

To: Licensing and Gambling Acts Committee

Date: 13 October 2010 **Item No:**

Report of: Head of Environmental Development

Title of Report: Response to Home Office Consultation: Rebalancing
The Licensing Act.

Summary and Recommendations

Purpose of report: To update Members regarding the response sent by the Licensing Authority to the Home Office consultation: Rebalancing The Licensing Act.

Report Approved by:

Finance: (Verbal Report at Meeting)

Legal: Daniel Smith

Policy Framework: Statement of Licensing Policy

Recommendation(s):

The Committee is recommended to note the contents of the report.

INTRODUCTION

1. The responsibility for the licensing of alcohol and late night refreshment premises has transferred from the Department of Culture media and Sport to the Home Office following the election of the Coalition Government.
2. Following its election, the Coalition Government pledged to review the Licensing Act 2003 and tackle alcohol related crime.

BACKGROUND

3. The Home Office perceives that the Licensing Act 2003 introduced by the previous Government to establish a "café culture" requires amending as they believe that the proposed new culture has not taken shape.

4. In order to redress the balance, the Home Office issued a consultation document entitled: Rebalancing the Licensing Act, which is attached as Appendix 1.
5. Local Authorities and other bodies were asked to respond to the consultation by 8th September 2010.
6. The Licensing Team Leader forward a draft of the Licensing Authorities response to all Members of the Licensing and Gambling Committee on 17th August 2010.
7. Members provided the Licensing Team Leader with their responses, and these were incorporated in the Authorities response to the consultation, which is attached as Appendix 2.
8. Any financial implications regarding this matter are covered within existing budgets.

Recommendations

9. The Committee is recommended to note the response to the Home Office consultation.


Name and contact details of author: Julian Alison
(01865) 252381
jalison@oxford.gov.uk

Background papers:
Version: 1.0



Home Office

REBALANCING THE LICENSING ACT
A CONSULTATION ON EMPOWERING
INDIVIDUALS, FAMILIES AND LOCAL
COMMUNITIES TO SHAPE AND
DETERMINE LOCAL LICENSING



MINISTERIAL FOREWORD



For too long town centres up and down the country have been blighted by crime and disorder driven by irresponsible binge drinking. Local communities have not had a strong enough voice in determining which pubs and clubs should be open

in their area and for how long they should trade. Local authorities have had their hands tied by an overly bureaucratic licensing regime meaning they have not been able to adequately respond to local concerns.

The majority of licensed premises are well run businesses, which provide a valuable service to their local communities and the Government recognises the important role which pubs can play as part of the fabric of neighbourhoods and villages. Whilst tackling alcohol-related crime is a priority for the Government, it will not be addressed at the expense of these responsible businesses. Instead, the Government's approach is to provide greater flexibility for communities to deal with the small minority of irresponsible premises that do not contribute to the well-being of local areas.

The Government believes that the Licensing Act is due an overhaul and that through this, the power to make licensing decisions needs to be rebalanced in favour of local communities. The presumption to approve all new licence applications that is embedded within the Licensing Act must be removed. And in its place a new licensing regime needs to be established with local authorities and the police better able to respond to local residents' concerns. If local communities don't want nightclubs open until six in the morning then the local authority should be able to respond flexibly to this concern. Similarly, if the local community does want a vibrant late-night economy, with premises open into the early hours, then the local authority should have the flexibility to charge a fee to pay for any additional policing this generates. Local tax payers shouldn't simply be left to pick up this cost.

Whilst the Government is determined to remove the bureaucracy behind licensing and to put local communities in the lead, it still has a role in setting the framework for responsible trading. For example, the Government is determined that irresponsible businesses which continue to flout the law by selling alcohol to children should no longer be able to trade. This will send a clear signal about individual behaviour and responsibility, and about what is and what isn't acceptable to the public. The Government is also concerned by those businesses that sell alcohol at a loss in order to gain wider trade. As evidenced by the Competition Commission's Groceries Market Inquiry in 2006-2008, all too often alcohol is sold at a price which simply doesn't reflect its cost. This sort of practice is irresponsible as it can lead to binge drinking and subsequent crime and disorder. The Government therefore intends to ban the sale of alcohol below cost price.

With the changes proposed in this consultation the Government believes the net result will be a fundamental shift in the licensing regime in this country, with more emphasis on local accountability and less emphasis on central interference. We welcome your views on these proposals, and on how they will support local decision making, local accountability, and vibrant local night-time economies.



CONTENTS

1.	Executive Summary	4
2.	Background	5
3.	About this consultation	7
4.	Licensing Legislation	8
5.	Giving more local powers to refuse and revoke licences	9
6.	Dealing with the problems of late night drinking	13
7.	Temporary Event Notices	16
8.	Protecting children from the harm of alcohol	18
9.	Banning below-cost sales	20
10.	Reducing burden and bureaucracy of licensing and covering its cost	21
11.	Responses to consultation	23
	Annex A	25

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.01 Alcohol plays an important part in the cultural life of this country, employing large numbers in production, retail and the hospitality industry. The industry as a whole contributes around £8.5bn to the Exchequer through excise duty alone, and over 200,000 premises have a licence to sell alcohol. Central to this is a system of alcohol licensing that is effective in regulating sales and reflective of local demands. This document sets out the Government's proposals for overhauling the current licensing regime to give more power to local authorities and the police to respond to local concerns about their night-time economy, whilst promoting responsible business. The Government will be consulting separately on the Coalition's proposals to deregulate live music and similar performances.

1.02 Since the introduction of the Licensing Act there has been growing concern that the original vision of a vibrant "café culture" has failed to materialise. The Government intends to introduce more flexibility into the current licensing regime to allow local authorities and the police, to clamp down on alcohol-related crime and disorder hot spots within local night-time economies. To rebalance the licensing regime the Government is proposing the following measures:

- a. Give licensing authorities the power to refuse licence applications or call for a licence review without requiring relevant representations from a responsible authority.
- b. Remove the need for licensing authorities to demonstrate their decisions on licences 'are necessary' for (rather than of benefit to) the promotion of the licensing objectives.
- c. Reduce the evidential burden of proof required by licensing authorities in making decisions on licence applications and licence reviews.
- d. Increase the weight licensing authorities will have to give to relevant representations and objection notices from the police.
- e. Simplify Cumulative Impact Policies to allow licensing authorities to have more control over outlet density.
- f. Increase the opportunities for local residents or their representative groups to be involved in licensing decisions, without regard to their immediate proximity to premises.
- g. Enable more involvement of local health bodies in licensing decisions by designating health bodies as a responsible authority and seeking views on making health a licensing objective.
- h. Amend the process of appeal to avoid the costly practice of rehearing licensing decisions.
- i. Enable licensing authorities to have flexibility in restricting or extending opening hours to reflect community concerns or preferences.
- j. Repeal the unpopular power to establish Alcohol Disorder Zones and allow licensing authorities to use a simple adjustment to the existing fee system to pay for any additional policing needed during late-night opening.
- k. Substantial overhaul of the system of Temporary Event Notices to give the police more time to object, enable all responsible authorities to object, increase the notification period and reduce the number that can be applied for by personal licence holders.
- l. Introduce tougher sentences for persistent underage sales.
- m. Trigger automatic licence reviews following persistent underage sales.
- n. Ban the sale of alcohol below cost price.
- o. Enable local authorities to increase licensing fees so that they are based on full cost recovery.
- p. Enable licensing authorities to revoke licences due to non-payment of fees.
- q. Consult on the impact of the Mandatory Licensing Conditions Order and whether the current conditions should be removed.

2. BACKGROUND

2.01 The police are fighting a constant and expensive battle against alcohol fuelled crime and anti-social behaviour. The last 5 years have introduced a new drinking culture in our towns and cities. The promised “café-culture” from 24 hour licences has not materialised, instead in 2009/10 almost one million violent crimes were alcohol-related and 47% of all violent crime was fuelled by alcohol. A fifth of all violent incidents took place in or around a pub or club, and almost two-thirds at night or in the evening. There are 6.6 million alcohol-related attendances at hospital accident and emergency (A&E) per year at a cost of £645 million. In addition, 1.2 million ambulance call outs each year costing £372 million are alcohol-related. The total costs of alcohol-related crime and disorder to the taxpayer are estimated to be between £8bn and £13bn.

