



**BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

Report of the Housing & Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Panel

## **Experiences of Extended Nightclub Hours**

6<sup>th</sup> November 2003

### **Review Panel Members**

Chris Watt (Chair)  
David Bellotti  
Bryan Chalker  
Gitte Dawson  
Hilary Fraser  
Roger Symonds  
Sarah Webb

# Experiences of Extended Nightclub Hours

## Contents

1. Introduction
2. Background
3. Submissions to the Panel
4. Conclusions
5. Recommendations
6. List of Appendices

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 *Objectives and scope of this review*

#### Objectives

To consider contributions from a range of stakeholders including the general public, the police, businesses and any other interested parties in order to assess the impact of having extended nightclub hours past 2am on Fridays and Saturdays.

To submit the Panel's considered views on this subject to the Council Executive to assist in the formulation of a new licensing policy for Bath & North East Somerset.

#### Scope

The scope of this review followed from its objectives, i.e. the focus was on the impact of having extended nightclub hours past 2pm on Fridays and Saturdays. Inevitably, in correspondence from members of the public and in hearing from invited contributors, it has not always been easy to separate out experiences directly related to the nightclub hours extensions from more general night-time experiences.

This review will not determine the policy on nightclub hours but it will help inform the creation of a policy.

### 1.2 *Research*

The review has gathered information in a number of ways, principally those listed in the table below.

21 Aug	Initial press releases inviting letters or emails
22 Aug – 16 Sep	Letters to residents associations and a range of selected stakeholders inviting written comments (see Appendix 2)
18-28 Sep	Distribution of approximately 1000 cards and 50 posters to selected pubs and leaflets to residents in the vicinity of clubs operating later hours inviting people to call a freephone number to express their views. (The clubs opening later were all in Bath or Midsomer)

	Norton.)
19 Sep	Press release to promote the freephone number
19-20 Sep	Panel “night out” activities - opportunities for Panel members to visit the CCTV control centre and talk to taxi marshals, police and nightclub door staff. Chair of Panel distributed many feedback cards and talked to people in pubs known to “feed” clubs. Some Panel members spent time with police on duty in the evenings.
26 Sep	Pack of information sent to Panel members for consideration in advance of 3 Oct contributor session. This pack included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of postal and email correspondence received up to 25<sup>th</sup> Sep</li> <li>• Summary of freephone responses received up to 25<sup>th</sup> Sep</li> <li>• Copies of letters and email received up to 25<sup>th</sup> Sep</li> <li>• Charts of logged CCTV incidents (Appendix 12)</li> </ul> Background information also included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extracts or complete reports from 4 Overview &amp; Scrutiny Reviews relating to licensing conducted by other local authorities (Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council, Medway Council, Bristol City Council, London Borough of Camden)</li> <li>• Information on Scottish and Irish drinking legislation</li> <li>• Local Government Association discussion paper on local authorities and the evening economy</li> <li>• Links to further information on the internet including draft guidance on the Licensing Act 2003</li> </ul>
3 Oct	Panel hear from and question a range of selected contributors (Appendix 3) including the Police, club owners, taxi operators, Federation of Bath Residents Association and Council Licensing and Environmental Health Officers. The record of this is in Appendix 5.

Further information is provided in the appendices to this report (listed in section 6.0 below), including the list of contributors, those invited to submit written submissions, submissions received, summaries of correspondence and other information.

## 2.0 Background

Bath & North East Somerset Council has introduced arrangements under which councillors examine local policy and service issues and matters of local interest, and make reports of their findings to the Council Executive. Called “overview and scrutiny”, this process seeks to involve local people and organisations in working with councillors to explore these matters and to reach conclusions.

On 11th September 2003 the Housing and Community Safety Overview & Scrutiny Panel agreed Terms of Reference for a review of experiences of extended nightclub hours (Appendix 1). The Panel will pass its views on the subject to the Council Executive to assist in the formulation of a new licensing policy for Bath & North East Somerset which will be central to the exercise of the Council's new and extended responsibilities under the Licensing Act 2003.

