

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



27 October 2011

To: Chairman – Councillor Roger Hall
Vice-Chairman – Councillor Raymond Matthews
Members of the Licensing Committee – Councillors Richard Barrett, Val Barrett,
Trisha Bear, Alison Elcox, Jose Hales, Sally Hatton, Liz Hezell,
Janet Lockwood, David McCraith, Cicely Murfitt, Charles Nightingale, Alex Riley
and Ben Shelton

cc Cllr Sue Ellington, Environmental Services Portfolio Holder

Quorum: 4

Dear Councillor

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **LICENSING COMMITTEE**, which will be held in **SWANSLEY ROOM, GROUND FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **MONDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 2011 at 9.30 a.m.**

Members are respectfully reminded that when substituting on committees, subcommittees, and outside or joint bodies, Democratic Services must be advised of the substitution *in advance of* the meeting. It is not possible to accept a substitute once the meeting has started. Council Standing Order 4.3 refers.

Yours faithfully
JEAN HUNTER
Chief Executive

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you.

	AGENDA	PAGES
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive apologies for absence from committee members.	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	
3.	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING To authorise the Chairman to sign the Minutes of the meetings held on 3 March and 26 May 2011 as correct records.	1 - 4
4.	LICENSING ACT 2003, REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT: CONSULTATION Members of the Licensing Committee are requested to bring with them to the meeting, the copy of the Dept for Culture, Media and Sport	5 - 18

consultation document on Regulated Entertainment that has already been distributed to them.

OUR VISION

- We will make South Cambridgeshire a safe and healthy place where residents are proud to live and where there will be opportunities for employment, enterprise and world-leading innovation.
- We will be a listening Council, providing a voice for rural life and first-class services accessible to all.

OUR VALUES

We will demonstrate our corporate values in all our actions. These are:

- Trust
- Mutual respect
- A commitment to improving services
- Customer service

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL

While the District Council endeavours to ensure that visitors come to no harm when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall, those visitors also have a responsibility to make sure that they do not risk their own or others' safety.

Security

Members of the public attending meetings in non-public areas of the Council offices must report to Reception, sign in, and at all times wear the Visitor badges issued. Before leaving the building, such visitors must sign out and return their Visitor badges to Reception.

Emergency and Evacuation

In the event of a fire, a continuous alarm will sound. Evacuate the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park.

- **Do not** use the lifts to exit the building. If you are unable to negotiate stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings are provided with fire refuge areas, which afford protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for assistance from the Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.
- **Do not** re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

First Aid

If someone feels unwell or needs first aid, please alert a member of staff.

Access for People with Disabilities

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you. All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Infra-red hearing assistance systems are available in the Council Chamber and viewing gallery. To use these, you must sit in sight of the infra-red transmitter and wear a 'neck loop', which can be used with a hearing aid switched to the 'T' position. If your hearing aid does not have the 'T' position facility then earphones are also available and can be used independently. You can obtain both neck loops and earphones from Reception.

Toilets

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lifts.

Recording of Business and Use of Mobile Phones

The Council is committed to openness and transparency. Until such time as the Council's Constitution is updated to allow public recording of business, the Council and all its committees, sub-committees or any other sub-group of the Council or the Executive will have the ability to formally suspend Standing Order 21.4 (prohibition of recording of business) for the duration of that meeting to enable the recording of business, including any audio / visual or photographic recording in any format or use of social media to bring Council issues to a wider audience. To minimise disturbance to others attending the meeting, all attendees and visitors are asked to make sure that their phones and other mobile devices are set on silent / vibrate mode during meetings.

Banners, Placards and similar items

No member of the public shall be allowed to bring into or display at any Council meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. The Chairman may require any such item to be removed.

Disturbance by Public

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared.

Smoking

Since 1 July 2008, the Council has operated a new Smoke Free Policy. Visitors are not allowed to smoke at any time within the Council offices, or in the car park or other grounds forming part of those offices.

Food and Drink

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts at the front of the building. Visitors are not allowed to bring food or drink into the meeting room.

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on
Thursday, 3 March 2011 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillor Cicely Murfitt – Chairman
Councillor John F Williams – Vice-Chairman

Councillors:	Richard Barrett	Trisha Bear
	Roger Hall	Sally Hatton
	Liz Heazell	Janet Lockwood
	Mervyn Loynes	Raymond Matthews
	David McCraith	

Officers:	Myles Bebbington	Licensing Officer
	Gary Duthie	Senior Lawyer
	Maggie Jennings	Democratic Services Officer

Councillor Sue Ellington was also in attendance.

13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Val Barrett, Nigel Cathcart and Charlie Nightingale.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

15. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chairman was authorised to sign minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2010 as a correct record.

16. SEX ESTABLISHMENT LICENSING POLICY

The Licensing Officer informed the committee that Faith Groups had been removed from the list of consultees prior to commencement of the consultation process and that no representations had been received in respect of the draft policy.