2.02 The majority of people drink responsibly, but not enough has been done to enable local communities to take action against those that don't. It is vital that local communities – the public and their elected representatives – have the powers they need to tackle alcohol-related crime and anti-social behaviour whilst promoting local business and ensuring that those that drink responsibly are not unduly penalised. This challenge has to be achieved within the toughest economic climate for both the public sector and business that has been seen for decades.

2.03 In the past few years, legislation through the Licensing Act 2003, Violent Crime Reduction Act 2006 and Policing and Crime Act 2009 has been introduced to try and tackle the harms that arise from the misuse of alcohol. This legislation has not achieved the previous Government's objectives and has simultaneously introduced unnecessary additional burdens and bureaucracy in the system.

COALITION AGREEMENT

2.04 In the Coalition Agreement, the Government set out a clear programme of reform around alcohol licensing to tackle the crime and anti-social behaviour that is too often associated with binge drinking in the night-time economy. In particular, the Government set out the following five commitments which are covered in this consultation.

- We will overhaul the Licensing Act to give local authorities and the police much stronger powers to remove licences from, or refuse to grant licences to, any premises that are causing problems.
- We will allow councils and the police to shut down permanently any shop or bar found to be persistently selling alcohol to children.
- We will double the maximum fine for under-age alcohol sales to £20,000.
- We will permit local councils to charge more for late-night licences to pay for additional policing.
- We will ban the sale of alcohol below cost price.

2.05 A sixth commitment to “review alcohol taxation and pricing to ensure it tackles binge drinking without unfairly penalising responsible drinkers, pubs and important local industries” is being taken forward separately by the Home Office and HM Treasury.

SHIFTING THE BALANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALCOHOL RELATED CRIME AND DISORDER

2.06 All too often high streets are filled on a Friday and Saturday night with revellers who are not encouraged to take responsibility for their own actions. They drink to excess and expect the taxpayer to meet the cost of their overindulgence. The Government wants a fundamental shift in responsibilities. Central Government will no longer be the primary driver for reducing and addressing the problems of alcohol-related crime and anti-social behaviour. Local authorities and local communities will have a greater say in what happens in their local area and individuals will become increasingly responsible for their own actions. The Government is committed to challenging the assumption that the only way to change people's behaviour is through adding to rules and regulations. In future, solutions to address alcohol-related problems will be found locally, and by encouraging individuals to take responsibility for their own actions.

STRIKING THE RIGHT BALANCE – PROMOTING BUSINESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

2.07 The government is committed to striking an appropriate balance between supporting business and driving down alcohol-related crime and disorder. Encouraging innovation and supporting economic growth is vital during these challenging economic times. However, the two aims are not mutually exclusive as safer areas are more likely to be vibrant, attracting a greater range of people. There are numerous instances of local businesses working with the police and others to reduce alcohol-related harm whilst promoting their interests. Examples of this working in practice include the Retail of Alcohol Standards Group's Community Alcohol Partnerships which were successfully piloted in St Neots; Business Improvement Districts (BIDs); and the national Best Bar None (BBN) awards scheme.

2.08 BIDs are a public-private partnership in which businesses within a defined area pay a supplementary levy on their business rates, in

order to fund changes that will improve their trading environment and directly benefit their business. For many, this is achieved by implementing crime reduction initiatives that make the public feel safer and more inclined to visit. An excellent example of this initiative is Birmingham's Broad Street BID which covers the entertainment heart of the city. Amongst other things, the BID has developed town centre wardens, taxi marshalls and enhanced cleaning to tackle litter. During the BID's first year, police statistics showed a 60% reduction in general crime and a 28% reduction in violent crime (although it is not possible to conclude how much of the reduction was directly due to the BID).

2.09 The BBN award scheme was set up to acknowledge responsible and well run licensed premises. It provides an excellent way for the police to work with the licensed retail sector to raise standards and reduce crime. However, an additional benefit is that the high profile national awards ceremony attracts positive publicity for both the venue and the area. An excellent example of this is the Doncaster BBN scheme. An evaluation of the Doncaster scheme, carried out by the national BBN team, concluded that the scheme contributed to notable reductions in alcohol-related crime in Doncaster town centre, although the exact percentage amount could not be determined, because it was one of several evening economy measures that took place during this time. The evaluation noted that large reductions in violent offences were being recorded in the majority of BBN premises, and a number of additional benefits to licensed premises as a result of BBN accreditation were also noted.

2.10 Where these types of local schemes emerge the Government will encourage and support them, not interfere with them. Alongside this support, the role of Government is to ensure that the regulatory framework for alcohol reflects the needs of local communities, and empowers local agencies to act on their behalf. This is the focus of this consultation.

3. ABOUT THIS CONSULTATION

3.01 This consultation seeks views on proposals to deliver the Government's commitments on alcohol outlined in the Coalition Agreement. We are keen to hear from everyone who will be affected by the changes, including members of the public who are consumers of alcohol, those who are affected by alcohol-related crime, those that run or work in pubs, clubs, supermarkets and shops, criminal justice agencies, licensing authorities, and trade associations representing those who produce and sell alcohol. As the key commitments outlined have been published in the Coalition Agreement, this consultation primarily seeks views on the implications of implementing the proposals rather than inviting views on the commitments themselves.

3.02 This consultation runs for 6 weeks from 28 July to the 8 September and covers England and Wales, where these proposals apply. The Government has already consulted a number of key partners prior to publishing this consultation, which has included holding 8 meetings with over 55 stakeholders from the on and off trade, alcohol producers, police and local authorities, health and voluntary sectors.

3.03 Information on how to respond to this consultation can be found on the Home Office website at <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/about-us/consultations/>. Responses can be submitted online through the Home Office website or by post by sending responses to:

Home Office - Alcohol Strategy Unit,
4th Floor Fry Building,
2 Marsham Street,
London,
SW1P 4DF

You should contact the Home Office Alcohol Strategy Unit by email at Alcohol.consultation@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk if you require a copy of this consultation paper in any other format, e.g. Braille, Large Font, or Audio.'

DEVOLVED ADMINISTRATIONS

3.04 As most of these new measures will be introduced through the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill and include amendments to the Licensing Act 2003, they will only apply to England and Wales. We are yet to decide on how the ban on below cost sales of alcohol will be implemented. Were this ban to be implemented through the Mandatory Code of Practice for Alcohol Retailers or the Licensing Act 2003, it would only apply to alcohol sold in England and Wales. However, there is the possibility that the ban could be implemented across the whole of the United Kingdom if a more appropriate means of introduction is identified.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.05 The impact assessment which accompanies this consultation sets out further details of the estimated benefits and costs, including financial costs. Where costs have been estimated, these should be viewed as indicative only.

4. LICENSING LEGISLATION

4.01. The Licensing Act 2003 became law on 24 November 2005, and regulates licensable activities and qualifying club activities. These activities include:

- The sale by retail of alcohol;
- The supply of alcohol by or on behalf of a club to, or to the order of, a member of the club; and
- The sale by retail of alcohol by or on behalf of a club to a guest of a member of the club for consumption on the premises where the sale takes place.

4.02. Licensable activities also include the provision of regulated entertainment and late night refreshment (Schedules 1 and 2). An authorisation is required in respect of any licensable activity; authorisation can comprise a premises licence, club premises certificate or temporary event notice and there can be one or more authorisations for the same premises. The processes and procedures governing each form of authorisation are contained in Part 3 (premises licences), Part 4 (club premises certificates) and Part 5 (permitted temporary activities) of the Act.

