

**Committee:** LICENSING COMMITTEE  
**Date:** 29 November 2005  
**Title:** **DRAFT REVISED LICENSING POLICY**  
**Author:** Michael Perry, Executive Manager Corporate Governance, 01799 510416

**Agenda Item**

**4**

Item for decision

---

## Summary

On 14<sup>th</sup> September 2005 this Committee resolved to adopt a revised draft licensing policy as a basis for consultation. This report is to inform Members of the response to the consultation exercise to date. The consultation period closes on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2005. Any additional responses received prior to the date of the meeting will be verbally reported.

## Recommendations

1. That the Committee decides what amendments (if any) it wishes to make to the draft revised Licensing Policy in the light of responses to the consultation.
2. That the Committee recommends a draft revised Licensing Policy to Full Council for adoption.

## Background Papers

The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

1. Responses received to the consultation exercise.

## Impact

Communication/Consultation	None
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Finance	None
Human Rights	None
Legal Implications	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

### **Situation**

1. Following the meeting of this Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2005 the draft revised Licensing Policy approved by the Committee was posted on the Council's website. Letters were sent to all statutory consultees, all licensees within the district, all town and parish clerks within the district, breweries with premises within the district and trade representatives including the claimants in the Canterbury City Council case. The letters informed the addressees that the Licensing Policy could be accessed upon the Council's website and that hard copies would be provided upon request. The letters stated the closing date for the consultation period as being 25<sup>th</sup> November 2005 and invited comments before then.
2. At the time of preparing this report two responses have been received.
3. Saffron Walden Town Council state that they are pleased to see that it is intended to give notice of applications to town and parish councils. The town council supports this and other proposed changes to the policy.
4. The British Institute of Inn Keeping and Brewers (one of the claimants in the Canterbury City Council case) have indicated that they would like to participate in the consultation process and will respond in due course. Any further response received prior to the meeting will be reported verbally.

### **Options**

There are two potential options.

5. They are:
  - (i) Recommend the draft revised Licensing Policy to Full Council for adoption without amendment.
  - (ii) Amend the draft revised Licensing Policy in the light of any further responses received to the consultation process and recommend the amended version of the draft revised Licensing Policy to Full Council for adoption.

**Risk Analysis**

6. The following have been assessed as the potential risks associated with this issue.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating Actions
Members wish to amend the draft revised Licensing Policy other than in response to comments received from consultees.	LOW	LOW. Any significant amendments would require re-consultation.	Only amendments in response to comments received from consultees should be considered.