

LICENSING COMMITTEE AGENDA



Wednesday, 12 October 2011

at 2.00 pm

in Committee Room B, Civic Centre, Hartlepool

MEMBERS: LICENSING COMMITTEE:

Councillors Barclay, Brash, Fleet, Fleming, Griffin, Hall, Jackson, Lawton, A Lilley, G Lilley, Morris, Shields, Sutheran, Tempest and Wells.

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS**
3. **MINUTES**
 - 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2011
4. **ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION**
 - 4.1 Review of a Street Trading Consent – Mainsforth Terrace, Hartlepool – *Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning*
 - 4.2 Amendments to the Licensing Act 2003 – *Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning*
 - 4.3 Deregulation of Regulated Entertainment – *Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning*
5. **ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS ARE URGENT**

LICENSING COMMITTEE

MINUTES AND DECISION RECORD

20th July 2011

The meeting commenced at 2.00 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

Present:

Councillor George Morris (In the Chair)

Councillors Allan Barclay, Mary Fleet, Sheila Griffin, Gerard Hall,
Peter Jackson, Trisha Lawton, Alison Lilley, Geoff Lilley,
Linda Shields, Sylvia Tempest and Ray Wells

Officers: Sylvia Pinkney, Public Protection Manager
Tony Macnab, Solicitor
Denise Wimpenny, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Jo Stubbs, Democratic Services Officer

Also present

John Garthwaite, 23 Taxis
Rob Patterson, Streamline Taxis

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were submitted by Councillor Lilian Sutheran.

2. Declarations of interest by members

Councillor Fleet declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 4.2.

3. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 13th April 2011

Confirmed

4. Licensing Committee Sub Committee Memberships (Assistant Chief Executive)

Purpose of report

To re-appoint and fill vacancies in the Licensing Act Sub Committees and Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Sub Committees.

Issue(s) for consideration by the Committee

Members were advised of the proposed make-up of Licensing Act Sub Committees as follows:-

- 1 – Councillors Morris (Chair), Barclay and Fleming
- 2 – Councillors Lawton (Chair), Tempest and Wells
- 3 – Councillors Brash (Chair) G Lilley and Shields
- 4 – Councillors Hall (Chair), Fleet and Sutheran
- 5 – Councillors Griffin (Chair), Jackson and A Lilley

Members were also advised of proposals for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Sub Committee members as follows:-

- 1 – Councillors Morris (Chair) Fleet, Hall, Jackson and Sutheran
- 2 – Councillors Lawton (Chair), Fleming, A Lilley, Shields and Tempest
- 3 – Councillors Brash (Chair), Barclay, Griffin, G Lilley and Wells

Decision

That the Sub Committee memberships be approved.

5. Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing *(Assistant Director, Community Safety and Protection)*

Purpose of report

To inform Members of a significant decline in applications for private hire and hackney carriage drivers licences, to update Members on the current legal position regarding Criminal Records Bureau disclosures and to seek Members approval for an amendment to the hackney carriage and private hire licensing policy.

Issue(s) for consideration by the CommitteeDriving Standards Agency Taxi Test

On 19th January 2011 Members approved an amendment to the hackney carriage and private hire licensing policy requiring all new driver applicants from 1st April 2011 to pass the Driving Standards Agency (DSA) Taxi Test. This test was already a requirement in other Tees Valley licensing areas and across the country. Consultation had been carried out with the taxi trade and of the 54 responses received 33 had been in favour of the test while 18 were against. The cost of the test was £79.

Since the introduction of the DSA test in April there had been only 1 new application received, compared to 38 the previous year. It was noted however that this decline had also coincided with the withdrawal of grant funding aimed at getting the unemployed back into work. Neighbouring authorities also requiring the DSA test had reported no significant reduction in applications being made to them. However local taxi operators felt that the introduction of the DSA test, and cost attached to it, would have a detrimental impact on the

number of new drivers and this would impact on their ability to operate their companies in future. Mr Garthwaite and Mr Patterson, from 23 taxis and Streamline respectively, attended the meeting and addressed the committee. They acknowledged that Councillors wished to improve the quality of the town's taxi service but felt that the DSA test was another in a long line of expensive requirements and the additional cost would deter people from trying to get a licence. In order to pass the test some existing drivers would need to take lessons which would further add to the cost. However the Public Protection Manager clarified that only new drivers would be required to take the DSA test. If Hartlepool did not continue to require new drivers to sit this test they would be the 'odd one out' in the Tees Valley but the trade representatives countered this by highlighting that Hartlepool drivers were required to renew their vehicles every 6 years whereas other drivers in the Tees Valley area did not have to.

Members referred to a suggested alternative within the report whereby rather than remove the requirement to pass the DSA test completely new drivers be given a year's grace to complete the test. They felt that a year was too long particularly given the high turnover of taxi drivers. There was some discussion as to whether 6 months would be a fair compromise given the financial concerns which had been outlined however members felt an immediate investment of £79 was not unreasonable particularly as drivers would see an immediate return on this. They noted the concerns that new applicants would be dissuaded but felt that eventually a natural balance would be reached where the work was shared out more and existing drivers were able to make more money. Members voted in favour of retaining the immediate requirement for new applicants to pass the DSA test but asked that officers bring back a report on the impact of this decision in 6 months time.

Enhanced CRB Disclosures

On 13th April 2011 members had been advised that the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) had instructed local authorities that there was no longer a requirement for driver of hackney carriage and private hire vehicles to be given enhanced CRB checks. In the future drivers would only need the standard CRB check which did not include additional police information or reveal whether the applicant was barred from working with children or vulnerable adults. Members had reluctantly agreed to amend the existing licensing policy so as to comply with these new instructions but had asked officers to contact the CRB and express their outrage at this decision to deny them vital information about those they were being asked to licence. This issue had also been referred to other national bodies representing all local authority licensing bodies and Hartlepool had joined with other North East local authorities in engaging the services of a barrister to obtain a legal opinion on the matter. It was felt that given these feelings and other legal opinions gathered from across the country that change was inevitable. In light of this members were asked to approved a change to the licensing policy requiring applicants to provide the highest level of CRB disclosure legally available. This would allow any future changes in CRB advice to be actioned immediately rather than be delayed until the next meeting of the Licensing

Committee. Members were happy to approve this.

Decision

- I. That the Driving Standards Agency Taxi Test remain a requirement before any new licence is issued and that a report be brought back to the Committee in six months time giving details of the impact of this decision

- II. That an amendment to the taxi licensing policy requiring hackney carriage and private hire drivers and operators to produce the highest level of Criminal Records Bureau disclosure legally available be approved.

The meeting concluded at 2:40pm

CHAIR

Report of: Assistant Director, Regeneration & Planning

Subject: REVIEW OF A STREET TRADING CONSENT –
MAINSFORTH TERRACE, HARTLEPOOL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To review the street trading consent of a mobile food business currently trading as the 'Merry Chef' on Mainsforth Terrace, Hartlepool following objections by a local business.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 2nd March 2005 it was resolved that parts of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 be adopted to have the effect of requiring permissions to be obtained for street trading in Hartlepool.
- 2.2 Anyone wishing to trade from any street in Hartlepool, except a prohibited street, is required to obtain from the Council a street trading licence or a street trading consent by submitting a formal application to the Council.
- 2.3 Council's who have adopted the above provisions may choose to revoke or refuse a street trading consent and the holder has no right of appeal against the Council's decision.
- 2.4 For fixed site applications a number of Council departments and Cleveland Police are consulted to ensure that trading will not pose any risks to public safety or in any other way cause concern. Consultations do not extend to traders in the vicinity but permission will not be granted to any fixed site trader who proposes to sell goods of a similar nature in the vicinity of any other trader (including retail premises) in the area.
- 2.5 In June 2009 a street trading consent was granted to Miss Pauline Salmons to trade from a hot food van for 12 months on Parkview Road East (off Brenda Road).
- 2.6 This consent was subsequently renewed but in June 2011 the Council received a formal complaint from Holiways Ltd of Brenda Road alleging that Miss Salmons' business was causing an obstruction outside their premises.
- 2.7 Following an investigation by the Council's licensing team it became apparent that Miss Salmons had relocated her food van due to the imposition of parking restrictions at her original location.
- 2.8 As a result of the complaint, and her unauthorised trading from near the Holiways garage, Miss Salmons was required to cease trading until such time as a suitable alternative location could be identified.

- 2.9 In June 2011 a potential site on Parkview Road West was identified but a local trader raised concerns and, as such, a further alternative site was sought.
- 2.10 In July 2011 Miss Salmons applied to trade from a previously licensed location on Mainsforth Terrace – near to the Newburn Bridge Trading Estate entrance.
- 2.11 Following her relocation to this site in July a complaint was received from a local cafe proprietor - Mr Allan Booth of Big Berthas Café, Unit 3, Bertha Street, Hartlepool.
- 2.12 Mr Booth has stated that his business takings are down since Miss Salmons' arrival and that if the situation continued he may have to make some of his staff redundant. A copy of Mr Booth's letter is attached as **Appendix 1**.