4.03. The Act introduced a single licence scheme for licensing premises and gave licensing authorities (in the form of a committee of not less than ten nor more than 15 members of the local authority which has responsibility for both personal licences to sell alcohol and premises licences) four licensing objectives, to ensure that licensable activities are carried out in the public interest.

4.04. A licensing authority can be a district or county council, London borough or one of the other bodies listed in section 3(1) of the Act, and its area is defined by reference to that of the corresponding local authority. The licensing authority must carry out its functions under the Act (licensing functions) with a view to:

- promoting the licensing objectives; and
- having regard to the statement of its licensing policy and licensing guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

4.05. The four licensing objectives are:

- The prevention of crime and disorder;
- Public safety;
- The prevention of public nuisance; and
- The protection of children from harm.

4.06. The Act enabled flexible opening hours for premises, consideration of the impact of opening hours on local residents and businesses, and gave local residents and businesses the right to make representations about applications. These representations must be based on the fact that one or more of the licensing objectives is being undermined.

4.07. A “responsible authority” (Police, Fire, Health & Safety, Planning, Environmental Health, Child Protection or Trading Standards) or an “interested party” (a person living or involved in business in the vicinity of the premises or a representative body of either) may make representations against an application or apply for a review of a licensed premises providing these objections pertain to the licensing objectives as listed above. A 28 day period is allowed for other responsible authorities or interested parties to also make representations. A hearing is held and those who expressed concerns are given the opportunity to present the issues in front of the licensing committee members. As a result of the hearing for either a licence application or review, the committee will make a decision; this may include refusing or revoking a licence or placing additional conditions on the licence.

5. GIVING MORE LOCAL POWERS TO REFUSE AND REVOKE LICENCES

5.01. Under the provisions in the 2003 Licensing Act there is a fundamental presumption in favour of granting an application for a licence to sell alcohol, which makes it difficult for local authorities to turn down applications. The Government wants to overhaul the licensing system to empower local councils and the police to clamp down on binge drinking hotspots and irresponsible retailers.

5.02. The Government proposes to change the balance of the Licensing Act to make licensing authorities more pro-active and empowered to take decisions. Currently under the Licensing Act a licensing authority can only refuse or remove a licence, or impose conditions on the licence upon review, if it can be proved that this 'is necessary' for the promotion of the licensing objectives and if a relevant representation has been made by a responsible authority. Refusals on this basis are rare partly because the licensing authority is not a responsible authority under the Act.

5.03. To make existing powers stronger and more responsive to local needs, it is proposed that relevant licensing authorities are made responsible authorities under the Licensing Act (or given equivalent powers). This would empower them to refuse, remove or review licences themselves without first having had to have received a representation from one of the other responsible authorities. This will also benefit the Cumulative Impact Policies (see next chapter) because licensing authorities will be able to refuse an application without representation.

Consultation Question 1: What do you think the impact would be of making relevant licensing authorities responsible authorities?

5.04. In making determinations on new and existing licences, licensing authorities are currently required under the Licensing Act to demonstrate that these actions are 'necessary' for the promotion of the licensing objectives in their local area. This places a significant evidential burden on the licensing authority. The Government is considering amending the

Act to reduce the burden on licensing authorities from the requirement to prove that their actions are 'necessary', to empowering them to consider more widely what actions are most appropriate to promote the licensing objectives in their area. All decisions will remain within the framework of promoting the licensing objectives and not any area the licensing authority stipulates. The Government is also exploring possible changes to the licence application process, to shift the onus onto applicants to consider and demonstrate to the licensing authority in their application, how granting their licence application will impact on the local area, and how they will mitigate any potential negative impacts.

Consultation Question 2: What impact do you think reducing the burden of proof on licensing authorities will have?

Consultation Question 3: Do you have any suggestions about how the licence application process could be amended to ensure that applicants consider the impact of their licence application on the local area?

5.05. When determining an application for a premises licence, an application for a licence review or the granting of a personal licence, the licensing authority must have regard to relevant representations or objection notices (in the case of personal licence applications) from the chief officer of police. We propose to strengthen the weight that licensing authorities must give to police representations (including those voiced by the police at a hearing) and objection notices by amending the legislation to require licensing authorities to accept all representations and notices and adopt all recommendations from the police, unless there is clear evidence that these are not relevant.

Consultation Question 4: What would the effect be of requiring licensing authorities to accept all representations, notices and recommendations from the police unless there is clear evidence that these are not relevant?

INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

5.06. Licensing authorities currently have to produce and publish a statement of licensing policy for each three year period, which they then have to have regard to when making a determination on a licence application. In producing this statement, the Licensing Act states that the authority must consult the chief police officer for the area, the fire authority and such persons as the authority considers representative of holders of premises licences, club premises certificates, personal licences and local residents and businesses. In reality, some licensing authorities do not consult widely and practitioners have stated that as a result, licensing statements can be too narrowly defined and not representative of the views and needs of the local community.

5.07. To overcome this, the statutory guidance will be revised to encourage licensing authorities to consult more widely when determining their licensing policy statement, without prescribing from the Centre the parties they must consult with. To support licensing authorities in doing this, simple templates for self-assessment (e.g. Those used successfully for the Purple Flag scheme) will be provided within the guidance.

5.08. The Licensing Act 2003 allows local residents to raise concerns regarding new licence applications or existing licensed premises. Local residents are classified as interested parties within the Act, and as such are able to make relevant representations to licensing authorities about the impact of licensed premises on the promotion of the licensing objectives in their area. Relevant representations are considered in the determination of new licence applications and may lead to reviews of existing licences. To reduce any uncertainty amongst residents as to whether or not they are in the vicinity of a premises – and therefore whether they are an interested party – the legislation will be amended to remove the requirement to show vicinity. This means that any person, body or business will be able to make a relevant representation on any premises, regardless of their geographic proximity.

5.09. Currently each local authority is required to have a petition scheme outlining how residents can submit petitions and how the local authority will respond.

Consultation Question 5: How can licensing authorities encourage greater community and local resident involvement?

Consultation Question 6: What would be the effect of removing the requirement for interested parties to show vicinity when making relevant representations?

PUBLIC HEALTH

5.10. The determination of licensing decisions gives little consideration to the views of local health bodies, such as Primary Care Trusts (or their equivalents), as they are not included as responsible authorities within the Licensing Act. This means that they are unable to make representations to the local licensing authorities regarding concerns about the impact of new licensed premises on NHS resources. Designating health bodies as a responsible authority under the Act would enable them to make representations about the impact of new or existing licensed premises on the local NHS (primarily A&E departments and ambulance services) or more generally the safety of the public within the night-time economy. The expectation is that such representations would be based on analysis of the types of data already used to identify problematic premises and local violence hot-spots (e.g. alcohol-related A&E attendances or emergency response statistics), which will reinforce the Coalition Agreement commitment to roll-out A&E data sharing.

Consultation Question 7: Are there any unintended consequences of designating health bodies as a responsible authority?

5.11. Preventing harm to the health of the public is not currently a licensing objective. The Government would welcome views on making the prevention of health harm a material consideration for licensing authorities, either as a fifth licensing objective or as a discretionary power available to the authority where there is a particular local problem. This could allow licensing authorities to take account of local density of premises and hours of sale, and links to local alcohol-related illness and deaths. For example, this could mean restrictions on additional alcohol licences or additional hours of sale, whether within a defined area or within the local authority. Or it could mean encouraging or requiring premises to display sensible drinking messages or to promote low or non-alcoholic drinks.

5.12. This could mark a significant change in approach from the current Act and could have significant implications for businesses that incur additional costs or burden resulting from these decisions, and for their customers. The Government seeks views on how local areas might use this power, the implications for the public, businesses and local services, and whether this approach would be fair, targeted and proportionate.

Consultation Question 8: What are the implications in including the prevention of health harm as a licensing objective?

5.13. The Government considers that there is a case to be made for including additional bodies as interested parties under the Licensing Act. While all individuals resident in the vicinity are entitled to make representations about licence applications or existing licensed premises, the Government considers the scope of interested parties should be increased to cover bodies such as school governors, housing associations and registered social landlords which may wish to make representations as a collective, rather than as individual citizens.

