Appendix 1

Research Design and Methodology

Summary

Working in Soho, Covent Garden, Fitzrovia and Marylebone, all within the City of Westminster, four researchers conducted 10 hours of observations at 10 prominent ENTE locations over 20 fieldwork nights (Thursdays-Mondays) completing 800 hours of data collection overall. Structured observation and survey techniques were applied, principally involving the development of a Research Instrument (see Appendix 2) which aimed to capture various behaviours and behavioural 'traces' (Garwood et. al., 2000) of relevance to flexible application of the Licensing Act 2003 (LA2003) and three of its four Statutory Licensing Objectives: (1) the prevention of crime and disorder, (2) the prevention of public nuisance, and (3) the promotion of public safety. We did not measure behaviours concerned with the fourth Licensing Objective of the ‘protection of children from harm’ as there is little established evidence of the serving of underage drinkers, or the presence of underage street drinking in Westminster’s ENTE spaces.

Research Design

Fieldwork Locations:

© Phil Hadfield
Eight locations within the West End Stress Area (WESA)
One location within Marylebone
One location within Fitzrovia

There were 10 observation sub-locations in total, visited four times each.

There were 20 nights’ of observation.

There were four researchers, working in pairs.

Both teams worked on the same nights in different locations.

Locations were chosen in consultation with City of Westminster Officers.

Location sampling allowed for comparison of the WESA with Marylebone and Fitzrovia (the ‘Control Areas’).

All areas featured a geographical clustering of licensed premises. All are located within the City of Westminster boundaries.

Observation Dates

The survey/observations ran for four consecutive nights 18.00-04.00 (Thursday-Sunday) on 5 weekends, spread at intervals across the November 2013-July 2014 fieldwork periods. This long period of study was judged necessary in order to capture important shifts in public behaviour across the annual calendar of weather conditions / seasonality and important cultural events.

The survey ran Thursday through to Sunday nights, as follows:

14-17 November 2013 (Late-Autumn / Winter sample)
12-15 December 2013 (Festive period sample)
13-16 March 2014 (Spring period sample)
15-18 May 2014 (Control areas sample)
17-20 July 2014 (Summer sample)
Dates have been chosen as sample weeks across the year, with an additional sample of the pre-Christmas festive period.

With the exception of mid-December, dates were chosen to, as far as possible, represent ‘normal’ trading conditions for the ENTE, avoiding peaks of activity around the end-of-the-month ‘pay-day effect’, school holidays, festivals, major sporting, or cultural events etc. as well as avoiding predictable annual troughs such as the January and February post-festive period.

The two ‘control’ areas of Marylebone and Fitzrovia were chosen because they featured clusters of ENTE premises and activity within Westminster and yet lay outside the WESA, allowing for useful points of comparison in relation to cumulative impact. A May date was set for all of the control area observations. This was in order to assess public behaviour during the more active, warmer months of the year, whilst avoiding the general peaks and troughs of ENTE activity outlined above.

The Research Instrument

Survey data was recorded using a unique specially-designed research instrument (see Appendix 2) that aimed to capture key data indices for licensing purposes, as determined by the Statutory Licensing Objectives, as well as the wider indices of a successful and safe nightlife environment. Particular attention was paid to the ‘prevention of public nuisance’ and ‘promotion of public safety’ Licensing Objectives; appropriate measures lying mostly outside conventional Police-derived data sources.

Our survey research was designed to categorise and measure a wide range of human behaviours that have an effect upon the social and/or physical environment of Westminster at night. Behaviours were organized into two ‘Types’: either ‘anti-social’ or ‘pro-social’; each Type being constituted of various ‘Categories’ of behaviour. In the on-street survey, behavioural Categories of both Types were then recorded across the ENTE period, providing hour-by-hour coverage.

Survey Category Allocations: Positive or Negative Behaviours?

A particular challenge for the study was the question of what might be considered ‘pro-social’ and ‘anti-social behaviour’?

