



DO IT ONLINE
SCARBOROUGH.GOV.UK

SCARBOROUGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Scarborough Borough Council

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

Total Number of Responses

259

	Yes	No
The analysis undertaken in respect of Whitby Town Centre provides a picture of steady improvement. As a consequence and based on the evidence available it is proposed to dispense with the Whitby Town Centre Cumulative Impact Zone.	51	203
Do you agree with this proposal?	20.1%	79.9%
The analysis undertaken in respect of Scarborough Town Centre shows a slight year-on-year reduction in crimes and occurrences. This is not considered significant enough to dispense with the Cumulative Impact Zone altogether however it is proposed to reduce the zone in size.	68	38
Do you agree with this proposal?	64.2%	35.8%
Based on the analysis undertaken in respect of the Falsgrave area, it is not proposed that the Scarborough Town Cumulative Impact Zone (CIZ) be extended to include this area, but that the area be monitored with further analysis undertaken should the situation change in the future.	86	16
Do you agree with this proposal?	84.3%	15.7%
The area intended to be covered by the revised Cumulative Impact Zone is detailed at para 4.1 of the Cumulative Impact Assessment.	86	15
Do you agree with the area proposed and streets to be included?	85.1%	14.9%

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

The analysis undertaken in respect of Whitby Town Centre provides a picture of steady improvement. As a consequence and based on the evidence available it is proposed to dispense with the Whitby Town Centre Cumulative Impact Zone.

Do you Agree with this proposal?

	Percent of Responses
Yes	20.1%
No	79.9%

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Why abandon good work?	N	It is not the intention to abandon good work, however the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
The key findings of the crime pattern analysis carried out by NY Police show increases in violence and several crime group categories whilst most other significant categories remain predominantly static (p 54 of the report). There is certainly no compelling evidence to suggest that the zone in Whitby should be dispensed with. To the contrary, it is more likely that the "steady improvement" that is suggested in this consultation is owed, at least partially, to the suppression of increases in licensing in the zone. It is my view that the conclusion of the report does not follow the facts.	N	It is accepted that number of incidents have remained broadly static since 2015, however this should be considered over the longer term - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17. In terms of suppressing licences, very few applications have been refused as a direct result of the Cumulative Impact Policy being in place. Instead other mechanisms have been used such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have.
The improvement is down to the fact that the CIZ is there in the first place. Remove it and there will be a steady decline.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers visiting these premises may be creating

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The reason that Whitby shows steady improvement in the reduction of ASB is because we have a strict enforcement of a CIZ policy. To relax that in any way would be seriously detrimental to the relative state of equilibrium that exists within the zone. This authority is regarded as the best in the country for licensing policies and enforcement of them. It would be against everything that has been fought for to dispense with it.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers visiting these premises may be creating.</p>
there are plenty of establishments already	N/A	Comment