Consultation Question 9: What would be the effect of making community groups interested parties under the Licensing Act, and which groups should be included?

OVERHAULING THE APPEALS PROCESS FOR LICENCE APPLICATION DETERMINATIONS

5.14. The Licensing Act and accompanying guidance sets out the process by which an applicant can appeal against a licence determination. If the licensing authority rejects a new licence application, or an application to vary or transfer a premises licence, the applicant can lodge an appeal against the decision within 21 days of being notified of the determination. An applicant can also appeal against other licensing determinations including personal licence applications, Temporary Event Notices and closure orders. The appeal must be made to the magistrates' court for the petty sessions area. An appeal can be lodged if:

- the licensing authority has rejected the application or imposed conditions outside those specified in the operating schedule accompanying the application or imposed additional conditions necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives; or,
- the licensing authority rejects an application or takes action to remove a licensable activity from the licence or refuses to specify an individual as a designated premises supervisor.

5.15. Section 181 and Schedule 5 of the Licensing Act 2003 provide for a right of appeal to the magistrates' court against the decisions of licensing authorities. The applicant can appeal a licensing determination on the above grounds. Under the Act, parties who have made relevant representations in regard to a licence application also have a right of appeal against the determination of the licensing authority if they believe that the licence should not have been granted, or that different or additional conditions should have been imposed. These grounds therefore give scope for appeals to be lodged for a number of reasons and increase the burden on both courts and licensing authorities to conduct the appeal.

5.16. If an appeal is lodged against a licence determination, currently the magistrates' court has a number of options when determining an appeal. They can dismiss the appeal, substitute for the decision any other decision the licensing authority could have made, or remit the case to the licensing authority to hear (and dispose of in accordance with the direction of the court).

5.17. If the magistrates' court hears the appeal, case law, which predates the Licensing Act 2003, indicates that the appeal is by way of rehearing (*Sagnata Investments Ltd v Norwich Corpn* [1971]). In doing so, the court will have to have regard to the licensing authorities' statement of licensing policy and guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act. The appeals process therefore often takes the power away from the licensing authority to make the final decision on the application.

5.18. The Government is considering options to tighten the appeals process and ensure that fewer appeals are heard in court and that, where possible, the power for determining licensing decisions remains with the licensing authority throughout, while retaining appropriate procedural safeguards. Therefore we propose that remitting the case back to the licensing authority to hear should become the default position although the court will need to retain the power to dismiss the appeal or re-hear it if seen to be necessary. Any proposals taken forward will include safeguards to ensure that Article 6 ECHR rights to a fair trial are not compromised.

Consultation Question 10: What would be the effect of making the default position for the magistrates' court to remit the appeal back to the licensing authority to hear?

APPEALS BY APPLICANTS ON LICENCE REVIEWS

5.19. Reviews of a premises licence can be applied for by either responsible authorities or interested parties under the Licensing Act. Following the hearing, the licensing authority can take a number of actions including, modifying the licence conditions, removing the designated premises supervisor and

suspending the licence for a period of up to 3 months. However the decisions taken by the licensing authority at the review hearing do not take effect until any appeal is disposed of. There is evidence to suggest that some decisions are appealed against purely to ensure that the premises is able to trade during a profitable period (e.g. Christmas), and that the appeal may often be withdrawn once this period had passed. The Government considers that the sanctions imposed by a licensing authority should come into force when the holder of the premises licence receives the determination of the decision from the licensing authority, and that the sanctions should remain unless and until an appeal to the magistrates' court is successful.

Consultation Question 11: What would be the effect of amending the legislation so that the decision of the licensing authority applies as soon as the premises licence holder receives the determination.

6. DEALING WITH THE PROBLEMS OF LATE NIGHT DRINKING

6.01. The Government wants to make sure that all local authorities have the power to address the pressures caused by extensive late night drinking, and the 24 hour licensing culture. The introduction of the Licensing Act has not given local residents any more say in how late their licensed premises can stay open, so more local flexibility is needed in determining closing times and setting the fees to reflect the costs of policing the late night economy.

6.02. The latest figures show that at 31 March 2009 there were 7,178 premises holding licences to retail alcohol for up to 24 hours. Of these, 845 were pubs, bars and nightclubs able to sell alcohol for consumption on the premises for up to 24 hours. The number of premises open to sell alcohol after midnight or between 3am and 6am is not precisely known. Excluding hotels, many of these premises do not actually sell alcohol during these hours, but merely have the authorisation to do so.

EARLY MORNING RESTRICTION ORDERS

6.03. The Crime and Security Act 2010 has an uncommenced power to allow licensing authorities to make Early Morning Restriction Orders (EMROs) which restrict the sale of alcohol between 3am and 6am by any outlet with a premises licence or club premises certificate, if it is considered necessary by the licensing authority for the promotion of the licensing objectives. The aim of EMROs is to provide licensing authorities with an additional tool to use to promote the licensing objectives in their local area, by restricting alcohol sales between certain times. The Government intends to commence this power with a significant amendment to allow local councils to decide between which hours (e.g. from midnight to 6am) they would like to prevent premises from opening, according to what they believe to be most appropriate for their local area. This differs from the current situation which limits local councils to issuing the order only between the hours of 3am and 6am. The change would ensure that licensing authorities are given the freedom to respond to the needs of their local community in determining when premises can sell alcohol.

6.04. The relevant legislation will also be amended so that an EMRO could be created if it was felt to be "beneficial" for the promotion of the licensing objectives rather than if it is felt to be "necessary" as is currently the case, in order to bring it in line with the proposed changes to the Licensing Act in the previous chapter.

Consultation Question 12: What is the likely impact of extending the flexibility of Early Morning Restriction Orders to reflect the needs of the local areas?

ALCOHOL DISORDER ZONES

6.05. Alcohol Disorder Zones (ADZs) were introduced via the Violent Crime Reduction Act 2006. They permit local authorities (with the consent of the police) to designate areas where there are problems with alcohol-related nuisance, crime and disorder as ADZs. In theory ADZs allowed councils to charge a levy on problem premises.

6.06. However, since the regulations for ADZs came into force in June 2008 no local authorities have chosen to establish one in their area. We have received feedback on ADZs from local authorities that indicates that this is due to the lengthy and costly process involved in setting up an ADZ, along with the negative impact creating an ADZ might have on an area's image.

6.07. Local authorities have shown by not setting up any ADZs that they do not feel this policy is a suitable tool for tackling alcohol-related crime. Accordingly, the Government intends to repeal the legislation enabling ADZs. The policy intention behind ADZs will be met more effectively through the new late night levy, which is covered later in this consultation.

Consultation Question 13: Do you have any concerns about repealing Alcohol Disorder Zones?

CUMULATIVE IMPACT POLICIES

6.08. Cumulative Impact Policies were introduced as a tool for licensing authorities to limit the growth of licensed premises in a problem area. They are a potentially useful tool for licensing authorities to limit the number of licensed premises, but can be used only when they have received relevant representations from a responsible authority on the potential cumulative impact. They are often considered to be bureaucratic for licensing authorities (particularly smaller ones) as the link to the licensing objectives means there is a high evidential burden on responsible authorities before one can be introduced. As of March 2009 there were only 129 Cumulative Impact Policies in place in England and Wales, and when in place they do not necessarily make it easier to refuse licence applications as relevant representations are still required in order for an application to be refused.

6.09. The Government proposes to simplify Cumulative Impact Policies and make them more responsive to local needs. It intends to remove the evidential requirement in order to reduce the burden on licensing authorities and encourage greater use of them. This will give greater weight to the views of local people as the licensing authority will not be constrained by the requirement to provide detailed additional evidence where such evidence is unavailable.

Consultation Question 14: What are the consequences of removing the evidential requirement for Cumulative Impact Policies?