As a result of the ensuing discussion, the Licensing Committee **AGREED** the following amendments to the policy:

- Para 15 to include the words *as defined by s17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998* **after** *Premises that are not sexual entertainment venues*
- Para 58 – replace *the Licensing Officer and Cambridgeshire Constabulary* **with** *South Cambridgeshire District Council's appointed officers.*

The Licensing Committee **RECOMMENDS** to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, the approval of the Licensing Policy as the recognised policy of South Cambridgeshire District Council in relation to Sex Establishments and Sex Entertainment Venues within the district, subject to the amendments stated above.

17. STREET TRADING POLICY

Prior to consideration of the item, the Licensing Officer informed the Licensing Committee that he recommended that the Environmental Health Enforcement Policy, attached as Appendix C to the policy be removed as it was currently under review. This would be replaced by a new heading (para 14) at the end of the current policy entitled 'Enforcement' and the insertion of the following paragraphs:

- 14.1 Prior to pursuing enforcement action the Licensing Department will have regard to the relevant Council Enforcement Policy in place and consult with any partners as deemed appropriate.
- 14.2 In pursuing the objectives in para 1.1, the Authority will operate a proportionate and reasonable enforcement regime.
- 14.3 The responsibility for the overall supervision of Street Trading Consent licensing lies with South Cambridgeshire District Council's appointed officers.

The Licensing Committee unanimously **AGREED** to the officer's recommendation.

As a result of additional discussion at the meeting, the Licensing Committee **AGREED** the following amendments to the policy:

- Para 5, 3rd bullet point, include *country or farmers markets*
- Para 9.8 – in the final sentence, remove the words *or for any other reason* and replace with a full stop after *offence* and a new sentence added to read *There may be other reasons for refusal*

The Licensing Committee **RECOMMENDS** to the Environmental Services Portfolio Holder, the Street Trading Policy, subject to the changes agreed above, as the formal statement of licensing policy for Street Trading Consents within the district of South Cambridgeshire District Council

The Meeting ended at 10.50 a.m.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Licensing Committee held on
Thursday, 26 May 2011 at 3.46 p.m.

PRESENT:	Richard Barrett	Val Barrett
	Trisha Bear	Alison Elcox
	Jose Hales	Roger Hall
	Sally Hatton	Liz Hezell
	Janet Lockwood	Mervyn Loynes
	Raymond Matthews	David McCraith
	Cicely Murfitt	Charles Nightingale
Officers:	Holly Adams	Democratic Services Team Leader
	Jean Hunter	Chief Executive
	Fiona McMillan	Legal & Democratic Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alex Riley.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE 2011/12

Councillor Liz Hezell nominated Councillor Cicely Murfitt, seconded by Councillor Sally Hatton. Councillor Raymond Matthews nominated Councillor Roger Hall, seconded by Councillor Charlie Nightingale. A vote was held and, with 7 votes to 5, it was **RESOLVED** that Councillor Roger Hall be elected Licensing Committee Chairman 2011/12.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE LICENSING COMMITTEE 2011/12

Councillor Liz Hezell nominated Councillor Cicely Murfitt, seconded by Councillor Sally Hatton. Councillor Roger Hall nominated Councillor Raymond Matthews, seconded by Councillor Charlie Nightingale. A vote was held and, with 7 votes to 5, it was **RESOLVED** that Councillor Raymond Matthews be appointed Licensing Committee Vice-Chairman 2011/12.

The Meeting ended at 3.51 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Licensing Committee

7 November 2011

AUTHOR/S: Executive Director, Operational Services / Corporate Manager, Health & Environmental Services

DEPT FOR CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT (DCMS) CONSULTATION ON LICENSING ACT 2003, REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT**Purpose**

1. To consider and prepare a response to the DCMS proposals to remove regulated entertainment from Schedule 1 of the Licensing Act 2003 circulated to local Authorities on the 3 September 2011 and respond by no later than 3 December 2011.
2. This is not a key decision because any feedback will only have the effect of an expression of views rather than a direct impact on the Council's aims and objectives.

Recommendations

3. That the Licensing Committee agree and send a response on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council to the questions posed in the DCMS consultation attached as **Appendix A**.

Reasons for Recommendations

4. The consultation expressly seeks views on its proposals of a licensing activity currently carried out by powers delegated by full Council to the Licensing Committee.
5. The effect of the proposals will directly affect the current licensing regime with respect to regulated entertainment and may impact on residents and businesses within South Cambridgeshire District.

Background

6. The Licensing Act 2003 came into force in November 2005 bringing together under one piece of legislation the sale/supply of alcohol and the provision for defined entertainments referred to as "regulated Entertainment".
7. Regulated entertainment is clearly defined in the act as the following activities:
 - (a) A performance of a play
 - (b) An exhibition of a film
 - (c) An indoor sporting event
 - (d) A boxing or wrestling entertainment
 - (e) A performance of live music
 - (f) Any playing of recorded music
 - (g) A performance of dance
 - (h) Entertainment of a similar nature to that above
 - (i) The provision of entertainment facilities for making music
 - (j) The provision of entertainment facilities for the provision of dancing
 - (k) The provision of facilities of a similar nature to that above.

