Local Government Association

Open for business

LGA guidance on locally set licence fees

Guidance

Contents

Introduction

Councils are responsible for administering a range of licences and approvals relating to both national legislation and discretionary functions that are agreed locally. For the majority of these regimes the costs are recovered through fees set by each council and paid by the licence applicant. It is an accepted principle in relation to these schemes that those who benefit from the system (eg licence holders) should cover the cost of it. Locally set fees are a vital means of ensuring both that full costs can be recovered by each and every council, reducing the risk of a subsidy from local tax payers, and that businesses do not pay more than they should.

While the licensing role within local government may be long established, the decisions that are being made by individual councils in this area are facing increased scrutiny from businesses, the public and in the media, particularly in relation to fee setting. Recent case law resulting from the European Services Directive, the introduction of new licences for scrap metal dealers and the potential introduction of locally set fees for alcohol licensing have all placed an added emphasis on the need for every council to set fees in a legally robust and transparent manner. In particular, a recent case under the Services Directive has significant implications for the way in which councils apply their licence fees.

This guidance aims to help councils understand the full breadth of issues that should be considered when setting local licence fees in order to meet legal obligations and provide the necessary reassurances to local businesses. It does not contain a fees calculator because this assumes a uniformity of service design and associated costs, when it is vital that councils are free to design the service that best serves the needs of their community and recover costs accordingly.

Key issues

Understanding the role of licensing

Licensing is an integral part of councils' broader regulatory services. Regulatory services are increasingly recognised as being at the heart of councils' approaches to economic growth, and it is believed that over fifty per cent of a business' contact with a council takes place through regulatory services. Officers working in licensing, environmental health and trading standards have regular interactions with businesses and can therefore have an important role in helping them become established and grow, at the same time as ensuring they adhere to important safeguards.

While economic growth is a priority for every council in the country, there is also the need to ensure that licensing regimes can continue to protect communities and visitors; manage public health risks; and remain responsive to local concerns.

Licensing also has an important role to play in helping councils shape the areas in which people live and work; by determining what types of premises open there, how long they are open for, and what sort of activities take place. Councillors, as democratic representatives of local communities, should be able to take licensing decisions that are in line with the preferred wishes of those communities.

The balance of all these factors will vary for each local area. Councils can take the opportunity to work with businesses, community groups and residents to design a licensing service based on local priorities and understand the implications that this will have for the fees charged.

All of this work requires funding, and it is an accepted principle that licensed activities should be funded on a cost-recovery basis, paid for by those benefiting from the licensed activity, rather than drawing on the public purse.

Where councils have the flexibility to set local fees, it is possible to consider how resources can be focused on risk; whether business support is effective; and how the burden of inspections can simply be removed where it is not necessary. A streamlined approach to licensing will ensure that fees are kept to a minimum and businesses can be encouraged to prosper.

How does the European Services Directive impact on locally set licence fees?

The European Services Directive[1] aims to make it easier for service and retail providers to establish a business anywhere within Europe. The principle of ensuring that regulation is transparent and that the burdens placed on businesses are kept to a minimum is an objective that all councils can support. However, the legal requirements in the Directive do have practical implications for local licensing regimes, including fee setting.

Further guidance about the entirety of the European Services is available on the GOV.UK website[2].

1 EU Services Directive: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/LSU/?uri=CELEX:32006L0123&qid=1446478137741

2 BIS guidance on the EU Services Directive: https://www.gov.uk/eu-services-directive

Councils should specifically note that the Directive does not apply to licensing of taxis, or gambling activities; however, the principles remain a helpful way of providing a transparent and business-friendly approach to licensing.

Principles of the Services Directive

The general principles of the Services Directive apply to all processes and administrative procedures that need to be followed when establishing or running a service or retail business, including the setting, charging and processing of fees for licences. The core principles of the Directive – non-discriminatory; justified; proportionate; clear; objective; made public in advance; transparent and accessible – apply to fee setting and are already practiced by a large number of councils with the aim of ensuring a fair and transparent approach for local businesses and communities.

Most principles are self-explanatory, but the principle of 'non-discrimination' requires a little more explanation. In the Services Directive it is defined as meaning 'the general conditions of access to a service, which are made available to the public at large by the provider [and] do not contain discriminatory provisions relating to the nationality or place of residence of the recipient'.

This applies at the local level when considering fee setting meaning that all applicants must be treated equally irrespective of location and/ or nationality. Councils should not, for instance, seek to subsidise businesses operating in one geographical area by offering comparatively lower fees than required of those operating in another. Such an approach discriminates against those businesses located elsewhere in the locality.

The importance of this approach has also been established by case law on taxi and PHV licensing which, as it is not covered by the Services Directive, demonstrates that some core principles are shared between UK and EU legislation.

Cummings v Cardiff ruled that the charges within a licensing regime for different categories of licence should not subsidise each other; so a surplus gained on hackney carriage licences should not reduce the cost of a private hire vehicle licence. This can be logically extended to mean that the fees received under one licensing regime must not subsidise fees charged under another. For instance, a surplus generated by taxi fees must be reinvested back into taxi licensing and not used to reduce the cost of, for instance, a scrap metal dealers licence.

All councils should therefore ensure that they have individual, discrete cost-calculations for each of the licensing regimes that they operate. This may require a change in the way that some councils operate.

One of the LGA's priorities for ongoing Brexit negotiations is that fees covering licensing continue to be upheld in domestic law.

Administering payment of fees

Under the Services Directive councils need to ensure that details of any fees are easily accessible online, including the ability to make payments online.

Councils should be able to separate out the cost of processing an initial application from those costs associated with the on-going administration of a scheme, because this latter element cannot be charged to unsuccessful licence applicants.

This was a key issue in the Hemming v Westminster case (see case law, page 13), in which the Supreme Court asked the European Court of Justice (ECJ) to rule on how Westminster applied its licence fees. The Supreme Court identified two different approaches to charging fees:

(a) Whereby a council charged a fee upon application (covering the costs of authorisation procedures) and a subsequent fee to successful applicants (covering the cost of administering and enforcing the framework) - the 'type A' approach.

(b) Where a council charged a single fee on application covering all costs, on the basis that the relevant proportion of the fee would be refunded to unsuccessful applicants – the 'type B' approach.

The ECJ published its ruling on the issue on 16 November 2016, following an earlier opinion by the Advocate General in July 2016.

The ECJ ruled that the type B approach of fee setting is not compatible with the Services Directive, arguing that the Directive 'precludes the requirement for the payment of a fee, at the time of submitting an application for the grant or renewal of a authorisation, part of which corresponds to the costs relating to the management and enforcement of the authorisation scheme concerned, even if that part is refundable if that application is refused.'

Therefore, **licensing authorities will need to amend their fee structures for fees covered by the Services Directive to ensure that application fees relate solely to the cost of authorisation procedures** (ie, the costs associated with reviewing an application and granting / refusing a licence). **Under the type A approach, on which the Supreme Court ruling still holds, successful licence applicants should subsequently be charged an additional fee** relating to the costs of administering and enforcing the relevant licensing framework. An example of amended licensing fees which separate out administration and enforcement costs can be found on Westminster council's website[3].

It is worth noting on this point that the Supreme Court view – which again still holds – was that there is nothing to stop licensing authorities making the payment of such a fee a condition of holding a licence. This would mean that authorities could withhold a licence until payment of the relevant fee had been received:

'…nothing in article 13(2) precludes a licensing authority from charging a fee for the possession or retention of a licence, and making this licence conditional upon payment of such fee. Any such fee would however have to comply with the requirements, including that of proportionality, identified in section 2 of Chapter III and section 1 of Chapter IV. But there is no reason why it should not be set at a level enabling the authority to recover from licensed operators the full cost of running and enforcing the licensing scheme, including the costs of enforcement and proceedings against those operating sex establishments without licences.'