3. ISSUES

- 3.1 A 'condition' attached to every street trading consent prohibits the holder of the consent trading within the 'vicinity' of any premises selling articles/goods of a similar nature.
- 3.2 When an application for street trading is received by the licensing team careful consideration is given regarding the above condition. Although there is no specific distance or definition of the term 'vicinity', the nature of the surrounding properties, businesses, buildings etc, in the location are taken into consideration before granting any consent.
- 3.3 Miss Salmons' current location on Mainsforth Terrace is an established street trading location which was used for hot food sales between 2005 and 2010 without any complaints being received. It is understood that Mr Booth opened his Big Berthas Café in April 2010.
- 3.4 Mr Booth's complaint states that Miss Salmons should not be allowed to trade near his business. A plan showing the locations of Mr Booth's Big Berthas Café and Miss Salmons' Merry Chef is attached as **Appendix 2**.
- 3.5 Mr Booth's complaint is the first complaint the Council have received in relation to the Mainsforth Terrace street trading site since controls were introduced by the Council some six years ago.
- 3.6 Should a decision be made to refuse or revoke Miss Salmons' street trading consent then the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 requires the Council to consider whether it is appropriate to refund the whole or part of the fee paid for the consent (£1150).
- 3.7 Miss Salmons has no statutory right of appeal against any decision to refuse or revoke a Street Trading Consent.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members consider the comments of Miss Salmons and Mr Booth, the facts detailed in the report and any other evidence presented and determine what action, if any, should be taken with regard to Miss Salmons' street trading consent.



Mr ALAN BOOTH
BIG BERTHAS CAFE
UNIT 3
BERTHA STREET
HARTLEPOOL



TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I AM WRITING TO EXPRESS MY CONCERN AND ANGER REGARDING THE ARRIVAL OF THE 'MERRY CHEF' MOBILE FOOD VAN BASED ON MAINSFORTH TERRACE, IT CAME TO MY ATTENTION THAT ON MONDAY 25th JULY THIS MOBILE FOOD VAN STARTED TRADING NEAR MY CAFE. IT IS NO COINCIDENCE THAT SINCE THEN MY TAKINGS HAVE BEEN DOWN £40-50 PER DAY. I FEEL THAT THIS BUSINESS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO TRADE NEAR AN ESTABLISHMENT THAT IS PAYING RATES, PARTICIPATING IN THE BID TV CAMERA ORGANISATION.

I AM A SMALL BUSINESS WHO HAS PART TIME EMPLOYEES AND IF THIS SITUATION CONTINUES I WILL BE FORCED TO LET STAFF GO WHICH WOULD BE CATASTROPHIC TO THEIR LIVES AND MINE. I HAVE BUILT THE BUSINESS UP OVER THE LAST YEAR, KEEPING PRICES DOWN SO THAT IT BENEFITS THE LOCAL COMMUNITY BUT I FEEL THAT SINCE THE ARRIVAL OF THE MOBILE FOOD VAN IT WILL FORCE ME TO RAISE MY PRICES AND LET STAFF GO.


I FEEL VERY DISAPPOINTED WITH THIS SITUATION AND I HOPE YOU CAN DO SOMETHING TO HELP ME BEFORE THE SITUATION GETS WORSE.

PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO CONTACT ME IF YOU WANT ANY FURTHER INFORMATION

KIND REGARDS



MR BOOTH



Report of: Assistant Director, Regeneration & Planning

Subject: AMENDMENTS TO THE LICENSING ACT 2003

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform Members of impending changes to the Licensing Act 2003 that will provide licensing authorities with new powers to regulate the supply of alcohol, the provision of regulated entertainment and the provision of late night refreshment in Hartlepool.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 15th September 2011 the Police Reform & Social Responsibility Act (PRSR) received Royal Assent.
- 2.2 The Act, once implemented, will provide for a number of amendments to the Licensing Act 2003 and will give local licensing authorities new powers to tackle alcohol related crime and disorder.
- 2.3 As no implementation date has been set for the PRSR the new powers contained in it are not yet available to local authorities. However, this report details these new powers and invites Members to consider how they may be used in Hartlepool when they become available which is expected to be between April and October 2012.
- 2.4 Licensing Authorities to be Responsible Authorities
- 2.5 The Licensing Act identifies a number of 'Responsible Authorities' that must be consulted as part of the licensing process. At present responsible authorities are: -
- Cleveland Police
 - Cleveland Fire Service
 - Environmental Health (Noise Pollution)
 - Environmental Health (Health & Safety)
 - Trading Standards
 - Safeguarding & Review Board (Child protection)
 - Planning
- 2.6 Responsible authorities can comment on the merits of a licence application and enter negotiations with an applicant in order to promote the Act's licensing objectives. Where appropriate, responsible authorities can also apply for a licence to be reviewed where a current licence is a cause for concern.

- 2.7 The Licensing Act 2003 did not however designate the licensing authority to be a responsible authority and therefore it was unable to comment on an application or call a licence in for review. The licensing authority's role was to act as an administrator and enforcer but it could not take action against a licence without the initial involvement of another responsible authority.
- 2.8 As a practical example of this, the licensing authority could prosecute a licence holder for breaching the terms of a licence but could not then call the licence in for review – this would have to be done by a responsible authority as the licensing authority had no power to do so.
- 2.9 The amendment of the Licensing Act to allow the licensing authority to act as a responsible authority will allow licensing officers to use the benefit of their knowledge and experience to liaise with licence holders to secure appropriate licence conditions and, where necessary, to instigate licence reviews.
- 2.10 As a result of this, it may be necessary to review current procedures where the licensing officer instigates a licence review or otherwise makes representations regarding a licence or licence application in order to ensure that impartiality and fairness remains transparent for all parties.

2.11 Removal of the 'Vicinity' Test

- 2.12 The Licensing Act 2003 allows for either responsible authorities or 'interested parties' to make representations concerning licensing applications or to apply for existing licences to be reviewed.
- 2.13 Interested parties are defined as individuals or businesses that are located in the vicinity of the licensed premises and which may be directly affected by the operation of the licence.
- 2.14 The new Act removes the requirement for an individual or business to be in the vicinity of the licensed premises and therefore extends the opportunity to make an objection, or to apply for a licence review, to any person or business – irrespective of where they may be located.
- 2.15 Representations must still relate to at least one of the Act's licensing objectives which are: -
- The prevention of crime and disorder
 - The prevention of public nuisance
 - Public safety
 - The protection of children from harm

2.16 Licensing Authority Actions to be ‘Appropriate’ rather than ‘Necessary’

2.17 The Licensing Act provides for licensing authorities to make licensing decisions that are *necessary*. It was felt that the word *necessary* created an unrealistic burden of proof on licensing authorities to justify their actions and, as such, it has been replaced by the word *appropriate*.

2.18 It is believed by licensing experts that this small change in semantics will provide licensing authorities with a greater degree of freedom when making licensing determinations.

2.19 Temporary Event Notices

2.20 Temporary Event Notices (TENs) are short term authorisations to carry out licensable activities where no premises licence is in place. TENs are regularly used by voluntary groups for church fetes and other one-off activities but are also occasionally used to extend the hours or activities of licensed premises.

2.21 At present, TENs are limited to a maximum of 96 hours per event and a total of 15 days per premises. Applications for TENs must be made at least ten working days prior to the event taking place and notification must be given to the Police who may object on crime and disorder grounds.

2.22 The PRSR will relax the above restrictions insofar as temporary events may be up to 168 hours per event and a single premises can be used for temporary events for up to 21 days per year.

2.23 The administrative process has also been amended with applicants now being required to provide advance notification to the Environmental Health Noise Team (in addition to the Police) and a small number of applications may be made only five days prior to the event taking place (instead of ten days).

2.24 A significant amendment relating to TENs is that where either the Police or Environmental Health lodge an objection to an event taking place the licensing authority will be able to impose conditions on the operation of the event – something that is not possible under the Licensing Act at present.

2.25 Early Morning Alcohol Restriction Orders

2.26 Members will be aware that a number of licences have previously been issued with a terminal hour of 0400 hours and that, as a result of ongoing crime and disorder, Cleveland Police and Council licensing officers had been working to have licensees voluntarily close earlier.

2.27 Whilst these efforts have brought about significant successes there are still some premises that continue to open until 0400 hours and those that voluntarily close earlier have retained 0400 on their licences and could return to that hour if they choose.

- 2.28 The PRSR contains provisions to allow licensing authorities to adopt a policy requiring the closure of all alcohol licensed premises by a designated time.
- 2.29 Early Morning Alcohol Restriction Orders can begin no earlier than midnight and end no later than 0600 hours and can apply to the whole or part of the town.
- 2.30 Prior to the making of an Early Morning Alcohol Restriction Order the licensing authority must advertise the proposal and hold a public hearing to consider any relevant representations that may have been submitted.
- 2.31 Once adopted orders can be revoked or varied by following the same procedure detailed in 2.30 above.
- 2.32 Suspension of Licence for Failure to Pay Annual Fee
- 2.33 Since its implementation in 2004 the Licensing Act has contained a requirement for the licensee to pay an annual fee to the licensing authority. Unfortunately the Act did not make a link between the payment of the fee and the continued use of the licence, as such, non payment of the fee did not affect the ability of the licensee to continue to use the licence to trade. This has resulted in a number of licensees failing to pay their annual fee and the Council would therefore be required to pursue the outstanding debt as a civil debt through the courts.
- 2.34 The PRSR Act amends the Licensing Act in order to allow licensing authorities to suspend licences where the annual fee has not been paid.
- 2.35 Power for Licensing Authorities to Set Fees
- 2.36 The Licensing Act 2003 requires licensing authorities to levy a statutory charge for the granting, variation and maintenance of premises licences. These fees are based on the rateable value of the premises but have not increased since the Act was introduced in 2004.
- 2.37 The PRSR amends the Licensing Act so as to allow licensing authorities to set fees based on the actual cost to the authority of administering, maintaining and enforcing the licensing system. Significantly this extends to the costs incurred by those council departments that act as responsible authorities such as Planning, Environmental Health and Trading Standards.
- 2.38 Licensing Policies
- The Licensing Act 2003 requires licensing authorities to publish a policy every three years that details how the authority will discharge its functions under the Act.
- 2.39 The PRSR Act amends this requirement so as to require a licensing policy to be published every five years instead of three.

