption of alcohol is not the primary activity bringing footfall to grassroots music venues, but access to culture.	1	1.4
More responsible licensees and premises should spread out the load and reduce harm. Smaller venues should be encouraged.	1	1.4
It is not a change of name	1	1.4

that is of concern, it is the proposal to increase licencing hours in an already saturated area where alcohol related anti-social behaviour and crime are the norm. "Encouraging responsible venue management" may be the plan but when you have hundreds of inebriated customers spilling out onto the streets of the Old Town, even later than currently, there will only be more disturbance further into the early hours for the residents who live centrally.		
No it seems a better idea	1	1.4
<p>Cumulative Impact remains an issue within the city centre due to the large number of licensed premises in a small geographical area. This attracts a large amount of persons to a single area and the likelihood of crime and disorder increases. Sussex Police have produced crime statistics to inform this Statement of Licensing Policy which show that high levels of violent crime remain in the city centre into the early hours of the morning.</p> <p>Without the presumption of refusal of a cumulative impact area, Sussex Police do have some concerns around new applications in the central area. While we welcome and acknowledge the positives of a safety zone with a diversity of premises, we are acutely aware that operators will</p>	1	1.4

make applications and assurances just to enable their premises licence application to be granted. Once granted it is very difficult under the current Licensing Act 2003 to revoke / remove a premises licence and there have been several recent examples where premises like this have gone on to be the cause or involved with incidents of crime & disorder. This requires intense Police and other agency input and is a real risk to the public.		
Replacing with CSA is a more measured and realistic way to help local hospitality and music venues thrive	1	1.4
It is a step in the right direction but I worry the police will not buy the new concept.	1	1.4
No increase in opening times, food or not.	1	1.4
CSA makes much more sense as safe venues and late night spaces will make the City a better place to be late.	1	1.4
This is extremely important to support existing businesses with excellent track records in increasing revenue and securing there futures and staff jobs.	1	1.4
I fear that granting new licenses will stretch an already weak night time economy to the point of collapse. There simply is not enough people/customers	1	1.4

<p>in town to support the venues that already exist. More venues/licenses could likely cause existing safe &amp; compliant venues to close. In addition, if licenses are granted to, for example pubs &amp; bars, the first things to go will be the night clubs. However shortly after that you will start to see grass roots live music venues disappear as well. This is because small grass roots live music venues cannot operate on live music alone in this current economic climate. It requires the night club element as well to simply pay the rents. If the night clubs close, &amp; the pubs &amp; bars get busier - I believe you would also see more vulnerability on the streets. Not less. As responsible club operators have learned over the years how to keep customers safe. Pubs &amp; bars are simply not as well equipped to handle certain incidents.</p> <p>In summary, I believe the city would become more dangerous &amp; would cause catastrophic impact to the live music scene.</p>		
Even the language "safety" implies the licensing extension will affect the safety of residents, who are already under immense strain from late night ASB	1	1.4
Fully support	1	1.4
I believe the changes are fantastic	1	1.4
No case made anywhere for the introduction of a CSA and particularly for a	1	1.4

presumption in favour of additional licensed premises or extended hours.		
Oppose the presumption to grant additional licenses in the city centre rather than the previous presumption to refuse, which required democratic intervention. Oppose extension of takeaway hours.	1	1.4
Resources are too limited to ensure safety	1	1.4
This looks more like a rebranding exercise than any meaningful change. It certainly does not encourage or support existing licensed venues or potential new applicants	1	1.4
While the intention to prioritise safety is welcome, I am deeply concerned that moving away from automatic refusals could open the door to more late-night venues in an area already under immense pressure from crime, anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related harm. These problems are not hypothetical they are felt daily by the community. Relying on voluntary safety measures without strong, consistent enforcement risks making the situation worse, not better. Protecting residents, workers and vulnerable people must be the absolute priority, and any change that weakens existing safeguards would be a serious mistake.	1	1.4
The granting of new licence should be on a one	1	1.4

in one out basis. Essentially penalising those that break the rules		
Safety issues are important. Licencing changes (focusing on more leniency and extentions ) are not necessary and of major concern for all residents of the central old town area who are already suffering from an overload of licenced premises and the anti-social behaviour of inebriated customers from those restaurants, pubs and clubs into the early hours.	1	1.4
It isn't clear what a City Safety area will actually mean especially as we don't have enough police to actually ensure the safety of everyone if there are more late night venues operating. We are too dependent ont he voluntary sector to help enusre safety int he night-time economy.	1	1.4
The overall intent of increasing a safety-focused approach is very good. The encouragement of more mixed use and fewer night clubs etc is good. I very strongly object to the extension of licensing hours for any venues. The impact in ant-social behaviour, noise and disruption is unacceptable to the many people who live in the town centre.	1	1.4
This city is already drowning in licensed premises and now you propose to add more into this area. The problem is that judging by the amount of crime and anti-social behaviour in this city - I	1	1.4

don't have any confidence that you will be able "to keep people" as you describe it. Where are the police in all this? Way over-stretched I would say		
Antisocial behaviour	1	1.4
Only that I don't believe it will make any difference. I think that at street level everything that can be done is already being done. But in any event make the change, collect the data and then make a comparison.	1	1.4
More flexibility when it comes to issuing licenses in the area and their conditions	1	1.4
Why not just watch one episode of Night Coppers, is that the city you want? What about keeping residents safe, safe to be able to walk their own streets or open a window after 6pm? Safe to walk the streets from 6am. Safe from open drug dealing, noise, abuse, litter, bodily waste, 'no-go areas' and worse. Safe to know that the police aren't devoting 90% of their resources to mopping up commercial messes while the bar owners count the profits.	1	1.4
It makes no difference because the Council policy is ambiguous and designed to support premises to the detriment of residents	1	1.4
Policy is vague	1	1.4
This change feels very much like it's weighted in favour of more alcohol venues. The council do not do enough to keep residents safe and lessen the impact from	1	1.4

existing alcohol venues, why more?		
Plainer accessible language	1	1.4
Pay extra attention to the type of venue as some venues cause no problems	1	1.4
Needs to be based on size of venue to make sure the cost is not problematic	1	1.4
The new approach drives bars to be doing what they should be doing anyway, and moves the focus away from protecting residents from the ASB impact of bars. You seem to be encouraging more drinking and keeping the ASB on the streets. This is good for bars but bad for residents. Please remember that St James is unpoliced as it is, and this will make life unbearable for many of us.	1	1.4
I support the additional protections for women in the CSA, but I do not agree to the change of presumption to accept restaurant applications to open until 1am, particularly in the SSA. Neither do I agree to deliveries from late night take aways to 2am. No argument has been given for that change	1	1.4
From the info here, this seems a sensible approach	1	1.4
Pls limit any new licenses and overall seek to reduce them as they are withdrawn	1	1.4
As someone who lives on the seafront, the licensing of new spaces like Daltons, has had a negative impact on both flow of people as the exit venues but the level of noise has also increased, therefore replacing CIZ	1	1.4

when licenses are given out easily makes me worry for my own personal peace inside my home.		
Although some of the safety policies are to be commended I very strongly oppose the presumption to allow new licenses.	1	1.4
CSA does not add any help to the CIZ but makes it worse for residents. More community support officers and Police would help. How can extending licence hours keep people safe and able to work in the morning if they are kept up by noise well into the night?	1	1.4
Concerned that it reduces regulation and therefore safety for local residents.	1	1.4
Can something be done re the noise from "cruising" cars and motorbikes with very loud exhausts that are attracted to venues that are open late at night. I assume to "show off" to re the noise they make? They drive in from across the city to get to the central area, disturbing thousands of residents. In central London there are now some "sound cameras". These could be installed in densely populated brighton and hove too.	1	1.4
Will the CSA mean more Police then? And gating for narrow lanes where residents have no escape from crowds of drunk people and related ASB?	1	1.4
I'm concerned about the number of venues that are closing in our city. This seems like a smart	1	1.4

alternative to the current system.		
The whole idea of an area stopping licenses feels unnecessary when we've lost so many good venues.	1	1.4
I think it's a really good idea	1	1.4
I fully support the change.	1	1.4
Safety is key as us good management of licensed premises.	1	1.4
as a resident it is the cumulative impact that effects me. Obviously I think safety measures are important for people going to clubs and pubs but these should be a commercial and legal matter.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose replacing the 'restaurant' category with 'food and dining'?**