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The picture of steady improvement is not the same picture that I see, both as a resident of Whitby and with an adult son who works around the harbour and fish quay during the evenings. I suspect also that the assessment is based on figures from the Police, which may not present the true situation. With fewer police available for response to incidents in Whitby as they are drawn in to incidents in Scarborough, and the increasing difficulty in contacting Police for any reasonably prompt response to Whitby, I believe that fewer incidents of public disorder are reported to the Police. When incidents are reported, it is often the case that by the time police arrive, the situation has finished, although the consequences could be varied. There is much anecdotal evidence of alcohol fuelled behaviour around Whitby, some of which I hear from my son, who has recently witnessed 40+ drunken males and females rampaging from the pubs around Pier Road and jumping in the harbour. Similar numbers were seen jumping on roof tops and bonnets of cars on an alcohol fuelled spree recently. It is quite apparent that Whitby is increasingly becoming the place to go for large groups of both sexes, with regular coach and minibus trips visiting from Teeside area in particular. There doesn't appear to be anything at all cultural about many of these visiting groups, as the main aim seems to be to get as drunk as possible within the shortest possible time. This is not difficult with so many pubs within such a short distance of each other. In fact flash points often occur because groups of youths spill out onto the streets and gather withing spitting distance of neighbouring premises. There is also a significant problem around the fast food outlet usually when drinking time is coming to an end. This unfortunately is generally the time when NYP have been drawn into Scarborough to support colleagues, or have been effectively taken off patrol with a prisoner, which has to be taken into custody at Scarborough. Incidentally, it is not unusual to see individuals or groups being allowed into licensed, already in a drunken state, and no doubt served with drinks until they either fall down or begin fighting. This is clearly an offence under the Licensing Act but it appears to be one which is rarely if ever enforced. I have been involved in law enforcement for around 37 years, having retired from the Police as a Custody Sergeant, before my current work with SBC, so I have seen my fair share of public disorder and the results of heavy uncontrolled drinking, but with a steady relaxation of the Licensing Laws and regulation over recent years I believe that alcohol fuelled violence and disorder has become more of a problem. I certainly would not wish to see any relaxation of controls on licences in a town which is becoming more and more popular each year.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Cumulative Impact Policy only applies to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing problems. Although your concerns regarding police resources and the incidents you have witnessed are accepted, other more appropriate mechanisms do exist to tackle these issues.</p>
<p>if it is working please do not change it - prevention is better than cure</p>	N	<p>Your comments are noted, however the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The key findings of the crime pattern analysis carried out by NY Police show increases in violence and several other crime group categories whilst most significant categories remain predominantly static (p 54 of the report). There is certainly no compelling evidence to suggest that benefit would be derived if the zone in Whitby should be dispensed with. To the contrary, it is more likely that the "steady improvement" that is suggested in this consultation is owed, at least partially, to the suppression of increases in licensing in the zone. It is my view that the conclusion of the report does not follow the facts in the case of Whitby.</p>	N	<p>It is accepted that number of incidents have remained broadly static since 2015, however this should be considered over the longer term - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17. In terms of suppressing licences, very few applications have been refused as a direct result of the Cumulative Impact Policy being in place. Instead other mechanisms have been used such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have.</p>
<p>keep up the good work with evidence that shows it is working</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I am not sure that I understand this completely but if this means that there is less support from the police etc. then I am not comfortable about this being dispensed..</p>	N	<p>It is not considered that rescinding the Cumulative Impact Zone for Whitby would have a direct impact on police support.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
The decrease is not significant enough. Indeed crimes of violence are up	N	It is accepted that number of incidents have remained broadly static since 2015, however this should be considered over the longer term - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17. In terms of suppressing licences, very few applications have been refused as a direct result of the Cumulative Impact Policy being in place. Instead other mechanisms have been used such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have.
The fact that we have this control in Whitby is the reason why it is an improving area.	N	Your comments are noted, however the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
The key findings of the crime pattern analysis carried out by NY Police show increases in violence and several other crime group categories whilst most significant categories remain predominantly static (p 54 of the report). There is certainly no compelling evidence to suggest that benefit would be derived if the zone in Whitby should be dispensed with. To the contrary, it is more likely that the "steady improvement" that is suggested in this consultation is owed, at least partially, to the suppression of increases in licensing in the zone. It is my view that the conclusion of the report does not follow the facts in the case of Whitby.	N	It is accepted that number of incidents have remained broadly static since 2015, however this should be considered over the longer term - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17. In terms of suppressing licences, very few applications have been refused as a direct result of the Cumulative Impact Policy being in place. Instead other mechanisms have been used such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have.
The improvement is due in my opinion to the CIZ why remove it ?	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so.
An improving picture could quickly deteriorate if restrictions are lifted.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
I consider this would stretch Police resources to far	N	It is not considered that rescinding the Cumulative Impact Zone for Whitby would have a direct impact on police support.
The CIZ would appear to be working in respect of reducing the number of alcohol related incidents, so why remove it ? Within the next month, two new pubs will be opened , both close to other Public Houses. There is no evidence presented to show where the "Hot Spots" are in Whitby (No visual map to refer to) and without any provision of statistical evidence of where incidents take place, DAG cannot make an informed decision.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises.
keep the impact zone	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises.
If it is working why stop it? Typical council short term view of problems.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems they may be creating. This is not a short term view but one resulting from careful consideration of the evidence available - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>There is no map showing the areas of Whitby affected by this. Two new pubs are due to open this month and violence represents the most prevalent crime category. At the height of Summer, the town centre is often full with stag and hen parties so why remove something which seems to be working.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. In addition it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers visiting these premises may be creating. This is not a short term view but one resulting from careful consideration of the evidence available - as an example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to the 79 offences reported in 2016/17.</p>
<p>Because there is no option to say 'don't know'. (I live in Scarborough and have very little experience of evenings in Whitby.)</p>	N/A	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>If incidences have decreased since the introduction of the scheme why change it?</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>It is generally thought by residents and business owners that Whitby is suffering by the excess of licensed premises which have increased over the last few years. What is needed are more local type shops, not tourist junk shops, a proper market regular selling local products, more food stalls than we have every Thursday, variety please. People do live in the town not just tourists</p>	N/A	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Despite the report you have received there is a general trend for groups of people to drink heavily and create a nuisance and behave violently. I have personally witnessed serious anti social behaviours almost daily. We live in the twin centre.</p>	N	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>There is just as much street drinking as ever, Whitby is a small place and adverse behaviour can spread - people walking around with alcohol, etc. There are places with outright bans, or there used to be, and these should be enforced.</p>	N/A	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Longer term evidence/patterns needed to justify dispensation.</p>	N	<p>This proposal has been made after considering evidence gathered over the last 10 years. For example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence, this is compared to 79 offences reported in 2016/17 representing a 60% reduction in incidents over this time.</p>
<p>Groups of drunks shouting and lurching around day and night might not be a crime in your eyes but make people who live in town lives miserable.</p>	N/A	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Whitby town centre is becoming a frightening place full of swearing gangs of drinkers all day Saturday and Sunday, causing offence and public nuisance, urinating in the street,</p>	N/A	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Because it should be difficult to obtain a licence to sell alcohol. Not all anti-social behaviour is criminal; it is intimidating to share public spaces with loud, inebriated people. It often results in noise and uninhibited behaviour, such as urinating in the street, or vomiting. This is disturbing to residents and holiday makers alike. Making it easier to obtain a licence to sell alcohol is unlikely to reduce these occurrences but will almost certainly lead to their increase. This is not the image of Whitby that we should be striving for.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. Unfortunately the evidence provided does not support this.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Anti-social behaviour is increasing in the town centre. Lack of police. There are already a vast number of premises where alcohol can be purchased. Those still living in the centre of town dread Friday and Saturday nights where vomiting and using the yards etc. are used as a toilet.	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
I've witnessed too many incidents of street drunkenness, even during daylight hours.	N/A	Comment
I have witnessed a growing number of large 'group' drinkers who go from pub to pub with the express interest of getting drunk. It is now the case that I rarely walk through the town at the weekend with my children because of the behaviour of certain groups. Whitby is very attractive to the stag and hen market because it has such a large concentration of establishments selling alcohol in a small area with readily available accommodation close by. It is however detrimental to family living as these large groups of drinkers are often loud, aggressive, intimidating and foul mouthed. It is not something which should be encouraged by relaxing of rules.	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
As a resident of Flowergate I can only describe the drinking shouting , singing and general drunken behaviour a nightmare but if you are relying on people like us to report it then this won't happen as we just want to enjoy our lives and get some sleep at night as we all have to get up for work. The noise and drunken behaviour has increased and I must say I have noticed a reduction in police presence around the town. If we were to report every incident we would never be off the phone these visitors who stay in the holiday homes and B & Bs are the ones out there doing the drinking and I think have no idea that people do actually live down the streets. Sadly they are encouraged to stay in the pubs and spill greatly out on to the streets due to lack of space in the pubs , bands on until way after hours and then are too drunk to even know there way home. The only way to avoid it is to move but we are going to try some secondary glazing first !	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
There is so much anti social behaviour due to drink related issues (mainly tourists on day trips) that it has to stay in place. We also need more policing around and in the area.	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
I live in one of the yards off Church St. and frequently find cigarette stubs, pools of vomit and once a copulating couple in the entrance to our yard. This happens regularly at weekends. There are five pubs within a small area here and to let more licences premises join in this hotspot would increase this antisocial and often noisy activity.	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>this will have an adverse effect on drunken behaviour in the town, particularly at holidays and weekend. This combined with the lack of a police presence is not good for visitors with families or residents (who pay council taxes) who see town as a no go area at certain times</p>	N	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>The numbers of drunken groups, particularly at weekends and festival periods, has increased considerably over the last few years to the extent that I do not feel safe walking from Chubb Hill to the Co-op at certain times of day; moreover, as the owner of a quality B&B, to have guests raise concerns about the overall decline in the standard of Whitby town centre re unsociable drink related behaviour and litter is extremely worrying. I fear that to remove the impact zone would be detrimental to residents, business owners and adversely affect the visitor experience.</p>	N	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>The drunken behaviour in the town centre has increased and is very intimidating, especially during weekend afternoons. Crowds of hen and stag parties go from pub to pub on our main shopping streets and they are very drunk, and using foul language even early afternoon. Local families with children no longer feel safe. I do not go into town on a weekend, many people feel the same. I know people who live in Well Court and they have to suffer the indignity of drunken men urinating against their wall.</p>	N	<p>The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Removal of the CIZ for Whitby removes a layer of protection for Whitby residents and businesses. If current laws and regulations are enough to protect Whitby without a CIZ, why are not the same regulations not enough to protect Scarborough, where the CIZ is proposed to remain?</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is also difficult to draw direct comparisons between Scarborough and Whitby town centres. For example, although violence remains the most prevalent category in both areas in 2016/17, there were 326 incidents in Scarborough compared with only 79 in Whitby.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Surely if there has been a steady improvement with it in place it would make absolute sense to continue in order to see a greater improvement.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