2.40 Late Night Levy

- 2.41 The PRSR contains a provision for licensing authorities to charge an additional levy on alcohol licensed premises that operate between midnight and 0600 hours.
- 2.42 It will be for individual licensing authorities to determine whether a levy should be charged and, if so, the operating hours that it should apply. For example, Hartlepool could adopt a policy imposing a levy on any licensed premises that traded after midnight or after 0200 hours.
- 2.43 The exact cost of the levy will be determined by the Secretary of State and will be introduced by regulations but it is likely that discounts will be available where premises can demonstrate compliance with certain standards such as Best Bar None (a quality award scheme).
- 2.44 Income generated by the levy must be shared between the licensing authority (not more than 30%) and the Police (not less than 70%) and it is therefore possible, if not likely, that Cleveland Police will make representations to the Council requesting that the levy be introduced as soon as regulations allow.

3. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3.1 The Police Reform & Social Responsibility Act has received Royal Assent but has not yet been implemented as law and therefore the amendments to the Licensing Act as detailed above are not yet in force.
- 3.2 There are however a number of changes to the Licensing Act that may have a significant impact on the Council's administration of the Act and Members are invited, at this early stage, to consider their potential implications.
- 3.3 Specifically Members are reminded that the Night Time Economy in Hartlepool is, like many other business sectors, suffering significantly in the current economic climate with a number of premises either closing or reducing their operating hours.
- 3.4 As a number of the amendments to the Licensing Act will allow the Council to both levy increased charges and close some premises earlier Members may wish to consider how these new powers can best be used to ensure the licensed trade are held accountable for their operations whilst encouraging and promoting a vibrant and safe night time economy that provides enjoyment for many Hartlepool people.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the contents of this report.

Report of: Assistant Director, Regeneration & Planning

Subject: DEREGULATION OF REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform and seek Members views on the Government's proposals to deregulate Schedule 1 of the Licensing Act 2003 (the provision of regulated entertainment).

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Licensing Act 2003 brought together nine separate licensing related regimes covering the sale and supply of alcohol, late night refreshment, and "regulated entertainment". In doing so the Act modernised many out-dated laws that had been left behind by changes in technology and modern lifestyle.
- 2.2 The Government has now announced its intention to deregulate most of the entertainment defined in the Licensing Act and this will mean, in effect, that most entertainment currently subject to the licensing system will no longer be so.
- 2.3 Regulated entertainment is currently defined by Schedule 1 of the Licensing Act 2003 and is described as: -
- 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 description to that falling with paragraph (e), (f) or (g) above,
- and where the entertainment takes place in the presence of an audience and is provided for the purpose, or for purposes which include the purpose, of entertaining that audience.
- 2.4 The only entertainment listed above that is not subject to the proposed deregulation is boxing, wrestling, sexual entertainment and any other entertainment where the audience will be 5000 or greater.
- 2.5 The government is currently carrying out a consultation exercise and are asking for interested parties to respond to a number of questions concerning the potential impact and benefits of deregulation. The consultation document is attached as **Appendix 1**.

3. ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3.1 The Government is proposing to deregulate the provision of all entertainment currently regulated by the Licensing Act 2003 with the exception of entertainment offered to an audience greater than 5000 people and the provision of boxing, wrestling and sexual entertainment.
- 3.2 The current requirement for entertainment to be licensed allows responsible authorities, particularly the Police, Environmental Health Noise Team and the Health & Safety Team, to discuss with an entertainment provider the potential impact of their entertainment on the licensing objectives.
- 3.3 At present, conditions are regularly added to licences that require the licence holder to take necessary and proportionate steps to reduce the likelihood of nuisance for those who may live close to licensed premises. These may include a requirement to keep doors and windows closed to avoid noise breakout or to restrict live entertainment to a reasonable hour.
- 3.4 Similarly the Health and Safety Team will look to secure licence conditions that will protect both performers and audiences from potential harm.
- 3.5 The Government's proposals for deregulation would remove the requirement for entertainment providers to liaise with local authorities and the Police prior to events taking place and therefore the opportunity to discuss and implement measures to reduce the potential for nuisance or protect public safety would be lost.
- 3.6 Deregulation would remove both the opportunity for conditions to be added and the legal obligation for them to be complied with. Essentially the current proactive approach would be replaced by a reactive response whereby a nuisance or accident would have to happen before enforcement agencies could become involved.
- 3.7 In addition to the above, as the Government is proposing to deregulate entertainment provided to fewer than 5000 people it would become possible for large scale events (up to 4999 people) to be organised without the need for prior notification to agencies such as the Police, health authority or the Council.
- 3.8 Due to the potential impact of the proposed deregulation on the residents of Hartlepool, Members are asked to consider whether a response should be made to the Government's consultation and, if so, what position Members wish to take on the issue.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 That Members note the contents of this report and instruct officers to formally reply to the Government's consultation on the deregulation of entertainment.



department for
culture, media
and sport

Regulated Entertainment

A Consultation proposal to examine the deregulation of
Schedule One of the Licensing Act 2003

September 2011

improving
the quality
of life for all

Our aim is to improve the quality of life for all through cultural and sporting activities, support the pursuit of excellence, and champion the tourism, creative and leisure industries.

Contents

Foreword	4
Chapter 1: Regulated Entertainment - a proposal to deregulate.....	5
Chapter 2: The Current situation, and our detailed proposal	7
Chapter 3: The role of licensing controls	13
Chapter 4: Performance of Live Music	20
Chapter 5: Performance of plays.....	22
Chapter 6: Performance of dance	24
Chapter 7: Exhibition of film	25
Chapter 8: Indoor sport.....	27
Chapter 9: Boxing and Wrestling.....	29
Chapter 10: Recorded Music and Entertainment Facilities	30
Chapter 11: Clearing up unintended consequences: clear laws and clear guidance	32
Annex A: Summary list of questions.....	34
Annex B: How to Respond	39
Annex C: List of Consultees	40

Foreword

At the moment, the law and regulations which require some (but not all) types of entertainment to be licensed are a mess. For example, you will need a licence if you want to put on an opera but not if you want to organise a stock car race. A folk duo performing in the corner of a village pub needs permission, but the big screen broadcast of an England football match to a packed barn-like city centre pub does not. An athletics meeting needs licensing if it is an indoor event, but not if it's held outdoors. A free school concert to parents doesn't need a licence, but would if there is a small charge to raise money for PTA funds or if there are members of the wider public present. A travelling circus generally needs a permit whereas a travelling funfair does not. A carol concert in a Church doesn't need a licence, but does if it is moved to the Church Hall. There are many other examples where types of entertainment are treated differently for no good reason – the distinctions are inconsistent, illogical and capricious.

But they cause other problems too. Whenever we force local community groups to obtain a licence to put on entertainment such as a fundraising disco, an amateur play or a film night, the bureaucratic burden soaks up their energy and time and the application fees cost them money too. Effectively we're imposing a deadweight cost which holds back the work of the voluntary and community sector, and hobbles the big society as well.

Equally importantly, the various musicians' and other performers' unions are extremely concerned that all these obstacles reduce the scope for new talent to get started, because small-scale venues find it harder to stay open with all the extra red tape. There is also evidence that pubs which diversified their offer to include activities other than drinking were better able to survive the recession. Making it easier for them to put on entertainment may therefore provide an important source of new income to struggling businesses such as pubs, restaurants and hotels.

Last but not least, laws which require Government approval for such a large range of public events put a small but significant dent in our community creativity and expression. If there's no good reason for preventing them, our presumption should be that they should be allowed.

So this is a golden opportunity to deregulate, reduce bureaucratic burdens, cut costs, give the big society a boost and give free speech a helping hand as well. Our proposals are, simply, to remove the need for a licence from as many types of entertainment as possible. I urge you to participate in this consultation so that we can restore the balance.