Response	Number	%
Support	18	25.7
Strongly support	16	22.9
Strongly oppose	14	20.0
Neither support or oppose	8	11.4
Oppose	7	10.0
No answer	7	10.0
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose replacing the 'late night takeaway' category with 'fast food premises'?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly oppose	18	25.7
Support	17	24.3
Strongly support	12	17.1
Neither support or oppose	9	12.9
Oppose	7	10.0
No answer	5	7.1
Don't know	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose introducing a 'grassroots music venue' category?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	27	38.6
Support	15	21.4
Strongly oppose	11	15.7
Neither support or oppose	8	11.4
Oppose	5	7.1
No answer	4	5.7
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose introducing a 'shared workspaces' category?**

Response	Number	%
Neither support or oppose	21	30.0
Support	19	27.1
Strongly support	10	14.3
Strongly oppose	9	12.9
No answer	5	7.1
Oppose	4	5.7
Don't know	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**Do have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the matrix categories and hours?**

Response	Number	%
No	23	33%
We suggest that the matrix wording defining GMVs be amended to acknowledge that GMVs can be small or medium venues. We support the definition being met against membership of MVAB, MVT's Music Venues Alliance or similar. GMV live music cultural programming is risk-taking on talent development and as such will often incur financial risks. Because of this, many underwrite these financial losses with 'club' style events after gigs, on weekends or on key calendar dates. So, we hope that venues in the CSA and	1	1.4

SSA will still be able to apply for additional hours on their license or TENS and these applications will be considered and supported on their merits, as an important component of the GMV's viability. Later night 'club' style offerings at GMVs are also a valuable opportunity of diversification of programming that therefore enables audience diversification, development and growth.		
I support increasing music venues but not till 1pm. Midnight is an acceptable closing time. I can't see how allowing shared space working till midnight is a healthy thing to do	1	1.4
Re Fast food outlets - the delivery drivers are disrespectful of residents. We live in a twitten with a constant flow of riders using the lane as a cut through (because Google "says so"). They are gradually dislodging the paving bricks which are now noisy as they ride over them. When told it is a footpath we are met with indifference or are simple ignored. Being in the Old Town with it's burgeoning number of restaurants , it has been a relief that at least their licences are not so late, so at least the spill out onto the street is staggered ie. restaurents, then bars, then clubs.	1	1.4
Sussex Police welcome clarity around expectations of how premises will	1	1.4

<p>operate. We support diversity of premises within the city but are aware that applicants/operators will apply or amend their new application to make it 'fit' to one of the matrix types/timings to ensure it is granted. When visited post grant or some time later they are often breaching hours or conditions that they agreed to which requires enforcement work. It is hoped the new and amended matrix categories will give applicants a clear idea of the types of premises that will be supported within the city.</p> <p>The inclusion of specific expectations for certain matrix categories are also welcomed. Putting into policy requirements such as having a working kitchen in order to be considered as a café gives clear direction moving forwards. It might be worth this being listed as a requirement for 'food and dining' premises also.</p> <p>Regarding fast food premises, Sussex Police note the change in timings for the SSA and welcome a move to delivery only after 00:00. This stops persons congregating in public areas and becoming potential perpetrators or victims of crime. By allowing deliveries only until 02:00 it is hoped that people will be encouraged to head home away from risk areas and order food to their home address.</p>		
--	--	--

Sussex Police were consulted on the hours as part of the pre-consultation process and are in support of the timings proposed.		
Live music, theatre or any other kind of performance should be supported.	1	1.4
Deliveries re food cause noise nuisance. Later eating and later drinking causes noise and public order issues. Asking staff to work later and later is no good for their health or their family.	1	1.4
Would need more info to comment further.	1	1.4
We feel it is imperative these new changes are put in place to support the longevity of existing long standing businesses in the city	1	1.4
In regarding to the "Grass root's music venue" - As I mentioned previously, you simply cannot have live music venues without the night club element. This change would mean the night club element could not exist & therefore the venues would close.	1	1.4
We welcome the updated matrix approach to licensing as an improvement on the current blanket restrictions in City Safe Areas (CSAs). However, greater flexibility should be applied to the proposed categories, which are currently too restrictive.  The matrix should be revised to state:	1	1.4

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The food and dining category is restrictive and should remain defined simply as "restaurant"</li> <li>• Food and dining venues may obtain a licence without the requirement for substantial table meals, as this would limit the tenants able to occupy new developments</li> <li>• Pubs and bars may operate in the CSA, but with restricted opening hours to help manage antisocial behaviour</li> </ul> <p>Further comments are provided in the Representation Letter issued by Quod on behalf of Ingka Centres.</p>		
<p>We have restaurants and small music venues local to us and we very strongly oppose them being open past midnight. We already experience the noise of drunken people late in the evening, with shouting, fighting, using the streets as a toilet etc. We already have cars parked illegally on pavements and on double yellow lines every evening. We already have the noise of bottles being cascaded into rubbish bins until gone midnight and then these being emptied into waste lorries very early in the morning. This proposal will mean all of this happening until an hour later, past 2am as the venues clear-up. This is alongside the noise of party's in airbnb venues etc. We very much support local music venues and musicians</p>	1	1.4

<p>but why do these need to be open past midnight? For instance we are regulars at the Verdict jazz club in Kemp Town which is a fantastic music venue, that always empties out before midnight. There is no need for music to happen in the early hours.</p> <p>We very much enjoy living in the centre of Brighton, where we are part of a vibrant local community. We greatly enjoy the fantastic and diverse cultural life, including the arts, restaurants etc. We know it is a lively tourist destination for holiday-makers, weekenders and day trippers but the Council must focus on sustaining or improving the quality of life for local residents, if you want it to be a living town. The presumption should be that midnight is late enough for music and restaurants and a very strong discouragement of binge drinking and anti-social behaviour. Also, we should not have to continually look out for licence applications that might impact us. The presumption should be for a quiet time between midnight and 7am to allow local residents time to enjoy their homes.</p>		
Grassroots music is a huge part of this city and something we should support	1	1.4
These are all sensible and considered changes	1	1.4
Extremely concerned at proposal to extend hours for fast food deliveries in	1	1.4

the SSA until 2 am, particularly in residential areas such as Central Hove.		
Oppose the change of hours for grassroots music venues across the city to midnight as this may disturb residents. Oppose strongly the fast food delivery until 2am as this will definitely disturb residents. Let's face it - who asks for food at 2am - not people who are sober.....	1	1.4
Yes, I do not agree to the change of hours for food and dining premises to 1am, grassroots music venues to 1am in the SSA or fast food deliveries. There are many residential areas in this city who just do not want or need late night opening. I refer particularly to the area I live, Central Hove ward.	1	1.4
Yes we do not agree to food and beverage venues opening until 1am, Grassroot music in SSA to 1 am and fast food outlets deliver to 4am.	1	1.4
Unsafe	1	1.4
Whilst it's great to see grassroots venues recognised, the conditions imposed on venues and businesses in the CSA are punitive and reductive. How are already struggling businesses meant to survive when licensing are so strict?	1	1.4
1 or 2am closures in will enhance the anti social behaviour even more	1	1.4
There is a huge amount of anti social behaviour, disturbance and littering as a result of the number of	1	1.4