Should moderate public alcohol consumption and the sounds of busking and raised voices be seen as pro- or anti-social behaviour? Much depends on the public acceptability and utility of these activities in different city contexts. The notion of ‘balance’ must form a major theme of this type of research within naturally-occurring central urban settings. To support policymaking the category allocation must be fair and even-handed, although the results and recommendations of the research may point in various directions. For example, in measuring pro-social behaviour categories, such as ‘conviviality’, the research aims to inform a positive vision for ENTE development by capturing aspects of the current social scene that appear to be ‘working’.

In light of these considerations the allocation of survey categories was subject to discussion amongst the research team and our sponsors. This was resolved as follows:
‘Pro-Social’ Behaviour

Definition: Behaviours that support the Westminster ENTE; its diversity, inclusivity, attractiveness, safety, and liveability.

Pro-social behaviours we measured included:

a) Noise events that may be considered pro-social, adding to the vitality and viability of nightlife in a particular or suitable context (away from residential areas, or pre-midnight (Fri-Sat), pre-23.00hrs (Sun-Thurs): Examples being boisterous chatter/laughter, live music/busking, street entertainment.

b) Bystander intervention and helping others, conviviality (good-natured interaction between friendship groups and between strangers), reporting of crimes and ASB.

c) Behavioural indicators of responsible alcohol consumption (sounds and actions). Our interim reporting indicated that inclusion of these categories may be deemed controversial by some stakeholders. However, the research team, our clients, and the reviewers of this report all agree that a sense of ‘balance’ is essential in the assignment of research categories associated with alcohol consumption and related behaviours in the public realm.

As the associated Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) report demonstrates in more detail than ever before, the ENTE makes major social, cultural and economic contributions to the City of Westminster, to London, and to the UK. The responsible provision and consumption of alcohol can and does support this in observable ways. This is not a viewpoint from which anyone involved in this research would depart.

d) Cultural and educational activities: Behaviours that increase the range of opportunities for enjoyment of the night-time city beyond that of drinking and of the pub/club clientele. This might include youth cultural, religious, ethnic, lifestyle, sporting, or touristic occasions/ gatherings.

e) Retail activities: licensed street trading, pop-up markets, evening and night-time shopping.
‘Anti-Social’ Behaviour

Definition: Behaviours that detract from the diversity, appeal, safety and security of the ENTE and from liveability within Westminster.

This definition is deliberately broader than the Home Office definition of an ASB criminal offence, which, under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Section 2: Part 1) requires the action in question to be:

(a) Conduct that has caused, or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to any person;
(b) Conduct capable of causing nuisance or annoyance to a person in relation to that person’s occupation of residential premises, or
(c) Conduct capable of causing housing-related nuisance or annoyance to any person.

A key requirement of our brief was to unpick and measure the concept of ‘public nuisance’ as used in licensing law and (to date) poorly evidenced in policy circles. Therefore, our concern was not simply to record when laws were broken, but more importantly, to convey a sense in which the feel of an area can be affected by social incivility and by thoughtless or aggressive actions, sounds, or exchanges such that it becomes a less pleasant environment in which to spend time.

The ASB categories we measured included:

Public nuisance

- Noise events that may cause alarm, disturbance, or distress: this breaks down into noise from persons and noise related to vehicle use, e.g. minicabs and pedi-cabs. Also, noise emitted from licensed premises, including outdoor smoking areas.

- Physical (bodily) soiling of the environment: for example, urination and vomiting

- Littering: including street drinking and takeaway food detritus

- Vandalism and trespass: destructive acts against property or territorial rights

- Incivility: drunken comportment (lurching etc.), likely to cause alarm and / or distress.
- Touting: Approaches to members of the public offering access to licensed premises, pedi-cab and minicab transport and sexual services. NB: in some countries, street touting is the basic way of competing for customers in busy ENTE environments. In Westminster, however, there are various laws or regulations governing different activities of this type and their relationships with the licensing requirements governing the services being sold.