LATE NIGHT LEVY

6.10. The Government intends to legislate to enable licensing authorities to charge a late night levy to help pay for the cost of policing the local night-time economy, where this is deemed necessary.

6.11. It is intended that the levy would be introduced as an additional charge for licensed premises that local authorities have the discretion to introduce. This would apply to premises that have a licence to open beyond a specified time (e.g. all premises that open after midnight on any day of the week).

6.12. It may be possible to use the late night levy either as a means of recovering additional costs related to late night policing (in which case it would be determined by the additional cost of policing in the area it is applied, and the number of premises the cost is divided between). It may also be possible to allow the local authority some discretion over the amount that is charged for the levy.

Consultation Question 15: Do you agree that the late night levy should be limited to recovery of these additional costs? Do you think that the local authority should be given some discretion on how much they can charge under the levy?

6.13. It may be possible to charge different amounts for premises with reductions given to premises that are involved in schemes which reduce additional costs and which are deemed to be "best practice" (for example Best Bar None).

Consultation Question 16: Do you think it would be advantageous to offer such reductions for the late night levy?

6.14. As well as policing, it would be possible to give local authorities the discretion to use the late night levy to fund the additional costs of other services related to the consequence of alcohol on the night time economy such as taxi-marshalling or street cleaning.

Consultation Question 17: Do you agree that the additional costs of these services should be funded by the late night levy?

AMENDING THE STATUTORY GUIDANCE TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT MEASURES TO LIMIT OPENING HOURS CAN BE CONSIDERED

6.15. The Licensing Act 2003 introduced 24 hour alcohol licences, with the intention of allowing premises to adopt flexible opening hours. The objective was that consideration would be given to the impact of opening hours on local residents and businesses, and as part of this process, the Act gave local residents and businesses the right to make representations to the licensing authority to raise their concerns about new licence applications and the impact of existing licensed

premises on the local area. These representations must be based on the requirement that one or more of the licensing objectives is being undermined.

6.16. The aim behind introducing flexible opening hours was that through an extension of opening hours, concentrations of people leaving licensed premises at a set time should be reduced, with people dispersing more gradually from licensed premises at their different closing times. To this effect, in the guidance issued alongside the Licensing Act 2003, local areas were actively discouraged from implementing measures that could reduce this flexibility such as fixed closing times, staggered closing times and zoning; where fixed closing hours are set within a designated area. Many practitioners have reported that this advice is confusing and contrary to what local areas would like to do.

6.17. The Government intends to amend the guidance to make it clear to local areas that they can make decisions about the most appropriate licensing strategy for their area. Licensing authorities will be encouraged to consider using measures including fixed closing times, staggered closing times and zoning where they are appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives in their area. This change acknowledges the fact that different licensing approaches may be best for different areas and will empower licensing authorities to implement a licensing strategy that is best placed to meet the needs of their local area, based on their local knowledge.

Consultation Question 18: Do you believe that giving more autonomy to local authorities regarding closing times would be advantageous to cutting alcohol-related crime?

7. TEMPORARY EVENT NOTICES

7.01. A Temporary Event Notice (TEN) is a notification to the licensing authority that an individual intends to conduct licensable activities on a temporary basis for a period not exceeding 96 hours. There are several other statutory requirements which relate to a TEN, which restrict the number of persons allowed onto the premises, and the number of TENs that can be applied for in a year.

7.02. The TEN must be submitted to the licensing authority and the police at least ten working days in advance of the planned event. Only the police can object to a TEN, and only on crime prevention grounds. The police have 48 hours after the receipt of the TEN to object, and (unless the premises user agrees to modify the TEN) the licensing authority must hold a hearing to consider any objection that has been received. If the licensing authority decides that the objection is valid, it must issue a counter notice to the applicant at least 24 hours before the beginning of the event to prevent it going ahead.

7.03. The Government has recently amended the Licensing Act by Legislative Reform Order (LRO) on 19 July 2010 to extend the police objection period from 48 hours to two working days. The new arrangements, which come into force in October this year, will ensure that the police always have two full days to object to a TEN, even when it is submitted at the weekend or over a Bank Holiday. Restrictions on the use of LROs meant that it was not possible to use this mechanism to make more wide-ranging changes.

7.04. However the Government now has the opportunity to make a number of further simple changes to TENs in order to improve their effectiveness and ensure that events held using TENs are properly regulated. The proposed changes are: giving discretion to licensing authorities to apply existing licensing conditions for the period of a TEN when the applicant is already a licensed premises; extending the period of time that the police have to object (from two to five working days); and extending the right to object to other responsible authorities under the Act, including the right to object under the three other licensing objectives.

7.05. The Government also proposes to give the licensing authority the power to prescribe the exact address to where the TEN should be sent, as there is evidence to suggest that the service of the TEN to 'the relevant chief officer of police' results in delays in the proper person within the police receiving the details of the TEN. The licensing authority would be able to require that the papers be sent to a specific address for each of the responsible authorities under the Act, ensuring that TENs can be dealt with more efficiently.

7.06. The Government intends to amend the TENs structure to increase the period of notice that has to be given to a licensing authority in advance of the event. Currently this is 10 working days, but it is the Government's view that this should be increased to take account of the fact that extending the time that the police have to object to a TEN will impact upon the licensing authority's ability to schedule a hearing in advance of the event to consider any objections. The Government proposes that the legislation be amended so that TENs applied for where an existing premises licence is in operation would have to give a longer period of notice than applications for a TEN where there is no current premises licence. This could mean for example, that premises such as a pub or an off-licence would have to provide notice (for example) one month in advance, whereas a village fete or community event would be required to provide notice (for example) 15 working days in advance of the event.

7.07. The Government also proposes to restrict the number of TENs that a personal licence holder could apply for to 12 in one year. This would correspond with the number of TENs permitted at the same venue. The Government further intends to address the issue of the number of TENs that may be applied for in a single vicinity. Currently, it is possible for a field (for example) to have an unlimited number of TEN applications, with each TEN permitting up to 499 persons at each one. The Government proposes to amend the legislation to ensure that only one TEN would be able to be applied for in events such as this.

Consultation Question 19: What would be the consequences of amending the legislation relating to TENs so that:

- a. All the responsible authorities can object to a TEN on all of the licensing objectives?**
- b. The police (and other responsible authorities) have five working days to object to a TEN?**
- c. The notification period for a TEN is increased, and is longer for those venues already holding a premises licence?**
- d. Licensing authorities have the discretion to apply existing licence conditions to a TEN?**

Consultation Question 20: What would be the consequences of

- a. Reducing the number of TENs that can be applied for by a personal licence holder to 12 per year?**
- b. Restricting the number of TENs that could be applied for in the same vicinity (e.g. a field)?**

8. PROTECTING CHILDREN FROM THE HARM OF ALCOHOL

8.01. The quantity of alcohol consumed by children who drink alcohol has increased significantly in the past decade. The 2008 Smoking Drinking and Drug Use Survey found that the average weekly intake for pupils aged 11-15 who had drunk alcohol in the week before they were surveyed was 14.6 units, this figure has more than doubled since 1990. Beer accounted for half of pupils' weekly intake (7.6 units), followed by alcopops (2.8 units), spirits (2.1 units) and wine (1.8 units).

8.02. Children's drinking is putting increasing pressure on the police and the health services. High levels of alcohol consumption are associated with a range of health harms and high risk behaviours, including unprotected sex and offending. 12,718 children in England aged 11-17 were admitted to hospital in 2008/09 with an alcohol-related condition (3,554 aged 11-15 and 9,164 aged 16-17). The UK has one of the highest rates in the EU of admission to hospital or A&E due to alcohol use by 15-16 year olds.

8.03. Frequency of drinking is associated with offending in children and young people. The 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey found those who drank alcohol once a week or more committed a disproportionate volume of crime, accounting for 37% of all offences reported by 10- to 17-year-olds but only 14% of respondents.