venues we already have. Do we actually need more?		
Any change that increases the licencing hours in the Old Town is not supported.	1	1.4
<p>There is a real danger in allowing restuarants to stay open until 1am and that is that many of them will apply to bring in DJs and allow some dancing as a way of keeping people in their restaurants. The council have had applications like this in the past - for later hours, DJs etc in the CIZ - and refused them.</p> <p>Regarding food deliveries 2am is far to late for the SSA. This will disturb residents as motorbikes and cars tend to deliver at these late hours and so noise increases. Also doorbells going, doors opening and shutting. People and their families wish to sleep and the SSA is a heavily residential area. If businesses want deliveries after 11am they should have to go to a panel to decide this.</p> <p>Very supportive of grassroots music but not until 1am in the SSA as it's a heavily residential area and it wouldn't be fair on residents. This type of thing is much more suited to the city centre if it is to go on until late. 10 or 11am is more suitable for the SSA and such applications should go to a panel.</p> <p>Co-working spaces do not need to be open until midnight. Yes, it's great they have events but they</p>	1	1.4

can finish at 10pm. There is absolutely no need to go on until midnight - this would change the whole understanding of what a co-workspace is. There have been some co-working spaces applying for licences which have wanted cocktails etc at their bar - just introducing a bar by the back door with fewer conditions.		
It seems very strange that you are proposing all these changes when less people are going out because they can't afford to! And they are tending to eat earlier not later...so again the logic is bizarre to me..	1	1.4
Hours are already late enough. In terms of dining, we are not souther Europe and do not have culturally late dining habits. The only late night diners are drunks leaving pubs/clubs.	1	1.4
If the SSA is nearer residential property then I personally don't want businesses and especially music going on until midnight or after. As it is the areas around the current fast food premises seem to attract an excess of graffiti and rubbish.	1	1.4
'Shared workspaces' is shorthand for greedy landlords pretending to offer 'community' spaces while raking in profits from cafes and bars under false pretences. they snap up the spaces that could have been used by real businesses with real employees, driving them out of town.	1	1.4

The council supports antisocial behaviour through it's policies to increase access to alcohol late and to play loud music that disturbs residents.	1	1.4
Over complicated	1	1.4
I don't believe enough is done by the ones sat round a table making decisions in isolation about the impact in late to early morning hours closures have in residential homes. You need to revisit your defunct 'out of hour's' noise service and reinstate it back 7 nights a week if you're to implement these changes.	1	1.4
I think it needs flexibility depending on vituperation of venue and experience of licensee	1	1.4
<p>The new category for food and dining, opens the door to more of the establishments linked to ASB, such as the kebab shops and chicken shops that attract clubbers. We already know these places are hubs for ASB and drugs, and more of them in places like St James will make the area more threatening and unpleasant for residents. Our previous MP informed us that more clubs was part of his 'plan' for our area, but this is our home, and bar owners have a disproportionate voice as it is. If you cannot police these changes they will produce more ASB.</p> <p>We do need more venues for local talent and this is welcomed. The council has a love affair for tribute</p>	1	1.4

bands and has-beens, but we could do so much more to celebrate our creativity (rather than try to shut it down and kill it off as your events team is doing now).  The co-working spaces feels like you are creating a loophole. Co-working spaces do not need to be open until midnight and do not need drinks licenses. Is this a way of slipping in yet more bars? Don't gaslight us any more than you do already please.		
The authority recognises the need for a SSA yet are advocating allowing live music until 1am. That is too late in residential areas such as Central Hove.	1	1.4
I strongly oppose licensing food and dining venues to 1am, fast food premises to 2am and music venues to 1am in the SSA. It is called the SSA for a reason!	1	1.4
If the changes allow for music to be played for longer then that can only be a good thing, and obviously if done responsibly	1	1.4
Shared workspaces do not need to serve alcohol	1	1.4
The overall statements you make in the policy do not support these extensions in opening hours. There are no arguments for a presumption to increase opening hours instead of the usual debate in front of a panel where safeguards and mitigation can be discussed.	1	1.4
In general, there are plenty of venues in Brighton and	1	1.4

Hove which have late licenses. Why extend into more residential areas? I need to get up early for work, so does my partner. We live behind a pub that turned into a live music venue. Already, we have to call (an often absent), manager and are constantly fobbed off with excuses when we complain about the level of noise from the venue. Extending their opening hours would make living next door insufferable and we would have to move. Whilst you acknowledge high levels of crime, the renaming of certain licence conditions does nothing to change this.		
No one needs to eat at 1am and delivery drivers on motorbikes in the early hours will be a disaster for local residents. Terrible idea.	1	1.4
Music venues are essential to the city	1	1.4
Violence is already horrific in the BN1 Ship street, West Street and Middle Street, so measures need to be in place to reduce crime, not encourage later times for groups e.g. Co working spaces and drinking.	1	1.4
Later licenses for restaurants is great, I would like later licenses for pubs and clubs as well.	1	1.4
We need later takeaways in the city there's nothing to eat after a certain time	1	1.4
Strongly support doing everything possible to support grassroots music venues	1	1.4

I fully support the proposed changes	1	1.4
A modern approach, focussed on safety with concern for residents too.	1	1.4
I am concerned that the streets outside and the fast food premises themselves become social scenes, and the aggravation that will cause to residents and others. I would be concerned about the litter from these fast food premises. Who would clear it up?	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### Do you support or oppose the introduction of a good operator policy?

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	28	40.0
Support	16	22.9
Strongly oppose	14	20.0
Neither support or oppose	6	8.6
Oppose	4	5.7
No answer	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

### Do you have any comments about the proposed good operator policy?

Response	Number	%
No	18	26%
<p>I think that any well operated venue should be given strong consideration for alterations to their licenses. However I strongly do not think that later licenses should be granted. Pubs &amp; bars need to close earlier in my opinion.</p> <p>As stated in my previous statements - Pubs/Bars staying open later are putting tremendous strain on nightclubs. If the night clubs close, shortly after Grass roots music venues will follow as venues cannot</p>	1	1.4

<p>pay their rent on the live music element alone.</p> <p>I also believe that the streets will become less safe as Pubs &amp; bars are simply not equipped to handle certain incidents.</p>		
<p>Read the earlier comments. It is not about how a business is run but the behaviour of people around the site and the knock-on impact of rubbish clearance etc.</p>	1	1.4
<p>Compulsory CCTV with the council as the data controller</p>	1	1.4
<p>The licencing hours were given for a reason. Extending opening hours will only be detrimental to the city centre as once customers have left a venue, that venue has no responsibility over that customers behaviour. An example is a group leaving a pub, to walk 10 yards and then all needing to urinate so do so against a wall or a local resident's front door.</p>	1	1.4
<p>Caution will need to be had around this policy and expectations managed that just because the applicant meets the criteria for a 'Good Operator' does not automatically mean they will be granted what they apply for.</p> <p>We believe further explanation could be helpful within the explanatory notes to emphasise that the Good Operator Policy does NOT apply to new applications, only variations.</p>	1	1.4