Public safety

Another important licensing concept – measured especially in relation to:

- Road traffic safety involving pedestrians
- Street drinking (open air alcohol consumption, not within licensed premises)
- Management of glass in public spaces and external areas of licensed premises

Crime and Disorder

Observed instances of Violence Against the Person (VAP), robbery, street-level drug dealing.

Measurement and Recording

As with all social scientific endeavour, there is an element of subjectivity to such typology and category assessments. However, our judgments are based upon training and experience of research and policy implications in nightlife settings, including many social scenes in which high levels of intoxication and their effects are apparent.

Observation and recording of each category was conducted according to explicit rules in order to reduce researcher bias and improve the consistency of data collection across the teams. For example, in the case of ‘noise outbreak from licensed premises’ - which may involve the presence of several hundred customers stood outside licensed premises over a period of several hours - this category received one-mark-per-hour on the survey instrument from the hour-slot in which the behaviour was first observed through to the hour-slot in which the behaviour ceased. One mark was allocated per-hour for each premises at which the behaviour had been observed to enable measurement of cumulative impacts.

Researchers were trained in the assessment of drunkenness, following established guidance. In support of the Responsible Alcohol Sales Campaign (RASC) of 2007 the Home Office provided national briefing notes to police officers on how to identify a person who is drunk, through aspects of their comportment including: “rambling conversation”, “an unkempt appearance”, “being careless with money”, “spilling drinks”, “fumbling for cigarettes” and “bumping into furniture” (Slade, 2007: 5). In addition, epidemiological research reports a high degree of correspondence between Blood Alcohol Concentration, as an objective measure of intoxication, and subjective ratings of its physical manifestations (slurred speech, staggering gait and glazed eyes) when conducted by trained
researchers in naturally occurring nightlife settings (Perham et al., 2007). This is the approach previously applied in a major national study of alcohol law implementation funded by the Home Office and conducted by two of the research team in collaboration with KPMG (Home Office / KPMG, 2008; Hadfield and Measham, 2015). It is echoed also in the work of Hughes et al., (2014) who used pseudo-intoxicated actors in order to check compliance with the laws on serving alcohol to customers who are drunk in bars and clubs in the North West of England.

The research design involved the exploration of ‘natural social settings’, however, the research team stood with clip-boards in hand and made no attempt to disguise their presence. The purpose of the research was explained to those persons who asked and a small number of in-situ interviews with policing and security staff, street pastors, venue touts, taxi drivers and para-medics were conducted over the course of the fieldwork. This allowed many of the quantitative aspects recorded to be contextualized. The research was conducted wholly outdoors. In relation to licensed premises, only aspects of their operations visible or audible from the street were recorded; primarily this involved issues such as noise escape from open doors and windows, management of queues and outdoor smoking areas.

Each sub-location featured a limited radius of patrol, as illustrated in the map at the head of this section and in the 10 individual location maps in Section 2 of the main body of this Report. The approach of the team was to gain a qualitative understanding of each location and how it was used in order to build a profile of the location as a ‘natural area’ featuring a pattern of usage and activity flows distinct from other and adjoining areas. The starting point for designation of each sub-location was that it featured a clustering of licensed premises and/or that it functioned as a hub for exiting the City at night by public transport.

Each pair of researchers worked within sight of each other for safety reasons and focused their attention on different directions within the location in order to avoid ‘double counting’. Researchers also communicated at regular intervals; again, to check against double counting. The research team held daily de-briefing exercises in order to ensure consistency in their category allocations. These processes were also conducted in order to reduce the opportunities for individual researcher bias.

The research focuses on the uses and functions of public spaces within the night-time city. Although the behaviour of persons in outdoor areas of licensed premises such as street-located smoking areas is recorded, the project did not attempt to make direct linkages between observed behaviours and the customers of specific licensed premises. The central objectives of the project are to present a qualitative and quantitative overview of public behaviours as observed and recorded in the different sub-locations at night. The research was only able to measure those behaviours observed in-situ. There was no way of checking, for example, where persons who had been drinking had obtained their alcohol. This would have required conducting on-street interviews and therefore a study of a different nature. Nonetheless, in our sister report (Bevan et al., 2014: 42) evidence is presented from the evaluation of the Soho Alcohol Recovery Centre (SARC) project which records that 71.9% of persons surveyed at the facility reported having consumed their ‘last drink’ of the evening in licensed premises.