The Licensing Act 2003 modernises and integrates the licensing of public entertainment, theatre, cinema, the sale of alcohol and a number of other activities. Its objectives are to prevent crime and disorder, enhance public safety, prevent public nuisance and protect children from harm.

Background information on the subject of the extension of nightclub hours is available in section 4 of the Terms of Reference for this review (Appendix 1).

The project team assisting the Panel with the review is listed in Appendix 1 and comprised officers from Environmental & Consumer Services, Corporate Performance Unit and Democratic Services.

## **3.0 Submissions To The Panel**

### **3.1 Residents**

The majority of letters and emails received and calls to the freephone number (Appendix 6) were of the view that nightclub hours should not be extended, although there were some views in favour of extended hours. The majority of correspondence was from Bath residents however two Midsomer Norton residents expressed views, both opposing extended nightclub hours.

Many respondents expressed a great deal of concern about the night-time environment, in particular regarding late night disturbance which is attributed to drunkenness. There are also associated concerns such as the unfriendly atmosphere in the centre of Bath at night, urination, vomiting, vandalism and waste from take-away food.

In the responses to the freephone number there was again a clear majority opposed to extended nightclub hours, with many specific references to problems having occurred later into the night as a result of extended hours.

A minority took the view that extending nightclub hours was a good idea and that it would reduce problems caused by rowdy people.

Two callers to the freephone number made the point that the noise of people on the streets after they had left clubs was not the fault of the clubs themselves.

Of those who expressed a view on the question "Has extending nightclub opening hours made you feel safer at night or not?" a great majority answered that they did not feel safer.

Problems referred to in responses included noise/disturbance, drunkenness, vandalism, vomiting, urination, litter and fights.

When asked about ideas for reducing disturbance for nearby residents, two patterns of answers were most common. These were around limiting club opening hours / shutting clubs earlier and having more policing and security on the streets.

Residents also expressed the view that hours should not be extended until existing problems were dealt with effectively.

### **3.2 Residents' Associations**

The Panel heard in person from Major Crombie from the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations and also Ms Spohn of The Abbey Residents' Association (Appendix 5). The Federation additionally provided a pack of information (Appendix 7). Following the Panel's invitation to comment, letters were received from 4 individual residents' associations (Appendix 8).

The view of the Residents' Associations was that nightclub hours should not be extended, and that the situation should revert to what existed previously, with no 24 hour licensing and nightclubs closing at 2am. More than one Association saw this as imperative because of changes that will happen with the Licensing Act 2003 – a worry being that under the new arrangements the Council will face a large number of applications for later drinking that will not be stopped.

Major Crombie of the Federation felt that noise and disturbance to residents has been extended later into the night by the extended nightclub hours. Even if people leaving clubs was staggered, it would only take a few people to make a noise. Ms Spohn of Abbey Residents' Association supported the view that later nightclub hours meant more punctuations of noise. Specific examples were given, for example The Abbey Residents' Association referred to reports of disturbances continuing later into the night in Manvers St, George St and Miles Buildings.

The Federation also said that this extra disturbance had been experienced by residents and yet the extended hours had not had any demonstrable benefit for the community.

A common message from Residents' Associations was Bath's uniqueness in having a central area where the majority of the nightclubs are and where there also large numbers of residents, hotels, guests houses and hostels. There was also the Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases in the centre. This was contrasted with the situation in Bristol where nightclubs allowed to open late are not in areas where there are large numbers of residents.

Major Crombie referred to the large number of venues in one particular small area – "14 licensed premises in 200 yards" – and that local authorities must take account of "saturation".

Major Crombie referred to a planning appeal decision relating to Babylon (copy contained in Appendix 7), where the Inspector had considered the 24 hour public entertainment licence, but had not upheld the appeal for planning permission to open until 4am on nights of the week because "the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of nearby residents by reason of noise and disturbance".