There are venues that are well run and part of the city's music scene, it is fair that consideration to these venues is given when seeking to change licensing	1	1.4
Makes perfect sense.	1	1.4
Take digital I.D at every premise. I have seen this done first hand and it massively reduces disorder inside or within some distance of the venue. If someone knows they can be linked to that premise that has their digital ID then they move well away before causing trouble. Be careful of accepting fake IDs and strong management on the door is the only way (ask for additional ID like a driving license and copy of passport or bank cards). The emphasis must be on keeping everyone safe.	1	1.4
Who will oversee this?	1	1.4
If a venue can show an excellent track record we believe we should be able to extend our offer of service.	1	1.4
The first criterion of being a 'good operator' should be removed, as it does not take into account new or proposed developments that require flexibility in opening hours. The ability to vary trading hours is critical in determining which use classes are proposed within new developments. However, the proposed 'good operator' policy prevents applications to vary a premises licence until	1	1.4

buildings are completed and occupied, which creates an unnecessary barrier.		
<p>MVT is a best-practice organisation and gives our members tools and resources to ensure that their operational policies, in particular their adherence to licensing objectives, is thorough and woven into all operational procedures, so we support any licensing policy which works to recognise good work and conscientious thorough operators as we know our sector to be. Brighton has an exceptional network of very well established music venues and operators, but should a new grassroots music venue wish to establish themselves in BHCC we would like there to be the opportunity for clear and staged support to help the operator understand what it takes to be a 'good operator' within the licensing framework - Is there scope for interim recognition and support as new operators seek to build up to their 'five year' good operator threshold?</p> <p>Can you confirm that the good operator policy would extend to existing GMV operators opening new cultural venues in the Town, and that their history of good practice would support their applications for additional hours/ new licenses.</p> <p>If noise complaints are not</p>	1	1.4

substantiated, or are substantiated but come to a positive resolution can the licensing policy confirm that this will not go against any 'good operator' accreditation?		
Good operators should be rewarded for good practice and used as an example for new business	1	1.4
This is a fantastic way to encourage and promote high quality establishments	1	1.4
This is nonsense. Premises are licensed NOT operators.	1	1.4
This is nonsense as the premises are licensed not the operator. All this will achieve is an increase in the value of the premises.	1	1.4
Yes a license is issued to a property not a person so I do not really understand how this will work.	1	1.4
Any license rests with the property no manager so we cannot get how this would work.	1	1.4
Safer	1	1.4
Good, in theory, if Police Licensing actually support and work with these good operators. The wording being that they 'MAY be given more flexibility' sounds like an easy way to still reject logical and meaningful licensing changes.	1	1.4
While I recognise the value of well-run venues, I strongly oppose giving existing licence holders more flexibility to extend their hours simply because they have avoided formal issues in the past. A 'good	1	1.4

track record' doesn't necessarily mean a venue has no negative impact on the surrounding community, it can just as easily reflect gaps in reporting or enforcement. Extending hours in areas already under pressure from late-night activity risks increasing crime, anti-social behaviour and noise disturbance. Policies should prioritise protecting residents and reducing harm, not rewarding operators with longer opening hours.		
Good idea. Incentivise better behaviour	1	1.4
Any change that increases the licencing hours in the Old Town is not supported.	1	1.4
I find this a deeply concerning policy when you look closely at it. It sounds great - rewarding responsible business's, but how does it operate in practice. Having seen that we don't have enough BHCC licensing officers and that we have a much reduced police team of licensing officers I can't see how it would be possible to know who all the good operators were especially as there have been some serious emergency reviews of premises which had been performing poorly for some time but the relevant authorities seemed unaware of it. Some of those premises have been closed down permanently . I suppose there is an incentive in that 'good operator' premises would	1	1.4

<p>find their licences gaining in value and owners could sell their premises on that basis so it would have to be that the good operator policy would only apply to the owner of the premises at that time.</p> <p>I noticed that Revolution in West Street - a very well-run, large premises is applying for a later licence as it has had TENS for a later time - all due to Pryzym being closed down. The police are objecting because it would mean quite a few venues in the vicinity all closing at the same time - 4am - and that would cause trouble. So, how would that scenario be managed in the future? There would have to be some strong ground rules! Also, this policy could invite corruption which would undermine licensing policy and objectives.</p>		
<p>Venues should already adhere to being responsible without being rewarded to do so. Standards of being a "good operator" Should apply at all times as a basic rule. perhaps venues should be fined / reprimanded instead for being a bad operator.</p>	1	1.4
<p>How do you define 'good management' and 'formal issues with the authorities' I read this as premises will do what they want unless they get a complaint. 1) Complaining is exhausting and it is up to the complainer to gather the proof and 2) it is difficult to complain to the Council.</p>	1	1.4

You are short staffed and difficult to get hold of due to reduced opening hours. Not your fault I hasten to add just a sign of the times. So for that reason I strongly oppose.		
Needs to be fair and include consultation with operators for input.	1	1.4
Another excuse to let profits dictate at the expense of community.	1	1.4
The council does not have the resources to assess if an operator is a good one and will take the word of the operator that they are. This expands on the council policy of encouraging premises to self police, to the detriment of residents	1	1.4
Needs more criteria- too easy to get around	1	1.4
This needs to look at the licensee and their complete background plus the building and its location. You really need to do your homework before you implement this.	1	1.4
Some concerns in allowing later opening via this route	1	1.4
How to keep track if operator changes is important	1	1.4
Good idea	1	1.4

Why reward bars for doing what they should be doing already. this is another loophole to push the envelope. You cannot enforce what you have now, so this will be a another disaster for residents. Bar owners are a very influential community, who are also very abusive to residents and rarely follow existing rules. This will be just another example of the chumocracy that is so obvious at the moment.	1	1.4
Fabulous addition	1	1.4
Seems to be a good approach	1	1.4
I don't think they should be permitted to extend	1	1.4
At present, noise complaints to the council follow a lengthy and invested approach by the person making the complaint, these complaints are usually abandoned due to the length of time and diary keeping needed, meaning nuisance venues are often not investigated fully (this is anecdotal) therefore my fear is operators who appear to be good operators are actually not and will be given more leniency.	1	1.4
rewarding good practice is positive	1	1.4
Licenses attach to a premises not an operator, unless I have missed a recent change in the law. All this does is increase the value of a premises which the so called „good operator“ can then go on to sell to any other operator.	1	1.4
It seems like a fig leaf and I	1	1.4

do not believe it will be successfully implemented from the point of view of complainants		
No operator, however good they are, can control what happens when people are leaving their premises. Have you seen hen and stag parties staggering round the streets?	1	1.4
seems sensible	1	1.4
Venues in BN1 are open late enough as it is. Venues away from residential streets, fine.	1	1.4
I think it would be good to include venues that have strong policies around sexual harassment, spiking, and safety. eg if there staff are well trained, they have safe spaces, and clear procedures.	1	1.4
We need to protect our venues and this makes sense.	1	1.4
Seems like a good idea	1	1.4
It's very important to have lots of vibrant licensed premises in Brighton and hove	1	1.4
I fully support the changes	1	1.4
A sensible policy - aiming for responsible management	1	1.4
Would the license pass from one operator to the next? ie is it to do with the place.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Do you support or oppose licensed venues having clear, fair policies that promote inclusion and prevent discrimination?**

Response	Number	%
Yes	59	84.3
Not sure	5	7.1
No answer	4	5.7
No	2	2.9

Total	70	100.0
-------	----	-------

**Do you support or oppose licensed venues having enhanced anti-spiking policies and training for staff?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	46	65.7
Support	17	24.3
Neither support or oppose	4	5.7
No answer	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose licensed premises having safety-first door policies?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	44	62.9
Support	13	18.6
Neither support or oppose	6	8.6
No answer	4	5.7
Don't know	2	2.9
Oppose	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose licensed premises having ID scanners?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	26	37.1
Support	16	22.9
Neither support or oppose	10	14.3
Oppose	9	12.9
No answer	4	5.7
Strongly oppose	3	4.3
Don't know	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0