These activities must take place in the presence of an audience and should be provided at least partly to entertain that audience. There are further exceptions for activities that are incidental. Educational, activities of worship, rehearsals or for the purpose of demonstrating a product.

8. When considering any response, the current status of licenses within South Cambridgeshire should be considered, these are as follows:
- (a) Total number of licensed with alcohol & entertainment provision = 314
 - (b) Total Number of premises with ONLY entertainment provisions = 102
 - (c) Total number of premises with alcohol provision only = 88
 - (d) Total Number of Temporary Event Notices issued for entertainment only (Jan 2010 to Dec 2011) = 37
9. The Officer's interpretation of the consultation document is that the proposals would directly affect premises that have no provision for the sale or supply of alcohol. This would therefore primarily affect village halls and community centres. It is, however, unclear from the consultation document whether this would affect premises that sell or supply alcohol by default or whether they would be permitted to apply to have entertainment restrictions removed.
10. The view from Government in the consultation document is that: *"despite a radical approach to alcohol licensing, the 2003 Act failed to match its ambition. The regime for regulated entertainment missed a real opportunity to enable entertainment activities and either simply aped old licensing regimes or instead took a new overcautious line".* Government sees this consultation as *"A golden opportunity to deregulate. Reduce bureaucratic burdens, cut costs, give the big society a boost and give free speech a helping hand."*
11. The proposals are to remove the need for a licence from as many types of entertainment as possible by examining the need for a licensing regime for each of the activities referred to in para.7 above, where there is no such need it is proposed to remove the licensing requirement.
12. In preparing this consultation, Government has stated the following parameters:
- Events with audiences of more than 5000 (Five Thousand) will still be subject to regulation
 - An intention to keep Boxing and Wrestling within the scope of licensing
 - To keep a licensing requirement for performances of dance that may be classed as sexual entertainment.

Considerations

13. In preparing a response, the Licensing Committee may choose to respond to all or parts of the consultation as it sees fit and consider the potential effects of the proposals in whole or part on the residents, businesses of South Cambridgeshire and the cost implications in respect of staffing, enforcement and administration of the proposed changes by South Cambridgeshire District Council.

Options

14. The Licensing Committee may choose to respond in whole or part of the consultation as it sees appropriate.

Implications

- 15. There are no immediate implications arising from response to this consultation, however, any amendments to existing legislation will affect residents and businesses within South Cambridgeshire in differing ways and may impact on existing staffing resources within South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- 16. The removal of entertainment from the existing licensing regime may have a significant impact on the ability to deal with issues, particularly noise related, within an acceptable period of time due to the constraints of other pieces of legislation and create an increased burden on existing Environmental Health Officers involved in such complaints.

17. Financial	It is estimated that there would be a reduction of income to the Council of approximately £5,000 or 5% of licensing income per annum should the proposed changes be introduced
Legal	Proposed changes would result in an increase to the legal costs due to the differing legal processes that would be required to deal with issues arising, particularly in respect of noise and nuisance issues. In broad terms, matters would be dealt with through the Courts process rather than the Council Sub Committee process
Staffing	The proposed changes will have a likely impact on the existing resources in respect of Environmental Health Officers. There will not be an equal reduction in resources to Licensing staff as premises with alcohol will still be subject to regulation
Risk Management	None identified at present
Equality and Diversity	N/A
Equality Impact Assessment completed	No Consultation document only
Climate Change	N/A

Consultations

- 18. None, this is a consultation by Central Government.

Consultation with Children and Young People

- 19. As this is a Government consultation they will determine whom they wish to consult with.

Effect on Strategic Aims

- 20. When considering its response, the Licensing Committee will take into consideration the overall effect of any proposals on the Council's strategic aims and objectives.

Conclusions / Summary

- 21. This consultation represents the biggest change to the licensing controls exerted over entertainment facilities in public places since 1982. The Government's stated intention is to deregulate such activities unless it can be shown that there is a good and valid reason to keep such legislation either in full or part.

22. The deregulation of entertainment as proposed would impact on the way in which officers of South Cambridgeshire District Council deal with nuisance issues relating to public premises that hold entertainment events and in many cases this would be reactive rather than proactive which due to the structure of current legislation would require more investigative work before enforcement can take place.
23. This document provides the primary way in which South Cambridgeshire District Council can express its views in relation to the questions asked and will form part of a national response from all sections of society that are involved in providing or regulating entertainment activities at present. It is important, therefore, that a balanced and considered response is submitted that reflects the views of the Council.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Licensing Act 2003

Guidance issued under S.182 of the Licensing Act 2003

DCMS consultation document on “regulated Entertainment” – September 2011

Contact Officer: Myles Bebbington – Licensing officer
Telephone: (01954) 713132

Deregulation of Schedule 1 – Officer guidance for discussion

Q1: Do you agree that the proposals outlined in this consultation will lead to more performances, and would benefit community and voluntary organisations? If yes, please can you estimate the amount of extra events that you or your organisation or that you think others would put on?