Ms Spohn talked about the difficulties in ensuring action is taken in response to residents' complaints about street noise, the police only being interested in acting if

there was a serious crime such as an actual assault taking place, and complaints to the Council's Environmental Health team not having any effect unless the noise could be definitely linked to a particular establishment. In the case of noise in the street, it was often not possible to link it to a particular establishment and so many residents had given up making complaints about noise. Ms Spohn expressed frustration that "residents have to prove a problem that everybody acknowledges exists".

As well as noise disturbance, Residents' Associations' letters and submissions echoed the reports of individual residents regarding urination, vomiting, vandalism and waste from take-away food. The Federation submission contained information from the Council department responsible for street cleansing. This stated that increased late night activity had resulted in difficulties in maintaining previous standards of cleanliness.

The Federation submission contained references to the night-time atmosphere in Bath city centre being more threatening and several Association responses referred to the need for additional, more visible and more effective policing. The Federation submission contained an extract from the Council's Voicebox News (Jun 01 survey) in which only 23% responded that they felt safe in their town or city centre at night. In the same survey 33.2% were very concerned about disorderly behaviour associated with pubs/clubs, with 44.5% slightly concerned.

Major Crombie quoted a 1997 Council News survey in which 43% were against the idea of extending club opening hours beyond 2am. In Abbey Ward where the majority of clubs are located, the figure was 68% opposed.

Several Residents' Associations referred to the undesirability of the prevailing British binge-drinking culture.

### **3.3 The Police**

The Panel heard from and questioned Acting Chief Inspector Paul Mogg at their contributor session (Appendix 5). Inspector Mogg submitted figures for disorder calls to the police for 2002/3 and first 6 months of 2003/4 for both Bath City Centre and Midsomer Norton (Appendix 9).

Inspector Mogg stated that the problems seen in Bath & North East Somerset were not isolated - there had been an increase in alcohol-related disorder generally all over the country. The Police were frustrated that the Council had not allocated funding to initiatives such as Operation Exuberant and the Orange Grove taxi marshals. The taxi marshals were funded initially by Doorsafe, and then subsequently by the Police with Basic Command Unit (Home Office) funding, but future funding had not been secured. Inspector Mogg stated that the police would like the Council to adopt a strategy for the night-time economy because currently things were handled in a piecemeal fashion.

Inspector Mogg reported the police view that there should be a limit of 2am on the sale of alcohol. His personal view was that extended hours (without alcohol) and a later closing time was good since it meant that everyone was not out on the streets

at the same time, leading to an increased potential for trouble. Even with people coming out at staggered times, Inspector Mogg reported that there were still bottlenecks later which became potential hotspots for trouble, e.g. take-aways and taxi queues.

The Police view was that the situation was not irreversible – with the right resources problems could be solved. Operation Exuberant was an example of this, with greater availability of officers and cells, enabling the police to take more action and better enforce a threshold for what was acceptable behaviour. “Naming and shaming” was another feature of Operation Exuberant, and Inspector Mogg emphasised that the solution to problems would come through partnership working.

One Panel member questioned Inspector Mogg about dissatisfaction that the police were reportedly not arresting people who were clearly drunk or who were urinating in shop doorways. The response was that this is due to the levels of staffing available. The police were working flat out. There were only 9 cells at Bath police station – if any more than that were required then people had to be moved to other locations, which took up time. The cells had to be used for the most serious crimes.

The police authority covers areas other than just Bath & North East Somerset, including Bristol. Inspector Mogg reported that the spread of police manpower across these areas was based on a demand profile. A Panel member pointed out that the Police referred to resourcing difficulties despite a 30% increase in the police precept. Inspector Mogg explained that resources had increased but that retirements were an issue.

Inspector Mogg reported that arrests did have a preventative effect – that “every Saturday morning the cells are full of people who’ve learned their lesson”.