**Are there any other safety measures you think should be required?**

Response	Number	%
No answer	6	8.6
No	16	23
metal detectors - for knives etc	1	1.4
Something for needle spikibg	1	1.4
Address the drinking culture in the UK. Venues should be part of this.	1	1.4
One of the things you should encourage is that local businesses positively	1	1.4

engage with local residents, listening and responding to their concerns.		
Compulsory CCTV with the council as the data controller	1	1.4
Consider many people over 30 no longer carry cards or IDs with them on a night out.	1	1.4
Should be mandatory for digital CCTV in all licensed venues regardless of location	1	1.4
Safety is a collective concern for all who work in and utilise the nighttime economy and Sussex Police support a joined-up approach. Membership of community partnerships, harm reduction or safety schemes could be another possible requirement. The Brighton Crime Reduction Partnership (BCRP) has been in place in Brighton & Hove for around 20 years and is an essential resource for responsible operators. This has been placed as a condition on licences before but can also be voluntary. It may be that membership of the BCRP or other similar scheme is viewed positively on any new application or licence variation.	1	1.4
Safety measures should be in line with the premises business. If you run a club on West Street you probably need a lot of safety. If you are running a cinema less so.	1	1.4
High quality image CCTV inside and outside. Random dip sampling done at night on premises by council. If	1	1.4

the CCTV is off or not a clear picture then immediately close the venue and fine.		
Need more info to be able to answer fully.	1	1.4
No, however ID scanners are extremely expensive and not viable for smaller venues	1	1.4
I think after 23:00 everyone entering any venue should be subject to a search.	1	1.4
Safety should be paramount across all the council does in licensing	1	1.4
For people who Can Usually Not Typically Sustain behaviour should have banning orders. This is not aimed at stage or hens or other groups but identified individuals	1	1.4
How will these requirements be enforced and will the additional costs be recouped from operators?	1	1.4
Many of these are already in place voluntarily in the good clubs. Anything that prevents spiking would be more than welcome.	1	1.4
This is fine	1	1.4
More policing	1	1.4
Licensing should be providing venues with drinks toppers - they are very expensive for already struggling venues	1	1.4
Street lighting along Ship Street Gardens and Red Lion Twittens t's so dark and dangerous	1	1.4
More police presence at night especially foot patrols	1	1.4
Most of the above measures are already in place in licensed venues but there	1	1.4

<p>are some where staff training is poor etc. Scanners are a good idea but they don't always work and some venues have ended up having to write down people names and details which is why scanners gernerally aren't popular in the clubs. They are also quite intrusive and expensive. Generally the police insist on scanners where there are known issues.</p> <p>More work on preventing spiked drinks is a great idea and Suusex University were doign quite a bit of work on that.</p> <p>Most licensed venues are already fair and inclusive as they need customers especially in these challenging financial times. I strongly support diversity but feel it's already a very important part of this city and it's night life.</p> <p>Also, many of the clubs have recovery rooms and help people who are vulnerable although some of the rooms are better than others. The voluntary sector helps here too - to a very large extent!</p>		
greater police presence	1	1.4
It sounds like you want to create a vast new bureaucracy of rules and regulation. How on earth do you think staff will have the time or ability to enforce all this? Totally impractical I suggest	1	1.4
I fully support the changes	1	1.4
Full training for staff, however temporary	1	1.4
Would it not be simpler to	1	1.4

refuse serving customers alcohol before they get to the intoxicated state rather than after. Also 1) refuse entry to anyone who already intoxicated 2) refuse to sell alcohol in supermarkets etc to anyone who is intoxicated 3) What about a barred list with images circulated between venues? Or breathalyser tests?		
Staff trained in knowing signs of drugs essential	1	1.4
It's a matter of suitability - we should encourage smaller venues who might not have the resources nor the necessity for formal door policy	1	1.4
More Police	1	1.4
What about safety of the community? the non-students? the people who have to get up early for work? why are we so unimportant to you?	1	1.4
Facial recognition mandatory in all pubs clubs and late night food premises	1	1.4
Brighton being a vibrant multicultural city, you need to look at these alcohol venues that only fly rainbow flags during pride to attract money but fail in their inclusive support the other 50 weeks of the year.	1	1.4
Staff training in de-escalation of conflict.	1	1.4
Some of these ideas sound good but will place extra financial burden upon already struggling businesses. Who pays for these measures, will there	1	1.4

be a cut in business rates for licensed premises?		
Appropriate policing in areas of ASB to ensure that ASB is managed outside bars and clubs.	1	1.4
nightclubs i support but small indie pubs id not staff should be trained not to serve under age	1	1.4
responsibility rests with good behaviour..	1	1.4
Training in modern slavery, better links to beach patrol and safe spaces.	1	1.4
Licence holder should be on site and pence e withdrawn if not	1	1.4
More Police presence, with The Hippodrome opening, more measures in place to protect residents. It's ill thought out as it stands.	1	1.4
staff should have standardised training around sexual harassment. they should know what to do if they spot it, and how to respond if its reported. this should include staff feeling emboldened to bar customers who are harassing others, know who to contact, etc.	1	1.4
I'm not sure ID scanners are necessary for every venue.	1	1.4
The police should be responding to things better	1	1.4
It is what happens just outside pubs/clubs/venues that worries me, once the customer is off the premises they no longer seem to be the responsibility of the pub/club/venue. Any problem continues, without any protection.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**How important is it to you that licensed venues in Brighton & Hove actively promote equality, diversity, and inclusion?**

Response	Number	%
Very important	37	52.9
Somewhat important	15	21.4
Not important at all	6	8.6
No answer	5	7.1
Not very important	4	5.7
Not sure	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**How important is it to you that venue staff receive training about LGBTQ+ and TNBI communities?**

Response	Number	%
Very important	35	50.0
Somewhat important	11	15.7
No answer	10	14.3
Not important at all	8	11.4
Not very important	3	4.3
Not sure	3	4.3
Total	70	100.0

**Do you think venues should offer a way to report discrimination or harassment?**

Response	Number	%
Yes	55	78.6
No answer	10	14.3
Not sure	4	5.7
No	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Are there any other steps you think venues should take to make LGBTQ+ and TNBI communities feel safe and welcome?**

Response	Number	%
No answer	13	18.6
Not sure	5	7.14
No	20	28.6
signage inside explaining what help is available & how to report	1	1.4
Clear policy, training records, inclusion training during onboarding.	1	1.4
No other steps to put forward currently. Sussex Police actively encourage	1	1.4

reporting of incidents including hate crime from all communities and are continually improving ways for the public to do so.		
Venues should not discriminate against anyone. All venues should strive to be a safe place.	1	1.4
Dont treat them any differently from anyone else. They arent special and shouldnt be treated as such. What makes them more special and needy than anyone else?	1	1.4
Being good operators should cover this.	1	1.4
Accessible requirements are met where possible and graded for a point of reference for customers	1	1.4
The 2025 CGA Music Fans Voice survey, for which Brighton & Hove City Council was a supporting partner revealed that 94% of music fans said that they feel safe or very safe at a grassroots music venue. So we firmly believe that there is a safe and inclusive environment being offered by Brighton's GMVs, and that forums such as the MVAB meetings could be utilised to pilot any new initiatives or importantly hear ideas from the venues themselves and share best practices.	1	1.4
I think this is a tricky path to go down - once you start discriminating between different groups of people, people's own personal views, ideology and agendas may come into the frame - and policing that will	1	1.4

potentially be divisive. What happens when a member of staff simply decides they don't like the look of a customer...?		
Brighton needs to continue to be the LGBT capital it has been for years and this will help that	1	1.4
I don't know, I am not part of the community. I hope they feel included	1	1.4
No but venues need to ensure the safety of all customers	1	1.4
More policing	1	1.4
The council need to step-up and actually support local LGBTQ+ businesses and venues. Everything currently - and in this document - are performative. What practical steps at the council taking to actually support venues that are constantly subjected to homophobic and transphobic abuse? Where are the night marshals to support vulnerable people in the St James Street and Kemptown areas, where the majority of LGBTQ+ venues are? There are the highest concentration of street drinkers and public drug-taking, but it's local venues that have to deal with the issues they cause. And then the crimes these people commit are used against venues, as they then are deemed to operate in a 'high crime' area.	1	1.4
To be fair to the city I think there's already a very welcoming attitude to the LGBTQ+ community. It's	1	1.4