8.04. Despite the growing problem of children's alcohol misuse and the increasing impact on public services, not enough has been done at the local level to limit the availability of alcohol to children. The current powers do not go far enough to prevent selling alcohol to children. Although pupils' access to alcohol is typically by being given it by friends or parents, about half of pupils who have ever drunk also say that they do buy alcohol, despite being well below the age when they can legally do so.

8.05. The Government wants to take tougher action to penalise those premises found to be persistently selling alcohol to children. Currently, if a licence holder pleads not guilty to persistent underage selling and is prosecuted, then they face a fine of up to £10,000 and up to 3 months suspension of their alcohol licence. In

2008 there were 9 prosecutions with 4 fines issued. The average fine issued is £1,713. However, as an alternative to prosecution the police can give the licence holder the option to voluntarily accept a 48 hour closure notice which discharges criminal liability. The 48 hour suspension of alcohol sales was given 54 times in 2008/09. In addition, the police can ask the licensing authority to review the licence although it is not clear how many reviews have been conducted following a licence holder having been found persistently selling alcohol to children.

8.06. In the Coalition Agreement, the Government set out a commitment to double the fine for persistent under-age selling from £10,000 to £20,000. Alongside this, the Government is proposing to extend the period of voluntary closure that can be given by the police as an alternative to prosecution to bring this in line with the increased fine. Currently police can give a closure notice of up to 48 hours, but the Government is considering amending this closure period to set a minimum period of voluntary closure that can be given by the police of 168 hours (7 days) and is inviting feedback on this proposal and a suitable upper-limit for the voluntary closure period. The intention behind setting a minimum and upper limit for the period of voluntary closure is to give police the flexibility to decide upon an appropriate period of voluntary closure as an alternative to prosecution based on the type of premises being sanctioned. This could include consideration of the size of the premises and the type of business. This gives police the power to ensure that the sanction given is a proportionate penalty for the premises found to have committed the offence. Additional guidance will be issued to encourage police to use this sanction flexibly.

Consultation Question 21: Do you think 168 hours (7 days) is a suitable minimum for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?

Consultation Question 22: What do you think would be an appropriate upper limit for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?

8.07. The Coalition Agreement also set out a commitment to allow councils and the police to shut down permanently any shop or bar found to be persistently selling alcohol to children. Although licensing authorities already have the power to review a licence if a licence holder is found to be persistently selling alcohol to children, it is not clear in how many cases this review takes place. The Government is proposing amending the legislation to ensure that all premises found to be persistently selling alcohol to children will have their licence reviewed, regardless of whether they have opted for voluntary closure or prosecution. At the review process the licensing authority has the power to impose a 3 month licence suspension, impose further conditions on the licence or to revoke the licence. Ensuring that licence reviews are automatic in these circumstances gives licensing authorities the power to consider each case and if seen to be necessary, the power to make a decision to revoke the licence.

Consultation Question 23: What do you think the impact will be of making licence reviews automatic for those found to be persistently selling alcohol to children?

9. BANNING BELOW-COST SALES

9.01. There has been a growing concern over the last few years about how cheaply some alcoholic drinks are being sold. We are also aware of the public's unease and their perception of heavily discounted alcohol being a key contributory factor to unacceptable levels of alcohol-related crime and disorder – in many cases as a result of “pre-loading” in preparation for a night out.

9.02. According to the British Crime Survey, over a quarter of local residents perceive drunk and rowdy behaviour to be a problem in their area. There is a belief that most of the alcohol which contributes to this drunk and rowdy behaviour is irresponsibly priced and sold, allowing irresponsible drinkers to be able to get drunk cheaply. Examples of deals such as bottles of cider containing more than the weekly recommended unit guidelines but costing less than the price of a pint of beer in an average pub, continue to contribute to calls for action by Government. Victims of crime and anti-social behaviour, as well as senior figures from the enforcement and health sectors that have first hand experience of tackling the harms caused by excessive and irresponsible consumption, have long called on the Government to take firm action to tackle cheap sales of alcohol.

9.03. We are committed to ensuring that local people are able to enjoy all parts of their community without feeling intimidated by those who have drunk too much alcohol and to reducing the burden on frontline services of dealing with drunken behaviour. As set out in the Coalition Agreement, the government is carrying out a review of alcohol pricing and taxation and associated with this a ban on the sale of alcohol below cost. This consultation will inform the review. For more information go to: http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/alcohol_taxation.htm

LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS FOR BANNING BELOW-COST SALES

9.04. The definition of ‘cost’ has implications for the policy, powers required, enforcement and different incentives. The ‘cost’ of an alcoholic product differs between retail businesses as they negotiate their own prices with suppliers, have different internal cost structures and may

base overall profitability on a basket of goods. This can make it difficult for a retailer to prove, or an enforcement authority to check, whether a product has been sold ‘below cost’.

9.05. There are a number of ways in which such a ban might work, and Government must find an approach which is compatible with EU trade and competition laws and realistic to enforce. Most EU countries which have tried similar policies have banned selling below ‘net invoice price’ where the reference price is broadly the unit price on the invoice.

9.06. One option would be to specifically define an ‘average cost’. This might be easier to enforce than determining the true cost of each product, but could be a barrier to trade. An alternative option might be to introduce a mandatory licence condition by amendment to the Mandatory Code of Practice (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) Order 2010 through secondary legislation. Under these circumstances, it would be a breach of the licence condition to sell alcohol below what it cost the premises. This would have the advantage of not having to define what the cost is. Where responsible authorities or interested parties were concerned about the prices being offered in local premises this could trigger a licence review.

Consultation Question 24: For the purpose of this consultation we are interested in expert views on the following.

- a. **Simple and effective ways to define the ‘cost’ of alcohol**
- b. **Effective ways to enforce a ban on below cost selling and their costs**
- c. **The feasibility of using the Mandatory Code of Practice to set a licence condition that no sale can be below cost, without defining cost.**

10. REDUCING BURDEN AND BUREAUCRACY OF LICENSING AND COVERING ITS COST

INCREASES IN LICENCE FEES

10.01. Licence fees have not been increased since their introduction and therefore some sort of increase is long overdue. This would be hugely welcomed by local authorities who have long argued that their enforcement costs exceed their fee income. The government commissioned Elton Report in 2006 concluded that there was a £43m shortfall for the three year period 2004/05 to 2006/07 and recommended an increase of 7% for the three year period 2007/08 to 2009/10. This has never happened and the Government therefore proposes to enable local authorities to increase the licence fees so that they are based on full cost recovery.

10.02. The Government also acknowledges that adopting a tougher licensing regime as outlined in these proposals may lead to an increase in the number of licence reviews conducted, and a subsequent risk of increased burden on local licensing authorities. Any additional burdens on licensing authorities should also be reflected in the level of licensing fees.

Consultation Question 25: Would you be in favour of increasing licence fees based on full cost recovery, and what impact would this have?

AUTOMATIC REVOCATION OF LICENCE FOR NON-PAYMENT OF FEES.

10.03. The automatic revocation of licences for non-payment of fees is a simple change that could save local authorities many thousands of pounds currently spent in recovering unpaid annual fees through councils' own recovery sections and bailiffs. A precedent can be found for it in the Gambling Act. The Government proposes to amend the legislation so that a premises licence is automatically revoked if the premises has failed to pay the annual fees.

Consultation Question 26: Are you in favour of automatically revoking the premises licence if the annual fees have not been paid?

DEREGULATION

10.04. In April 2010, the previous administration enacted a Mandatory Code of Practice (Mandatory Licensing Conditions) Order 2010 for Alcohol Retailers, which was intended to be introduced in two stages. The first stage, which took place in April 2010, imposed conditions on licensed premises to:

- (a) Ban irresponsible promotions in the on-trade
- (b) Ban dispensing alcohol directly into the mouths of customers
- (c) Ensure that free tap water was available in all licensed premises in the on-trade

10.05. The legislation for the Mandatory Code contained two further conditions for licensed premises. These will be introduced on 1 October 2010. These conditions were delayed to give business more time to prepare and will mandate all licensed premises to:

- (d) Ensure they have an age verification policy in place
- (e) Ensure they are able to offer smaller servings of beer, wine and spirits.