When asked about the role of community wardens he responded that they had a positive role but that the Wardens’ current shift pattern did not allow them to contribute to dealing with anti-social behaviour associated with the night-time economy. Inspector Mogg also pointed out that the Council has the power to issue fixed penalties for littering.

Although under-age drinking was a problem nationally, Inspector Mogg did not believe that the extension of nightclub hours had had an effect on this locally. He suggested education as a way to reduce this problem, and a move toward having a greater variety of night-time activities on offer, such as tapas bars and coffee shops.

When asked what else he’d like the Council to do to assist the police, he said that he’d like to get rid of bureaucracy, and gave an example of some hedges on Duke Street that he’d like removed as they were obscuring a location frequented by drug users. He also re-emphasised his earlier point regarding the need for a strategy to deal with the night-time economy.

### **3.4 Hotels, Guest Houses and Restaurants**

At the contributor session (Appendix 5) the Panel heard from Mr Hall of the Bath Restaurants and Hotels Association, and also Mr Merkl a guest house proprietor. The submission from the Federation of Bath Residents' Association (Appendix 7) included a letter from a former manager of a central hotel in Bath. All 3 reported problems with noise and guests being disturbed by noise. Examples given included people congregating outside establishments and in queuing for taxis.

Bath Restaurant and Hotels Association members were opposed to extending hours beyond 2am and in fact would have preferred a reduction in hours. Mr Hall said that local hotels and guest houses had mostly either older foreign clients or clients from Britain who had not come to Bath for the clubbing. He reported incidents of night staff being intimidated and that many taxis seemed not to want to work after 2am.

Hotels and guest houses have had problems reducing noise for their visitors who may wish to have windows open, particularly in hot weather. Mr Hall referred to the high cost of installing air conditioning and difficulties installing double-glazing because of planning regulations. "Even with windows closed the noise problem is intense."

Mr Merkl expressed concern that visitors' experiences of noise and complaints may impact upon the reputation of Bath as a tourist destination. He felt that clubbers left clubs in groups and caused a disturbance – the earlier in the night this happened the better. If the noise was over by 2.30 (as opposed to later) then there was still the opportunity to get a quality sleep.

### **3.5 Taxi Operators**

The Panel heard from and questioned Mr Rob Hollingdale and Mr Ron Folks of Bath Taxi Drivers Association (Appendix 5).

Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks reported that the Orange Grove taxi rank marshals were seen as a success, having made things safer for both taxi drivers and users. Some taxis drivers who had been going at 12 were now reportedly working on later

Taxi operators felt that there was no need for marshals at all taxi ranks, and only a need for them at Orange Grove at peak hours on the busiest nights. They reported that having extended nightclub hours had been successful in spreading things out in terms of people leaving clubs and going home. An example given was that groups of people having left one particular club would often block the road outside in their reluctance to move on, but that now there would only be a few people there at a time.

A plan for future placement of new taxi ranks was referred to - the placement of ranks was felt to be important – but this was something the Panel did not have the opportunity to explore in detail. Temporary ranks / ranks near to clubs, possibly with door staff keeping an eye on queuing, was one idea that was not fully explored.

Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks reported that a rank on Walcot Street near to a nightclub was not well used but the Panel did not have the opportunity to explore why this is, other than the fact that many clubbers seem to follow a club/take-away/taxi pattern at the end of the night.

A Panel member asked about comments to him from taxi marshals that up to midnight there might be about 25 taxis working the Abbey rank but that by 2am it might be around 10. This was out of a total of 89 hackney carriage licences. The response from Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks was that they didn't think those figures were counted correctly. It was pointed out that taxis do a lot of out of town work and also cover trains arriving late in Bath. For out of town fares, such as Warminster, a taxi may be away for up to an hour. Also, drivers were self-employed and could choose their hours. Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks acknowledged that there wouldn't be 89 taxis working.