John Penrose

Minister for Tourism and Heritage

Chapter 1: Regulated Entertainment - a proposal to deregulate

Introduction

- 1.1. The consultation seeks views on a proposal to remove licensing requirements in England and Wales for most activities currently defined as “regulated entertainment” in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003.
- 1.2. The Licensing Act 2003 brought together nine separate licensing related regimes covering alcohol supply and sale, late night refreshment, and “regulated entertainment”. In doing so the Act modernised many out-dated laws that had been left behind by changes in technology and modern lifestyle.
- 1.3. The Licensing Act 2003 changed the way that licensing procedures worked. Having a single licence for permissions for multiple licensable activities was undoubtedly a great step forward for many, who had previously needed to make separate costly and time consuming licence applications. In this respect, the 2003 Act has been a success. In other respects, it has been less successful. The Government is currently legislating via the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill to rebalance alcohol licensing in favour of local communities, for example.
- 1.4. In addition, 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. This was particularly apparent with the removal of the “two in a bar” rule, which allowed previously two musicians to perform in a pub without needing to obtain a specific entertainment licence. But instead of modernising an old law that had simply gone past its sell by date, the 2003 Act ended up potentially criminalising a harmless cultural pastime.
- 1.5. Indeed tidying up the administrative processes created new problems for many others. The Government has received countless representations about the difficulties that the 2003 Act has brought to a wide range of cultural and voluntary sector and commercial organisations. New licensing requirements, under the 2003 Act were, for many, a step backwards, bringing costly and bureaucratic processes for low risk, or no risk, events, including:
 - Private events where a charge is made to raise money for charity;
 - School plays and productions;
 - Punch and Judy performances;
 - Travelling circuses;

- Children’s films shown to toddler groups;
 - Music performances to hospital patients;
 - Brass bands playing in the local park;
 - School discos where children are charged a ticket price to support the PTA;
 - Exhibitions of dancing by pupils at school fetes;
 - Costumed storytellers;
 - Folk duos in pubs;
 - Pianists in restaurants;
 - Magician’s shows;
 - Performances by street artists;
 - And even performances by a quayside barber shop quartet.
- 1.6. Before the General Election both Coalition parties recognised the need for reform, and in the Coalition Programme for Government we made a firm commitment to remove red tape affecting live music in small venues. Then, as part of the Growth Review which was published alongside the Budget this year, we announced an examination of “regulated entertainment”, with the aim of removing licensing regulation that unnecessarily restricts creativity or participation in cultural and sporting events. This consultation is the result of that work.
- 1.7. In the chapters to come we will explore each of the entertainment activities regulated by the Licensing Act 2003 and ask for views on the key question: “what would happen if this activity were no longer licensable?”
- 1.8. In many areas, early discussions with stakeholders have indicated that deregulation would be welcome and straightforward. With other forms of licensable activity though, we recognise that there may be some inherent difficulties. In such circumstances, this consultation outlines where we feel particular protections will be needed, and indeed where full deregulation may not be possible at all.
- 1.9. This consultation is predicated on the fact that we think there is ample scope to sensibly deregulate most, but not all, of Schedule One to the 2003 Act. Removing the need for proactive licensing for regulated entertainment could provide a great boost for community organisations, charities, cultural and sporting organisations, for artists and performers, for entertainment venues, and for those local institutions that are at the heart of every community, such as parent/teacher organisations, schools and hospitals.
- 1.10. We do, though, need to request and examine evidence from this consultation in order to fully evaluate the proposals and to ensure we have a complete picture with regard to any potential benefits or impacts to ensure there are no unintended consequences.

Chapter 2: The Current situation, and our detailed proposal

The current situation - background

2. The Licensing Act 2003 classifies the following activities as “regulated entertainment”, and therefore licensable:

- a performance of a play,
- an exhibition of a film,
- an indoor sporting event,
- a boxing or wrestling entertainment (both indoors and outdoors),
- a performance of live music,
- any playing of recorded music, and
- a performance of dance

- 2.1. In addition, there is a licence requirement relating to the provision for entertainment facilities (which generally means the provision of facilities which enable members of the public to make music or dance).
- 2.2. Licensable activities can only be carried out under the permission of a licence¹ or a Temporary Event Notice (TEN) from a local licensing authority. Licences (or TENs) are required for any of the activities above (subject to limited exemptions set out in part 2 of Schedule 1) whether they are free events to which the general public is admitted, or public or private events where a charge is made with the intention of making a profit - even when raising money for charity.
- 2.3. Applications for licences to host regulated entertainment can often occur as part of an application for an alcohol licence, particularly in venues such as pubs, clubs, and hotels, but there are also many venues that are primarily “entertainment venues” that operate a bar, such as theatres, which still require alcohol licence permissions to do so.

¹ In this consultation “licence” refers to a Premises Licence or a Club Premises Certificate for ease of reading.

Licensing powers and national scale

- 2.4. The Licensing Act 2003 has four underlying licensing objectives: Prevention of Crime and Disorder; Prevention of Public Nuisance; Protection of Children from Harm; and Public Safety. Licensing authorities must exercise their functions and make their decisions with a view to promoting those objectives .
- 2.5. In support of these four objectives, licences can be subject to extensive conditions. These conditions can be placed on a licence at time of grant - either volunteered by the applicant or imposed by the licensing authority, as part of an application to vary a licence, or imposed as part of a licence Review. Conditions play an important part role in ensuring a “contract” between a licensing authority and licensee, and play an important role in setting the context in which the licensed premise can operate.
- 2.6. Similarly, licence Reviews play an important role in the controls process. Reviews provide relevant authorities with powers to address problems, and they ensure appropriate local representation in the decision making processes. Reviews can be triggered by complaints from local residents or businesses, or by representations by relevant authorities such as the police. For a licensee, a licence review is a very serious issue, and failure to comply with the law could lead to closure of a premises, a very heavy fine, and even a potential prison sentence.
- 2.7. In terms of scale, there are currently around 133,000 premises in England and Wales licensed for regulated entertainment, with almost all of these premises licensed to sell alcohol. Additionally, over 120,000 TENs are authorised each year. TENs can be used as an alternative to a fuller licence, as a “one-off” permission for a licensable event, at a cost of £21 per application.
- 2.8. An event organiser is permitted up to five TENs per year, unless they also hold a personal licence for alcohol sale or supply, in which case the limit is extended to 12 TENs per year at the same premises or up to 50 events at different places.

This proposal

- 2.9. The starting point for this consultation is to examine the need for a licensing regime for each of the activities classed as “regulated entertainment”. Where there is no such need, we propose to remove the licensing requirement, subject to the views and evidence generated through this consultation.
- 2.10. Where there is a genuine need to licence a type of entertainment, then this consultation proposes that the licensing requirement would remain, either in full, or in part if more appropriate. In such cases this consultation seeks to identify the precise nature of the potential harm, and seek evidence to identify effective and proportionate solutions.
- 2.11. Chapter 3 of this consultation will address the generic issues that are relevant to more than one type of regulated entertainment. For example, we are interested to hear views on the handling of health and safety protections and noise nuisance prevention, as well as views from a public safety and crime and disorder perspective. The consultation will pose a number of questions related to these aspects, and will ask a final question where any further comments can be added on any issues of note.

- 2.12. Chapters 4-11 will then examine each activity in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003 and investigate specific issues particular to that activity.
- 2.13. Although both Chapter 3, and Chapters 4-11 will ask questions relating to deregulation principles, **this consultation would like to make clear at the outset that in any instance, Government intends to retain the licensing requirements for:**
- Any performance of live music, theatre, dance, recorded music, indoor sport or exhibition of film where the audience is of 5,000 people or more.
 - Boxing and wrestling.
 - Any performance of dance that may be classed as sexual entertainment, but is exempt from separate sexual entertainment venue regulations.

More details of how we would ensure these protections are in place can be found in Chapters 4-11.

Next steps and methodology

- 2.14. We will collate and review comments from this consultation and then publish a Government response. Where we have a clear view that deregulation for an activity is supported, we will look to remove or replace the Schedule One definition relating to that activity as soon as possible, using existing powers in the 2003 Act to do so where this is possible.
- 2.15. Where changes would require either new exemptions or new provisions in the Licensing Act 2003, or an amendment to any other legislation, we will assess needs and legislative options following the consultation analysis and set out the forward plan in the consultation response.

Who will be interested in this proposal?

- 2.16. Each aspect of regulated entertainment has a wide range of interested parties. In some cases there are groups of stakeholders who will have interest in more than one of the regulated entertainment activities. Some of these will include:
- Existing small and medium professional and amateur cultural groups, such as arts centres, theatre groups, dance groups.
 - Mainstream and independent cinemas, film clubs
 - Musicians – amateur and professional
 - Actors, performers
 - Local cultural providers and practitioners, and event organisers
 - Charities, PTAs, Schools
 - Community audiences for all of the art forms regulated by the 2003 Act
 - Residents and community representatives
 - Licensed premises, such as clubs and pubs, hotels and bed and breakfasts

- Unlicensed premises such as coffee shops, scout huts, church halls, record shops, schools and hospitals, amongst others
- The music industry
- Larger cultural institutions, and cultural development stakeholders
- Those involved in local regeneration
- Other cultural and creative institutions, such as dance and theatre companies, sports bodies who could gain increased exposure in their sport from greater opportunities, potentially leading to an uptake in participation
- Cultural and sporting development organisations
- Licensing authorities, noise officers, health and safety officers
- The police, fire service and trading standards officers and others with an interest in public safety and crime and disorder.

Impacts and benefits

- 2.17. An initial Impact Assessment has been produced for these proposals. This Assessment details, wherever possible, the benefits and impacts of these proposals and has been examined by the independent Regulatory Policy Committee. The initial Impact Assessment can be viewed online at www.culture.gov.uk and is available in hard copy from DCMS from the address provided in annex A.
- 2.18. The initial Impact Assessment has a provisional status and will be informed by the responses to this consultation. We will undertake further work to quantify the consequential costs, benefits and burdens on the police, licensing authorities and others on the central proposal to deregulate entertainment events involving 4999 people or less. Many of the activities classed as regulated entertainment are small local events and, because of this, national data collection is currently disproportionately expensive.
- 2.19. In these circumstances assumptions have been made by Government analysts, following various extrapolations of the available data but in this consultation we would be very grateful for any new data that may be helpful to our overall understanding of the local nuance or the national statistical picture.
- 2.20. It is not possible, for instance, to predict precisely the additional activities that we expect to arise if there were currently no licensing requirements in respect of regulated entertainment, and so we are grateful for views through the questions in this consultation. It has also not been possible to cost every possible benefit (such as the effect of the Culture and Sport Evidence Programme led by DCMS, Arts Council England, English Heritage and Sport England) or possible impact (for example data on costs of the noise complaint processes under the Noise or Environmental Protection Acts) - so again we will use evidence from the consultation responses to update the Impact Assessment to ensure costs and benefits of these proposals are reflected as accurately as possible before any final considerations.
- 2.21. The headline detail from the Impact Assessment is that we would expect to see a huge range of benefits, with a total economic benefit of best estimate of £43.2m per year. Besides the direct economic benefit, and the costs and labour saving, there are expected to be substantial benefits to individual and collective wellbeing due to extra provision of entertainment and participation, as well as additional social interaction

benefits.