10.06. As the regulations have been enacted, it is not possible to prevent d) and e) coming into force in October. However, the Government believes strongly that regulation should only be used as a last resort, and that alternatives to regulation should be used wherever possible. We want to take the opportunity of this consultation to give people the chance to comment on the necessity, cost, and impact of the provisions outlined in the mandatory code.

Consultation Question 27: Have the first set of mandatory conditions that came into force in April 2010 had a positive impact on preventing alcohol related crime?

Consultation Question 28: Would you support the repeal of any or all of the mandatory conditions (conditions (a) – (e) above)?

10.07. The Government is also interested in further de-regulating the Licensing Act in order to reduce the administrative burden both on business and licensing authorities. For example the application forms for both a premises licence and a TEN could be reduced, and the requirement on the licensing authority to determine and publish a statement of licensing policy every three years could be removed.

Consultation Question 29: Would you support measures to de-regulate the Licensing Act, and what sections of the Act in your view could be removed or simplified?

11. RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

11.01. A list of the consultation questions included in this document is below.

- Consultation Question 1: What do you think the impact would be of making relevant licensing authorities responsible authorities?
- Consultation Question 2: What impact do you think reducing the burden of proof on licensing authorities will have?
- Consultation Question 3: Do you have any suggestions about how the licence application process could be amended to ensure that applicants consider the impact of their licence application on the local area?
- Consultation Question 4: What would the effect be of requiring licensing authorities to accept all representations, notices and recommendations from the police unless there is clear evidence that these are not relevant?
- Consultation Question 5: How can licensing authorities encourage greater community and local resident involvement?
- Consultation Question 6: What would be the effect of removing the requirement for interested parties to show vicinity when making relevant representations?
- Consultation Question 7: Are there any unintended consequences of designating health bodies as a responsible authority?
- Consultation Question 8: What are the implications in including the prevention of health harm as a licensing objective?
- Consultation Question 9: What would be the effect of making community groups interested parties under the Licensing Act, and which groups should be included?
- Consultation Question 10: What would be the effect of making the default position for the magistrates' court to remit the appeal back to the licensing authority to hear?
- Consultation Question 11: What would be the effect of amending the legislation so that the decision of the licensing authority applies as soon as the premises licence holder receives the determination.
- Consultation Question 12: What is the likely impact of extending the flexibility of Early Morning Restriction Orders to reflect the needs of the local areas?
- Consultation Question 13: Do you have any concerns about repealing Alcohol Disorder Zones?
- Consultation Question 14: What are the consequences of removing the evidential requirement for Cumulative Impact Policies?
- Consultation Question 15: Do you agree that the late night levy should be limited to recovery of these additional costs? Do you think that the local authority should be given some discretion on how much they can charge under the levy?
- Consultation Question 16: Do you think it would be advantageous to offer such reductions for the late night levy?
- Consultation Question 17: Do you agree that the additional costs of these services should be funded by the late night levy?
- Consultation Question 18: Do you believe that giving more autonomy to local authorities regarding closing times would be advantageous to cutting alcohol-related crime?
- Consultation Question 19: What would be the consequences of amending the legislation relating to TENs so that:
 - a. All the responsible authorities can object to a TEN on all of the licensing objectives?
 - b. The police (and other responsible authorities) have five working days to object to a TEN?
 - c. The notification period for a TEN is increased, and is longer for those venues already holding a premises licence?
 - d. Licensing authorities have the discretion to apply existing licence conditions to a TEN?

- Consultation Question 20: What would be the consequences of:
 - a. Reducing the number of TENs that can be applied for by a personal licence holder to 12 per year?
 - b. Restricting the number of TENs that could be applied for in the same vicinity (e.g. a field)?
 - Consultation Question 21: Do you think 168 hours (7 days) is a suitable minimum for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?
 - Consultation Question 22: What do you think would be an appropriate upper limit for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?
 - Consultation Question 23: What do you think the impact will be of making licence reviews automatic for those found to be persistently selling alcohol to children?
 - Consultation Question 24: For the purpose of this consultation we are interested in expert views on the following.
 - a. Simple and effective ways to define the 'cost' of alcohol
 - b. Effective ways to enforce a ban on below cost selling and their costs
 - c. The feasibility of using the Mandatory Code of Practice to set a licence condition that no sale can be below cost, without defining cost.
 - Consultation Question 25: Would you be in favour of increasing licence fees based on full cost recovery, and what impact would this have?
 - Consultation Question 26: Are you in favour of automatically revoking the premises licence if the annual fees have not been paid?
 - Consultation Question 27: Have the first set of mandatory conditions that came into force in April 2010 had a positive impact on preventing alcohol-related crime?
 - Consultation Question 28: Would you support the repeal of any or all of the mandatory conditions?
 - Consultation Question 29: Would you support measures to de-regulate the Licensing Act, and what sections of the Act in your view could be removed or simplified?
- 11.02. The information you send us may be passed to colleagues within the Home Office, the Government or related agencies.
- 11.03. Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. These are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
- 11.04. If you want other information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the Freedom of Information Act, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence.
- 11.05. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.
- 11.06. The Department will process your personal data in accordance with the DPA and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

ANNEX A

CONSULTATION CRITERIA

The Consultation follows the Government's Code of Practice on Consultation – the criteria for which are set out below:

Criterion 1 – When to consult – Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome.

Criterion 2 – Duration of consultation exercises – Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.

Criterion 3 – Clarity of scope and impact – Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Criterion 4 – Accessibility of consultation exercises – Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is intended to reach.

Criterion 5 – The burden of consultation – Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.

Criterion 6 – Responsiveness of consultation exercises – Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.

Criterion 7 – Capacity to consult – Officials running consultations should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise and share what they have learned from the experience.

The full Code of Practice on Consultation is available at: <http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/consultation-guidance/page44420.html>

CONSULTATION CO-ORDINATOR

If you have a complaint or comment about the Home Office's approach to consultation, you should contact the Home Office Consultation Co-ordinator, Nigel Lawrence. Please DO NOT send your response to this consultation to Nigel Lawrence. The Co-ordinator works to promote best practice standards set by the Government's Code of Practice, advises policy teams on how to conduct consultations and investigates complaints made against the Home Office. He does not process your response to this consultation.

The Co-ordinator can be emailed at: Nigel.Lawrence@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk or alternatively write to him at:

Nigel Lawrence, Consultation Co-ordinator
Home Office
Performance and Delivery Unit
Better Regulation Team
3rd Floor Seacole
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

ISBN: 978-1-84987-245-4

HO_01692_G

CONSULTATION QUESTION 1:

What do you think the impact would be of making relevant licensing authorities responsible authorities?

Clarification is needed as to whether this would be limited to Elected Members of the Licensing Authority or the power be given the Head of the Licensing Authority "Officer Department" to make a representation or seek a review. Elected Members currently have these powers as they are "Interested Parties".

Giving the Licensing Authority the power to make decisions without having received representations from the other Responsible Authorities is fine as it will enable them to go beyond the subject of representations. However, in the absence of representations from Responsible Authorities, there would only be a hearing following a relevant representation from an Interested Party. Giving power to the Licensing Officer would enable a hearing for to take place but it would be the Licensing Authority Members that make the decision.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 2:

What impact do you think reducing the burden of proof on licensing authorities will have?

It will allow for speedier enforcement measures, and speedier initiation of Reviews. However this must be tempered by the need for real evidence being obtained, in order to prevent hearsay from being overly relied upon.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 3:

Do you have any suggestions about how the licence application process could be amended to ensure that applicants consider the impact of their licence application on the local area?

Currently we would advise all applicants to consult with the responsible Authorities prior to submitting any application. However, this advice is not necessarily taken up by applicants.

It would be useful for applicants to discuss their proposals with local people and businesses, in order to ensure support for their proposals and to establish close community ties.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 4:

What would the effect be of requiring licensing authorities to accept all representations, notices and recommendations from the police unless there is clear evidence that these are not relevant?

