

Consultation Comments Summary

No	Name	Organisation / Service / Premises	Overview of Comments	Has the Policy been updated following the comments?
1	Donna Gracey, Corporate Governance and Estates Manager	Punch Pubs & Co	Various comments were made regarding the entire document	Yes – some comments were accepted Full details will be available at the meeting
2	Des O'Neill	MoP	Happy with existing and proposed policy – no amendments requested.	N/A
3	David Butcher	Greene King	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
4	Mr P Maloney	PJM Leisure Ltd	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, but needs more interaction with local businesses when events are taking place – lamp post signs are not enough. More control needed around loitering and groups of people and 'illegal raves'.	No – not for addressing in Policy specifically as legislation stipulates process. Possibility of Licensing Service addressing this on a separate basis, locally.
5	Sheena Wild	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
6	Samuel Hill	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
7	M. Grey	MoP	Clauses need simplifying, with some feeling contradictory allowing for possible circumventing.	No – Not specific enough to consider
8	Martin White	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected. Wants relaxing of public gatherings and licensed premises to be delayed as he is in vulnerable category.	No – referring more to covid specific situation, which is a temporary occurrence and not for change in a long term policy.
9	Mark Delmar	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
10	Peter Davies	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
11	Andrew Tabor	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
12	Anonymous		Not enough clarity on what document is being referred to. No street names on City Centre map allowing for argument of boundaries being meaningless with no context – not	Yes - 'Sheffield' label added to map to specify as suggested.

			even a Sheffield label. Would expect to see worked through examples of when a licence is required in different circumstances.	
13	Emma Kirkby	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
14	Anonymous		Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
15	Anthony Davenport	MoP	How does policy take account of environmental policies like acknowledging climate crisis, levels of air pollution and an ambition towards creating safer and more desirable neighbourhoods? All licensed premises and operators should produce an environmental statement showing how they are minimising their environmental impact – links to all four objectives. Details referring to safe biodegradable takeaway containers and reusable polycarbs which have been successfully used at large festivals.	No – We can only encourage operators; we are unable to enforce anything formally within the policy.
16	Gurvinder Singh	Off Licensee	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
17	A.M.Peat	MoP and Ex-Councillor	Greater emphasis of the importance of accurate "evidence" being required by those making application or objecting to the grant of a licence. Some guidance for applicants or objectors on what the Committee can accept as acceptable and reliable evidence.	Yes – reinforced information in 'Grant' and 'Representation' sections of policy to outline importance of factual evidence and the requirement to be able to be considered by committee.
18	Balraj Johal	Crowdpleaser. club Ltd	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
19	Brien Messider	Access Officer SCC	<p>Applicants to include short paragraphs -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highlighting the cost-effectiveness and potential for increased business of meeting current accessible/inclusive design standards at fit out or during refurbishment. • referring to the current design standards. <p>The most relevant design standards are -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Regulations Approved Document M: Access to and use of buildings - Volume 2: Building other than dwellings • BS 8300-1 2018: Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment - Part 1: External 	Yes – HPS officer supported this being included, to assist in new applications, or existing ones undergoing substantial changes, in line with Equality Act 2010 – Confirmed wording provided from HPS officer.

			<p>environment - Code of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS 8300-2 2018: Design of an accessible and inclusive built environment - Part 2: Buildings - Code of practice <p>(The BS is more thorough and provides a more inclusive environment but the approved document is more readily available at https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200135/approved_documents/80/part_m_-_access_to_and_use_of_buildings/2)</p>	
20	Ruth Mitchell	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected. Supports the idea of developing the Cumulative Impact Areas	No – Not enough evidence for a CIA in Sheffield currently
21	Tracey Browes	The Office Pub	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
22	Paul Fogg	Innserve Ltd	CCTV should not be optional in licensed premises, should be a legal requirement to support all services including the police.	No – Not our remit – SYP apply to most, if not all applications anyway.
23	Marion Gerson	MoP	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
24	Xiangbin Cao	Wharcliffe Side Takeaway Ltd	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
25	Lisa Sharkey	Poppleston Allen Solicitors	<p>Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 18 of the revised policy, under the heading of “Prevention of Crime and Disorder”, paragraph 2 references ‘all staff to access and operate the system at any time’. I believe the Information Commissioner requires access to be controlled and limited. It might be better to rephrase to say ‘nominated or authorised staff’. • Paragraph 2, page 22 under the heading “Outside Areas and Smoking / Vaping Shelters”. This states that vaping must be treated in exactly the same way as smoking under the smoke free legislation. This is misleading as it suggests that vaping is illegal inside premises. Many operators choose not to allow it inside premises but The Health Act 2006 does not currently ban it. The definition of ‘smoking’ in section 1 of the 2006 Act refers smoking tobacco or other substances. There is no tobacco in vape juice nor smoke. If the intention is to recommend that vaping be treated the same as 	<p>Comment 2 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 3 – Yes – wording amended to reflect that vaping isn’t ‘unlawful’, just treated in the same way as smoking.</p> <p>Comment 4 - Yes</p>