When asked whether the numbers of hackney carriage licenses was adequate to meet demand, Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks said that surveys had not shown an unmet demand.

When asked about night-buses Mr Hollingdale and Mr Folks said that they wouldn't last long because of the trouble and it would be difficult to find drivers prepared to drive them. They felt it would be difficult to get routes worked out and that the buses would spread the trouble out geographically – at the moment the police knew which places to watch for trouble and they were in the centre.

### **3.6 Nightclubs**

The Panel heard from proprietors of 3 nightclubs: Mr Andrews (Moles, Bath) who represented the views of Bath nightclubs, Mr Sawyer from Moonjuice, Midsomer Norton, and Mr Coyle from The Venue, University of Bath campus (Appendix 5). Mr Mistry from the University of Bath Students' Union accompanied Mr Coyle and provided the student perspective.

The views expressed were that extending nightclub hours had given a buffer zone – a time for customers to wind down. An example was given of The Venue which made a particular effort to aid this by selling cheap non-alcoholic drinks and providing free bottled water. This was reported to have worked well.

The view of Mr Andrews was that allowing people to leave nightclubs when they wanted meant that they were more likely to move on when they left the establishment and not congregate, which increased noise disturbance and potentially led to trouble. Mr Andrews compared the situation outside Moles on nights when there were extended hours with nights earlier in the week when there weren't extended hours and there was more congregation outside. Similar views about allowing people to leave under their own steam were expressed by Mr Coyle and Mr Sawyer.

Mr Andrews went on to say that the extended hours may not be profitable, but led to a better night experience for club-goers. By limiting nightclub hours, there was a

danger that customers would be lost to places such as Bristol without the same restrictions, and this was probably happening already to a degree. In addition, extended hours meant that things were spread out, taxi queuing was more pleasant and there were less people on the street at any one time.

Mr Andrews felt that the Council should look at each license on its merits and not have a policy for a particular ending time. He said that extended hours should additionally be considered for other nights of the week. Bath belonged to more than just the centre residents and the minority should not be allowed to dominate. He felt that most nightclubs took a responsible attitude towards under-age drinking but said that possibly some didn't do enough.

He said that the police should be more pro-active at arresting and charging people whose behaviour was unacceptable. He reported having "to be firm to get police action" and felt that the police were reluctant to charge people.

Mr Coyle said that the majority of problems were early on as people queued to get into clubs, and then later on in the evening as they queued for taxis. Mr Mistry of the Students Union gave an example of how it was possible to get large numbers of people out of town quickly and with no disturbance. 2000 students had been transferred onto specially arranged buses with manned and managed queues. A campaign had also been run to encourage students to keep noise down for the benefit of residents and this was felt to have worked well.

At the University of Bath there was security by The Venue, and also by the bus stop. Mr Coyle reported that he was not keen on cut price promotional drinking and encouraged responsible drinking.

### **3.7 Council Officers**

The Panel heard the views of the Senior Environmental Health Officer (EHO) who managed the Emergency Environmental Health out of hours service which provides a response to late night noise complaints (Appendix 5). The Senior EHO additionally provided information regarding entertainment noise complaints received about pubs and clubs in Bath & North East Somerset 1995-2002 (Appendix 10).

The Senior EHO reported that in her view there had been no significant impact on noise complaints due to extended opening hours. She reported that noise complaints in general had increased (Appendix 10, page 2). Complaints may have increased because people were less tolerant of noise issues or were more aware of how to complain.

In the Panel's discussion of this with the Senior EHO, the point was made that these complaint figures were those received in relation to a particular establishment. Other contributors and submissions made the point that noise that disturbed residents could often not be related to a particular establishment and may not be recorded.

The Senior EHO pointed out that complaints relating to urination and rubbish from take-aways went to waste services and were recorded separately.