- 2.22. This proposal would also bring clarity to existing laws, ending uncertainty about whether and in what circumstances activities, such as street artists, buskers, poets, and carol singers would require a licence under the Licensing Act 2003.

Effect on the current licensing regime

- 2.23. Over 133,000 premises have some form of regulated entertainment provision granted on their licence. The benefits of removing licensing requirements will vary, depending on individual circumstances.
- 2.24. Premises that currently hold a licence **only** for the activities that were formerly classed as regulated entertainment (for example, some church halls) would no longer need a licence. In these cases all licensing requirements would cease, and fees and licence conditions would end when a licence is surrendered. Venues would be able to host activities formerly classed as regulated entertainment without the need for any licence.
- 2.25. Premises that continue to hold a licence after the reforms (for example, for alcohol, late night refreshment, or remaining forms of regulated entertainment) would be able to host entertainment activities that were formerly regulated without the need to go through a Minor or Full Variation process. We propose that all existing conditions on such licences would continue to apply unless the premises decided to apply for a variation to remove or amend them - a situation that should prevent the need for a wholesale reissue of licences by licensing authorities. Conditions are an integral part of a licence authorisation, so this consultation seeks evidence with regard to any potential transitional issues, to ensure sufficient certainty for both licensee and those monitoring compliance to ensure all parties are aware of what is required of a premises. Taking account of any such issues, full guidance would be issued to licensing authorities and other interested parties before any changes would be made.
- 2.26. Finally, on a very practical local level, there are also at least 900 areas listed on the DCMS licensed public land register² which represent areas licensed by local authorities solely for regulated entertainment purposes - such as town centres, promenades, high streets, parks, gardens and recreation grounds. Licensing authorities would also no longer have to process and oversee over 12,500 licences per annum for which they do not receive a fee, such as village halls and for certain performances held in schools. Together this is at least 13,400 community and non-commercial premises per annum that would no longer be subject to a licensing regime.

² http://www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/regulated_entertainment/3196.aspx

Proposal Impacts: Questions

You may wish to read the full document before commenting - a composite list of questions is provided at the end of the document

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?

Q2: If you are replying as an individual, do you think this proposal would help you participate in, or attend, extra community or voluntary performance?

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).

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.

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

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.

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

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

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?

Chapter 3: The role of licensing controls

Introduction

3. In this section we will explain the general background to regulatory protections in the Licensing Act 2003 and ask for views that apply across the “regulated entertainment” regime. Chapters 4-11 will cover individual items included in Schedule One, so you may choose to apply your comments in questions posed in those sections if more appropriate.

The four licensing objectives

- 3.1. As set out in paragraph 2.4, the Licensing Act 2003 has four licensing objectives and licensing authorities must exercise their functions with a view to promoting those objectives. They are:

- Prevention of Crime and Disorder;
- Prevention of Public Nuisance;
- Protection of Children from Harm;
- Public Safety.

These four objectives are important protections, particularly in respect of alcohol sale and supply, which is the principal component of the Licensing Act 2003.

- 3.2. In taking stock of the efficacy and proportionality of the licensing regime, this proposal seeks to examine the need for licensing in the context of the other legislative protections that are already in place. This chapter will do this by examining each of the four licensing objectives and seek views regarding necessary controls.
- 3.3. This consultation proposal suggests that regulated entertainment itself in general poses little risk to the licensing objectives. There are though considerations concerning noise nuisance from music and where audiences of up to 4,999 people could attend events where no licensing authority licence was present, as well as related public safety issues.

Crime and disorder

- 3.4. Where problems do occur, it is often because of the presence of alcohol sales and consumption.
- 3.5. Most existing venues offering regulated entertainment are already licensed for alcohol and **existing controls will continue to apply under these proposals**. The existing alcohol safeguards provide a powerful incentive to ensure that licensing objectives are safeguarded, and as outlined earlier, failure to comply can result in a licence review,

which can lead to closure of the premises, a very heavy fine, and a potential prison sentence for the licensee. However, under our proposals, there would be no requirement to notify the licensing authority or the police of an event of up to 4999 people that did not involve the sale of alcohol.

- 3.6. The Government is also legislating via the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill to rebalance the regulation around alcohol licensing. These measures include, for example giving licensing authorities and the police more powers to remove licences from problem premises and increasing the involvement of health bodies and environmental health authorities in licensing decisions, including Temporary Event Notices.
- 3.7. In addition, the Government is giving local communities additional powers to shape their night-time economies and tackle alcohol-fuelled crime and disorder, by allowing licensing authorities to collect a contribution or levy from late opening alcohol retailers towards the cost of late night policing and extending powers to restrict the sale of alcohol in problem areas. The Government will also take steps to dismantle unnecessary legislation but will continue to regulate in a targeted way where this is needed. The new measures on alcohol, taken together with a sensible deregulation of the no risk or low risk entertainment activities, should lead to a more effective and focussed controls regime.
- 3.8. So while there would no longer be a requirement for a specific permission for activities currently classed as regulated entertainment, there would still be generic controls in place related to the alcohol licence (or, where relevant, permission for late night refreshment). For example, under the current arrangements, a pub does not need a specific permission to show a big screen football international. However, if it is necessary to address identifiable risk of disorder related to the event, a responsible authority such as the police can seek a review to apply measures such as limits on opening hours before the screening, or the use of plastic glasses, or the employment of extra door staff - even though the television broadcast itself is not a licensable activity.
- 3.9. Events in non-licensed premises that are currently held under a TEN will usually be held in non-commercial premises that are overseen and controlled by a management committee or governing body (for example, a community hall, school or club) or otherwise run by the local authority. While this may not singularly remove every risk of crime and disorder, it does suggest that a blanket requirement for all those providing music and other entertainment to secure a licence is disproportionate and unnecessary.
- 3.10. However, we should also pay regard to the fact that the removal of licensing regulations will remove the requirement to automatically notify the Licensing Authority and the police that an entertainment event is taking place. We would be grateful for views on potential public safety and crime and disorder considerations in the questions in this consultation.

Public Nuisance (noise)

- 3.11. **Premises selling alcohol will still require a licence** as outlined above. Alcohol licences can already be used to address noise and other areas of concern, and the Licensing Act 2003 gives the police powers to close licensed premises at short notice as a result of disorder or on the grounds of public nuisance, which includes noise. This process can result in conditions being stipulated which must be met before the premises can reopen. Such Closure Orders under the Licensing Act 2003 lead automatically to a review of the licence where, again, conditions can be attached to the licence. Local Authorities also maintain the right to impose a full range of conditions on alcohol licenses after a licence Review. Again, failure to comply can result in a very heavy fine, and a potential prison sentence up to six months for the licensee.
- 3.12. **All premises**, whether licensed for alcohol or not, will also continue be subject to existing noise nuisance and abatement powers in the Environmental Protection Act 1990. These powers require local authorities to take reasonable steps to investigate a complaint about a potential nuisance and to serve an abatement notice when they are satisfied that a nuisance exists or is likely to occur or recur.
- 3.13. Additionally, there are also powers in the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 which allow the police to close licensed premises to prevent a public nuisance caused by noise from those premises. Earlier this year, the Government set out proposals to radically simplify and improve the powers the police and others have to deal with anti-social behaviour.
- 3.14. There is also the Noise Act 1996 which allows the local authority to take action (issuing a warning notice, or fixed penalty notice, or seizing equipment) in respect of licensed premises where noise between 11pm and 7am exceeds permitted levels.
- 3.15. Finally, under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, the police currently have powers to remove people attending or preparing for night-time raves on land in the open air - refusal to leave or returning to such land following a police direction is a criminal offence.
- 3.16. **Premises which do not sell alcohol** (such as non-licensed restaurants and cafes, as well as non-commercial premises such as community halls, schools and hospitals) would be covered by noise nuisance legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act 1990. As referenced above, non-commercial premises such as village halls tend to be run by a local management board or committee to represent the interests of the local community and exercise necessary control should problems occur. In such circumstances though the existing licence controls would no longer be in place, and so in the questions in this consultation we would be grateful for views on any potential concerns.

Public Safety

- 3.17. The Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 together with disability legislation, offers protection in relation to the safety of the public at an event, placing a clear duty to take reasonable steps to protect the public from risks to their health and safety. In addition, the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (SI 2005/1541) imposes fire safety

duties in respect of most non-domestic premises.