The majority of premises within South Cambridgeshire already hold licence. There are currently 89 community-based premises with entertainment provision out of a maximum of approximately 102. The current regime allows for premises to have a degree of flexibility by use of TENS whilst allowing the regulatory body (The Licensing Authority) to consider the expectations, particularly of nearby residents, in the promotion of the licensing objectives. It is not expected that the removal of Schedule 1 would increase the number of performances in South Cambridgeshire.

Q.2 If you are replying as an individual, do you think this proposal would help you participate in, or attend, extra community or voluntary performance?

N/A

Q3: Do you agree with our estimates of savings to businesses, charitable and voluntary organisations as outlined in the impact assessment? If you do not, please outline the areas of difference and any figures that you think need to be taken into account (see paragraph 57 of the Impact Assessment).

It is difficult to agree with any such assessment especially when there are so many assumptions throughout the impact assessment. The cost saving is not a realistic reflection as it is primarily a time saving to the applicant. Therefore, it would be better to consider how the forms themselves can be simplified to remove this burden as much as possible.

Q4: Do you agree with our estimates of potential savings and costs to local authorities, police and others as outlined in the impact assessment? If you do not, please outline the areas of difference and any figures you think need to be taken into account.

No. The current system allows for Local Authorities to be aware of events that are happening within the area, i.e if a TEN is served and there is an associated risk of noise nuisance, the EHO/Licensing Officer work pattern can be amended to be available for monitoring or enforcement at no extra direct cost to the Local Authority. The removal of an entertainment licence will result in a reactive response to problems which is more costly to the Local Authority by way of an “out of hours service” which typically involves extra payments for officers to attend.

Q5: Would you expect any change in the number of noise complaints as a result of these proposals? If you do, please provide a rationale and evidence, taking into account the continuation of licensing authority controls on alcohol licensed premises and for late night refreshment

The current system permits conditions to be attached to reflect the issues raised, particularly in respect of times and frequency. This gives both the licence holders and nearby residents/businesses a clear understanding of what is permitted. The SCDC area is one of a largely rural nature with no clear urban centre and therefore the activities of local village based pubs and community centres are vital. Noise related issues can and often do cause as much disturbance as that of a pub. Whilst it is generally accepted that alcohol can contribute to anti social behaviour, it should be recognised that it is not the sole cause. A Village hall

event with 200 sober people is likely to disturb residents just as much as 30 people leaving the local pub slightly worse for wear.

A potential loophole that is not addressed in these proposals is the scenario where premises without a licence for alcohol allow 'a bring your own event', therefore going round the provisions and controls of an alcohol licence, or, technically close the pub and use the TEN system so that any disturbance caused effectively bypasses the Licensing review framework.

Q6: The Impact Assessment for these proposals makes a number of assumptions around the number of extra events, and likely attendance that would arise, if the deregulation proposals are implemented. If you disagree with the assumptions, as per paragraphs 79 and 80 of the Impact Assessment, please provide estimates of what you think the correct ranges should be and explain how those figures have been estimated.

It is difficult to give estimates, given the number of premises within our district and the very limited requests or complaints from either premise licence holders or the public regarding the current restrictions either via licences or the TENS system. We can only assume that there would be no significant increase in activities should the proposals be introduced. The effect would be on the lack of boundaries that event organisers would be required to adhere to and the subsequent complaints that would follow.

Q7: Can you provide any additional evidence to inform the Impact Assessment, in particular in respect of the impacts that have not been monetised?

Little or no consideration has been given to the fact that prevention is better than cure. The knock-on effect, particularly for smaller district councils of reactive out of hours noise complaints could be significant. A number of premises have been brought into line by the Licensing Act in a manner that allows the business to operate successfully, whilst setting boundaries that residents are satisfied with. This applies equally to alcohol and non-alcohol related premises. To remove those boundaries will in our view significantly increase the workload on other areas of enforcement within the Council whilst at the same time eroding the confidence of the public who have come to terms with a system that if applied reasonably and with common sense works.

Q8: Are there any impacts that have not been identified in the Impact Assessment?

Public trust. The public have, since the introduction of the Licensing Act, had a clear and transparent route in which to express their views and concerns as well as a clear way in which to address complaints. Many Local Authorities outside of the cities have community premises that have entertainment only licences and these can cause as many problems as alcohol licensed premises. Therefore the removal of this schedule would undermine the trust of those members of the public and take away the transparent and clear methods in which to raise issues.

Q9: Would any of the different options explored in this consultation have noticeable implications for costs, burdens and savings set out in the impact assessment? If so, please give figures and details of evidence behind your assumptions.

Q10: Do you agree that premises that continue to hold a licence after the reforms would be able to host entertainment activities that were formerly regulated without the need to go through a Minor or Full Variation process?