The Panel also heard from the Council's Environmental Monitoring and Licensing Manager (Appendix 5). He reported that following the Licensing Act 2003, when the Council took on its new licensing powers, the role of Trading Standards would expand with regard to under-age drinking.

A Panel member gave examples of one club which had orderly queuing and another that didn't – which might lead to noise and disorder problems at the latter. The Environmental Monitoring and Licensing Manager responded that licenses could specify that nightclubs must have door staff who were part of the Doorsafe scheme, and that these door staff were then relied upon to ensure orderly queuing.

He stated that Councils were only able to use license fees for the licensing service, and not for funding other services such as waste cleansing.

### **3.8 Others**

The Panel regrets that it did not receive any submissions from the bus companies and that there was a disappointing response from clubbers.

## **4.0 Observations and Conclusion**

### **4.1 Observations**

Although extended hours have had no noticeable overall impact, residents and Residents' Associations report that noise has spread later in the vicinity of the clubs that have opened later.

Even if the time-span over which people leave clubs and go home is staggered, thus reducing peak congregations of people, as one resident put it, it only takes a few people to make a noise that will cause a disturbance. The Panel has heard the view that extending nightclub hours has meant that noise disturbance is staggered later into the night. This kind of noise disturbance often cannot be linked to any particular establishment and in terms of decisions regarding individual licenses, may be very difficult to take account of.

There has been an increase over time in the total number of recorded noise *complaints* but this reflects a national trend and may or may not have been affected locally by the extension to nightclub hours. Noise complaint monitoring by Council Environmental Health Officers relates to noise coming out of particular establishments and not to individuals who are identified as being associated with those establishments.

Noise complaints may also have increased because people are less tolerant of noise issues or are more aware of how to complain, but the Panel also heard that some people may have given up complaining because they do not feel it will do any good.

Noise complaint figures the police may hold were unavailable at the time of writing this report.

The extension of nightclub hours has improved the situation for club-users by removing the sudden need to leave the club, and by spreading out demand for take-aways and taxis. This has improved the taxi situation for taxi drivers *and* users and also means that there are fewer congregations of people in town all at once, although take-aways and taxi queues can still become hotspots for trouble later in the night.

The Police would not wish to see the sale of alcohol later than 2am. Inspector Mogg was personally in favour of the extension of the time period over which people left clubs and made their way home, but stated that better management of other collection points such as take-aways and taxi ranks was needed as part of the County's strategy for dealing with the late night economy.

The Panel did not have the opportunity to explore matters of Police resourcing.

Disorder and noise disturbance are reduced by getting people home quickly and safely, and taxis play a vital role in this. Night buses may also be able to play a useful role, though the Panel have not had the opportunity to greatly explore this. First Bus were among those invited to submit information to the review but did not do so.

The taxi marshals scheme at Orange Grove is seen as a success, although improvements to the scheme may be desirable (e.g. body protection clothing, improvements to barriers, a shelter against the elements). The scheme has made things feel much safer for those using taxis and also for the drivers themselves - some taxi drivers who had been stopping work at midnight are now working later.

However, from various sources it is clear that there are peak times when there are congregations of people waiting for taxis which become hotspots of potential trouble.

There are ways in which the Council can contribute to an improved night-time environment: through more partnership working with organisations such as the police and Doorsafe; through developing a broader-based night-time economy; through its taxi strategy and in other ways.

## **4.2 Conclusion**

The majority view of the Panel is that the extension of nightclub hours from 2am to 4am cannot be definitely linked to increases in disturbance. Extended hours has had some benefits to clubbers and other stakeholders in the late night economy but the residents who live close by say they have lost some of their peace as a result. The Panel recognises that in our own residents' survey there appears to be greater dissatisfaction amongst residents about late night noise than previously and that dissatisfaction is not reflected in any official count of disturbances.

The following alternative conclusion was supported by Cllr Sarah Webb and Cllr Bryan Chalker:

The overwhelming response from the city residents and hotels has been against extending night-club activity later than 2am.