- 3.18. Potential problems at events should be prevented through the risk assessments and compliance with other duties imposed by this legislation, rather than the additional layer of bureaucracy imposed by requirements of the Licensing Act 2003.
- 3.19. Although some licensing authorities rely on the Licensing Act 2003 rather than other legislation, many types of existing mass entertainment activity already take place successfully outside the licensing regime. Large numbers of people gather in one place without an entertainment licence for events such as fun fairs, country shows, political rallies and demonstrations, religious events, stock car racing, or outdoor sport such as the Ryder Cup, or three-day eventing. There is no directly justifiable reason why events such as ballet, classical concerts or circuses should be considered any more of a risk to public safety than these activities.

Protection of Children

- 3.20. There are two main areas of relevance in relation to regulated entertainment where it is important we protect children from harm.
- 3.21. The first of these is the prevention of access to unsuitable content (for example by film classification restrictions, and by restrictions on sexual entertainment). The second aspect is with the physical protection of children in relation to participation in indoor sport and other activities.
- 3.22. Issues specific to unsuitable content in the context of dance and film are addressed directly in chapters 6 and 7 respectively in this consultation. Some content protection themes do though cut across several forms of regulated entertainment, and we seek your views on these at the end of this chapter.
- 3.23. Adult entertainment is not a separate or distinct licensable activity under the 2003 Act, but is generally dealt with under other legislation (see paragraph 11.4). Some forms of adult entertainment (such as “blue” comedians) are not currently licensable at all. In most cases, such activities take place in premises that are licensed for the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises, and restrictions automatically apply on the admission of unaccompanied children. The proposals in this consultation would not affect the status quo.
- 3.24. In the second area of child protection (physical protection for children taking part in indoor sports, and similar activities) there are already robust existing child protection policies in place across all Government funded sports. Recognised sports are required to have a governing body in place that controls the sport and ensures that coaches and officials are properly trained.
- 3.25. Most importantly, the Children Act 1989 places a duty on Local Authorities to investigate if there are concerns that a child may be suffering or may be at risk of suffering significant harm. Additionally, the employment of children is covered by other legislation, such as the Children and Young Persons Act 1963 which, among other things, places restrictions on children taking part in public performances.

Size of events

- 3.26. The Government recognises that, once an event reaches a certain size, it can be difficult to control the events using alcohol licences alone, and there may also be large entertainment events that do not – either currently or in the future – choose to sell alcohol. Sports ground safety legislation, which applies to outdoor sport, applies a limit of 5,000 spectators for football, and 10,000 for other sports before specific safety requirements apply.
- 3.27. The Licensing 2003 Act already recognises the additional burden that large events can cause for local authorities by applying an additional licence fee for events where more than 4,999 people are present.
- 3.28. **This consultation therefore proposes that only events with an audience of fewer than 5,000 people are deregulated from the 2003 Act.**
- 3.29. We would welcome views on this figure in the questions at the end of this chapter. The Association of Chief Police Officers has, for example, suggested that the 500 audience limit which applies to Temporary Event Notices may be a more appropriate starting point.
- 3.30. Similarly, we would welcome views on whether there should be different limits for different types of entertainment – for example whether unamplified music performances should have no audience limit applied at all (as they are self-limiting, due to acoustic reach), and whether outdoor events should be treated differently to those held in a building. Again, questions relating generically to these issues are posed at the end of this chapter.

Time of events

- 3.31. Noise nuisance can be a particular issue of concern for those living near venues. It has been argued that particular controls need to be applied to events held after 11pm. The background to this issue is that 11pm is stipulated in existing noise legislation as the beginning of “night hours” (defined by the World Health Organisation as *the period beginning with 11pm and ending with the following 7am*) in the Noise Act 1996 and the point at which the control powers of the Noise Act begin to apply.
- 3.32. **This consultation does not propose applying an 11pm cut off for the deregulation of regulated entertainment.** This is because existing legal powers in the Noise Act 1996 already make special provision to deal with problems occurring after 11pm for alcohol licensed premises, which will cover the vast majority of venues for entertainment. Noise Act powers work in tandem with the Licensing Act 2003 so that any premises that is not abiding by its licence conditions can be immediately tackled by Local Authority officers, but it should be noted that most Local Authorities do not operate a full nuisance complaints service outside normal working hours.
- 3.33. The Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003 provides Local Authorities with powers to immediately close noisy premises for up to 24 hours, with consequences of up to three months in prison, a fine up to £20,000, or both. Whilst this is a substantial deterrent we would be grateful for views relating to any potential problems or enforcement or

resourcing issues, including where there may be other issues, such as “out of hours” resourcing.

- 3.34. Additional measures under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 cover outdoor night time music events that are not licensed under the 2003 Act. Most currently regulated entertainment does not go beyond 11pm, but to impose a cut off would introduce inflexibility and in effect make it illegal for an unlicensed performance to run 10 minutes over time. This would simply reintroduce the kind of unintended consequences the deregulation seeks to remove whereby illegality has no bearing on the impact of the actual individual activity.
- 3.35. In the recent debate during the Committee stage of the Live Music Bill in the House of Lords, several speakers, expressed their support for a cut off time of midnight for exemptions for small music events.³
- 3.36. The Government is therefore not proposing any time related cut off for entertainment which is to be deregulated from the 2003 Act. However, we welcome views on this issue at the end of this chapter. This includes seeking views on whether any time restrictions should apply and, if so, whether this should be the same for all entertainment activities or just those which are believed to pose a particular risk. It would also be helpful to have views on whether there should be a distinction between indoor and outdoor events.
- 3.37. One alternative option to the current licensing arrangement could be to develop a Code of Practice for entertainment venues. This could help to ensure preventative best practice without the need for regulation. While this would have no statutory sanctions, it would encourage good practice. Would such an approach mitigate risks? Again, we would welcome views.

³ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201011/ldhansrd/text/110715-0001.htm#11071554000685>

The Role of Licensing Controls: Questions

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?

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Q17: Should there be a different cut off time for different types of entertainment and/or for outdoor and indoor events? If so please explain why.

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

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?

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?

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.

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?

Chapter 4: Performance of Live Music

Introduction

4. The Coalition Agreement committed to cutting red tape to encourage the performance of more live music.
 - 4.1. We intend to honour this agreement in two ways. The first is to honour our public commitment to support the Live Music Bill, a Private Member's Bill tabled in 2010 in the House of Lords by Lord Clement Jones, which followed a recommendation for live music deregulation by the Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee in 2009 and a full public consultation on the subject in 2010. Because of this, the Live Music Bill is **not** the subject of this consultation.⁴
 - 4.2. The second is to examine, through this consultation, whether our proposed deregulation is ambitious enough for the vast quantity of talent in England and Wales that would benefit from a wider deregulation than the Live Music Bill will, alone, permit. In examining live music we would be grateful for responses to the generic questions posed in chapter 3, and also to the live music questions based on the consultation proposal below.
 - 4.3. Live music is at the heart of our national and local cultural traditions, and continues to play a very important part in our national and local identity. As well as being exhilarating and inclusive, music can change the way we view ourselves and how others perceive us. Our musical heritage is strongly felt across England and Wales, with a live line of performance from folk and traditional song through many hundreds of years to our present day with internationally famous local music scenes across so many towns and cities.
 - 4.4. In recent years though, whilst music in large venues is thriving, music in small venues has been gradually dwindling. Many pubs – the traditional venue of much live music - have closed, and there has been a downward trend in music provision in secondary venues⁵.

⁴ Lord Clement Jones' Bill was tabled last year, and can be read in full at:
<http://services.parliament.uk/bills/2010-11/livemusichl/documents.html>

⁵http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/%2B/http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/research_and_statistics/4854.aspx

Our proposal

- 4.5. **This proposal is to deregulate public performance of live music (both amplified and unamplified) for audiences of fewer than 5,000 people.**
- 4.6. As outlined in Chapter 3, other legislative protections already exist in respect of each of the four licensing objectives, and it is those measures that should be used as controls for music events, rather than an inflexible and burdensome licensing system.

Audience size

- 4.7. The issues around size and time of events are often raised in relation to events such as large music festivals, which would continue to require a licence under Government proposals if they have capacities of 5,000 people or greater. As explained in chapter 3, the 5,000 limit is already recognised as an audience threshold for larger events in the sporting and entertainment sectors. This limit features also as a capacity boundary for fees in the Licensing Act 2003, recognising intrinsic issues associated with controls for events above that size of audience.
- 4.8. With regard to unamplified music, there is a potential argument that no audience limit is necessary due to the self-limiting possibilities from the event's acoustic reach. So we would thus welcome views on whether unamplified music should simply be deregulated with no restrictions on numbers or on the time of day.

Performance of Live Music: Questions

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?

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.

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

Chapter 5: Performance of plays

Introduction

5. The regulation of plays has a long and famous history. The Licensing Act 2003 provided the first amendments to theatre licensing since the Theatres Act 1968, which released playwrights from the strict censorship of the Lord Chamberlain that had been in place since the introduction of the Licensing Act 1737.
- 5.1 It made clear that licensing authorities could not generally refuse a theatre licence on content grounds. The 1968 Act updated other aspects of law which still stand on the statute book – around obscenity, defamation and provocation of a breach of peace.

Venue sizes

- 5.2. Each year, there are an estimated 92,000 performances of plays by voluntary or amateur groups alone, with the vast majority held in small venues or by touring productions. For many of these venues existence is hand to mouth, and individual productions are in constant jeopardy due to the need to recoup staging costs. We believe that deregulation of some of the requirements where alcohol is not sold or supplied offers a real opportunity to help make the staging of plays and performances in smaller venues much easier, as well as enabling greater opportunity for “site specific” theatre (for example, productions set in factories or forests) to flourish.