			<p>smoking as it did not exist when the legislation was enacted then you might wish to consider rewording the current paragraph to make this clearer.</p> <p>• Page 37 under “Minor Variations” states that a minor variation cannot be used to amend alcohol hours. This is not correct. The alcohol hours cannot be extended between 11:00 and 07:00 the following morning, but between 07:00 and 23:00, a minor variation can be used to amend hours.</p>	
26	Razvan Marius Nica	Las Iguanas	Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected, no amendments requested.	N/A
27	Amanda Hughes	Sheffield Hallam University	<p>Policy is easy to understand, and provides information as expected. On page 33 there seems to be a contradiction regarding the number of TENS licences that can be applied for: "No more than 15 TENS can be given for the same premises in any calendar year."</p> <p>Is Sheffield Hallam University considered to be 1 premise, or are each of our buildings a premise? If the former, this would be a big issue for us as we apply for more than 15 TENS in a calendar year.</p>	No – Not a specific policy change – more of an enquiry about specific premises in Sheffield.
28	Eamonn Ward	Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Green Party	Various comments were made regarding the entire document	<p>Comment 1 – N/A</p> <p>Comment 2 – No – this is the legislation</p> <p>Comment 3 & 4 – No – feedback about service provision only</p> <p>Comment 5 & 6 – No – Separate piece of work to assist residents with possible guidance.</p> <p>Comment 7 & 8 – No – separate piece of work not specific to policy content.</p> <p>Full details will be available at the meeting</p>
29	Magda Boo	Public Health SCC and DACT	Various comments were made regarding the entire document	<p>Comment 1 – No</p> <p>Comment 2 – Yes – addition of ‘minor infringement’ wording as suggested</p> <p>Comment 3 – Yes – minor change of wording referring to education and awareness, but explanation that door searches are not always applicable to all premises as sometimes not proportionate/relevant at some types of premises.</p> <p>Comment 4 – Yes – amend wording to reflect past tense as policy ends in 2020, and LA03 new policy will be published after this date.</p> <p>Comment 5 – No – nothing to amend</p> <p>Comment 6 – Yes – Amended to acknowledge unseen disabilities</p> <p>Comments 7-9 – No – nothing to</p>

				<p>amend</p> <p>Comment 10 – No – Not enough evidence for this to still be relevant.</p> <p>Comments 11- No – Nothing to amend</p> <p>Comment 12 – No – Already addressed in policy and number of drinks monitoring would not be feasible.</p> <p>Comment 13 –</p> <p>Comment 14 – No – No change to be made</p> <p>Comment 15 – No – Already in SAG process as confirmed by SCC SAG lead.</p> <p>Comment 16 – No - Not enough evidence for a CIA currently in Sheffield.</p> <p>Comment 17 – No – Not enough evidence at present.</p> <p>Comment 18 – No - Not enough evidence for a CIA currently in Sheffield.</p> <p>Full details will be available at the meeting</p>
30	Louise Ashton	Principle Trading Standards Officer	Various comments were made regarding the entire document	<p>Comment 1 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 2 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 3 - Yes</p>
31	SMT		<p>Take out linked strategies that end n 2020 as policy will be published after and therefore out of date.</p> <p>Take out detail of strategies and list them/links.</p> <p>Include information in Planning section regarding council ambition to work together to a single point of access, but reflect clearly that Planning and Licensing are still separate entities.</p> <p>Add back into policy description of an ‘area nearing stress’ and link to future development plans of the city moulding what areas accept which applications to avoid these occurring.</p> <p>Mick Crofts found document difficult to read – can it be restructured?</p>	<p>Comment 1 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 2 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 3 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 4 – Yes</p> <p>Comment 5 - Yes</p>

This page is intentionally left blank