The proportion of visitor alcohol intake that was ‘pre-loaded’ from off-trade sources is not known. Research on the drinking practices of ENTE patrons has been conducted wherein persons are surveyed on the streets concerning the amount of alcohol they have consumed prior to their night out, either at home, or at a friend’s home. Published studies of ENTE patrons of this type have not been conducted in Central London, however, studies conducted in cities in the North of England typically report approximately 50% of respondents having pre-loaded, with a quarter of total alcohol unit intake over the course of a night purchased from off-trade outlets.

We did not attempt to measure behaviours associated with the Licensing Objective of ‘the protection of children from harm’. In accordance with our previous experience and that of our clients, underage drinking outside licensed premises and in public spaces did not emerge as salient themes within our observations. This is a situation we know to be different in some other UK and international central city spaces.
Quantitative Data Analysis and sampling

Data from the completed Survey Instrument for each hour in each location were collated. The findings are presented in this report in the form of descriptive statistics and are displayed graphically for each sub-area, for the eight West End Stress Area locations and the two Control Areas as a whole, and in a manner that allows for various forms of comparison.

Data was collated and analysed to show hourly intervals in order to record any time-sensitive patterns relating to four particular sub-periods: 18.00-22.29 ‘Evening’; 22.30-00.29 ‘Night-time’; 00.30-03.29 (‘Late-night’), and 03.30 to 04.59 (‘Twilight’), chosen in order to achieve a nuanced understanding of behaviour change. We also recorded behaviour patterns across four nights of the week (Thursday evening-Sunday/Monday twilight) and across seasons of the year (late-autumn/winter, spring and summer), with the additional inclusion of a ‘festive’ sample in December. The control areas were visited in May.

Certain Behaviour Types and Behaviour Categories were drawn out for attention in order to trace their trajectory. Our analysis allows for the consideration of evidence as to the need for any particular interventions in certain areas on certain nights of the week and/or during identified time periods.

Behaviour Rates v Behaviour Counts

The well-known UKCrimeStats website [https://www.ukcrimestats.com/](https://www.ukcrimestats.com/) provides publically accessible radius mappings for all postcodes across England, Wales and Northern Ireland which are matched and percent-ranked according to crime rate; that is, recorded crimes per 1,000 residents over the last 24 months. This is an effective way to compare all the crime categories across different areas relative to the national average. Yet, crime rates are by no means a perfect measure as they are calculated according to static residential populations. In areas in which visitor footfall is so high and the residential population so comparatively small, such as the WESA, crime rates of this kind are generally invalid; grossly over-estimating levels of crime within a population. A lot of crime, particularly in central cities, tends to involve people who are not resident. In order to achieve a more accurate rate one would need to know the total footfall of the street population in any given area and across time, as it is this that creates more opportunities for crime and disorder. The authors could find no current or projected footfall figures for Westminster at night from accessible sources at the time of writing and even if these were available there would be significant obstacles in attempting to retrospectively cross-reference two differently-derived data sets.

Performing ‘head counts’ in order to estimate changes in street population over the ENTE period is an approach that a well-resourced research team could conduct in the context of, say, a small town with one or two identifiable drinking circuits. This method - which would permit the calculation of behaviour ‘rates’ across the ENTE hours - was not feasible in our research locations due to the exceptionally large volumes of human activity occurring into the early hours.

The simple counting of events is both practical and appropriate for current purposes, because, although it cannot purport to show accurate ‘rates’ of behavioural change over the ENTE period, the method provides insight into the location and timing of the most prominent categories of behaviour recorded in Westminster at night. These mappings are pertinent to licensing considerations in Westminster. There is nothing within the Statutory Licensing Objectives to suggest that it is the ‘rates’
of crime, disorder or nuisance that are to be measured (as a precursor to targeted prevention) rather than their actual numbers.