Regeneration and renewal

- 5.3. The British theatre ecology is wide and varied, with amateur groups and fringe productions playing an important role in feeding into larger venues. The importance of theatre to the UK economy is well documented, with studies such as the Shellard Report (2004) showing a positive annual economic impact of £2.6bn.
- 5.4. We have seen the impact of theatre on small and large scale cultural festivals across the regions –the Edinburgh Festivals are thought to contribute £245m to the local economy. Cultural festivals have a huge regenerative effect and provide a highly positive community self-image.

Educative value

- 5.5. Plays offer an almost unique opportunity to engage children, enhancing self-value, attendance within education, and participatory skills. At present it is not necessary for a school to apply for a licence where parents are admitted for free, but if the school wishes to perform for the wider public or charge a small entry fee to benefit the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), a licence is required. As with dance and live music, this is one example of how removing the regulatory burden will free up schools

(and similarly community and volunteer groups) to put on low risk productions in the community.

- 5.6. But the educational effect of theatre does not stop at schools. The effects of prison theatre for example have a major role in rehabilitation, and public performance can have a similarly beneficial effect on self-value as seen in other educational forums.

Our proposal

- 5.7. This consultation proposes that we remove theatre from the list of regulated entertainment in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003 for audiences of fewer than 5,000 people.
- 5.8. Existing controls from the 1968 Theatres Act on obscenity, defamation and provocation of a breach of peace remain on the statute book, and separate rules on health and safety and children's protection are set out in Chapter 3.

Performance of Plays: Questions

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?

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?

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?

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

Chapter 6: Performance of dance

Introduction

6. The main reasons for licensing performance of dance have historically centred around ensuring audience protection from unsuitable content, health and safety issues related to venues and performers, and generic noise control issues as outlined in Chapter 3.
- 6.1. At present dance in England and Wales is undergoing an explosion of interest across a very wide socio-demographic, with heightened interest in various forms of dance from street dance to ballroom as typified by television shows like *Britain's Got Talent*, *Strictly Come Dancing* and *So You Think You Can Dance?*.
- 6.2. There are multiple benefits from participation in this type of activity. As well as healthier lifestyles, there are social bond benefits in participation and performance. In addition the performance aspect of dance leads to awareness of teamwork and self esteem. As with plays, there is an empowering Big Society effect where local public place and local performance meet.
- 6.3. On many occasions, dance performance will be licensable, creating burdens on amateur dance groups and schools across England and Wales. At present schools are exempt from licensing requirements where parents are admitted for free, but if a school wished to admit the public or charge a small entry fee to benefit the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), a licence or TEN would be required. This is one simple example of how removing the regulatory burden will free up schools (and similarly community and volunteer groups) to put on low risk productions in the community.

Our proposal

- 6.4. **This consultation proposal is to remove dance from the definition of “regulated entertainment” in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003 for events for audiences of fewer than 5,000 people.**
- 6.5. Please note that Chapter 10 outlines that the Government is not proposing any relaxation of adult entertainment that could be classified as a performance of dance.

Performance of Dance: Questions

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?

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

Chapter 7: Exhibition of film

Introduction

7. The exhibition of a film (defined as “any exhibition of moving pictures”) for public performance in England and Wales requires a licence.
 - 7.1. Aside from any venue-specific operating conditions, as outlined in Chapter 3, the Licensing Act 2003 stipulates that licences to exhibit film must include as a mandatory condition that exhibitors comply with age classification restrictions on film content.
 - 7.2. Section 20 of the Licensing Act 2003 sets out that that the licensing authority may itself provide the age restriction classification, or may defer to a qualified body under the Video Recordings Act 2004 (currently this is a role designated to the British Board of Film Classification “BBFC”).
 - 7.3. Although licensing authorities use the BBFC ratings almost without exception, occasionally some licensing authorities have chosen to impose their own film classification to reflect local concerns.
 - 7.4. In addition, licensing authorities are able to classify films that have not been given a BBFC rating. This can be because the film is not intended for national distribution - perhaps it is a local film or documentary intended mainly for streaming over the internet - or because a national classification will follow at a later point, as is the case with some film festivals, where a film is previewed before the final cut is made for distribution.

Current situation - discrepancies

- 7.5. The existing BBFC and local licensing authority classification situation is, in our view, an effective mechanism to ensure child protection from unsuitable content and the Government has no intention of deregulating the exhibition of film unless it is able to continue the classification system which is well understood and is working effectively. However, the Government believes the licensing of film under the 2003 Act is largely unnecessary and disproportionate.
- 7.6. Examples have been where pre-school nurseries have required a licence to show children’s DVDs. There have been cases where pubs or clubs have wished to host a “tribute night” showing, for example, a recording of the 1966 World Cup final, but have been prevented from doing so by not having a licence. The list could extend to many other low risk activities, such as a members clubs wanting to show reruns of Virginia Wade’s Wimbledon victory during Wimbledon fortnight. Similarly if a venue without a licence permission for the exhibition of film wanted to run a film theme night, showing foreign film, or seasonal showing such as “It’s a Wonderful Life” at Christmas time –

they would require a licence or a TEN.

- 7.7. Additionally, where a venue wants to show a live broadcast of a football match there would not be a problem, but showing a broadcast that had been pre-recorded – even by a few minutes – would be classed as a licensable activity.
- 7.8. Besides these practical problems with the legislation as it stands, we have considered the potential benefits to film societies and community based film projects by removing the need for a licence – removing costs and bureaucracy. We would be grateful for your views on this aspect in the questions below.

Our proposal

- 7.9. **This consultation proposal is to remove “exhibition of film” from the definition of “regulated entertainment” in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003 for events with audiences of fewer than 5,000 people. But before doing so we would ensure that the age classification safeguards could be retained.**
- 7.10. To do this we would use primary legislation to amend existing legislation before removing the activity from the Licensing Act 2003, so that there are no gaps in child protection. We see no reason to disrupt the arrangement where local licensing authorities are able to make local decisions on classifications, and we see the practical advantages in doing so.

Cinema advertising

- 7.11. A separate consultation will be launched in the near future examining whether there is an ongoing need for both BBFC regulation and industry co-regulation of cinema advertising shown in auditoriums. **This is not the subject of this consultation.**

Exhibition of Film: Questions

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?

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

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?

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

Chapter 8: Indoor sport

Introduction

8. Indoor sport held before a public audience is also regulated by the Licensing Act 2003, unlike outdoor sport (excluding Boxing and Wrestling). It is unclear why indoor sport should be subject to this additional level of regulation. Sport in outdoor venues, including those with moveable roofs, is regulated by a different regime and does not require a licence under the 2003 Act.
- 8.1. Indoor sport is defined as: a sporting event which takes place wholly inside a building in front of spectators. Sport includes any game in which physical skill is the predominant factor, and any form of physical recreation which is also engaged in for purposes of competition or display. This includes activities such as gymnastics, netball, ice hockey and swimming as well as acrobatic displays at a circus or, where there is an audience, darts and snooker.

Outdoor sport

- 8.2. Football is obviously one of the key spectator sports in England and Wales, and in the past has a history of crowd management problems. Football is regulated by the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, modified by the Safety of Sports Grounds (Accommodation of Spectators) Order 1996, which makes use of a capacity spectator threshold of 5,000 before the specific designations need to be put in place for Premiership or Football League grounds. A higher limit, of 10,000, applies to other sports grounds.

Indoor sport

- 8.3. The Government believes that the different approaches to outdoor and indoor sports are not justified and that indoor sport should be brought more in line with the arrangements for outdoor events.
- 8.4. This consultation therefore seeks views on the removal of indoor sport, for venues with under 5,000 spectators. Deregulating indoor sports with a capacity of below 5,000 spectators would put sports such as snooker, gymnastics and swimming on a par with football, which is often seen as a greater risk due to incidents of public disorder.

Indoor Sport: Questions

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.

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

Chapter 9: Boxing and Wrestling

Introduction

9. Public exhibition of boxing and wrestling and events of a similar nature are classed as regulated entertainment under Schedule One of the Licensing Act 2003.
- 9.1. Boxing and wrestling have historically been subject to licensing controls to ensure there is a safe environment for spectators with regard to crowd control and certain health and safety aspects connected with the physical activity on display. In addition, the licence requirement has provided additional safeguards for participants.
- 9.2. **This consultation proposes that boxing exhibitions, and events of a similar nature, should in general continue to be licensed.** However, we would welcome views as to whether boxing and wrestling events that are organised by the governing bodies of the sport recognised by the Sports Councils should continue to require licences under the 2003 Act. In addition, we would welcome views on whether the definition of boxing and wrestling should be refined to ensure it includes, for example, martial arts and cage fighting.

Boxing and Wrestling, and Events of a Similar Nature: Questions

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?

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.

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

Chapter 10: Recorded Music and Entertainment Facilities

Background: recorded music

10. The playing of recorded music to an audience is licensable under the Licensing Act 2003, where music is more than merely incidental to another activity that is not, in itself, regulated entertainment. For example, recorded music playing in a hotel lobby or a shop is not likely to be thought to be the primary reason for attendance at that location and does not require a licence – but a performance of a set by a famous DJ is likely to be currently licensable in pursuance of the four licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003
- 10.1. We see no reason why recorded music needs to be licensed. If live music should be deregulated, as is our proposal, then we feel that the same principles should apply to recorded music, with the same controls and sanctions available to ensure that good practice is followed.
- 10.2. Please note that this is not the same issue as a requirement to pay the Performing Rights Society or similar organisation for use of their artists' intellectual copyright – the proposal is simply to deregulate from a licensing regime in pursuance of the four licensing objectives of the Licensing Act 2003.