No. Premises that hold alcohol licences should apply for the entertainment activities to be removed and by doing so give people the opportunity to make representations either for or against. Whilst the majority of premises work successfully within conditions attached to their licence, they often have little regard for neighbours. This can be demonstrated when TENS are used by premises to avoid restrictions on their licence.

Q11: Do you agree that events for under 5,000 people should be deregulated across all of the activities listed in Schedule One of the Licensing Act 2003?

NO. In a rural area there are very few events that attract 5,000 people but an event for 250 people in a village of 150 is a significant event Therefore we would urge Government to reconsider this level. It is understood that certain quarters feel that 250 is an acceptable number, but in reality this would be of very little help to small rural areas.

Q12: If you believe there should be a different limit – either under or over 5,000, what do you think the limit should be? Please explain why you feel a different limit should apply and what evidence supports your view.

The question is inferring that we should propose a numerical limit whereas in reality our view is that no arbitrary limit should be imposed.

Q13: Do you think there should be different audience limits for different activities listed in Schedule One? If so, please could you outline why you think this is the case. Please could you also suggest the limits you feel should apply to the specific activity in question.

If an activity is licensable then no minimum number should be imposed before it becomes a licensable activity.

Q14: Do you believe that premises that would no longer have a licence, due to the entertainment deregulation, would pose a significant risk to any of the four original licensing objectives? If so please provide details of the scenario in question.

Yes. The main area will be that of public nuisance and in particular noise related complaints either from events involving entertainment, music in particular, or people leaving or being outside premises late at night

The use of conditions on licences to promote the licensing objectives, particularly that of noise related nuisance, currently allow for swift action to be taken in cases of a breach whereas the environmental health based measures referred to in the consultation document often rely on a continuous exposure that has to be measured over a period of time and therefore attracts a cost in terms of officer time and use of expensive noise monitoring equipment. Only where there is substantial disturbance would environmental health legislation be effective, however the powers in the Licensing Act allow for an alternative approach as “nuisance “ is not defined and low-level nuisance can be considered.

Q15: Do you think that outdoor events should be treated differently to those held indoors with regard to audience sizes? If so, please could you explain why, and what would this mean in practice.

Safety issues arising from outdoor events are often different than those within a confined space. For example, it is far easier to evacuate people from a field or large marquee if a safety risk arises rather than trying to get a number of people out from confined premises such as pubs and Village Halls. If the consultation is considering safety, based upon audience size then there is an argument to say that outdoor and indoor events could have

differing parameters. However a small pub with a capacity of 50 is indoors, just as the NEC with a capacity in excess of 10,000 is. It would be foolish to consider them in a similar manner by just saying "indoor events"

Q16: Do you think that events held after a certain time should not be deregulated? If so, please could you explain what time you think would be an appropriate cut-off point, and why this should apply.

There should be no cut off point for entertainments. Each premise and activity should be judged on its individual merits. With decisions taken at a local level considering the local situation. A recent play taking place in an open area created a number of complaints due to amplification of the voices and incidental music, primarily because the event went over 3hours for 4 consecutive evenings and finished by 22.00 whereas live music at the same venue for 2 hrs but finishing at Midnight has received no complaints in the past.

Q18: Are there alternative approaches to a licensing regime that could help tackle any potential risks around the timing of events?

If Government is determined to remove all current restrictions, then there should still be scope for local decisions to be made when the evidence supports the fact that disturbance is proving unacceptable after a given time. The consultation panel needs to be aware that a "district wide" policy would not work and such a policy should be flexible to account for localised variations. It may be worthwhile considering turning the emphasis around to the Licensing Authority who would have to demonstrate why a premise should not be permitted to operate after a given time.

Q19: Do you think that a code of practice would be a good way to mitigate potential risks from noise? If so, what do think such a code should contain and how should it operate?

No. A code of practice is only as good as the weakest operator. The Licensing Act has allowed authorities to identify the poor performing licences and impose conditions to protect the public at large. The question would also be as to who enforces the code of practice?

Q20: Do you agree that laws covering issues such as noise, public safety, fire safety and disorder, can deal with potential risks at deregulated entertainment events? If not, how can those risks be managed in the absence of a licensing regime?

No. The existing laws are often unwieldy and time consuming. To receive a complaint after an event makes it impossible for officers to take forward any meaningful enforcement due to the evidence being hearsay only, and the process for determining disturbance is subjective and can be affected by many natural factors i.e wind, distance, background noise etc, what upsets one person is acceptable to another. Whereas an event going on beyond a permitted time is clear and can be actioned upon to prevent further occurrences.

The various pieces of legislation mentioned within the document do not give a local authority the appropriate tools to deal with matters in a quick and efficient way. For this authority, it may mean a restructuring of the current environmental health resources to take account of the lack of control envisaged, but at present is controlled via the Licensing Act 2003.

Q21: How do you think the timing / duration of events might change as a result of these proposals? Please provide reasoning and evidence for any your view.