The town has an ever-increasing problem with inebriated people causing noise, nuisance, and violence at all times of the day and night. Removing the CIZ will not address this. We need a stronger police presence in the town to deal with the problems at source. The minority of landlords who sell alcohol to people who have already had enough should be weeded out and punished.	N	Comments noted.
A small town with families visiting is not the place to attract loud drunken hen, stag parties and 'lads or girls drinking days'	N	Comments noted.
Whitby is crazy now with drunks and fighting on a weekend and at night to the point where lots of us locals are avoiding the town especially at night. Its not the safe place it used to be. There are also too many stag and hen parties coming for weekends just with a view of getting drunk, not to take in our lovely town	N	Comments noted.
Steady improvement does not guarantee that the problems have gone away	N	Comments noted.
Still problems in town and believe this helps curb a lot more trouble	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
Although you have a steady improvement this area is well guarded by the provision of private door staff, the number of visitors to this area at peak times of the year is immense and after myself going to Whitby Pavilion last bank holiday witnessed a lot of people from away using language which was offensive, because they thought they could because it wasn't in their backyard not a pleasant environment and needs closely monitoring also the amount of people requiring transport out of the town was far more than transport available	N	Comments noted.
There are still significant problems and without the Cumulative Impact Zone it would be more difficult for the Licensing Committee to make decisions which balance business and Residents interests. From personal experience how this can work.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. With regard to decision making, the Licensing Committee remain able to make the same decision regardless of whether an Assessment is in place or not.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
There are already a large number of licensed premises, lots of drinkers and frequent nuisance/antisocial behaviour in the town and the east side.	N	Comment
Surely if the CIZ is removed, there will be a return to previous ASB etc. fuelled by alcohol? Why dispense with it, when it obviously showing a steady improvement	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
In the last two weeks walking through Whitby my wife was walked into by a man who was drunk, who then held her by both arms laughing but showing no intention of letting go or stopping until I stepped forward. This was about 19:00 hrs. We had children with us and had just been for a meal at Mr Chips. On another, this time mid afternoon, I unfortunately caught the eye of a man with a group of lads, who continued to look at me and ask me what I was looking at, trying to draw me into an argument. I of course immediately looked away and continued walking past the group with my wife. They were sitting on the front of The Dolphin. The area was full of people drinking and very loud. For the record, I am 63, I live and work in Whitby, and I fail to see how it can be acceptable for both my wife and myself to have to put up with this behaviour resulting from on these occasions groups of drunken men. I often witness this behaviour, and on my assessment it is an increasing threat to p people who live here and their quality of life. Incidentally I hardly ever see police patrolling this area, although I do see blue lights from time to time. You might say they is probably already too late. Finally in the same couple of weeks more drinking places are opening: one just around from the above mentioned Dolphin on Grape Lane; another on Skinner Street. Why do we need more in an area with more licences premises than most other towns in the country. Not only do you need to keep this cumulative measure in place, but you need to use it effectively to stop an unnecessary addition of even more opportunities for drunken behaviour which becomes increasingly difficult to police.	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described. the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
We live in very close proximity to 4 pubs with a further 3 in the vicinity. Every weekend we hear noise from people using these pubs often until 2 or 3 a.m. also there is often vomit in our yard which we have to clear up and also people using the yard to urinate. I work until 10pm and to return home alone at that time is uncomfortable and intimidating. Burglar alarms are often activated in the early hours of the morning. Fights occur regularly and damage is done to properties . It should be unthinkable that we will not have the scant peace of mind the impact zone offers	N	The issues raised are accepted, however it is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
I have just completed the survey but would like to add that despite having complained about the nuisance in the town centre related to alcohol that I would have thought we should have been contacted by post for our views .	N	Comment - Please contact the Council if the nuisance problems are continuing.
That based on the Home Office's 'Modern Crime Prevention Strategy' published in March 2016 and 'The Alcohol: cumulative impact assessment' briefing paper 02/05/17. Whitby Town Council call on Scarborough Borough Council as the licensing authority to maintain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby. Whitby Town Council have clearly identified concerns about crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children from harm in relation to the excessive consumption of alcohol within the existing CIP zone. These concerns have been evidenced by complaints received and voiced in relation to litter, noise and inappropriate offensive drunken behaviour. It is Whitby Town Council assertion that the number of licensed premises within the current Cumulative Impact Zone is such that the granting of further licences would be inconsistent with the Licensing Authorities duty to promote the licensing objective.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Yes I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Don't know I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures - Yes</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>5 of the following comments received</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Don't know I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures - Yes</p>		<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Don't know I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Don't know I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Don't know</p>		<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>6 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Don't know I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Don't know</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Don't know I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Don't know I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Yes</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>2 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – No I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Don't Know I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Don't Know</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>2 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Yes</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>14 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Yes I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Don't Know</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>111 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of: Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children</p> <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Yes I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Yes I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Yes</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I fully agree with Cllr Turner, removing the CIZ in Whitby is a retrograde step, it has proved its worth but that is no reason to remove it, in my opinion it has been a successful deterrent and should remain, Sincerely</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>I comment only to Whitby in that management to strong scrutiny of new licensing outlet applications has been assisted through the inclusion of a CIZ and the removal or reducing of the zone because we rely on data only to the excesses thereby not placing enough importance to the 'grey and white' areas of poor behaviour.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>I absolutely agree with Cllr Turner. To relax our very sound policies would be regressive and pave the way for increases in crime and anti social behaviour. A great many people have worked very hard to get where we are and we should continue to work to make our town centres even safer.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>Having been on a night time economy visit to Whitby I agree with my colleagues, with regards to Whitby. Removal of the CI assessment will seriously test the police and their ability to deal with issues once restrictions are removed. Things will get progressively worse as conditions are no longer followed and I believe that this will overwhelm the police resources very quickly. This is a bad idea and if it happens the cabinet needs to own this and not the licensing committee.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described. the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. There is nothing to suggest that removing the Zone for Whitby but lead to an increase in non-compliance with conditions, compliance is obligatory whether a Cumulative Impact Assessment is in place or not.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Whitby Civic Society opposes any proposal to rescind the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. First, we consider the evidence considered by the Council insufficiently robust to warrant a significant change in policy. Second, we believe that rescinding the CIZ will send completely the wrong message to developers as well as to the community more widely. The area affected covers much of Whitby Conservation Area, which is therefore vulnerable to any increase in criminal and anti-social behaviour linked to heavy drinking.</p> <p>The Council's evidence base covers a very limited period. Even so, while the numbers of reported offences did not increase in 2016/17, public order and anti-social behaviour continue to pose a challenge; and the accompanying police report also draws attention to a small rise in violent offences, particularly those defined as common assault. In addition, we believe that there is significant under-reporting of offences, including anti-social behaviour and some types of violent crime; Whitby Street Angels will have important supplementary evidence on this issue. In terms of reported crime, your Hot Spot map shows a marked concentration of occurrences in the central area around Wellington Road/Baxtergate/Station Square, an area with a large number of licensed premises and late night take-aways, as well as serving as a hub for taxis and public transport. Our members are also aware of a large number of lower level occurrences in the yards and streets elsewhere within</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. The report provided by the Police is considered to be thorough and a good evidential basis for this proposal. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported and it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>the existing CIZ, as well as a growing if still relatively small number of rough sleepers in the area. Local residents are already concerned about returning home in the late evening; there is a real risk that this historic area could become a no-go area for residents.</p> <p>Whitby is a small town with a historic centre. Excessive public drunkenness affects wider use of the historic centre, making it unattractive to families and others, and influencing developers in their thinking about future usage. Rescinding the CIZ will send a strong message about the licensing authority's attitude to any future growth in the numbers of licensed premises, and negatively affect the prospects of businesses which do not offer alcohol. We are confident that this is not the intention, but nevertheless we believe that this is how it will be perceived.</p> <p>The main advantage of retaining the CIZ is that the onus is on applicants to demonstrate that their premises will meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the prevention of crime and disorder - public safety - the prevention of public nuisance - the protection of children from harm. <p>We believe that removing this requirement will place these four goals at risk.</p>		<p>It is also important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described. Finally in respect of applications for new licences or variations, even without Whitby being included within the Assessment, applicants would still be required to demonstrate how they would support the Licensing Objectives. Although this is supported by the presence of Policy, where an applicant has failed to adequately demonstrate this their application is likely to garner representations.</p>
<p>1 of the following comments received:</p> <p>I believe that Scarborough Borough Council met on the 12th June 2018 and proposed to remove the Cumulative Impact Zone from Whitby. I understand that the Cumulative Impact Zone was introduced in 2006 with the aims of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention of Crime and disorder Public Safety Prevention of Public Nuisance Protection of harm from Children <p>I am deeply concerned that the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone will be to the detriment of the majority of residences and businesses of Whitby and to our Visitors too.</p> <p>It may be that the statistics show fewer crimes are being reported in this zone but that does not reflect the reality of what happens on the streets. Violence represents the most prevalent recorded Crime category with 79 offences in 2016-2017. I feel it is important to retain the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby to make sure the crime in this area does not increase.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the removal of the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. I see an increase in drunken people in the town of Whitby – Don't know I see and hear of more criminal damage in Whitby – Yes I think the loss of police on the streets makes many people feel unsafe – Yes I have no confidence in the way the police record crime figures – Don't know</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is however agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