**Qualitative Analysis**

Field notes were taken in each sub-location, together with a small number of impromptu interviews wherein everyday users of the spaces engaged in conversation with the researchers concerning their interpretations of public and premises'-related behaviours and other socio-economic and regulatory matters effecting the areas. These procedures provided insight into the social atmosphere, or 'feel' of each sub-area at different points of the evening and night, over different days of the week and across different seasons of the year (late-autumn/winter, spring and summer), together with an understanding of the functions and uses of nearby licensed premises.

These qualitative data sources are used in this report to present brief qualitative profiles of each of the 10 study areas (in Section 2). Our data allows for much more rich and detailed accounts of the areas than that presented in this report. However, such detail is not appropriate or necessary for the purposes of this particular reporting exercise, which aims primarily to provide a quantitative overview of how various ENTE spaces within Westminster are used, focusing on the ebbs and flows of the human ecology.

Appendix 5 contains an overview of the strengths and limitations of our research design.
## Appendix 2

### Research Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location no:</th>
<th>Observer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day:</td>
<td>Hour:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANTI-SOCIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physical assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug dealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other bodily soiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>littering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street drinking (group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street drinking (individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunkenness (action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunkenness (sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound (amplified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police interception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warden argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleansing team argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency siren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Premises</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise outbreak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(licensed premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise outbreak (LNR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff-public argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff-public physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>touting (premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedi-cab (sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedi-cab (obstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedi-cab (touting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mini-cab (touting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mini-cab (sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mini-cab (obstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-cab (sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black-cab (obstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private vehicle (sound)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private vehicle (obstruction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jay-walking incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fare argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRO-SOCIAL**

### Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drunkenness (action)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunkenness (sound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conviviality (group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conviviality (inter-group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help request response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bystander intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>busking (group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural / art activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith group activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign tourist activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sporting activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police (visible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wardens (visible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleansing (visible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambulance (attending)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Premises</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Staff Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Overview of Police Data

Police-recorded crime figures have been widely shown as subject to under-reporting creating the so-called ‘dark figure’ of crime, wherein approximately 60% of all crimes are thought to go unrecorded; although this figure varies by crime type and by year (PASC, 2014; Tarling and Morris, 2010).

This view is supported by offences reported by victims to the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW). Offences found to be particularly under-reported to the police include lower-level violent incidents, not involving injury. Estimates from the Office for National Statistics suggest that around 65% of “assaults without injury” and 70% of “vandalism” cases may go unreported, with some annual fluctuations (Flatley and Bradley, 2013). In an ENTE context, the categories of ‘Wounding GBH’ and ‘Assault with Injury’ are proportionately more likely to be reported than those of ‘Common Assault’ and ‘Harassment’ (that may not involve any physical violence or injury).

Thus, we see a skewing in recording wherein forms of aggression that have primarily emotional, rather than physical effects on participants can be overlooked. A further limitation of police-recorded crime data is that it is influenced by changes to the rules governing the counting and categorisation of data, the systems in place, and operational decisions on the allocation of police resources (Government Statistical Service, 2011).

In terms of the Licensing Act 2003 and its four Statutory Objectives, the cumulative impact of low-level ‘nuisance’ behaviours is often especially pertinent to local government licensing policy.

At the same time, there are clear applicable processes to follow in the case of serious and/or repetitive patterns of physical violence where it can be directly linked to specific licensed premises - and this system works quite well when it is enforced; e.g., ‘bad apple’ premises with insurmountable track records of violence are subject to a Review of their licence.

The courts rarely ‘close’ licensed premises permanently; rather they impose Conditions on the Premises Licence, which some operators find unacceptable, e.g. reduced trading hours, which may then lead to a decision to close. In the WESA these premises are soon filled by new, often food-led businesses; such is the speed of turnover of new ENTE start-ups in Central London as indicated in our CBA study.