There has been specific evidence of disbenefit of extended nightclub hours – residents report that disturbances are prolonged into what was their remaining peaceful period of sleep.

There has been no demonstrable benefit from extended nightclub hours. Police figures for disorder during the 2.30am to 6.00am period have increased by 60%.

Results from the freephone survey were 30 to 4 against extended hours and 10 specifically reported extended noise problems. 19 to 1 felt less safe.

The biggest improvement reported by representatives of taxi drivers is the recently introduced marshalling scheme at Orange Grove. This scheme is unrelated to extended hours.

Nightclub operators support the extensions although they say they are not profitable. Under the Licensing Act 2003 they may apply to sell alcohol after 2.00am to rectify this.

This is of considerable concern to residents, hoteliers and to the Police.

## 5.0 Recommendations

### 5.1 Licensing

1. The Council's licensing policy being developed in response to the Licensing Act 2003 should provide a view about Bath city centre's capacity to deliver a balanced late night economy.
2. The Council's licensing policy should allow a firm line to be taken with licensed premises that allow under-age drinking and in the handling of known trouble-makers. The policy should include a range of measures which might include 24 hour closure orders.
3. The majority of the Panel recommends that Public Entertainment Licenses extending beyond 2am should not be granted for Sunday-Thursday nights until existing problems such as late night noise disturbance and street urination have been addressed.

*Cllr Sarah Webb and Cllr Bryan Chalker make an alternative recommendation to number 3 above as follows:*

*"Public Entertainment Licenses extending beyond 2am should not be granted."*

*Councillor Bellotti wished it to be noted that he did not wholeheartedly support recommendation 3 above.*

4. In developing a new licensing policy the Council should set out criteria by which it can judge if the night-time environment is improving. These criteria must be objective and may involve decibel monitoring on selected street furniture.

## **5.2 Drinking Culture**

5. The Panel recognise that many local problems are a reflection of a national problem – a culture of binge-drinking and associated unruly behaviour. The Panel recommend that the Executive explore ways for licensing policy to discourage binge-drinking, for example by ensuring licensees fulfil their responsibilities, and by controlling “happy hours” and drinks promotions.
6. Council should write to all licensees to remind them of their legal obligations and implications of selling alcohol to under 18’s and include a copy of the poster provided by the Community Safety Team which draws their attention to the types of ID cards schemes that are available to prove age.
7. The Council should examine the usefulness of making membership of the Bar Safe scheme a condition in getting a licence

## **5.3 Partnership Working / Night-time Economy Strategy / Diversity of Entertainments on Offer**

8. The Council in partnership with stakeholders should develop a night-time economy strategy that covers all operators; clubs, pubs, taxis, buses, restaurants, takeaway food outlets, etc.
9. The Council’s night-time economy strategy and use of planning and licensing powers should encourage a better balance and diversity in the late night economy. There should be a move away from the current dominance of activities involving alcohol and towards activities for a broader range of interests and age-groups including options not involving alcohol. Provision of activities for those aged under 18 should be included in the strategy.

## **5.4 Taxis & buses**

10. The Council Executive should work to ensure that people can get quickly and safely out of the city late at night. This should include looking at the feasibility of increasing the number of late night buses available to people leaving clubs.
11. In developing the Council’s taxi strategy the Council Executive should work to ensure that taxis efficiently and effectively take people home at all times.

12. This should include reviewing the number of hackney carriage licenses and other actions to meet the following targets:
  - a. Queuing times are reasonable at peak night-time hours on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights
  - b. An acceptable number of taxis are operating beyond 2am to service those still not out of the city centre
13. The Council Executive through its taxi strategy should explore the siting and use of existing ranks. There appear to be many in the city centre but they are not all used. Temporary ranks could be usefully sited outside clubs with the doorman taking responsibility for good order at them.