Our proposal

- 10.3. **We propose to remove the need for a special licence for the playing of recorded music to audiences of fewer than 5,000 people.** In the case of premises licensed to sell alcohol, we feel that this proposal is very sound. The possibility of a licence review, which can lead to the removal of an alcohol licence, a heavy fine, or even a sentence of up to six months imprisonment for the licence holder, provides a compelling reason for licensed premises to comply.
- 10.4. Where recorded music is played in other situations (such as a disco in a village hall with no alcohol licence) local management arrangements are likely to provide a common sense solution to any potential problems, coupled with the protections available in the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Nonetheless we welcome views on the subject below.
- 10.5. We have also received representations on the subject of “raves” and whether this proposal would open up any loopholes in the law with regard to illegal raves, and again, we pose questions below to ensure that this proposal does not open up any gaps in the law.

Entertainment facilities

- 10.6. The definition of “entertainment facilities” in the Licensing Act 2003 has proved to be a thorny issue.
- 10.7. Entertainment facilities are defined in the Licensing Act 2003 in the following manner:
- “entertainment facilities” means facilities for enabling persons to take part in entertainment of a description falling within sub-paragraph (2) for the purpose, or for purposes which include the purpose, of being entertained.
- (2)The descriptions of entertainment are—
- (a) making music,
 - (b) dancing,
 - (c) entertainment of a similar description to that falling within paragraph (a) or (b).
- 10.8. The intention of the principle of “entertainment facilities” in the Licensing Act 2003 was to ensure that as well as ensuring that the activities classified as “regulated entertainment” were properly considered by licensing authorities, any key equipment and its effects were similarly reviewed.
- 10.9. This consultation proposes to remove the need for consideration of entertainment facilities in any eventuality. This would cover, karaoke, musical instruments, dance floors and other equipment needed in support of making music or dancing. We would be grateful for views on this proposal.

Recorded Music and Entertainment Facilities: Questions

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.

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.

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?

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.

Chapter 11: Clearing up unintended consequences: clear laws and clear guidance

Introduction

11. There is a great deal of evidence that licensing authorities and event's organisers find parts of the Licensing Act 2003 very difficult to interpret. The 2003 Act is a voluminous and highly complex piece of legislation, and this has led to different interpretations across licensing authorities. In this chapter we would be grateful for views on this issue, and on how best to ensure greater clarity around entertainment licensing, notwithstanding the proposals to remove most regulated entertainment set out earlier in this document.

Clear laws and clear guidance

11.1. Where it is possible to clear up any problematic issues with regard to regulated entertainment we would like to take the opportunity to do so via this consultation.

Unintended consequences: Questions

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?

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?

Adult entertainment

11.2. **We see no reason to deregulate adult entertainment and this consultation is not seeking views on this issue.**

11.3. Although adult entertainment is not specified in Schedule One to the Licensing Act 2003 as a licensable activity, the Act does play a part in the current controls process.

11.4. The Policing and Crime Act 2009 amended the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 to make provision for the regulation of "sexual entertainment venues". As a result, venues that hold **regular** performance of adult entertainment,

such as lap dance, table dancing or striptease require a separate permission from the local authority.

- 11.5. The Licensing Act 2003 does though play a part in controlling performance of this nature that is held **infrequently**. Specifically, a venue is a sexual entertainment venue where live performance or live display of nudity is of such a nature that, ignoring financial gain, it must reasonably be assumed to be provided solely or principally for the purpose of sexually stimulating any member of the audience (whether by verbal or other means).
- 11.6. However, this does not apply when the venues has not been used on more than eleven occasions for such activities in the previous 12 months. In those instances, the activity is regulated under the 2003 Act as a performance of dance. In deregulating dance, the Government would ensure that there was no change in how sex entertainment is regulated.

Adult Entertainment: Question

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

Annex A: Summary list of questions

Proposal Impacts: Questions

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?

Q2: If you are replying as an individual, do you think this proposal would help you participate in, or attend, extra community or voluntary performance?

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).

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.

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

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.

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

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

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?

The Role of Licensing Controls: Questions

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?

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Q17: Should there be a different cut off time for different types of entertainment and/or for outdoor and indoor events? If so please explain why.

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

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?

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?

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.

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?

Performance of Live Music: Questions

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?

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.

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

Performance of Plays: Questions

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?

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?

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?

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

Performance of Dance: Questions

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?

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

Exhibition of Film: Questions

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?

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

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?

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

Indoor Sport: Questions

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.

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

Boxing and Wrestling, and Events of a Similar Nature: Questions

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?

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.

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.

Recorded Music and Entertainment Facilities: Questions

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.

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.

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?

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.

Unintended consequences: Questions

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?

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?

Adult Entertainment: Question

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

Annex B: How to Respond

You can respond to the consultation in the following ways:

Online

Regulated_entertainment_consultation@culture.gsi.gov.uk

By post

You can print out the summary list of questions above and fill in responses by hand. Please send these to:

Nigel Wakelin
Regulated Entertainment Consultation Co-ordinator
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
2-4 Cockspur Street
London
SW1Y 5DH

Closing date

The closing date for responses is **3 December, 2011**.

After the consultation

We will post a summary of answers on the DCMS website (www.culture.gov.uk) after the end of the consultation together with an analysis of responses. We will publish the Government's response in due course.

Freedom of Information

We are required to release information to comply with the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and Freedom of Information Act 2000. We will not allow any unwarranted breach of confidentiality, nor will we contravene our obligations under the Data Protection Act 1998, but please note that we will not treat any confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system in e-mail responses as a request not to release information.

Compliance with the Code of Practice on Consultation

This consultation complies with the Code.

Complaints

If you have any comments or complaints about the consultation process (as opposed to comments on these issues that are part of the consultation) please send them to:

Complaints Department (Consultations)
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
2-4 Cockspur Street
London
SW1Y 5DH

Annex C: List of Consultees

Anyone can respond to this consultation. This list of consultees indicates those organisations that we will contact to suggest that they may wish to respond.

Agents' Association
Action with Communities in Rural England
Alcohol Concern
Amateur Boxing Association
Arts Council England
Arts Council of Wales
Association of British Insurers
Association of Chief Police Officers
Association of Circus Proprietors of Great Britain
Association of Festival Organisers (AFO)
Association of Independent Festivals
Association of Independent Music (AIM)
Association of Inland Navigation Authorities
Association of Licensed Multiple Retailers
Association of School and College Leaders
Association of Show and Agricultural Organisations
BII (British Institute of Innkeeping)
BPI (The British Recorded Music Industry)
British Arts Festivals Association
British Association of Concert Halls
British Beer and Pub Association
British Board of Film Classification (BBFC)
British Boxing Board of Control
British Film Institute (BFI)
British Holiday and Home Parks Association
British Hospitality and Restaurant Association
British Marine Federation
British Retail Consortium
British Wrestling Association
Business in Sport and Leisure
Cadw
Campaign for Real Ale
Carnival Village
Charity Commission
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
Chief Fire Officers' Association
Children's Society
Cinema Advertising Association
Cinema Exhibition Association
Circus Arts Forum

Commission for Rural Communities
Committee of Registered Clubs Associations
Community Matters
Dance UK
English Folk Dance and Song Society
English Heritage
Equity
Federation of Licensed Victuallers
Federation of Licensed Victuallers (Wales)
Federation of Private Residents' Association
Federation of Small Businesses
Film Distributors' Association
Fire Officers Association
Football Licensing Authority (FLA)
Foundation for Community Dance
Guild of Master Victuallers
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)
Historic Houses Association
Independent Street Arts Network
Independent Theatre Council (ITC)
Institute of Licensing
International Live Music Conference
Jazz Services
Justices Clerk Society
Lap Dancing Association
Licensing Act Active Residents Network
Local Government Regulation (LGR)
Local Government Association (LGA)
Magistrates Association
Making Music (the National Federation of Music Societies)
Maritime and Coastguard Agency
Metropolitan Police
Musicians Union
National Arenas Association
National Association of Head Teachers
National Association of Local Councils
National Association of Local Government Arts Officers
National Campaign for the Arts
National Confederation of Parent Teacher Associations
National Farmers' Retail & Markets Association
National Governors' Association
National Neighbourhood Watch Association
National Operatic and Dramatic Association
National Organisation of Residents Associations
National Rural Touring Forum
National Village Halls Forum
Noctis
Noise Abatement Society
Open all Hours
Parliamentary Performers Alliance
Passenger Boat Association

Paterson's Licensing Acts
Police Federation
Police Superintendents' Association
Production Services Association
Rotary International in GB and Ireland
Society of Local Council Clerks
Society of London Theatres/ Theatrical Management Association (SLT/TMA)
Sports Council for Wales
Sport England
Sports and Recreation Alliance
The Theatres Trust
Tourism for All
Trading Standards Institute
UK Centre for Carnival Arts
UK Live Music Group
UK Music
UK Sport
Voluntary Arts Network
Welsh Local Government Association
Welsh Music Foundation
Welsh Council for Voluntary Action



department for
**culture, media
and sport**

2-4 Cockspur Street
London SW1Y 5DH
www.culture.gov.uk