Whilst holding the limitations of police statistics in mind, Geographical Information System (GIS) mappings for police-recorded ‘Violence Against the Person’ (VAP) and ‘Anti-Social Behaviour’ (ASB) offence categories / behaviour were collated with the assistance of City of Westminster Planning Officers who drew on Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) recorded crime statistics.

These police-recorded statistics formed part of the project in order to draw comparisons with the primary data collected by the research team. The ‘official statistics’ trace a more restricted behavioural range (that associated with criminal offences and related calls to the police), in comparison with the data collected through our Survey Instrument.
Police-recorded Violence Against the Person (VAP)

Offences classified by The Metropolitan Police Service as 'Violence Against the Person' are governed by the Home Office Counting Rules, and the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS), procedures that promote greater consistency between police forces when they record crime. VAP data includes everything from minor, through to serious violence. These different levels of severity are likely to influence the levels of reporting of different offences in accordance with the general national trends noted above. Metropolitan Police Service recording of VAP records the following categories:

- Wounding GBH
- Assault with Injury
- Common Assault
- Harassment
- Offensive Weapon (can be driven by police stop and search tactics)
- Other Violence (includes murder/homicide)

VAP does not include robbery or sexual offences (these are two separate offence categories). Such offences are often, quite correctly, included when talking about an area’s ENT. For example, drunk people leaving a pub or nightclub are easy targets for both of these crime types. Research for Drinkaware UK has pointed to a reported ‘cultural expectation’ of sexual harassment, including unwanted physical contact, in English ENT contexts amongst groups of young adults engaged in ‘drunken nights out’ (Christmas and Seymour, 2014).

In our study, only four acts of physical violence were noted across the 10 locations indicating that such public behaviour may, thankfully, not be commonly apparent to the general ENT visitor, or to observational research in most contexts. However VAP, as reported to and recorded by the police, was present in the months we studied and its known presence may well be having some economic and reputational impact on Westminster.

The following six maps, which, like our data, record the period November 2013 to July 2014, compliment our survey by showing how VAP incident locations within the WESA and control areas shift geographically across the following ENT time periods:

18.00-22.29 ‘Evening’
22.30-00.29 ‘Night’
00.30-03.29 (‘Late-night’)
03.30 to 04.59 (‘Twilight’)

These uneven time slots were chosen, not for the purposes of calculating rates of change by the hour, but rather, for the more useful (we think) purpose of marrying with our qualitative understanding of
how the WESA functions across the evening and night-time period. The focus on half-past-the-hour distinctions reflects the fact that the Premises Licences of venues typically allow for 30 minutes of ‘drinking-up time’ following the cessation of alcohol sales at the bar. For example: to record a cut-off point of midnight (whilst ‘neat’ for statistical purposes) would not permit a valid appraisal of the cumulative impact of those premises operating up until 01.00. It would underestimate attributable impacts of the midnight closures, wherein many patrons will disperse from midnight-closing premises between 00.00 and 00.30 hours. These recorded instances would influence the 00.00 – 01.00 statistics unduly.

The source for VAP data presented on ‘heat maps’ below is The Metropolitan Police Service, Crime Reporting Information System (CRIS) from 1 November 2013 to 31 July 2014.

Starting below, this section of the report presents the following Figures and Tables:

Figure 49: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Evening)
Figure 50: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Night)
Figure 51: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Late-night)
Figure 52: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Twilight Hours)
Figure 53: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Evening)
Figure 54: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Night)
Figure 55: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Late-night)
Figure 56: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Twilight Hours)
Figure 57: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Evening)
Figure 58: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Night)
Figure 59: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Late-night)
Figure 60: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Twilight Hours)
Figure 61: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, minus the New Categories (Evening)
Figure 62: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, New Categories only (Evening)
Figure 63: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, minus the New Categories (Night)
Figure 64: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, New Categories only (Night)
Figure 65: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, minus the New Categories (Late-Night)
Figure 66: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, New Categories only (Late-Night)
Figure 67: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, minus the New Categories (Twilight Hours)
Figure 68: Map of ASB recorded by the police in the WESA, New Categories only (Twilight Hours)
Figure 69: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, minus the New Categories (Evening)
Figure 70: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, New Categories only (Evening)