The analysis undertaken in respect of Scarborough Town Centre shows a slight year-on-year reduction in crimes and occurrences. This is not considered significant enough to dispense with the Cumulative Impact Zone altogether however it is proposed to reduce the zone in size.

Do you agree with this proposal?

	Percent of Responses
Yes	64.2%
No	35.8%

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
no change in crime, so no change to the impact zone.	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
Given a slight year on year reduction, why cannot the zone be held as it is for a further time period	N	The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is important that the areas included within the Zone reflect the evidence available.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Having been out to see the late night economy I feel that there is along way to go before we should contemplate reducing the size of the zone. We have the best licensing authority in the country and to reduce the size of the CIZ would only serve to weaken that position and open the gate for dramatic increases in ASB.</p>	N	<p>The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place. It is important that the areas included within the Zone reflect the evidence available.</p>
<p>if it is working please do not change it - prevention is better than cure - and hopefully it might improve and bring decent shops. The town centre is awful - I try and stay away whenever possible due to the dross and awful atmosphere - prefer to shop in other areas ie Malton, Pickering</p>	N	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>Scarborough Town Centre is awful - terrible rough atmosphere - I avoid the town centre and shop in Malton, Pickering or York if needed.</p>	N	<p>Comment</p>
<p>The expansion of micro pubs and change of use of retail units to licensed premises has widened the area not reduced the area that should be considered.</p>	N	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Money saved today will cost more in the future. The council has got to start looking at problems and how to solve them with a longer view. Macro economic not micro.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>I think Scarborough has a major problem with heavy drinking and associated anti-social behaviour. I don't see much incentive or benefit in reducing the size of the zone.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The CIZ should remain the same- not be reduced. The table titled 'Crimes Where There Have Been Notable Increases in 2016/17' indicate a 25% increase in common assault and battery, a 75% increase in wounding with intent to do GBH, 33% increase in arson and criminal damage and even higher percentages for breach of restraining order and causing intentional harassment, alarm or distress</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>It is agreed that the CIZ should not be dispensed with It is NOT agreed that the zone should be reduced in size as this in all probability would result in an increase in the remaining area or reduced area. (A pity colours were used on the map e.g. white/ pink and not ink etching)</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Keep the zone as it has been, people soon take advantage if things relax and become not monitored	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
I consider this to be 'early days'. Time will prove the move!	N	Comment
As for Whitby Longer term evidence/patterns needed to justify dispensation.	N/A	Comment - This question relates to the Scarborough Zone.
As above Groups of drunks shouting and lurching around day and night might not be a crime in your eyes but make people who live in town lives miserable.	N	Comments noted.
again drinkers causing constant problems daytime at weekend	N	Comments noted.
See above reasons. Because it should be difficult to obtain a licence to sell alcohol. Not all anti-social behaviour is criminal; it is intimidating to share public spaces with loud, inebriated people. It often results in noise and uninhibited behaviour, such as urinating in the street, or vomiting. This is disturbing to residents and holiday makers alike. Making it easier to obtain a licence to sell alcohol is unlikely to reduce these occurrences but will almost certainly lead to their increase. This is not the image of Whitby that we should be striving for.	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Most people don't bother reporting to 101 as they feel as though they are reporting petty offences	N	Comments noted.
I rarely see police officers, regularly hear about drink related trouble.	N	Comments noted.
It doesn't really cover the whole of the problem area as it us	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
I live in Whitby but I'm sure the issues are the same	N	Comments noted.
As above There is so much anti social behaviour due to drink related issues (mainly tourists on day trips) that it has to stay in place. We also need more policing around and in the area.	N	Comments noted.
A possible solution as long as the hotspots are monitored.	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The Assessment as a whole will be regularly reviewed every 3 years and may be subject to more frequent reviews.
No police presence and the lack of recorded crime as a result lead to misleading statistics.	N	Comment - It is agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Please see above. Per capita Whitby has a very high number of licensed premises and potentially adding more would most certainly damage the atmosphere here and experience of families visiting the area. As for residents, I suspect that were a consultation undertaken that directly approached everyone the response would be a resounding no. We do not want to see the jewel in the coasts crown being further damaged and cheapened. This is not Blackpool!</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>This question relates to the Zone in Scarborough only.</p>
<p>Not all crime is reported so statistics are not accurate</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>Comment - It is agreed that some incidents go un-reported, it is difficult to quantify the scale of under-reporting so that it can have a meaningful input to the content of the Assessment.</p>
<p>Why remove that extra layer of protection?</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
It would only make the problem worse	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.
As it is not significant enough to dispense with the CIZ at this moment in time I would suggest it was slightly premature to reduce its size also. It is important to maintain to reduce crimes by keeping the zone as it is rather than this to lapse and the crimes to revert it is very important to keep a safe environment within all of our Borough	N	St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Any reduction shows the effectiveness of the policy and the fact that it is needed. It seems illogical to wait for the figures to get worse before having to re implement the Zone when inevitably the figures will increase. A 'slight' increase can not be regarded as being statistically significant in showing a trend and could be reflective of a variety of factors, e.g. reporting and recording procedures.</p>	N	<p>St Nicholas Street and St Thomas Street continue to be identified as the key locations where most activity occurs and will continue to be included. The five areas proposed to be removed are on the very periphery of the Zone where the evidence no longer supports the need for their inclusion. The guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 requires Licensing Authorities to regularly review the Zone to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>Sufficient licensed premises already.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>See above? If implemented, it will almost certainly revert to extra work for your already overstretched services employed to keep Scarborough Town Centre less like a battle zone as at present</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>As above . It is still distressing for residents and occupiers of holiday homes to be subjected to these incidents weekly . Despite the official figures it is still an unpleasant atmosphere on Friday Saturday and all bank holiday weekends .</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

Based on the analysis undertaken in respect of the Falsgrave area, it is not proposed that the Scarborough Town Cumulative Impact Zone (CIZ) be extended to include this area, but that the area be monitored with further analysis undertaken should the situation change in the future.

Do you agree with this proposal?