### **5.5 *Street noise complaint monitoring***

14. The Council Executive should explore the reporting and recording of street noise disturbances to ensure that residents' complaints can be better taken into account and lead to actions to improve the night-time environment.

### **5.6 *Funding of Community Safety Initiatives***

15. The Panel requests that the Community Safety Partnership should review prioritisation of community safety initiatives and give high priority to support for the taxi rank marshal scheme.
16. The taxi rank marshal scheme should be kept under review with the intention of improving it. (For example possible improvements to barriers, protective clothing for marshals and a shelter for marshals.)

### **5.7 *Policing***

17. The Community Safety Partnership should look at how the levels of policing and police action seen in Operation Exuberant could be continued as the norm.
18. The Panel expects the district to be policed in line with the timeframe that matches the disturbances reported by residents and the matter considered by the Bath and North East Somerset Police Commander.
19. Illegal activity, such as urination in the street, should be policed and the matter considered by the Bath and North East Somerset Police Commander.
20. The Council's representative of the Police Authority should take the issues up at the appropriate level regarding the issues of resourcing police and the other issues outlined in this section.

### **5.8 *Public Conveniences***

21. Through its planning and licensing functions Council should:

- a) require licensed premises to have conveniences with appropriate signage
- b) require late night take-aways to have conveniences with appropriate signage

22. The Council should investigate having a mobile urinal at night.

23. The Council should encourage premises with public entertainment licenses to remind people to use toilet facilities before they leave.

24. The issue should be referred to the Planning, Transportation, Environment and Sustainability Overview and Scrutiny Panel's 'Public Loo Review' for further investigation.

### **5.9 Take-away Food Outlets / Street Cleanliness / CCTV Coverage**

25. The Council Executive should explore possibilities provided by the Licensing Act 2003 to ensure that areas near take-aways are kept free of waste.

26. The Council Executive should explore ways of making take-aways responsible for clearing away their own waste. This is already the case for McDonalds in Bath who must clear waste from outside their shop every 30 mins.

27. The Council Executive should explore the control of licensing hours of take-aways and mobile take-aways with a view to reducing late night congregations of people which may cause disturbance.

28. CCTV coverage should be extended to cover Grand Parade, Bath and the CCTV coverage in Midsomer Norton should not be obscured by trees.

29. Extra CCTV cameras should be installed, if necessary, to ensure coverage of take-away establishments that may become hotspots for late night disturbance.

30. In granting licenses/planning consents to takeaway food outlets the council should consider whether they should be within the existing CCTV coverage.

### **6.0 List of Appendices**

- 1 Terms of Reference for the review
- 2 List of invited contributors and those invited to make written submissions
- 3 List of contributors and speakers at 3<sup>rd</sup> October Panel meeting
- 4 Copy of poster advertising freephone number (lower resolution version than the actual poster)
- 5 Write up of 3<sup>rd</sup> October contributor session
- 6 Summary of letters and email received and summary of freephone consultation responses

- 7 Submission from Federation of Bath Residents' Associations presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> October contributor session
- 8 Submissions received from 4 Residents' Associations (Abbey Residents' Association, Circus Area Residents' Association, Macaulay/Prospect Residents' Association, Widcombe Association)
- 9 Handout from Acting Chief Inspector Paul Mogg at 3<sup>rd</sup> October contributor session – figures for disorder calls to the police for 2002/3 and first 6 months of 2003/4 for both Bath City Centre and Midsomer Norton
- 10 Handout from Senior Environmental Health Officer, Environmental Protection Team, Bath & North East Somerset Council at 3<sup>rd</sup> October contributor session – briefing note and charts of noise complaints 1995-2002
- 11 Submission received from Avon Ambulance Service NHS Trust – ambulance responses to individual night clubs in Bath and Midsomer Norton
- 12 Closed Circuit Television Control Centre logged incident figures
- 13 Map of premises in Bath City Centre open after midnight showing occupancy figures
- 14 Map showing Bath taxi ranks