Figure 71: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, minus the New Categories (Night)

Figure 72: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, New Categories only (Night)

Figure 73: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, minus the New Categories (Late-Night)

Figure 74: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, New Categories only (Late-Night)

Figure 75: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, minus the New Categories (Twilight Hours)

Figure 76: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Marylebone, New Categories only (Twilight Hours)

Figure 77: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, minus the New Categories (Evening)

Figure 78: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, New Categories only (Evening)

Figure 79: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, minus the New Categories (Night)

Figure 80: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, New Categories only (Night)

Figure 81: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, minus the New Categories (Late-Night)

Figure 82: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, New Categories only (Late-Night)

Figure 83: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, minus the New Categories (Twilight Hours)

Figure 84: Map of ASB recorded by the police in Fitzrovia, New Categories only (Twilight Hours)

Figure 85: Map showing the WESA boundaries

Table 1: Anti-Social Behaviour: Police-Recording Sub-Categories
Table 2: Home Office Revised ASB-Category Definitions from April 2011
Table 3: The Cardiff Model
West End Stress Area
Concentration of Violence Against the Person incidents
1 November 2013 to 31 July 2014 - Evening (18:00 - 22:29)

Figure 50: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Night)

West End Stress Area
Concentration of Violence Against the Person incidents
1 November 2013 to 31 July 2014 - Night (22:30 - 00:29)
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Figure 51: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Late-night)

West End Stress Area
Concentration of Violence Against the Person incidents
1 November 2013 to 31 July 2014 - Late Night (00:30 - 03:29)

Figure 52: Map of Police-recorded VAP in the WESA (Twilight Hours)
Figure 53: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Evening)

Figure 54: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Night)
Figure 55: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Late-night)
Figure 56: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Marylebone (Twilight Hours)
Figure 57: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Evening)
Figure 58: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Night)

Fitzrovia
Concentration of Violence Against the Person incidents
1 November 2013 to 31 July 2014 - Night (22:30 - 00:29)

Figure 59: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Late-night)
Figure 60: Map of Police-recorded VAP in Fitzrovia (Twilight Hours)
In the above map series we can see that the police-derived data matches those of the research team by locating ‘negative’ behavioural incidents (on this occasion, crimes of violence) recorded during the ENTE period firmly within the WESA, more so than in the control areas.

The differences between the WESA and the control areas become even more apparent beyond 00.29, reflecting the general absence of pedestrian activity once licensed premises have closed in the control areas, in comparison with the continued activity into the early hours within the WESA.

Again, not all areas within the WESA are equally effected by VAP at all times; geographically VAP follows pedestrian activity, which in turn follows licensed premises’ closure times across different parts of the WESA. At the same time, the twilight activities of the illegal drug trade and prostitution become more apparent in parts of Soho beyond 03.30; a time when much of the legal-ENTE activity begins to ease.

**Police-recorded Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)**

It is the general level of hostility and aggression which effects the ‘feel’ of an area and research shows that these factors are the main security issues likely to be exercising the minds of residents and older people (over-25s) planning their nights out in the West End (Brands, et al., forthcoming; Bromley, et al., 2000; Taylor et al., 2014), although younger participants may subscribe to collective drinking norms and rituals which make them less susceptible to such concerns (Christmas and Seymour, 2014; Roberts, forthcoming).

The survey team spent 800 hours in the 10 research locations and witnessed four physically violent incidents; all low level. At the same time, our counts of street urination and other incivility categories, such as drunken rowdiness, were often high.

In 2011, the Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) issued a new National Incident Category List (NICL) and counting rules for the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). In terms of police-recorded Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), the NICL categories judged by the research team as most relevant to the Licensing Objectives were as follows: