



Licensing Committee

Tuesday, 7 November 2023 at 7.30 pm

Council Chamber - Civic Centre

Members of the Committee

Councillors: J Wilson (Chairman), E Gill (Vice-Chairman), R Bromley, T Burton, D Clarke, R Davies, J Furey, M Harnden, C Mann, J Mavi and M Singh

In accordance with Standing Order 29.1, any Member of the Council may attend the meeting of this Committee, but may speak only with the permission of the Chairman of the Committee, if they are not a member of this Committee.

AGENDA

Notes:

- 1) Any report on the Agenda involving confidential information (as defined by section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972) must be discussed in private. Any report involving exempt information (as defined by section 100I of the Local Government Act 1972), whether it appears in Part 1 or Part 2 below, may be discussed in private but only if the Committee so resolves.
- 2) The relevant 'background papers' are listed after each report in Part 1. Enquiries about any of the Agenda reports and background papers should be directed in the first instance to **Democratic Services, Democratic Services Section, Law and Governance Business Centre, Runnymede Civic Centre, Station Road, Addlestone (Tel: Direct Line: 01932 425627). (Email: Democratic.Services@runnymede.gov.uk).**
- 3) Agendas and Minutes are available on a subscription basis. For details, please ring 01932 425620. Agendas and Minutes for all the Council's Committees may also be viewed on www.runnymede.gov.uk.
- 4) In the unlikely event of an alarm sounding, members of the public should leave the building immediately, either using the staircase leading from the public gallery or following other instructions as appropriate.
- 5) Filming, Audio-Recording, Photography, Tweeting and Blogging of Meetings

Members of the public are permitted to film, audio record, take photographs or make use of social media (tweet/blog) at Council and Committee meetings provided that this does not disturb the business

of the meeting. If you wish to film a particular meeting, please liaise with the Council Officer listed on the front of the Agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman is aware and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Filming should be limited to the formal meeting area and not extend to those in the public seating area.

The Chairman will make the final decision on all matters of dispute in regard to the use of social media audio-recording, photography and filming in the Committee meeting.

List of matters for consideration

Page

Part I

Matters in respect of which reports have been made available for public inspection

1. **Notification of Changes to Committee Membership**

2. **Minutes**

4 - 9

To confirm and sign as a correct record, the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2023 (Appendix 'A') and those of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 12 September 2023 (Appendix 'B').

3. **Apologies for Absence**

4. **Declarations of Interest**

Members are invited to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registrable and non-registrable interests in items on the agenda.

5. **Fees and Charges 2024/2025**

10 - 15

6. **Exclusion of Press and Public**

Part II

There are no exempt or confidential items on this agenda

Runnymede Borough Council

Licensing Committee

Tuesday, 26 September 2023 at 7.30 pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors J Wilson (Chairman), E Gill (Vice-Chairman), R Bromley, D Clarke, R Davies, M Harnden and J Mavi.

Members of the Committee absent: Councillors T Burton, J Furey, C Mann and M Singh.

6 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2023 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors T Burton, J Furey, C Mann and M Singh.

8 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

9 Proposal for Pre-Application fees

The Committee's approval was sought to introduce a formal pre-application advice service from 1 April 2024, for which a three-tier charging structure would apply.

Officers explained that they already spent a significant amount of time providing free advice to applicants. They did this to avoid having to reject an application because it was incorrect or incomplete which was a frequent occurrence. This was because the statutory application forms could be confusing and for people unfamiliar with them it was easy to get something wrong. For example, applicants often failed to demonstrate satisfactorily how they would promote the Licensing objectives and might not complete the operating schedule or do so in a confusing way.

There was no statutory duty to provide advice. However, Officers wanted to be as helpful as possible to assist businesses and ensure, where possible, compliance. Members were advised that more local authorities were introducing this service which was common in Planning for example. Although only two other local licensing authorities in Surrey currently provided a pre-application service, it was anticipated that this would increase as more Councils sought to recover costs where they could.

In terms of delivering the service, simple advice could be given over the telephone but applicants were usually invited in to speak in person, especially if the matter was complex. It was clarified that if an applicant initially paid for the basic checking service and then decided they needed more advice the next tier charge would be applied.

Officers had set out a detailed breakdown of how the proposed charges had been arrived at, based on the hourly rates, including re-charges.

The Committee noted the three-tier approach, from a basic passport-like checking service (£28), the advice service (£72), to a full pre-application service, costing £275. It was

agreed that these compared well with other structures available and bearing in mind that a specialist Licensing Solicitor could charge in the region of £400.

The Committee was supportive of the service and content with the level of fees proposed. It was difficult to predict how popular the service would be. Therefore, Officers were asked to report on income from the service at the meeting of the Committee in June 2025 after a full year of the fees being place from 1 April 2024. This would be included in the annual report on matters under the Licensing Act 2003.

The Committee noted that the Council could only cover costs so any surplus or deficit would need to be carried forward to the next financial year as with other licensing related fees and charges.

Officers confirmed that the introduction of a pre-application service was permitted under Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003.

Officers confirmed that the lead in time would be used to advertise the service and produce information sheets to accompany the application forms fully available from the Council's website. This was so that applicants would be well aware of the new service and encouraged to take advantage of it although it would be the applicant's decision as to whether they did or not.

Resolved that –

the introduction of charging for pre-application advice for applications under the Licensing Act 2003, be approved, as set out below:

1. Application Checking Service

Cost: £28

2. Application Advice Service

Cost: £72

3. Full Pre-Application Service

Cost: £275

10 Exclusion of Press and Public

There were no exempt or confidential items on the agenda.

(The meeting ended at 7.50 pm.)

Chairman

Runnymede Borough Council

Licensing Sub Committee

Tuesday, 12 September 2023 at 2.10 pm

Members of the Committee present: Councillors D Clarke, E Gill (Chairman) and J Wilson.

Also Present: Mr Khalid and Mr Sohani, applicants, an objector, a Ward Councillor, M Willingale, speaking on behalf of the residents, Mr R Smith, Senior Licensing Officer, Ms K Dutfield, Senior Environmental Health Officer, Mrs J Grant, Surrey Police Licensing Officer, Ms L Woodward, Solicitor for RBC and Miss C Pinnock, Democratic Services Officer.

In attendance: Councillor T Gates (Observer)

1 Election of Chairman

Councillor E Gill was elected as Chairman for the meeting.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3 Procedure

The procedure to be followed for the meeting was explained to all present. The Chairman also introduced the parties to each other and assured all parties that they would have an equal opportunity to present their case, ask and answer questions.

4 Exclusion of Press and Public

By resolution of the Sub-Committee, for the reasons set out in the agenda, the press and public were excluded from the determination of the application under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the grounds that the discussion would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information of the description specified in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 the Schedule 12A to part 1 of the Act.

5 Application for a variation to a Premises Licence

Mr Smith, Senior Licensing Officer, was invited to present his report. This outlined the details of the application to vary the premises licence of Super Pizza in Chertsey.

The Sub-Committee was advised that the application for the variation to the premises licence held by Super Pizza concerned late night refreshment only as defined under the Licensing Act as 'involving the supply of hot food or hot drink between the hours of 23:00 and 05:00 hours to the public for consumption on or off the premises to which the public has access.'

Members noted that Super Pizza was a relatively small premises in Guildford Street, Chertsey. Currently it was in use as a takeaway and eat in premises containing one condition prohibiting retail trading (over the counter) after 23:00 hours, reducing late night refreshment to deliveries only. Its primary licensable activity was the provision of late night refreshment and the sale by retail of alcohol. The application to vary the premises licence would effectively remove the condition on over the counter sales to allow retail over the

counter and eat in until the existing closing times of the premises as set out in the report.

Mr Smith explained that two responsible authorities and six residents had submitted objections to the application. Members were cautioned not to take those objections relating to Planning into consideration and to focus only on those issues pertinent to the Licensing objectives. Members were also advised that some of the objections related to alleged incidents in the past for which there was no evidence that they were related to the premises in question.

It was confirmed that the applicants had not responded to any of the objections prior to the Hearing.

The Committee's attention was drawn to sections of the Council's Licensing Policy and relevant parts of the guidance issued under Section 182 of the Licensing Act.

The agenda bundle also contained full details of the objections, and recent photographs of the premises and its location.

There were no questions at this stage for Mr Smith. Therefore the applicants were invited to state their case.

Mr Khalid explained that the previous owner of the premises had led them to believe that the licence allowed them to engage in over the counter trade beyond 23:00 hours until closing time and they had been doing so until it had been pointed out to them by Mr Smith that it was in fact a breach of their conditions. Mr Khalid conceded that he should have been more diligent in this regard.

Mr Khalid stated that there had been no issues in the last year they had been trading; no-one had complained to them about any of the issues contained in the objections apart from the noisy exhaust on the extractor which had been upgraded with a silencer and filter at their own expense. There had been one issue with a customer raised by the Police which was described as a personal matter and quickly resolved.

Mr Khalid confirmed their premises was covered by CCTV and that this revealed no evidence of incidents connected with Super Pizza.

Mr Khalid stressed that they were keen to co-operate with the Police and other interested parties if there were incidents such as the one at the nearby Travelodge. Mrs Grant clarified that in relation to their application to vary the licence they had not liaised with the Police.

Mr Khalid, employee at the premises, spoke on behalf of Mr Sobhani, owner of the premises, due to language ease. Mr Sobhani understood English but was not so comfortable speaking it. Mr Khalid was asked whether there was much noise and/or litter generated by their customers. He replied that sometimes this occurred in the summer, but customers would be asked to wait inside the shop for their order to reduce this.

The Responsible Authorities were then asked to present their representations. Ms Duffield, Senior Environmental Health Officer confirmed that the basis of their objection was on the grounds of public nuisance, specifically the potential impact on residents from noise and litter, and noise and odour and light pollution. Ms Duffield agreed that the noise and odour problem had been resolved through the installation of the new equipment referred to in the applicant's submission.

There had been complaints about over the counter sales, which the applicant had already admitted.

In respect of the impact on residents, a map was tabled at the meeting, which identified all the residential properties in the area and public houses. Environmental Health were concerned about the potential for customers to congregate in the vicinity, given that Super Pizza was the only takeaway selling pizzas late at night. It was thought that patrons of the public houses would then move on to Super Pizza and cause a nuisance.

Environmental Health considered that the operating schedule as presented on the application did not demonstrate how the applicants intended to promote the licensing objectives with regard to the prevention of public nuisance, nor how customers would be managed and prevented from having a negative impact on residents.

Environmental Health then tabled a list of 6 conditions, which if the variation was granted, they would like to be attached to the licence.

Mr Smith confirmed that the applicants were more responsive than the previous owner and were keen to regularise their activities.

Surrey Police were then invited to present their objections to the variation of the licence.

Mrs Grant stated that the Police had two objections; the first was that late opening increased the potential for anti-social behaviour from late night drinkers frequenting the premises. She cited the closing times of nearby public houses and referred to the relatively modest size of Super Pizza and how this might also encourage anti-social behaviour. Mrs Grant also referred to the nearby ALDI car park where potentially customers might go to eat their pizzas. The Travelodge was also a hot spot for anti-social behaviour and noise which after hours could be reported to the Police.

Surrey Police considered that the operating schedule lacked the evidence to promote the licensing objective of the prevention of Crime and Disorder. To that end a list of 4 conditions was tabled which they would like to include if the licence was granted. However, their preference was for the application to be refused.

The Police were asked to produce evidence of reports of anti-social behaviour etc in the area. Three incidents were reported. These were a fight outside a local newsagents/off licence on 20 July 2023, a civil dispute at a restaurant on 27 May 2023 and an argument at a different restaurant on 1 March 2023. However, it was confirmed that none were connected to Super Pizza, nor did the Police attend on any of these occasions. There had been 12 telephone calls to the Police about Guildford Street, excluding calls about the Travelodge, none of which concerned Super Pizza. It was noted that crime and disorder reports were low and the Police wished to keep it that way.

Mr Smith asked how the delivery driver accessed the premises after 23:00 hours. Mr Khalid said that a door was unlocked for him to enter and collect the orders.

A local Ward Member was then invited to put forward objections received by residents. He stated that since the original licence had been granted in 2010, a significant number of additional residential properties were now in the immediate vicinity of Super Pizza and were suffering from the effects of noise, litter, anti-social behaviour and light pollution. The residents who had made representations felt there was a direct impact on them and the amenity. It was suggested that in addition to refusing the application, the licence itself should be reviewed.

It was suggested that residents had complained about Super Pizza to Environmental Health. However, when asked, Ms Dutfield confirmed that there had been no complaints in the last 9 months, and the last complaint was in May 2022, prior to the current owners of the premises.

Regarding capacity of the premises, Mr Smith said that a figure would be set on their fire safety plan. However, it would not be possible to attach a condition on capacity nor judge what a desirable number might be in relation to the size of the premises. He commented that a number of people congregating inside the premises could be problematic especially if alcohol had previously been consumed.

In his concluding remarks, Mr Smith thanked the applicants for engaging with the Licensing Section. He stated that the existing licence was rather old and attaching the suggested conditions might assist. With regard to the potential for light pollution, he suggested that the applicants could look to only have lighting in the kitchen and servery area to address residents' concerns.

Mr Smith confirmed that the Licensing Sub-Committee had no powers to instigate a review of the premises licence. A review would have to be evidence based. He stated that it was preferable to work with the applicants to avoid this happening.

The applicants were invited to make some closing remarks. Mr Khalid was very amenable to complying with the suggested conditions by both Environmental Health and Surrey Police, if possible, and agreed that the main reason for the application was to reduce delivery costs and having to employ a driver. He added that over counter sales post 23:00 hours was far cheaper, especially in the current economic climate.

With regard to the customers, Mr Khalid said that typically they were roadworkers and similar, it was very rare for someone to order Pizza having left any of the nearby public houses. The number of customers at any one time was mostly 1 – 2, occasionally between 5 and 6 people, who he felt could easily be accommodated inside when waiting for their orders. Mr Khalid confirmed that all the incidents of anti-social behaviour were unconnected with their premises or their customers.

Having established that no-one had anything else to add, the Chairman advised that the Sub-Committee would retire to determine the application and that although welcome to stay the applicants would be advised of the outcome within 5 working days of the meeting and of their right of appeal should they be unhappy with the decision of the Sub-Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 15:00 hours and re-convened at 16:05 hours.

The decision of the Sub-Committee having taken into account all the available information was to refuse the application on the grounds of the prevention of public nuisance, primarily noise from greater footfall, car doors slamming, passing cars and the impact on the local area. It was also considered that potentially more customers would lead to congregations of customers, loitering and waiting for their orders and then consuming them in the ALDI car park etc, which would have a negative impact on local residents.

The Sub-Committee considered that these issues could not be remedied by the suggested conditions, nor by reducing the hours/days of operation.

Officers from Legal would issue a decision notice accordingly.

Report title	Fees and Charges 2024/2025
Report author	Jill Stockdale / Helen Clark
Department	Financial Services / Environmental
Exempt	No

Purpose of report:
To Resolve.

Synopsis of report:
To set out the context and rationale for changes to fees and charges for the next financial year for the services managed by this committee and to recommend that the proposed fees and charges are adopted as set out.

Recommendation(s):
The proposed fees and charges as set out in Appendix ‘A’ are approved to be effective from the dates within the appendix or as soon as practical thereafter.

1. Context and background of report

- 1.1 The annual review of charges is an important part of the overall budget setting process and the policy framework for service provision in general.
- 1.2 Whilst the Council’s Constitution places initial fee setting with each service committee, it also provides delegated authority to Officers to alter fees, charges and prices without reference to a Committee, in order to respond to market conditions, new needs, changes in tax rates, and so on.

2. Report and, where applicable, options considered and recommended

Methodology

- 2.1 As part of the budget setting process, Service Managers are requested to review their charges each year. Members have previously agreed that officers put forward recommended increases based on:
 - Current market conditions
 - Local competition
 - The likely yield of any fee increase
 - On-going savings targets and revenue reduction programmes

Members have accepted that in some service areas it may not be possible to significantly increase fees, and in others it may be necessary to decrease them to

stimulate demand, however an average of 5% for discretionary locally set charges should be aimed for as the financial plans of the Council assume at least an inflationary increase.

- 2.2 This report reviews current levels of fees and charges, with a view to helping to balance next year's budget and is a key strand of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- 2.3 The fees and charges proposed by service managers for next year are set out at Appendix 'A'. The appendix includes a Yield column showing the next year's budget for each charge/group of charges, so that Members can estimate the financial implications of any price rises.

Premises and Alcohol related Licences

- 2.4 All the fees under the Licensing Act 2003 are set by statute. The Licensing Act 2003 listed the fees and charges which we have to make as a local authority. These fees and charges are set by statute and have not changed since their introduction. This means that as inflation increases the cost base, the net cost of running the service increases. The estimated deficit for 2024/25 is £25,100.

3. Policy framework implications

- 3.1 There are no policy framework implications.

4 Resource implications/Value for Money

- 4.1 At the start of the 2023/24 financial year, the Council had an ongoing budget deficit estimated to be £5.2m by the end of 2026/27 that needed to be addressed. This included an assumption that fees and charges would increase by 2% each year. The setting of fees and charges is an important tool in helping to address this situation and maximising income from services should be a priority.
- 4.2 In setting fees and charges there is a fine balance to be struck between trying to recover the cost of running services and not alienating our customers by making the charges unaffordable. In undertaking their reviews managers must balance these risks whilst at the same time trying to generate additional income to contribute towards the Council's ongoing budget deficit. Consideration should also be given to the cost of pay-to-use services, so that those choosing not to avail themselves of those services, are not carrying the burden, through taxation, of subsidised services for others.
- 4.3 Once agreed, the fees and charges will be included as part of the 2024-25 budget and the effects of any increases/reductions in the charges will be incorporated into the figures for the appropriate service areas.

5. Legal implications

- 5.1 Where the status of a charge is marked as 'statutory' the Council is required under the law to levy a fee. Where the status is given as 'discretionary' the Council may amend the fee charged or choose to make no charge for the service.

6. Equality implications

6.1 Where any major changes to the structure of any charging regime are proposed, an Equality Impact Assessment will have been completed by the relevant Budget Manager.

7. Environmental/Sustainability/Biodiversity implications

7.1 The annual setting of existing fees and charges has no environmental, sustainability or biodiversity implications. Any change to a structure or the inclusion of new charges that have any such implications will be set out in a separate report to Committee.

8. Timetable for Implementation

8.1 The proposed fees and charges will not take effect until 1 April 2024 or as soon as practicable thereafter unless a different date is set out in the Appendix.

9. Background papers

None

10. Appendices

Appendix 'A' Proposed Fees & Charges for 2024/25

Fees and charges

Premises and alcohol related licences

Charge Status	From April 2023 £	From April 2024 £	% Increase		Yield £	VAT treatment
---------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------	--	------------	---------------

Licensing Act 2003

Main application fee

The application fee for a new premises licence, or conversion of an existing licence is based on rateable values as follows:-

Non City / Town Centre

Band A	Rateable value £0 to £4,300	Statutory	100.00	100.00	0.00%	} 1,900	Outside Scope
Band B	£4,301 to £33,000	Statutory	190.00	190.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band C	£33,001 to £87,000	Statutory	315.00	315.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band D	£87,001 to £125,000	Statutory	450.00	450.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band E	£125,001 and above	Statutory	635.00	635.00	0.00%		Outside Scope

City / Town Centre where they are exclusively/ primarily used to sell alcohol

Band D	£87,001 to £125,000	Statutory	900.00	900.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band E	£125,001 and above	Statutory	1,905.00	1,905.00	0.00%		Outside Scope

Annual charge

The annual charge is due one year after the application fee was paid and is based on rateable values as follows:-

Non City / Town Centre

Band A	Rateable value £0 to £4,300	Statutory	70.00	70.00	0.00%	} 52,450	Outside Scope
Band B	£4,301 to £33,000	Statutory	180.00	180.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band C	£33,001 to £87,000	Statutory	295.00	295.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band D	£87,001 to £125,000	Statutory	320.00	320.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band E	£125,001 and above	Statutory	350.00	350.00	0.00%		Outside Scope

City / Town Centre where they are exclusively/ primarily used to sell alcohol

Band D	£87,001 to £125,000	Statutory	640.00	640.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Band E	£125,001 and above	Statutory	1,050.00	1,050.00	0.00%		Outside Scope

Minor variations to premises licences and club premises certificates as per the Legislative reform order 2009

Statutory			89.00	89.00	0.00%	300	Outside Scope
-----------	--	--	-------	-------	-------	-----	---------------

Fees and charges

Premises and alcohol related licences

Charge Status	From April 2023 £	From April 2024 £	% Increase	Yield £	VAT treatment
---------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------	------------	---------------

Exceptionally large capacity sites

This is an additional charge for large events based on the number of attendees as follows:

New licence

5,000 to 9,999	Statutory	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00%	} Included under Annual fees	Outside Scope
10,000 to 14,999	Statutory	2,000.00	2,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
15,000 to 19,999	Statutory	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
20,000 to 29,999	Statutory	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
30,000 to 39,999	Statutory	16,000.00	16,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
40,000 to 49,000	Statutory	24,000.00	24,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
50,000 to 59,999	Statutory	32,000.00	32,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
60,000 to 69,999	Statutory	40,000.00	40,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
70,000 to 79,999	Statutory	48,000.00	48,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
80,000 to 89,999	Statutory	56,000.00	56,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
90,000 and over	Statutory	64,000.00	64,000.00	0.00%	Outside Scope	

Annual fee

The Annual fee is half the above thereafter

5,000 to 9,999	Statutory	500.00	500.00	0.00%	} Included under Annual fees	Outside Scope
10,000 to 14,999	Statutory	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
15,000 to 19,999	Statutory	2,000.00	2,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
20,000 to 29,999	Statutory	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
30,000 to 39,999	Statutory	8,000.00	8,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
40,000 to 49,000	Statutory	12,000.00	12,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
50,000 to 59,999	Statutory	16,000.00	16,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
60,000 to 69,999	Statutory	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
70,000 to 79,999	Statutory	24,000.00	24,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
80,000 to 89,999	Statutory	28,000.00	28,000.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
90,000 and over	Statutory	32,000.00	32,000.00	0.00%	Outside Scope	

Personal Licences

Application for a grant of personal licence	Statutory	37.00	37.00	0.00%	1,600	Outside Scope
---	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------

Temporary events

Temporary event notice	Statutory	21.00	21.00	0.00%	4,500	Outside Scope
------------------------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------

Fees and charges

Premises and alcohol related licences

	Charge Status	From April 2023 £	From April 2024 £	% Increase	Yield £	VAT treatment
<u>Other licences</u>						
Theft, loss, etc. of premises licences or summary	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%	300	Outside Scope
Application for a provisional statement where premises being built etc.	Statutory	315.00	315.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Notification of change of name or address	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Application to vary licence to specify individual as premises supervisor	Statutory	23.00	23.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Application for transfer of premises licence	Statutory	23.00	23.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Interim authority notice following death etc. of licence holder	Statutory	23.00	23.00	0.00%		Outside Scope
Theft, loss etc. of certificate or summary	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Notification of change of name or alteration of rules of club	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Change of relevant registered address of club	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Theft, loss etc. of temporary event notice	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Theft, loss etc. of personal licence	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Duty to notify change of name or address	Statutory	10.50	10.50	0.00%		Outside Scope
Right of freeholder etc. to be notified of licensing matters	Statutory	21.00	21.00	0.00%		Outside Scope

No fee shall be payable in respect of the above licences for an entertainment at a church hall, chapel hall or other similar building occupied in connection with a place of public religious worship, or at village hall, parish or community hall or other similar building. At the discretion of the Council no fee may be payable if the entertainment is of an educational or other like character or is given for charitable or other like purposes.