one of the hallmarks of the city's night life and Brighton is very proud of how inclusive thier night life is. Some gay bars have disapperaed in the last few years but that's mainly due to economic reasons as there's such competition in the city and cost have risen.		
greater police response	1	1.4
Advertising & Recruitment process should promote engagement by minorities.	1	1.4
Improve the importance of training in all venues	1	1.4
Advertise as such.	1	1.4
An inclusive atmosphere isn't necessary dependent on signage nor group specific training for every member of staff. A good venue will make everyone safe and welcome.	1	1.4
what about their responsibilities to make members of the community feel safe and welcome when walking past or waiting for a bus outside their venues?	1	1.4
Understanding door staff	1	1.4
Be inclusive all year round, not just during pride.	1	1.4
Positive and inclusive images on advertising etc.	1	1.4
More signage is not the way forward, especially in a small venue. We are becoming swamped in compliance signage.	1	1.4
i feel it's over the top every one should be made welcome what ever race or sexual orientation i've worked in the licensing industry for many years i've never seen any such issues	1	1.4
I think respect and courtesy go along way,	1	1.4

accepting everyone as they are		
Simple signs saying everyone is welcome	1	1.4
Not allow big groups of straight men	1	1.4
staff should be trained on inclusive language, and the ways different communities might react to harassment and abuse.	1	1.4
We need more queer spaces	1	1.4
Smiling confident door people.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**How much do you support or oppose high risk venues having clear procedures in place to prevent and respond to drink spiking, including staff training, incident reporting and victim support?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	55	78.6
Support	9	12.9
No answer	4	5.7
Don't know	1	1.4
Neither support or oppose	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Do you support or oppose the enhanced focus on stopping violence against women and girls?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	58	82.9
Support	9	12.9
Don't know	2	2.9
Neither support or oppose	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Do you support or oppose the inclusion of enhanced scrutiny and conditions for alcohol delivery services?**

Response	Number	%
Strongly support	38	54.3
Support	14	20.0
Neither support or oppose	10	14.3
No answer	5	7.1
Don't know	2	2.9
Strongly oppose	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### Do you have any further comments about alcohol delivery services?

Response	Number	%
No answer	12	17.1
No	31	44.3
I dont think it should be delivered	1	1.4
Better control of delivery drivers employed, IE not sub contract to the likes of deliveroo as venues lose control	1	1.4
Sussex Police will continue to scrutinise all applications for alcohol delivery services and the potential risks around these (particularly when it is solely alcohol delivery, not alongside food). We welcome the suggested conditions being included in policy for clarity and to indicate the minimum expected standard across the city.	1	1.4
Massively open to abuse. Do you think an illegal immigrant who hardly speaks a word of English is going to properly check IDs at a door etc...You must be kidding. Just look at what happens with your own deliveries! Delivery drivers serving alcohol should have special training and a certificate. Again this will be abused and fake people will use other peoples certificate to work and deliver the alcohol. Wake up top the real menace here of fake IDs and peoples dishonesty in a lot of the delivery drivers.	1	1.4
Should be stopped.	1	1.4
should only be with food	1	1.4
I suspect there are too many drivers in Brighton working without any legal right to work and this needs	1	1.4

to be checked by the employer		
I think that ID and no parks is a great idea but not sure about certified addresses as who decides this	1	1.4
I believe that Deliveroo and Uber should take more responsibility.	1	1.4
This is importantly. However, I wonder how this can be enforced. Will councillors on the licensing committee be able see the detailed records ? Will the delivery operators have to pay for this service which requires additional Council staff?	1	1.4
Ideally we would ban this. Essentially we are accommodating preloading	1	1.4
I thought that all these conditions were already in place. Maybe the face-to-face ID wasn't. Very supportive of this to discourage under-age drinking.	1	1.4
Important	1	1.4
I support the changes	1	1.4
Alcohol should be banned totally	1	1.4
Should be banned imo	1	1.4
Look around you. We need less alcohol, less drugs, less noise. the whole city is a cess pit. You want to run a party town, fine, don't expect people to work and live here and pay tax. Hopefully the students and AirBNB and club landlords will pay enough taxes to support you, while the adults and families and hard-working people just leave, taking their spending power, businesses and jobs	1	1.4

with them. Look at Europe, see how major cities are fighting back against this sort of tourism and the damage of the night time economy in favour of residents and a community that welcomes all ages. Why is Brighton so far behind? Carry on like this and this place that considers itself innovative will be another Blackpool soon. There is no sanctuary here for any normal citizen.		
Alcohol should not be available for delivery at any time	1	1.4
End delivery points need to know where the alcohol is being sourced from so they can make an informed choice to support local distilleries etc.	1	1.4
This could include supermarket deliveries it's a bit much	1	1.4
Not sure delivery of alcohol in necessary unless to a private address.	1	1.4
Nothing obvious, although I am concerned about the way in which party houses and non-licensed AirBnB (of which there are a lot) will benefit from a more relaxed approach to hours etc.	1	1.4
I don't think there should be any delivery service for alcohol	1	1.4
This is very important. I wonder whatever BHCC has the capacity to enforce this and how it will be monitored. How will the costs of monitoring be paid for.	1	1.4
Time limits	1	1.4

It's tough, but we do need to crack down	1	1.4
I wasn't aware that you could have alcohol delivered.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Overall, do you think the proposed changes will:**

Response	Number	%
Significantly improve safety and licensing	19	27.1
Somewhat improve the situation	17	24.3
Make little difference	15	21.4
Somewhat worsen the situation	8	11.4
Significantly worsen the situation	5	7.1
No answer	5	7.1
Don't know	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

**Do you have any concerns about the proposed changes?**

Response	Number	%
No answer	19	27.1
no	7	10
Please refer to Representation Letter issued by Quod on behalf of Ingka Centres	1	1.4
Please include safety and inclusion for all folk living with disabilities including hidden disabilities. This is a problem in many venues across the city.	1	1.4
Overemphasis on ID	1	1.4
The 1pm closing /later closing will increase ASB and increase nuisance for local residents	1	1.4
No concerns, I think it's important to ensure that Brighton keeps it commercial element alive, there are too many pubs and venues closing down due to costs, they need	1	1.4

support		
<p>As explained in previous questions, Sussex Police do have some concerns around the removal of the cumulative impact area / policy but welcome the focus on safety.</p> <p>Regarding the question 'How much do you support or oppose high risk venues having clear procedures in place to prevent and respond to drink spiking, including staff training, incident reporting and victim support?' we would suggest that ALL venues should have clear procedures in place, not just 'high risk' venues. We ensures a unified approach to VAWG not based on venue size, timings or audience demographic.</p>	1	1.4
Worried that The Police will not change and object any relaxation of existing rules	1	1.4
<p>Dont treat LGBT any different... they arent any different from other people who also experience violence. Be careful of being conned into believing all women are sweet, innocent and vulnerable...they aren't all like that. Women can be just as aggressive as men and commit many acts of disorder. Ask night time taxi drivers and doorstaff re this very subject... they see how women behave in 2025. Be careful in just focusing on women and LGBT.</p>	1	1.4
Yes	1	1.4

Only requirements for ID scanners as beyond our venues financial or actual requirements	1	1.4
As previously stated, you seem to be creating a vast new bureaucracy which will place huge pressures on employers and may simply end up with venues closing because of difficulties in complying - the night time economy will end up being a police state.	1	1.4
Private companies not taking responsibility	1	1.4
<p>The presumption in favour of extending hours is not based on any evidence . In fact the evidence included in the review would suggest a tightening of the restrictions would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The sections on preventing discrimination do not include any reference to discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity. On the face of it this would appear a clear and obvious breach of the council's statutory responsibilities under the Equality Act, 2010</p>	1	1.4
You have not asked about increasing hours across the city at all in this consultation which I find astonishing. The extension of hours is not argued for anywhere in the policy. Quite the opposite, in fact BH has a 20% higher incidence of alcohol related deaths than the UK average (as set out in your own document) and you are planning to increase the	1	1.4

alcohol availability across the city....irresponsible in my opinion. Also, where is the section on race discrimination?		
Yes, later opening hours are most definitely not welcome in our residential areas.	1	1.4
Yes later opening hours for Grassroots music and food and beverage outlets. Not acceptable in residential areas.	1	1.4
Not enough policing	1	1.4
Lack of any practical support for LGBTQ+ venues - just performative lines about inclusion and diversity without meaningful change	1	1.4
It is unclear if this will dramatically increase the amount of licensed premises.	1	1.4
Yes, I have written many of my concerns down. All the Safety measures sound great but in reality there will be a major dependence on the voluntary sector once people have left late night venues . There's Beach Buggy Patrol which is invaluable - Night Owls etc.etc. Is BHCC putting more money into this voluntary sector help? I suspect not. It would be great to have the Beach Buggy Patrol operate on a Thursday night as well. They actually save lives. I don't understand the increased hours for restaurants, deliveries, live music venues, co-working places have been arrived at. Where's the evidence that supports doing this? I	1	1.4

haven't seen any. I am all for the safety of women and girls as there is an extraordinary amount of sexual harassment of women and girls that goes on in clubs and bars but also in the street when these venues empty. Deeply shocking and the beach is a very dangerous place indeed late at night. I support diversity and inclusion but the city does it so well already so do we just need to help encourage more venues to cater to the LGBTQ+ community.		
without police response they are meaningless once people leave the venue. residents continue to suffer.	1	1.4
As explained I have a strong objection to the proposed extensions to opening hours. I also think that local residents should be notified of any proposed changes in licensing. We should not have to monitor all applications in case they impact us. Aside from this the proposals seem positive.	1	1.4
Just that it may be a tick box exercise - a lot is being asked of the people on the 'shop floor'	1	1.4
I have given my views, but this feels like the council is appeasing a powerful lobby group to the detriment of residents. We cannot control ASB now, and these proposals will make things worse for us.	1	1.4
Any new venue demands should be proportional. A small venue which has	1	1.4

created an inclusive and safe atmosphere/environment without the need for door staff, signage or compulsory staff training in how to sensitively deal with certain groups shouldn't have the same demands placed on them as another larger venue with issues.		
The only concern would be the overuse of ID which could step over a line in relation to privacy. There would need to be greater clarity about the use of ID.	1	1.4
Yes already stated. Council does not have enforcement resources to encourage premises to extend hours and amplified entertainment AND look after the welfare of residents. This council focused on minority groups relating to gender and sexual orientation but has no regard for minorities such as neuro diverse autism and ADHD where over stimulation ( loud music penetrating their home) is incredibly stressful.	1	1.4
Overly complicated. Focus on operators - good operators reduce crime bad operators bend the rules for profit only and cause most issues	1	1.4
It's all in the planning and delivery of this change and how you communicate it. The council are notoriously known for implementing change without open and honest collaborative working and hide behind a communication process that	1	1.4

is fundamentally flawed.		
Only that area should go north slightly not stopping at st peters but include some of London rd	1	1.4
Residual concern over later opening near residential areas.	1	1.4
Impact on smaller licensed premises may be disproportionate	1	1.4
It could go further	1	1.4
Yes I have huge concerns about the later licenses for restaurants specially in the SSA, as well as 1am for live music venues and 2am for fast food premises deliveries.	1	1.4
Yes in the hours should not be extended in the SSA	1	1.4
Leniency on licensing	1	1.4
it risks just being more bureaucracy .. thd whole issue is about personal responsibility and behaviour.. sadly la cking	1	1.4
The presumption in favour of new licenses in the CSA is a major worry for me. While food led premises are an improvement over alcohol led premises, the overall impact is still an increase in alcohol outlets . The policy document nowhere justifies this. In fact it argues the opposite by quoting allocator related deaths in B&H as 20% higher than England average.	1	1.4
Extending licensing hours for local live music venues is a particularly bad idea. I don't understand why 1am is required. Most people have to go to work and shows finish before 12 for that reason. If people need	1	1.4

to keep drinking and dancing there are plenty of venues in the city already		
Yes, please dont extend licensing hours or allow early hours delivery drivers.	1	1.4
Who will police this and how will they have powers	1	1.4
Later licencing	1	1.4
i think safety training needs to be consistent, mandatory, and standardised	1	1.4
The pressure to drink more alcohol is not good for the health of the nation.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### What do you think is the most positive aspect of the proposed changes?

Response	Number	%
No answer	18	25.7
the proposals' relating to lone females	1	1.4
supporting local business to thrive in a difficult climate and enhancing the cites nightlife as well as employment	1	1.4
Increased safety measures for women and vulnerable people	1	1.4
Focus on women's & girls	1	1.4
The discouragement of venues that contribute to binge drinking and all the resulting disgusting behaviour and harm.	1	1.4
A drive towards equity.	1	1.4
Rewarding responsible operators	1	1.4
Emphasis on safeguarding / inclusivity /and violence against women and girls	1	1.4
Not the blanket assumption of refusal	1	1.4
A clear focus on safety in the city centre which is Sussex Police's highest recorded crime area for violent crime during Marble	1	1.4

hours. More accountability on operators to have good policies and procedures in place to protect and care for the public.		
Digital I.D	1	1.4
Safety	1	1.4
Recognition of GMVs as a distinct part of Brighton's licensed venue offer, culture and economy is an extremely positive initiative, one that we are confident will result in better supported, well resourced GMVs that have more tools needed to thrive and develop.	1	1.4
Really important to keep Brighton safe and welcoming to people for nights out	1	1.4
The improved level of flexibility applied to the determination of license applications as opposed to the current blanket approach.	1	1.4
Safety and good operators	1	1.4
The support for business	1	1.4
A safety first approach	1	1.4
the VAWG section and anti spiking sections though I think training on modern slavery could be added to make it stronger.	1	1.4
Better protection for women, girls and LGBT	1	1.4
Better safety	1	1.4
The good operator scheme, IF Police Licensing actually stick to it	1	1.4
Additional safety measures are sensible	1	1.4
Most positive is the focus on Safety but there is little here to show how that will be addressed. A policy on spiked drinks is great - just	1	1.4

ensure the one that is already there is actually used. Encouraging live music. Improved training of staff.		
Safety having a bigger priority	1	1.4
The later licenses	1	1.4
That females have a safe space and the fact that they are physically more vulnerable than men has been recognised.	1	1.4
Increased safety for vulnerable people	1	1.4
Women's safety	1	1.4
Good Operator Policy	1	1.4
The flexible nature	1	1.4
more flexibility to issue premises licenses in the CIZ	1	1.4
That there are clear guidelines in place, making it clear that some behaviours are unacceptable, therefore encouraging accountability.	1	1.4
Welfare of women and girls	1	1.4
It won't make a difference. Too many buddy operators do what they want without action	1	1.4
Holding alcohol licenced venues accountable...but that only works with a 'proactive approach' from the council as apposed to the reactive way it work now to alcohol venues and noise.	1	1.4
Reduce hopefully antisocial behaviour and increase safety	1	1.4
Focus on safety, good practice and training of staff.	1	1.4
Addressing spiking	1	1.4
Better safety measures inside bars and clubs.	1	1.4
More flexibility for venues,	1	1.4

more restaurants in the nighttime economy and enhanced safety		
Better protection for women and girls and LGBT+ community	1	1.4
Protection of women and girls	1	1.4
Specific training for targeted communities in the zone	1	1.4
raising awareness	1	1.4
The BVAWG section and the section on spiking. However I worry about how all of this will be managed / enforced / policed.	1	1.4
Training and raising awareness of issues those running establishments should already be keenly aware of.	1	1.4
Traing for VAWG	1	1.4
Shows that these things are important	1	1.4
Protecting women and girls	1	1.4
more safety around VAWG and LGBTQIA+ people	1	1.4
the training schemes.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

#### Are there any important issues that have not been adequately addressed?

Response	Number	%
None	21	30
No answer	5	7.1
Disability and Vulnerability.	1	1.4
Clear CCTV in premises and outside. High definition. Storage of data standards i.e all data kept for 45 days min. Lighting outside premises so the images are crystal clear. Fake IDs and massive awareness and enforcement around this subject.	1	1.4
How much money will these changes cost the Council?	1	1.4

Will you spend any money on training and information? What are the Council going to do to make this change?		
Safety and inclusion for all folk living with a disability. More needs to be done.	1	1.4
The automatic assumptions that more is problematic - the people are here anyway - spread the load	1	1.4
Making the street safer for women	1	1.4
I think this covers the issues.	1	1.4
The hippodrome will cause chaos for the immediate local residents. If even later license is taken this will have an even worse impact on late night ASB.	1	1.4
<p>Given that understanding is growing between the subsequent link between poor planning and noise complaints and BHCC already recognises the Agent of Change principle in local planning policy, there is an opportunity to tie the two cause &amp; effect together, and knit the Agent of Change principle into environmental health policy.</p> <p>85% of the Music Fan Voice responders surveyed said that they agree with the statement that there should be laws introduced so that people who move into areas near music venues cannot make complaints about noise related to a venue.</p>	1	1.4
Please refer to Representation Letter	1	1.4

issued by Quod on behalf of Ingka Centres		
Taxis accepting closed takeaways food in evenings	1	1.4
Inadequate consideration given to the impact of the proposals on residential areas in the SSA	1	1.4
As above - racial discrimination and the longer hours are not justified across the city. Plus the presumption in favour of new premises is also not supported by the policy document.	1	1.4
LGBT	1	1.4
<p>Encouraging the regeneration of our dying nighttime economy. This council needs to look to Manchester, and how they achieved this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A Night Mayor who worked across statutory bodies to implement positive and meaningful changes</li> <li>* Purple flag recognition</li> <li>* Better and more frequent late-night transport so people can get home safely</li> <li>* More presence on streets at night by first aiders and night marshals</li> <li>* Promotion of the different nighttime districts (for Brighton, this could be - Kemptown, the Seafront, The Laines, etc.)</li> </ul>	1	1.4
While I welcome the stronger emphasis on safety, inclusion and safeguarding, I am concerned that several of the proposed changes particularly replacing the	1	1.4

<p>Cumulative Impact Zone with a City Safety Area and introducing the good operator policy risk weakening existing protections for residents. This is already a high-harm area with serious and persistent issues around crime, anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related harm. Shifting away from a precautionary approach and giving operators more flexibility could make these problems worse, not better.</p> <p>Enhanced safety initiatives and training are positive steps, but they will only be effective if they are backed by strong, consistent enforcement and genuine accountability. A safer, more inclusive night-time environment must not come at the cost of increased noise, disruption and harm to those who live and work in the area. Protecting the community must remain the highest priority.</p> <p>In addition, the council must address practical safety concerns on the ground. Installing proper street lighting along the two twittens where I live is essential. These routes are currently poorly lit and feel unsafe at night. Better lighting would help deter anti-social behaviour, reduce the risk of harm, and make a tangible difference to residents' sense of security.</p>		
Reduction in overall crime and antisocial behaviour	1	1.4

resulting from drunken behaviour		
As I have said, I can't see where the rationale is for the more generous hours for some businesses and that is a deeply worrying omission. Also, all applications for a licence in the central area of the city - the present CIZ - really do need to go to a panel if there's an objection. It can't just be assumed they are allowable under the new matrix. There's some good ideas here but a lot of potential downsides too.	1	1.4
violence on the streets once people have been ejected from or left a venue.	1	1.4
Impact of drugs in the city & greater consumption.	1	1.4
Front of venue tidiness and noise	1	1.4
Drinking for the sake of getting drunk isn't being addressed. It is that cultural mindset that needs to be tackled. Prevention rather than forever dealing with the aftermath.	1	1.4
Off Sales	1	1.4
Flexibility in allowing unusual venues to easily obtain a license. Eg a gallery might have a second income stream by occasionally hosting small gigs, supper clubs, film nights, community events where selling alcohol is intrinsic to the success of the event. Having smaller non traditional venues having the option to sell alcohol would help bring people into town who aren't just out to get drunk.	1	1.4

More Police	1	1.4
Yes, focusing all of your energies on creating a cut price night time Ayia Napa is a bad idea. See how the rest of Europe is swiftly moving away from this model as you continue to embrace it.	1	1.4
Licensing and noise enforcement	1	1.4
Make clubs accountable for the public before sending them out on the streets- they get them as drunk as possible quickly before closing and then letting the rest of the town deal with the problem.	1	1.4
Robust impact assessments on how these changes will affect home, lives and families living in the new proposed zones	1	1.4
Use of noisy vehicles (especially petrol motorbikes) and a licencing requirement to have a planned transition to the use electric bikes for noise pollution and wider sustainability reasons.	1	1.4
Street drinking and obvious drug taking and street dealing - this is what makes Brighton feel unsafe to residents and particularly visitors	1	1.4
Reasonable rules for vertical street drinking outside pavement license	1	1.4

The lack of policing in St James and the area is a major problem now. Not only do we have a LOT of addicts, we have clubbers opening dealing/taking drugs in residential streets and using them as public toilets. This problem is worsened by events sanctioned by the council (like on the beach) which are not professionally run or adequately policed. the lack of capability in the council itself to manage these issue is a significant risk, and needs to be addressed if you want to implement these proposals (and lets be honest, you will do that whatever residents think).	1	1.4
The reasoning to permit later opening,	1	1.4
More visible police presence at all times in city	1	1.4
Easy routes for complaints from residence, no mention of holiday rentals and Airbnb rentals and their governance	1	1.4
what about violence against young men...	1	1.4
Community impact of extending opening hours for all food led premises and deliveries to 1 am / 2am respectively. This will be felt across the whole city. Also there is no mention of race in the discrimination section of the policy.	1	1.4
The likely impact on residents to extending licensing hours.	1	1.4
Listen to residents who live in the area. It is a high density residential area and	1	1.4

the proposals will have a significant impact on peoples' quality of life and sleep.		
Noise pollution	1	1.4
Bigger venues in the centre. Re kick out times	1	1.4
No I believe all issues have been addressed.	1	1.4
the cumulative impact on the city.	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### What best describes your sex and gender?

Response	Number	%
No answer	34	48.6
Male	18	25.7
Female	17	24.3
Prefer not to say	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### Is the gender you identify with the same as your sex registered at birth?

Response	Number	%
Yes	36	51.4
No answer	34	48.6
Total	70	100.0

### How would you describe your ethnic origin?

Response	Number	%
No answer	34	48.6
White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, British	29	41.4
White: Other	4	5.7
White: Irish	2	2.9
Prefer not to say	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

### Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?

Response	Number	%
No answer	35	50.0
Heterosexual / Straight	19	27.1
Gay Man	7	10.0
Prefer not to say	3	4.3
Lesbian / Gay woman	2	2.9
Bisexual / Bi	2	2.9
No answer	1	1.4

Queer	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

#### What is your religion or belief?

Response	Number	%
No answer	35	50.0
I have no particular religion or belief	12	17.1
Atheist	9	12.9
Christian	8	11.4
No answer	4	5.7
Other philosophical belief	1	1.4
Buddhist	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

#### What is your age?

Response	Number	%
No answer	35	50.0
55 - 64	9	12.9
65 - 74	9	12.9
45 - 54	9	12.9
No answer	4	5.7
25 - 34	2	2.9
35 - 44	1	1.4
16 - 24	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

#### Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability which has lasted, or is expected to last, at least 12 months?

Response	Number	%
No answer	35	50.0
No	26	37.1
Yes, a little	5	7.1
Yes, a lot	2	2.9
No answer	2	2.9
Total	70	100.0