There is little doubt that in the short term, premises will extend the times that events terminate. However, given the number of licenses and flexibility of numerical limits within our district it is not expected that frequency of events will increase significantly. We currently have the following:

Total number of licensed with alcohol & entertainment provision = 314

Total Number of premises with ONLY entertainment provisions = 102

Total number of premises with alcohol provision only = 88

Total Number of Temporary Event Notices issued for entertainment only (Jan 2010 to Dec 2011) = 37

Q22: Are there any other aspects that need to be taken into account when considering the deregulation of Schedule One in respect of the four licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003?

The consultation document states that premises where alcohol is sold can still be held accountable and have conditions added if events are held!

We would raise the following questions:

- Why remove existing conditions that have been placed on the licence for good reason and only after representations, only to be put in the position of re-imposing them at a later date, therefore incurring an expense to the Licensing Authority and an increased workload for the Environmental Health dept to establish a nuisance.*
- If a premise with an alcohol licence has entertainment but “technically” closes the pub and applies for a TEN for sale of alcohol whilst the entertainment takes place, how will this affect the licence if complaints are made and upheld?*
- Given the current legal system, surely it will be argued by a competent Solicitor that entertainment is beyond the remit of a committee and that any disturbance from an event was not caused by alcohol but by a factor that the Licensing Committee has no legal remit to control? If so, how does Government propose to deregulate entertainment but still allow for a licence to be reviewed if entertainment is held that causes a nuisance?*
- Government should be aware of why and how current legislation has formed the entertainment aspect of the Licensing Act. The criminal element that effectively took over clubs and nightclubs in the late 1970`s and early 1980`s along with the total disregard for customer safety, i.e the stardust disaster in Ireland in 1981 resulting in 48 deaths. The following are examples where licensing standards are recognised to be significantly below that of the UK in recent years and have resulted in fatalities:*

Oct 30, 1999 - Fifty-five people were killed and over 70 injured in a fire at a karaoke bar in the South Korea.

Oct 20, 2000 - At least 20 people were killed after they were trapped in a fire at a trendy Mexico City dance club that had been shut by authorities 11 times previously.

Dec 25, 2000 - A Christmas Day fire killed 309 disco revellers and construction workers at a dance hall in a commercial centre in the Chinese city of Luoyang.

Jan 1, 2001 - Thirteen people were killed and 180 injured in a fire in a cafe packed with teenagers celebrating the New Year in Volendam, Netherlands.

July 20, 2002 - A fire started by a juggler with blazing batons ripped through the Utopia disco in the Peruvian capital Lima killing 14 people.

Dec 1, 2002 - Fifty people were killed, mostly by smoke, when fire swept through the Goajira bar and club in Venezuelan capital Caracas.

Feb 17, 2003 - Twenty-one people killed in a stampede in an unlicensed nightclub in Chicago when they tried to escape pepper spray used to break up a fight and were crushed behind blocked doors.

Feb 20, 2003 - Fire swept through a nightclub in West Warwick, Rhode Island, during a pyrotechnics display at the start of a heavy metal concert, killing 96 people and injuring nearly 200.

Dec 30, 2004 - A blaze in a nightclub in Buenos Aires killed 192 people and injured nearly 1,000. Cause of the fire is thought to have been a hand held flare or firework sold for New Year's celebrations fired into the club's ceiling, which was covered with foam.

May 8, 2006 - Fire sweeps through a nightclub in the Thai resort of Pattaya killing at least eight and injuring 54 others.

Nov 27, 2006 - Nine people were killed in a pre-dawn fire that swept through a nightclub in the Dominican Republic capital Santo Domingo.

Nov 14, 2007 - A fire sweeps through a Chinese karaoke bar killing 11 people. The fire broke out at a bar in Chengde county in Hebei province, 230 km (140 miles) northeast of Beijing.

April 19, 2008 - At least 15 people died and 35 were injured when a fire ignited by fireworks swept through a crowded Quito nightclub in Ecuador.

Jan 1, 2009 - A blaze at a top Bangkok nightclub killed 61 people, including four foreigners. More than 100 people were injured as they stampeded out of the burning building.

Dec 4, 2009 - A blaze sparked by an indoor firework show rips through a crowded Russian nightclub, killing at least 102 and injuring 134 as revellers stampeded for the exits.

None of these premises to our knowledge have a capacity of over 5000 and therefore would be exempt from licensing should the proposals be introduced. This list indicates that without rules and controls acting in a proactive manner the reality is that we will be dealing with the aftermath and potentially with fatalities.

Q23: Are there any public protection issues specific to the deregulation of the performance of live music that are not covered in chapter 3 of this consultation? If so, how could they be addressed in a proportionate and targeted way?