	Percent of Responses
Yes	84.3%
No	15.7%

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Most police reports received in the past year reflect problems in the Gladstone road/ falsgrave area. In my opinion it would be unwise to reduce monitoring or support that msy act as a deterrent.	N	The Falsgrave area does not currently form part of the existing Cumulative Impact Zone in Scarborough, therefore there will be no reduction in monitoring or the support offered to this area.
It would prevent Falsgrave area declining as a late night economy develops with artendant increases in crime and ASB.	N	Comments noted.
I live close to Falsgrave it is still an issue There are many pubs and it is increasingly popular with young people who now start their night out at one of our many pubs and meander up the road Many never make it as far as town We have enough watering holes here please keep the CIZ	N	The Falsgrave area does not currently form part of the existing Cumulative Impact Zone in Scarborough. Although it is not suggested to include Falsgrave at this stage, the number of incidents will be monitored and regularly reviewed.
As per my previous comment it should be subject to the same level of scrutiny as the Town Centre.	N	The Falsgrave area has been subject to the same in depth analysis as the Scarborough and Whitby town centre areas.
Falsgrave is one of the main gateways to the town and needs to present a clean and prosperous feel. Tatty and run down appearance give the wrong first impressions. This is especially important as visitors have already driven along Seamer rd (A64) which is a diabolical road.	N	Comments noted.
I can't answer for Scarborough	N	Comments noted.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
There may have been a reduction in pubs most of which are well managed but off licence/supermarket availability fairly concentrated around Falsgrave/Gallows Close etc.Need longer data analysis to track trends.	Y	Agreed - The Falsgrave area will continue to be monitored.
Falsgrave is mainly residential/retail and that is it's appeal	N	Comments noted.
N/a	N	N/A
Drugs are more prevalent and alcohol issues are rising. Improper facts!	N	Comments noted.
<p>see answers to q1 & 2</p> <p>Q1 - This will have an adverse effect on drunken behaviour in the town, particularly at holidays and weekend. This combined with the lack of a police presence is not good for visitors with families or residents (who pay council taxes) who see town as a no go area at certain times</p> <p>Q2 - No police presence and the lack of recorded crime as a result lead to misleading statistics.</p>	N	Comments noted.
The Zone needs to be as wide as possible to protect the local residents.	N	Although it may be considered desirable to include the Falsgrave area within the Cumulative Impact Zone, there needs to be an evidential basis to support this. Although this area has become a popular addition to Scarborough's Night Time Economy in recent years, the evidence does not suggest that there is a need to include this area at this time.
I think all areas should be monitored - there is an increasing problem with drinking and drink related crimes with high social costs.	N	Although the Falsgrave Area has become a popular addition to Scarborough's Night Time Economy in recent years, there is not currently enough evidence to suggest the area be included within the Cumulative Impact Zone at this time.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

The area intended to be covered by the revised Cumulative Impact Zone is detailed at para 4.1 of the Cumulative Impact Assessment.

Do you agree with the area proposed and streets to be included?

	Percent of Responses
Yes	85.1%
No	14.9%

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
I believe that the following streets should be included too. Cross St, Friargate and the land in between as during the summer months, traditionally ASB rises in this area on the H.A owned land and also East Mount Flats area	N	Although it is accepted incidents may rise in these areas during this time, the Cumulative Impact Zone focusses on the proliferation of licensed premises and associated negative impact rather than general ASB incidents.
I think it should also extend to Gladstone Road and Roscoe Street, and down as far as Sainsbury's and Candler Street. The whole area has problems with crime and drugs. In the space of 18 months there have been numerous incidents and several arrests witnessed - including a man walking the streets with a knife which required police helicopter attendance, various fights and domestic incidents, and visits to homes in Hibernia Street in relation to drugs.	N	A separate study has been undertaken in respect of the Falsgrave Area which does not suggest there is enough evidence to include the area at this time. In addition Cumulative Impact Zones focus on the proliferation of licensed premises and associated negative impact rather than general incidents of crime, ASB etc.
For reasons already given. Q1 - The reason that Whitby shows steady improvement in the reduction of ASB is because we have a strict enforcement of a CIZ policy. To relax that in any way would be seriously detrimental to the relative state of equilibrium that exists within the zone. This authority is regarded as the best in the country for licensing policies and enforcement of them. It would be against everything that has been fought for to dispense with it. Q2 - Having been out to see the late night economy I feel that there is along way to go before we should contemplate reducing the size of the zone. We have the best licensing authority in the country and to reduce the size of the CIZ would only serve to weaken that position and open the gate for dramatic increases in ASB. Q3 - It would prevent Falsgrave area declining as a late night economy develops with artendant increases in crime and ASB.	N/A	Comments noted

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Extension of the zone is needed to include the Falsgrave area.	N	A separate study has been undertaken in respect of the Falsgrave Area which does not suggest there is enough evidence to include the area at this time. The area will however continue to be monitored.
It should include Falsgrave up to and including the A64 / Falsgrave traffic lights to prevent a congregation of people outside the old school / bed king	N	A separate study has been undertaken in respect of the Falsgrave Area which does not suggest there is enough evidence to include the area at this time. The area will however continue to be monitored.
The reduction in crime does not appear to be significant to warrant a revised CIZ at this time. An extension for another one year may prove more significant	N/A	Comments noted
Keep the castle area in the plan	N	The majority of the Castle Ward has been included within the Zone, however due to a reduction in licensed premises and incidents it is proposed to no longer include the latter part of Castle Road.
Should include all areas East of Columbus Ravine.	N	Most areas east of Columbus Ravine do fall within the proposed Zone, however some areas have very few licensed premises / incidents and therefore are not included.
Too small	N	Comment - The Zone has been created based on the evidence available.
does not go far enough	N	Comment - The Zone has been created based on the evidence available.
I would be highly critical of any extension to include these streets due to the potential increase in anti-social drink related behaviour and negative impact on residents including the elderly and families.	N	Comment - there is no proposal to extend the Zone at this time.
In my opinion the CIZ needs to remain as it is at the moment to continue monitoring to make sure the improvements that have happened remain that way and not to allow that to change by removing the CIZ	N	The Zone largely remains unchanged with the exception of five areas relatively small areas. This is due to the available evidence no longer supporting their inclusion within the Zone.
I have not been able to access. These details do I am sorry I can't comment on this particular point.	N/A	Comment - It is unfortunate you have been unable to access the required information.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018

Please provide any additional suggestions below:

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I have read the Scarborough harbour report thoroughly. Whilst the analysis is very good and SMART. The recommendation are lacking in detail and scope. The council has an opportunity to improve/ increase the tourism pound by enhancing the whole harbour area, increasing revenue and making it self funding. At the same time it could become the real 'Centre' of the town with appropriate historical aspects, bespoke shopping experiences, dining with a close intimate sea view whilst providing leading class docking facilities for high end leisure craft. In essence the first port of call. I know this can be achieved. Is there someone on the council who can drive the necessary changes through??...</p>	N	Comments appear to relate to a different consultation.
<p>Keep up the good work, but don't forget Filey, that forgotten coastal town!!!</p>	N	Comment - At present it has not been considered necessary to undertake an analysis of Filey, however this will be reviewed going forward.
<p>The consultation document (ie this document) appears to missing a large section. It asks consultees whether they agree to changes to the zones in Scarborough town and provides a significant amount of statistical information, including plans and other related data. The Whitby zone on the other hand receives no supporting information in the consultation document despite the fact that a much more significant action is proposed. The consultation is poorly designed and poorly framed. The omission of data relating to the Whitby zone demonstrates precisely why a large number of Whitby residents feel that the Borough Council is failing to serve he town's interests.</p>	N	Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
It is essential that we have a vibrant, safe, and diverse day and NTE and that we look to bring Scarborough's day time economy into the NTE without impacting on crime and disorder.	N	Comments noted.
In view of the current apparent underfunding of agencies involved in working with vulnerable and difficult offenders to reduce antisocial behaviour, is there likely to be additional funding in the near future to mitigate problems?	N	Comment - Falls outside the scope of this consultation.
Unfortunately I have little personal knowledge of Scarborough Town centre as a place to drink during the evenings, as I generally avoid it, as a resident of Whitby. It would not be right therefore for me to comment on this, but as a general principle I would not like to see any controls relaxed. The figures on alcohol fuelled disorder and violence are not always an accurate marker as it depends on what is reported and how it is reported. The Police are often very busy with many other things, which often have little to do with crime and disorder, so there is a situation nowadays whereby much of the public disorder is left to sort itself out. We have also seen a significant change in drinking practices by young people over recent years, in that they often do not go out until after 10pm, by which time they have already fuelled up on cheap alcohol at home. I have never quite understood the reasoning behind extending drinking hours generally beyond 11pm, other than on a purely financial basis.	N	Comments noted.
please see previous comments - scarborough town centre is not appealing at all, drunk people, tatty street sellers, empty shops and a down trodden atmosphere - as a working family I stay away from Scarborough town centre now, whereas we used to be in town both Saturday and Sunday - we go elsewhere - to a neighbouring authority ie Ryedale, York or Middlesbrough (Yarm) Please enforce some positive action into the town centre	N	It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The consultation document (i.e. this document) appears to be missing a large section. It asks consultees whether they agree to changes to the zones in Scarborough town and provides a significant amount of statistical information, including plans and other related data. The Whitby zone on the other hand receives no supporting information in the consultation document despite the fact that a much more significant action is proposed. The consultation is poorly designed and poorly framed. The omission of data relating to the Whitby zone demonstrates precisely why a large number of Whitby residents feel that the Borough Council is failing to serve the town's interests.</p>	N	<p>Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document.</p>
<p>Scarborough Town Centre is awful - terrible rough atmosphere - I avoid the town centre and shop in Malton, Pickering or York if needed. Please place more emphasis on bringing it back to a better class of place before I bring my family back we need better shops, less buskers, charity muggers, beggars and drunks.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Whatever assessment the Council intends to undertake, it would be helpful if the interests of the community, in terms of health and safety, are always paramount.</p>	N	<p>Comment - Public Safety is one of the four licensing objectives which underpins the Licensing Act 2003 and is therefore fundamental in related Policy making.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The consultation document (i.e. this document) appears to missing a large section. It asks consultees whether they agree to changes to the zones in Scarborough town and provides a significant amount of statistical information, including plans and other related data. The Whitby zone on the other hand receives no supporting information in the consultation document despite the fact that a much more significant action is proposed. The consultation is poorly designed and poorly framed. The omission of data relating to the Whitby zone demonstrates precisely why a large number of Whitby residents feel that the Borough Council is failing to serve the town's interests.</p>	N	<p>Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document.</p>
<p>Whitby has become the jewel in the SBC crown, it's popularity is spilling over to RHB and other areas, careful management of this success is crucial</p>	N	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>If the council has put into place the correct procedures, and is prepared to listen to any complaints from the public no matter how trivial they seem, than I have no objection to any of the proposals. However! if there are any serious situations from any public house or night club then the council have every right to close those premises until a satisfactory result is found.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>As an ex Licensee , I cannot help thinking that the dilemmas that now face the Licensing authority would have been far less, had the decision not being made to extend licensing hours to "all and sundry" in the first place. Whitby declined the late license and there tells a tale.. as the Bars and Bistros appear to have a totally different clientele Wanting a Café culture and attracting the 35 years plus to Scarborough is a great if ambitious project and I wish them luck</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>None</p>	N/A	<p>N/A</p>
<p>I think late licenses after 12 at night should be much stricter and only granted on very special occasions and no more late licenses to be endorsed I also think early sale of drink is a big cause of the drink problems and small off licenses should be monitored much more stringently</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>No further comments to make.</p>	N/A	<p>N/A</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
Try looking at long term impact not short term savings.	N	This proposal has been made after considering evidence gathered over the last 10 years. For example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence in Whitby, this is compared to 79 offences reported in 2016/17 representing a 60% reduction in incidents over this time.
I refer to part 1. Introduction 1.7 Page 5. The dates must be wrong. I thank you for the opportunity to comment	N	Comment - The dates reflect the consultation period.
In paragraph 3.8 it states Ramshill Road (beyond Valley Bridge) will be removed, yet it is included in the CIZ map on page 10 (part 4, 4.1) RAMSHILL ROAD MUST REMAIN IN THE CIZ because stabbings, violence and drug problems have been reported there in the last year. The 'Street Angels' do a WONDERFUL job and deserve a community award for their labours.	N	Only a very small section of Ramshill Road beyond Valley Bridge was included within the Zone previously (to the junction of Belmont Road). Although there may be issues within the area of Ramshill Road it is important to note that the Cumulative Impact Assessment relates to licensed premises and the impact of these premises.
The statistical data 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 if given in percentages between 2016 and 2017 would be more meaningful rather than plus or minus between individual incidents e.g. ASB occurrences linked to alcohol is -54. What percentage of 419 (2015/16) and 365 (2016/17) is 54?	N	It was considered that + or - figures represented the most clear and transparent way of setting out the differences in occurrences year on year.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>This questionnaire is no good for Whitby, where is our map, st name list and data, all this form is for Scarborough. Whitby needs to be more recognized instead of being side stepped. The Tin Ship (Endeavour) that NO ONE likes, its trash, was supposed to be fore educational events but of course as usual Scarborough have conned us and it is to be a NOISY, ROWDY ALCOHOL FUELED nigh spot. I can assure you no locals like it. Come and ask for yourselves and hear the replies. I have been amazed by local people, young people included, their comments across the age board have been a surprise to me, all negative. Why cant Scarborough have the Tin Ship it would fit in better there</p>	N	<p>Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document.</p>
<p>The financial 'climate' is an indication of social spending. Caution is needed in future changes.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>The cost of policing/cleaning up/criminal damage/ASB continue to impact on local community so believe relaxations suggested premature without longer term analysis of data to justify.</p>	N	<p>This proposal has been made after considering evidence gathered over the last 10 years. For example when the Cumulative Impact Policy was first introduced in 2006 there were 200 reported incidents of violence in Whitby, this is compared to 79 offences reported in 2016/17 representing a 60% reduction in incidents over this time.</p>
<p>Only those on the council that live in the areas covered should have a say . If you are sitting in your leafy garden in Burniston or Sliegths it's very easy to say there is no impact .</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I live more or less in the centre of Whitby and I have noticed an increase in larger groups drinking to excess. More noise at night, more litter in the morning. Regularly hear people urinating outside my flat on St Anns Lane and have woken on several occasions to vomit in the alley. Never see a bobby on the beat</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Although it is a useful measure, we cannot assess the impact of alcohol on a population through crime convictions alone. Anti-social behaviour is intimidating and in Whitby is certainly on the increase. Police officers are only ever seen driving about in vans and are never available to report occurrences to. I have tried ringing 101 to make a complaint but, after spending 25 mins waiting for my call to be answered, gave up. There are no visible deterrents to any anti-social behaviour on the streets. (For example, I have seen the community support officers outside their vehicle, chatting to each other as they blithely ignore the boy racers revving their souped-up engines and driving up and down Langbourne Rd at speeds well in excess of 30mph.) Alcohol is a drug and therefore it should be difficult to obtain a licence to sell it; it certainly should not be made more easy. The overriding imperative now seems to be that anything likely to increase tourism should be welcomed unquestioningly. This attitude risks turning Whitby into a place that no-one wants to live and few want to visit.</p>	N	<p>It should be noted that the survey does include anti-social behaviour in addition to crime and disorder statistics. It is also important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
What about Whitby?	N	Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document.
Drunkenness spoils Whitby and it's not getting better. Families have to run the gauntlet of drunks, spitting, swearing, being sick, fighting, collapsing, shouting, even during the daytime.	N	It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.
A more visible police presence on our streets at all times would stave of some of the issues associated with excessive drinking.	N	Comments noted.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The weekend appears to be no more in Whitby it is just one long weekend here and if all cafes bars etc are allowed to change use and stay open to 9pm at night you are always going to get excessive noise and nuisance from the people using the establishments. I do notice that everyone around here seems to do what they like regarding the times they shut surely if you have opening and closing times they should be adhered too. Sadly there is probably nothing you can do the whole town centre will just be for holiday makers only then nobody will be bothered anyway. It is regrettably very sad that all most people do is to come to Whitby to get drunk I have seen a terrible decline in the town over the last 16 years and sadly I'm just very used to the drunken behaviour and to be honest just have to learn to live with it because it's not worth wasting your breath on people who choose to behave like this!</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>A more hands on approach by the policy makers who we the taxpayers of Whitby fund. I suggest as well as online surveys all those involved at executive level including police commissioner should visit Whitby on a busy Friday/Saturday as soon as possible to see the havoc caused by excessive drinking in the town centre. A higher police presence would be welcome as well as a larger tariff on pubs to pay for this. Whitby is a small community that attracts a wide range of visitors from all over the world. What do they take back as a lasting memory if they are walking through town at the weekend? Why should many local people see town as a no-go area at the weekend and holidays? Why not enforce what you have instead of trying to get rid of it basically to save money? How would the policy makers like it if they had to put up with the anti-social behaviour caused by excessive drink and a non-enforcement of existing legislation outside their homes This is all part of a general disconnect between policy and practice.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Whilst I am in support of developing the offer in Whitby for a) residents and b) visitors, I believe strongly that SBC needs to think carefully about the brand of our town and the target markets. I would welcome information being shared with the community which clearly specifies the strategic direction and reasons behind proposed changes.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>If more officers were present in Whitby Town Centre on a weekend and at the many event weekends that take place then they would see what the locals have to put up with. A pub crawl in Whitby is very easy to do as they are so near to each other. The extended opening hours for licensed premises have made it possible for drinking to start in the morning and continue until late at night.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>Although the official figures for Whitby reflect a low level of crime resulting from alcohol-related incidents, the disturbance to residents is considerable. A few establishments in town do not refuse to serve customers who are clearly intoxicated and these drunkards are then unleashed on the town. Applying a CIZ will at least prevent further drinking places from opening without proper scrutiny of the effect on residents.</p>	N	<p>It should be noted that even without the presence of a Cumulative Impact Zone for Whitby other mechanisms such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have are available in addition to the licence review process.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>The proposals only highlight that yet again it feels like Whitby is being abandoned by SBC . Surely the fact that there has been some improvement is evidence that CIZ is necessary. Even more so as recently more licenses have been grated in the town centre .</p>	N	<p>Comment - This consultation relates to the proposals put forward after consideration of North Yorkshire Police evidence which indicated Scarborough Town Centre remained the only area in need of a Cumulative Impact Zone. As such only Scarborough Town Centre was included within the Cumulative Impact Assessment, however a link to all the evidence for the three areas provided by the police was included on the front page of the consultation document. It should also be noted that the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>A stronger police presence is needed in Whitby. Crime reports cannot be lodged when there is no one available to take them. More on the spot monitoring is needed of the alcohol situation in Whitby. Those landlords who do serve to drunks must be identified and cautioned, and prosecuted for repeat offences.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>I agree with the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment, it need monitoring as there are a great deal of licensing premises at certain times it is quite frightening if I am in Scarborough. I do not always feel comfortable. Scarborough is a lovely place but sometimes it is overtaken with drunken behavior and it lets it down.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Whitby should keep it's Cummulative Impact Zone. If the council is to stay true to it's values of balancing fairly all the interest groups in the town, upholding it's duty of care to adults and children alike, the Licensing Committee and public must have this document to refer to. Alchohol problems are a serious concern for health and our public servants who have to deal with the consequences. I cannot see how in any way it can be justified to remove a policy which has had some success in controlling this issue in society. More councils in the country should be as enlightened in introducing such a scheme.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, there must be an evidential basis for doing so.</p>
<p>It would be good to begin to foster a culture where there is less tolerance of heavy drinking and related antisocial and aggressive behaviour. In York there is an increasing awareness of the way leniency leads to an increase in this behaviour and this in turn reduces the number of visitors who are not just coming for the drink. Larger groups are being dissuaded and an attempt to redress this balance is being made. Nevertheless, it has become a real problem and it would be a shame if Whitby was to drift further in that direction. Rowdy threatening drunken behaviour just inset acceptable today in a town and seaside resort visited by families and children, and it creates a no go area through most of the weekend and holidays this just can't be right, can it.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>I have not commented on Scarborough but as a resident of Whitby town centre I strongly sympathise with any resident who has their peace and home life disrupted on a regular bass</p>	N	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>That based on the Home Office's 'Modern Crime Prevention Strategy' published in March 2016 and 'The Alcohol: cumulative impact assessment' briefing paper 02/05/17. Whitby Town Council call on Scarborough Borough Council as the licensing authority to maintain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby. Whitby Town Council have clearly identified concerns about crime and disorder, public safety, public nuisance and the protection of children from harm in relation to the excessive consumption of alcohol within the existing CIP zone. These concerns have been evidenced by complaints received and voiced in relation to litter, noise and inappropriate offensive drunken behaviour. It is Whitby Town Council assertion that the number of licensed premises within the current Cumulative Impact Zone is such that the granting of further licences would be inconsistent with the Licensing Authorities duty to promote the licensing objective.</p>	N	<p>Although it may be considered desirable to retain the Cumulative Impact Policy for Whitby, the revised guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003 states that there must be an evidential basis for the decision to publish a Cumulative Impact Assessment. The guidance goes on to state that the Licensing Authority must also regularly review the Assessment to establish whether the evidence available justifies it remaining in place.</p>
<p>Just been confronted by a drunken man 10am Tuesday morning</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>As a local business owner of 15 years here in Whitby I've noticed a huge decline in family's and couples having fun. Feedback I recive on a regular basis is the town especially weekends is too rough to go out and enjoy. Far too many pubs full of stag and hen party's. Wild drunks shouting at each other. People strewn on grass or beaches. I feel we have too many pubs, yet the Ebdevour will be another licensed premises. Also the public are voicing that we have no nice little pubs for familys to enjoy a meal and drink. I feel if this is not addressed very son we will be even worse. Those here say its like Blackpool rough and loud. I myself have noticed a decline in business to the value of 25% to 30% over the last 2 years. We now hold a breakfast meeting along with 12 local businesses whom are all seeming a huge drop in profits only this last weekend Church Street had armed police and sniffer dogs at 11.30pm on a saturday evening doing drug raids. How lovely for visitors to see. I could go on but I'm sure you are aware of the above problems.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. Other more appropriate mechanisms should be used to tackle the specific problems described.</p>
<p>Customers are coming in my store not wanting to return to Whitby because of the town having drunken people about.</p>	N	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
As a young woman, I often feel intimidated whilst walking past large groups of men.	N	Comments noted.
I live and work within the Cumulative Impact Zone in Whitby. At present, and particularly at weekends, it has become normal for me to come across groups, of drunken folk moving from pub to pub, people incapacitated by drink. I have had abuse shouted at me and people stand in my way in the middle of the road when I am cycling. I am gravely concerned that the removal of this zone and the impact this could have on the number of premise licences granted in this area will only increase these incidents.	N	It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating. In terms of suppressing licences, very few applications have been refused as a direct result of the Cumulative Impact Policy being in place. Instead other mechanisms have been used such as the imposition of conditions on licences to mitigate any potential impact a new premises may have.
I have complained to police and been told the crime I was reporting wasn't serious enough and there wasn't enough police to investigate.	N	Comments noted.
I have personally been abused twice in the past week by drunken louts you can't walk anywhere these days without seeing someone throwing up due to alcohol intake. I have lived in pubs all my life (up until 2007) and over the past 24 years I have seen a huge change in this town with drunks and idioti bus trips, it is getting silly.	N	It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I live as close to the centre of Whitby as any of your respondents - above the shop at 9 Sandgate, where I have worked since 1968. During the World Cup matches, my staff were afraid for me to go out in the evening - the shouting and outside drinking at The Dolphine was intimidating. We depend on visitors for our livelihood. We welcome pushchairs, prams and dogs into the shop - but the coaches that bring people who are already drunk at 10am, and go on drinking till they leave in the evening are giving Whitby a bad reputation. We see Community Police Officers less frequently now. When our shop window was smashed 5 years ago and expensive stock stolen, we had immediate attention from the police - I doubt if that would happen now. Police cars can be heard - but individual officers - ? Closing the Swing Bridge on occasions when sheer volume of traffic versus pedestrians becomes dangerous is one of the most sensible measures in recent years. Thank goodness Sandgate is "Pedestrian Only" from 11am till 6pm</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating.</p>
<p>As a shop owners I have had my shop window smashed twice in the last 2 years on both occasions by drunken and disorderly people I have no confidence that this will not happen again as there is no police presence in town.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating.</p>
<p>I have stopped going into Whitby town at the weekend and on evenings towards the end of the week, because of the marked increase in unpleasant, drunken behaviour at these times. I find it very sad that responsible, law-abiding people like myself feel intimidated by the binge drinking culture that is ruining our town - and the wider country. Instead of loosening the laws that Borough Council should be strengthening them and making a stand against this culture.</p>	N	<p>It is important to note that the Policy can only be applied to applications for new premises and variations to existing premises, it cannot be used to tackle existing premises or the problems customers of these premises may be creating.</p>

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>As a Street Angel I feel most of the trouble is caused by alcohol (and maybe drugs) and on a Saturday hen and stag do's. If it was made clear to these groups that they were not welcome by the drinking venues they may just go somewhere else. Yet another 3 venues for drinking have been granted within the past these weeks why? Has anyone in your Cabinet counted the number of places to obtain alcohol within Whitby town centre?</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>As a business owner, I have seen over the past 12 months full of drunks - customers have commented they won't return for another break here.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>I now hear on a regular basis that family groups and individuals will not come into town (Whitby) at the weekends because of the drunken unruly behaviour of hen/stag and drinking parties this is getting worse no matter how the police hide the figures. The issue was a regular complaint when the police visited Whitby Town Council.</p> <p>As chair of Whitby and District Tourism Association (WDTA) it is of great concern to this organisation that quality tourism is being lost to the ongoing drink culture which is driving family and quieter people away from Whitby at weekends. N.B I understand SBC have already agreed to the reduction??</p>	N	Comment - No final decision on the proposals has yet been made.
<p>Recently I returned home after spending a month on a small Greek Island. After a scenic drive over the moors I was looking forward to getting back home... Until I got out of the taxi at the end of my Street. There the sight of falling down drunks staggering past my house greeted me! One of the drunks actually sat on my doorstep and not happy when I barely able to stand she had to move. How different things had been on my Greek Island where people sat in harbour side restaurants and bars and somewhere managed to enjoy good food and drink till the small hours in a quiet and civilised way.</p> <p>Unfortunately the drinking culture here is very different and it seems to be all about getting very drunk and behaving badly. Living near to a large bar we get a nightly raucous</p>	N	Comments noted.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>screaming and hollering stampede through my street at closing time! I am lucky if they do not bang on my door or smash a shop window as they run past. When my late husband and I bought this house it was to be our "forever home". Now I am not so sure if the removal of the cumulative impact zone goes ahead it will make an already bad situation worse. And if Whitby becomes the magalluf of the North East coast we risk loosing many quality holidaymakers who will not want to spend their holidays amidst hoardes of drunken barbarians. It has taken a lot of hard work and investment by local businesses to give us a more upmarket image amongst seaside towns. Hardly a week goes by without some quality publication promoting Whitby. We have too much to loose! I hope that the voice of the residents is hears and finally taken notice.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>I own a café on Church Street I have seen an increase in weekend drunks going past using fowl language and being loud, also about 3 weeks ago 2 police cars pulled up outside 8 officers got out and went to a flat on a drungs raid they cam out with big black bags full of something, Church Street is known for drugs, I feel Whitby is getting worse not better. I have since been informed that a grugs raid was carried out last night 3-8-18 by armed police.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>The increased incidence of anti-social behaviour by drunken groups of men and women has a direct impact on our business. Particularly when groups of shouting, swearing men congregate outside 'The Dolphin' pub. Surely this is in breach of the licensing conditions? There are more traffic wardens then police.</p>	N	Comments noted.
<p>Our shop windows smashed, and nothing is power</p>	N/A	N/A
<p>I live on the Market Place and see violence and disorderly behaviour, due to drugs, drink and general domestic issues, on a weekly basis and feel this has increased severely. It may not be reported and recorded but never the less, disruptive behaviour happens every weekend night.</p>	N	Comments noted.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>I have lived on Sandgate for 32 years and have never felt more vulnerable as I do now. Weekends are disgusting with the influx of drinkers. No respect for anybody or anything. Licensing hours being increased have also added to our problems. Come and sit in my living room on a Saturday night to see exactly what goes on!</p>	N	Comments noted.

Review of the Council's Cumulative Impact Assessment 2018 general - comments	Accepted into Policy?	Reason why or why not?
<p>Dear Cabinet Member</p> <p>I gathered these letters to show the anger of the people of Whitby at the poor report written by NYPI, I took it with me for show people and they were shocked at its contents. The idea the should use the hours from 18:00 to 05:59 hours is so out of date. There is no police precesnce on the streets and they don't seem to be aware of the new trend parties coming at 10am manybe having had a few cans so by 2:30 they are heading from pub to pub and getting to be a problem for visitors and local people. By the time they are thrown out onto the street its no good ringing 101 as you often get an answer machine to leave a message. If they then smash windows I beleieve they are not addedd to the figures if they offer to pay but at least two at these letters are still waiting for their money. The lack of police on the streets means they dont seem to know what is happening. They are often seen in vans on Church street one of the gems of the town for drink and drugs but not on foot with the last two months police drug raids have been made but I think from a house anyone who lives here would go if the needed something. Whitby police should be asked to run the whole of the (NYP) if they can get such good results with less police and more drunks on the streets. Its not just a bit of need you remember from your youth any more heavy drugs and pills are commen place it might be worth sending these letters to them to reply for or at least offer an answer.</p>	N	Comments noted.
You still need to be alert to the increase in anti-social activity	N	Comments noted.