

List of questions and officer answers.

Question G1: Do you consider that any, or all, of the proposed simplification measures can be achieved by non-legislative means?

No

Question G2: Do you consider that any of the simplifications measures is of constitutional significance?

No

Question A1: Do you agree that the existing requirement to review licensing statements every three years should be removed?

Yes

Question A2: Do you agree that the existing requirement for licensing authorities to consult all statutory consultees for all revisions should be replaced by a requirement to the licensing authority to consult those statutory consultees that will be affected by the proposed revision?

Yes

Question A3: Do you agree that the proposal to remove the requirement to review licensing statements every three years and require licensing authorities to consult only relevant statutory consultees is proportionate to the policy objective?

Yes

Question A4: Do you agree that the proposal to remove the requirement to review licensing statements every three years and require licensing authorities to consult only relevant statutory consultees strikes a fair balance?

Yes

Question A5: Do you agree that the proposal to remove the requirement to review licensing statements every three years and require licensing authorities to consult only relevant statutory consultees does not remove any necessary protection?

Yes

Question A6: Do you agree that the proposal to remove the requirement to review licensing statements every three years and require licensing authorities to consult only relevant statutory consultees does not prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right or freedom which that person might reasonably expect to continue to exercise?

Yes

Question B1: Do you agree that the period during which an Interim Authority Notice (IAN) can be issued should be extended to 28 consecutive days?

Yes

Question B2: Do you agree that the period during which a Reinstatement of Licence on Transfer (RT) can be applied for should be extended to 28 consecutive days?

Yes

Question B3: Do you agree that the period during which the police may cancel an IAN should be extended to two working days?

Yes

Question B4: Do you think that the interim authority period should be extended to three months?

Yes

Question B5: Do you agree that the Government's proposal to amend the deadlines for IAN and RTs is proportionate to the policy objectives?

Yes

Question B6: Do you agree that the proposal to amend the deadlines for IAN and RTs strikes a fair balance?

Yes

Question B7: Do you agree that the proposal to amend the deadlines for IAN and RT's will not remove any necessary protections?

Yes

Question B8: Do you agree that the proposal to amend the deadlines for IAN and RTs does not prevent any person from exercising a right that might reasonably expect to continue to exercise?

Yes

Question C1: Do you agree that the police should be able to decide (at their discretion) to permit licensed activities under a late TEN, by issuing a confirmation to the licensing authority?

No – how are low risk events going to be defined, each police officer/authority could give a different definition.

For example, an event organiser could apply for a late TEN to West Yorkshire Police for an event in Leeds and be giving permission as they believe the event is low risk. The same event organiser could apply for a late TEN to

North Yorkshire Police for a similar event in York and be refused as they do not believe the event is low risk.

A working agreement would be required between the police and licensing authority, defining low risk events.

TEN applicants could also start pressing the police to get permission to apply for a late TEN.

Question C2: Do you agree that the latest a TEN may be confirmed by the police should be three working days before the proposed event commences?

No – this is a very tight timeframe giving licensing authorities little time to send acknowledgements, and making sure that the applicant has the acknowledged notice prior to the event.

It puts extra pressure on licensing authorities who produce registers that are published on their websites and circulated around other agencies.

Question C3: Do you think that a police confirmation should be issued within two working days of receiving the TEN?

No

This would be satisfactory giving the current application timeframe of 10 working days notice. If this timeframe is reduced for late TENs this will be a very tight timeframe for both the police and licensing authority. If a TEN is received 3 days before the event, this would leave one day for the licensing authority to send the acknowledgement, the event organisers needs the acknowledge notice for the event as this is their 'licence'.

Question C4: Do you agree that the period during which the police can issue an objection to a TEN should be changed to two working days?

Yes

Question C5: Do you consider that the period during which the police can issue an objection to a TEN should be extended to three working days?

Yes – however we also believe that licensing authorities should be given 3 working days to acknowledge notices. It could confuse applicants if licensing authorities acknowledge receipt of the TEN within 2 working days (the current timeframe), on receipt of the acknowledgement they could believe everything is ok with the notice, to then receive a counter notice a few days later.

Question C6: Do you agree that the proposal to allow the police to issue a 'confirmation' of a TEN issued out of time and to change the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to two working days is proportionate to the policy objectives?

Yes

Question C7: Do you consider that the extension of the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to three working days would be proportionate to the policy?

Yes

Question C8: Do you agree that the proposal to allow the police to issue a 'confirmation' of a TEN issued out of time and to change the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to two working days strikes a fair balance?

Yes – however agreement between police and licensing authorities may be required with regards to what type of events will be classed as low risk.

Question C9: Do you consider that the extension of the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to three working days would strike a fair balance?

Yes – however, if licensing authorities are not given 3 days to acknowledge a notice guidance notes will need to be amended to advise applicant that they could receive a counter notice after the receipt of the acknowledge TEN.

Question C10: Do you agree that the proposal to allow the police to issue a 'confirmation' of a TEN issued out of time and to change the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to two working days or three working days does not remove any necessary protection?

No – This will put more pressure on licensing authorities:

- **If a counter notice is served by the police there will be less time to arrange hearings to determine the TEN.**
- **Registers will not be up to date on websites prior to events taking place.**
- **Other bodies, such as fire authority and noise control authorities, may not be notified prior to events taking place.**

Question C11: Do you agree that the proposal to allow the police to issue a 'confirmation' of a TEN issued out of time and to change the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to two working days does not prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right which that person might reasonably expect to continue to exercise?

Yes

Question C12: Do you consider that the extension of the deadline for the police to object to a TEN to three working days would not prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right which that person might reasonably expect to continue to exercise?

Yes