

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Adopt Zero</b>	<b>Say Yes</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Resident	11	1	The resident saying yes suggests this should be on a case by case basis (6)
Resident Group	2 <sup>1</sup>		Both residents Groups suggest the status quo but that the problem is where there are residents and suggest a distance criteria, unspecified.
Business	5	2	The 2 suggesting yes are connected with the same (existing) City premises (9 & 10). (35) expresses concerns re safety of women staff at night and extra policing burden. (38) suggest ideally nil but kept to a minimum
Business (Ward) Group	3 <sup>23</sup>		This is on the basis of public nuisance already caused through licensing premises generally (23) safety of staff at night and reputation of City (33)(40)
Church	5		(37) cites possible problems for vulnerable women, drugs and public nuisance matters
Police		1	(11) up to 3 well run, proven, premises operators
Education	1		Regarding safety of young people, public nuisance and impact on women (38)
Member	6	3	(17) one adopt zero is only in respect of their ward (14) one 'yes' is with the proviso that brothels are also licensed (not possible yet) (16) one yes with proviso that the City can say refuse if not safe for all stakeholders
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	

25 response reported initially to Committee 17 – 7 on the Total, with one neutral (see Stuart Fraser response No. 25)

Further 17 responses to 14/07/10; includes 1 new category (Education) 3 follow up letters (see footnotes) and 14 further, all advocating a zero policy option

Total 42 Responses to date

<sup>1</sup> Follow up letter from Barbican Association (to 5) at (28) confirming would wish for zero as SEV's not in keeping with City's World Class Financial Centre nor beneficial for safety of residents or quality of their environment

<sup>2</sup> Follow up letter from Aldgate Ward Club to (23) at (33) adding concern re safety of staff leaving work late at night

<sup>3</sup> Letter from President of Aldgate Ward Club (40)