Live music remains one of the main points of contention in the Licensing Act 2003. It is this Council's view that this should not be deregulated in any manner. The main issues surrounding live music are that of nuisance and the right for nearby residents to peacefully enjoy their property. The panel needs to be clearly aware that outside of the "hot spot" cities and towns, there are thousands of pubs that are cheek by jowl with neighbours and often back gardens are adjacent and pubs can be joined by party wall; all of which can give rise to an uneasy relationship. The current restrictions within the Act largely create a set of rules that everyone understands and can work to, but at the same time allows for both parties to ask for changes within a trusted and recognized set of procedures.

Q24: Do you think that unamplified music should be fully deregulated with no limits on numbers and time of day/night? If not, please explain why and any evidence of harm.

Unamplified music can be as loud as amplified and therefore any controls should remain. A brass band may be as noisy as a small, amplified band. The current exemptions for "incidental" could be widened and therefore give better clarity to existing legislation.

Q25: Any there any other benefits or problems associated specifically with the proposal to deregulate live music?

The consultation panel need to be aware that in many cases the deregulation of recorded and live music in particular will undermine a great deal of work that has been done at a local level involving licensing Authorities, the public and the trade. The effect on those residents affected by inconsiderate activities will be disproportionate to the perceived benefit of the

individual premises causing the disturbance. When a disturbance is caused, the speed and effectiveness by which the matter is resolved is how we as a council are judged. The Licensing Act gives us a tool to act quickly, proportionately and transparently. Without this, the perception by residents will be that we are largely powerless to act without drawn out investigation and monitoring, whilst the problem, often a low-level drip feed nuisance that may not meet the exceptionally high threshold test of other legislation, persists.

Q26: Are there any public protection issues specific to the deregulation of the performance of plays that are not covered in chapter 3 of this consultation? If so, how could they be addressed in a proportionate and targeted way?

This authority has received very few complaints regarding theatrical performances over the years and would consider amendments, provided that such activities were unamplified or were still subject to a form of notification to the Licensing Authority who could consider the relevance of conditions subject to the merits of the notice.

Q27: Are there any health and safety considerations that are unique to outdoor or site specific theatre that are different to indoor theatre that need to be taken into account?

Whilst no health & safety issues have occurred in recent years, the additional risk of often setting up temporary structures outside should not be ignored. Fixed premises will automatically be on the radar of bodies such as Fire, Health & Safety executive etc, how will responsible authorities be made aware of temporary structures and events?

Q28: Licensing authorities often include conditions regarding pyrotechnics and similar HAZMAT handling conditions in their licences. Can this type of restriction only be handled through the licensing regime?

Q28: The key is not whether pyrotechnics, hazardous materials, etc. at plays can only be handled through the licensing regime. The value of the licensing regime is in a "belt and braces" approach: there is a lower probability of failure if these issues are handled both through the licensing regime and through legislation such as the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health Regulations 2002, the Control of Explosives Regulations 1991, or the Manufacture and Storage of Explosives Regulations 2005, as appropriate.

Producers and organisers of plays need to be aware of their obligations towards public safety and the Licensing regulations are an effective tool to ensure this happens.

Q29: Any other benefits or problems associated specifically with the proposal to deregulate theatre?

To remove or amend the definitions of theatres from Schedule 1 would be worthy of further investigation given the general low risk nature of such events against the licensing objectives.

Q30: Are there any public protection issues specific to the deregulation of the performance of dance that are not covered in chapter 3 of this consultation? If so, how could they be addressed in a proportionate and targeted way?

The performance of dance is a matter that has caused confusion for many years. This authority would appreciate a clear indication on such determinations. It is our view that the

music activity is the main area where controls should be kept, not whether an area is cleared to allow people to dance to the music.

Q31: Any there any other benefits or problems associated the proposal to deregulate the performance of dance?

None identified

Q32: Do you agree with the Government's position that it should only remove film exhibition from the list of regulated activities if an appropriate age classification system remains in place?

Yes, the BBFC system is well understood and respected. However, a regulatory check system within the Licensing Act should remain to enforce breaches of the system.

Q33: Do you have any views on how a classification system might work in the absence of a mandatory licence condition?

Premises should be permitted to sign up to the BBFC system either as part of the application or voluntarily at a later date. However, it should remain a part of the licensing enforcement function to enforce breaches of any new system or where films are shown without agreement to adhere to the system or where films are shown without the appropriate classifications.

Q34: If the Government were unable to create the situation outlined in the proposal and above (for example, due to the availability of Parliamentary time) are there any changes to the definition of film that could be helpful to remove unintended consequences, as outlined earlier in this document - such as showing children's DVDs to pre-school nurseries, or to ensure more parity with live broadcasts?

The Act, Guidance and Statutory Instruments are clear that films shown for educational purposes are exempt. However, the definition of education could be widened to permit over cautious authorities imposing nonsensical conditions on premises such as schools etc.

Q35: Are there any other issues that should be considered in relation to deregulating the exhibition of film from licensing requirements?

None identified

Q36: Are there any public protection issues specific to the deregulation of the indoor sport that are not covered in chapter 3 of this consultation? If yes, please outline the specific nature of the sport and the risk involved and the extent to which other interventions can address those risks.