It is not necessary to change the current position as it would be open to the police to ask for conditions or restrictions on licences that are excessive. It should remain that the Licensing Authority makes the decision having considered all evidence and representations. This gives the applicant the opportunity to make their case and offer alternatives.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 5:

How can licensing authorities encourage greater community and local resident involvement?

More effort can be made by Licensing Authorities towards the community with regard to the availability of Statement of Licensing Policies, and specific ward members of communities.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 6:

What would be the effect of removing the requirement for interested parties to show vicinity when making relevant representations?

We agree with the proposal provided the requirement for the representation being relevant is retained and made clear to the objector. It is the substance of the objection that is important rather than where the objector lives.

In theory so long as the interested party can demonstrate how the granting of the licence would have a negative effect on them through the potential failure of the applicant to uphold the licensing objectives, then none.

However this should be tempered with the fact that experience has shown that many people have objected incorrectly to some previous applications, based on their moral views, and not on the licensing objectives.

When contentious applications have been received, those who clearly would not be affected by such applications have still made representations without regard to the Licensing Act 2003.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 7:

Are there any unintended consequences of designating health bodies as a responsible authority?

No

CONSULTATION QUESTION 8:

What are the implications in including the prevention of health harm as a licensing objective?

So long as the use of this power is fair, targeted, proportionate and consistent, any means of getting the message across to the public and the licensees of "responsible sale and responsible consumption" must be seen as a good thing.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 9:

What would be the effect of making community groups interested parties under the Licensing Act, and which groups should be included?

Whilst this Authority supports the idea of allowing the groups mentioned in the proposals, the Government must ensure that knee-jerk reactions to alcohol related premises do not occur, when there is no evidence to state that hypothetical problems exist. Perhaps it would be better if Ward Councillors liaised with who they felt were appropriate local bodies, and submit any representation as permitted already under the Act.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 10:

What would be the effect of making the default position for the magistrates' court to remit the appeal back to the licensing authority to hear?

This could make a saving in costs to the Licensing Authority, and ensure that appropriate weight was given to the decision of the Licensing Authority. However, It could also lead to the cost of unnecessary rehearings of matters which could have been adequately resolved by the magistrates'.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 11:

What would be the effect of amending the legislation so that the decision of the licensing authority applies as soon as the premises licence holder receives the determination.

This would prevent licensees from "buying time" where clearly the evidence to promote the licensing objectives has been established, and would serve as a deterrent to "problem" licensed premises.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 12:

What is the likely impact of extending the flexibility of Early Morning Restriction Orders to reflect the needs of the local areas?

This would enable the Licensing Authority and other agencies to tackle the social implications of late night venues.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 13:

Do you have any concerns about repealing Alcohol Disorder Zones?

No

CONSULTATION QUESTION 14:

What are the consequences of removing the evidential requirement for Cumulative Impact Policies?

We would have concerns that if evidence of existing problems is not required before adopting an SSP. There would be a danger of SSPs being adopted without grounds.

Cumulative Impact Policies can be a significant restriction on trade and commercial freedom. They only work if they carry the respect of the community. If they were to be implemented without evidence of need the standing and local respect for the policy could be diminished.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 15:

Do you agree that the late night levy should be limited to recovery of these additional costs? Do you think that the local authority should be given some discretion on how much they can charge under the levy?

Yes

CONSULTATION QUESTION 16:

Do you think it would be advantageous to offer such reductions for the late night levy?

Yes

CONSULTATION QUESTION 17:

Do you agree that the additional costs of these services should be funded by the late night levy?

Yes, it should be a requirement that any levy should be linked to measures implemented to mitigate any negative impacts of the night-time economy such as additional policing or taxi marshals.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 18:

Do you believe that giving more autonomy to local authorities regarding closing times would be advantageous to cutting alcohol-related crime?

Yes, but it could result in less flexibility over staggered closing times. This measure could be linked to the late night levy approach.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 19:

What would be the consequences of amending the legislation relating to TENs so that:

- a. All the responsible authorities can object to a TEN on all of the licensing objectives?**
- b. The police (and other responsible authorities) have five working days to object to a TEN?**
- c. The notification period for a TEN is increased, and is longer for those venues already holding a premises licence?**
- d. Licensing authorities have the discretion to apply existing licence conditions to a TEN?**

- a. Yes, this would be particularly beneficial for Environmental Health to object to TENs where they are likely to cause noise nuisance.
- b. We agree
- c. We agree
- d. We would support a requirement for all licensing conditions to apply but allow applicants to request certain conditions to be waived for a particular event. We would also support the ability to put conditions on a TEN, for example an appropriate noise condition for an outdoor musical event.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 20:

**What would be the consequences of a. Reducing the number of TENs that can be applied for by a personal licence holder to 12 per year?
b. Restricting the number of TENs that could be applied for in the same vicinity (e.g. a field)?**

- a. Concern that mobile events companies could be severely restricted in their trade, as could village pubs, halls, etc.
- b. We agree, this is a more appropriate control than (a) above.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 21:

Do you think 168 hours (7 days) is a suitable minimum for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?

Yes – this would be an effective deterrent.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 22:

What do you think would be an appropriate upper limit for the period of voluntary closure that can be flexibly applied by police for persistent underage selling?

3 months – in line with maximum sentence at Review

CONSULTATION QUESTION 23:

What do you think the impact will be of making licence reviews automatic for those found to be persistently selling alcohol to children?

This would be very welcome, in order to reinforce the message of protecting children from the harm of alcohol.

However, it could undermine the discretion of responsible authorities to seek reviews only in cases where they consider it necessary

CONSULTATION QUESTION 24:

For the purpose of this consultation we are interested in expert views on the following.

- a. Simple and effective ways to define the 'cost' of alcohol**
- b. Effective ways to enforce a ban on below cost selling and their costs**
- c. The feasibility of using the Mandatory Code of Practice to set a licence condition that no sale can be below cost, without defining cost.**

- a. The cost should be the gross price paid by the retailer to the supplier, including all other associated charges. Alternatively, look at the Scottish approach of centrally setting a minimum price per unit of alcohol.
- b. Set up "Off-Watch" to ensure that off-licences in districts meet with the Police and Licensing Authority and Trading Standards to ensure accurate pricing.
- c. This is feasible. Competitiveness should be encouraged, but responsibly.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 25:

Would you be in favour of increasing licence fees based on full cost recovery, and what impact would this have?

Yes. The impact would be on the late night venues, but would add the benefit of being able to adequately police the area, and ensure the late night venues operated to a high standard, and picked up the cost of keeping the areas clean and safe.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 26:

Are you in favour of automatically revoking the premises licence if the

annual fees have not been paid?

We strongly support this approach. However, there should be a requirement for Licensing authorities to invoice licence holders with the revocation linked to the payment terms of the invoice, e.g. 28 days from the due date.

Rather than automatic revocation it may be more flexible for LAs to have a discretionary power to revoke for non payment

CONSULTATION QUESTION 27:

Have the first set of mandatory conditions that came into force in April 2010 had a positive impact on preventing alcohol related crime?

Too early to say, but it has "sharpened" the mind of licensees, and allowed the Licensing Authority and Police to discuss concerns with licensees.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 28:

Would you support the repeal of any or all of the mandatory conditions (conditions (a) – (e) above)?

Yes, but it may be that Conditions A, C, D should stay. C was already on many Premises Licences. We also think that the wording of the mandatory conditions could be simplified.

CONSULTATION QUESTION 29:

Would you support measures to de-regulate the Licensing Act, and what sections of the Act in your view could be removed or simplified?

The advertisement is unnecessary because very few people find out about applications that way. However, the standard notice should be redesigned to make it more prominent when displayed on the premises.

Some simplification and use of plain English on the application forms would be of benefit.

Licensing Authorities should be able to Review their Statement of Licensing Policies when they chose, and minor amendments should be permitted without the need for wider consultation (i.e. amendments in legislation that are incorporated).