Indoor sport has raised no previous issues within our district. However by its very wording it has caused confusion to many despite Government guidance. This authority would support measures that either amended the definition, so that the weekly pool or darts leagues weren't treated differently by differing licensing authorities or the clarification on what constituted an audience and an indoor event.

Q37: Are there any other issues that should be considered in relation to deregulating the indoor sport from licensing requirements?

Q38: Do you agree with our proposal that boxing and wrestling should continue to be regarded as “regulated entertainment”, requiring a licence from a local licensing authority, as now?

Yes. The increase in Boxing and Wrestling type activities has increased since the commencement of the Licensing Act. Cage wrestling for example has increased, however given the nature of the events and the numbers that watch such events, the panel needs to be aware that outside of the televised -type event, these are often covered by TENS and therefore have very little control by the Licensing Authority

Q39: Do you think there is a case for deregulating boxing matches or wrestling entertainments that are governed by a recognised sport governing body? If so please list the instances that you suggest should be considered.

No.

Q40. Do you think that licensing requirements should be specifically extended to ensure that it covers public performance or exhibition of any other events of a similar nature, such as martial arts and cage fighting? If so, please outline the risks that are associated with these events, and explain why these cannot be dealt with via other interventions

The legislation should be amended to cover all aspects of Boxing and Wrestling in any form. Most “Cage fight” type events in our area operate under TENS to ensure that they do not fall foul of any legislation. Whilst not a common activity, there is a clear view that this type of event is gaining in popularity and the recent case in the North West where two 8 year olds were fighting, should give rise to serious concern.

Q41: Do you think that, using the protections outlined in Chapter 3, recorded music should be deregulated for audiences of fewer than 5,000 people? If not, please state reasons and evidence of harm.

Q41: There are considerable risks in deregulating performances of recorded music to audiences of fewer than 5000 people. Performances of recorded music of excessive volume, to audiences of, say, a couple of hundred people, cause great distress and anger in our communities, as evidenced by the fact that, in our experience, they are the single most frequent cause of telephone complaints to councillors and to the Environmental Health emergency line. How are we to explain to angry residents that Whitehall-imposed deregulation has denied their elected local authority the power, for example, to insist on volume limiters as a licence condition?

No. The disturbance from events including recorded music i.e a “disco” type event can be as disturbing to residents as a live music event. We frequently receive complaints about all types of licensed premises holding such events, The concept that Village halls or community centres are likely to be better controlled is an assumption that we would challenge. Many halls are hired out to persons unknown and very few, if any, checks are made during the events by the licence holders. The process of the Licensing Act in allowing interested parties to raise concerns before permissions are granted, allows for appropriate and necessary conditions to be attached to a licence that will in most cases give a degree of assurance to residents whilst allowing the licensed premises to flourish.

Q42: If you feel that a different audience limit should apply, please state the limit that you think suitable and the reasons why this limit is the right one.

It is the view of this authority that no numerical limit should apply, all events should be licensed.

Q43: Are there circumstances where you think recorded music should continue to require a licence? If so, please could you give specific details and the harm that could be caused by removing the requirement?

Recorded music remains one of the main points of contention in the Licensing Act 2003. It is this Council's view that this should not be deregulated in any manner, The main issues surrounding recorded music are that of nuisance and the right for nearby residents to peacefully enjoy their property. The panel needs to be clearly aware that outside of the "hot spot" cities and towns there are thousands of pubs and community premises that are cheek by jowl with neighbours and often back gardens are adjacent and pubs can be joined by party walls, all of which can give rise to an uneasy relationship. The current restrictions within the Act largely create a set of rules that everyone understands and can work to, but at the same time allows for both parties to ask for changes within a trusted and recognized set of procedures.

Q44: Any there any other benefits or problems associated specifically with the proposal to deregulate recorded music?

*Q45: Are there any specific instances where Entertainment Facilities need to be regulated by the Licensing Act, as in the current licensing regime? If so, please provide details.
None identified, this authority has no incidents recorded against this activity*

Q46: Are there any definitions within Schedule One to the Act that are particularly difficult to interpret, or that are otherwise unclear, that you would like to see changed or clarified?

The interpretations and areas of confusion are largely laid out in the consultation document at Para 1.5. This authority would prefer the existing restrictions to remain but would support any moves to amend legislation to remove the ambiguities outlined. However, it is unclear to this authority exactly why some of the activities mentioned have been raised as the Act is clear on many of the areas raised. It would be far better to ensure that those people who are charged with regulating the activities are fit and proper to do so. A recognized qualification for a licensing practitioner should be mandatory as a way to ensure national consistency which in turn will reduce the bureaucratic burden on business.

Q47: Paragraph 1.5 outlines some of the representations that DCMS has received over problems with the regulated entertainment aspects of the Licensing Act 2003. Are you aware of any other issues that we need to take into account?

None identified.

Q48: Do you agree with our proposal that deregulation of dance should not extend to sex entertainment? Please provide details.

Yes.