Not all legislation in England and Wales permits councils to separate out elements of the fee in this way. For instance, the Licensing Act 2003 has fees set nationally, which constrains councils' ability to adopt this approach. It is therefore unclear whether a council could offer a refund of the enforcement element if an application is refused under this Act: the LGA view is that this is not possible, as the legislation requires that the specified amount (fee) must be paid on application.

Nevertheless, despite these constraints, councils should calculate the notional costs of administration and enforcement separately and make applicants aware of the two elements to the fee. In addition to meeting the transparency requirements of the Services Directive, this enables councils to examine the efficiency of their internal processes and make improvements where necessary. The process adopted and information available about this should be simple and cost effective for both the council and businesses.

Reasonable and proportionate

The Directive also includes specific requirements that apply to the charging of fees. Charges must be reasonable and proportionate to the cost of the processes associated with a licensing scheme. Councils must not use fees covered by the Directive to make a profit or act as an economic deterrent to deter certain business types from operating within an area.

3 https://www.westminster.gov.uk/sites/www.westminster.gov.uk/files/licensing_fees_list.pdf

Keeping fees under review

Fees should be broadly cost neutral in budgetary terms, so that, over the lifespan of the licence, the budget should balance. Those benefitting from the activities permitted by the various licences should not, so far as there is discretion to do so, be subsidised by the general fund.

To ensure that fees remain reasonable and proportionate it is necessary to establish a regular and robust review process. This has particular advantages in the early stages of a new licensing regime, as with the Scrap Metal Dealers Act, where fees have been set on best guess estimates of the number of applications that will be received.

Annual reviews allow for the fine tuning of fees and allow councils to take steps to avoid either a surplus or deficit in future years. This will not immediately benefit licence holders where the licence has been granted for a number of years and paid for in a lump sum, but will ensure new entrants to the licensing scheme are charged appropriately.

Councils that divert fees income from the relevant licensing scheme to fund other licensing work, or to fund other council activities, will be breaking the law.

Where fees charged result in a surplus, both Hemming v Westminster and Cummings v Cardiff state that this surplus must be used to reduce the fees charged in the following year. It is possible to extend the reinvestment of the surplus over more than one year[4], but this will need careful consideration about whether contributors may leave the licensing system over that period and therefore lose out on the return.

Deficits can similarly be recovered[5], although where there is a significant deficit, councils may want to consider how recovery can be undertaken over more than one year so as not to financially harm otherwise viable businesses.

The case of R v Tower Hamlets LBC (1994)[6] may also be of relevance, as the High Court indicated that "a council has a duty to administer its funds so as to protect the interests of what is now the body of council tax payers".

Open route for challenge

In the interests of transparency it is helpful to give an indication of how the fee level has been calculated; the review process in place and a contact method for businesses to query or challenge the fees. Open consultation with businesses and residents to design a local service, including understanding the implications for fees, helps to provide a robust answer to challenge.

It may also prove helpful to engage elected members in the scrutiny of fees. They will use their knowledge as local representatives to consider councils' assumptions and challenge them where necessary.

4 R v Manchester City Council ex parte King (1991) 89 LGR 696. http://www.lawindexpro.co.uk/cgi-bin/casemap.php?case=197719&rf=scu%2520target=

5 R v Westminster City Council ex parte Hutton (1985) 83 LGR 516.

6 R v London Borough of Tower Hamlets ex parte Tower Hamlets Combined Traders Association, 19 July 1993; [1994] COD 325 QBD Sedley J. Although the decision was about the London Local Authorities Act 1990, it would appear to have general effect as a principle. http://www.lawindexpro.co.uk/cgi-bin/casemap.php?case=197718&rf=scu%2520target=

So what can be included in a licence fee?

Councils may want to consider the following elements when setting licence fees. It should be noted that this list is for consideration only, as councils may choose not to charge for all the elements listed if they do not apply locally, or there may be additional areas of work carried out during the licensing process that were not highlighted during the development of this guidance.

Individual pieces of legislation may also have specific items that may or may not be chargeable under the scheme. The lists below will apply for most schemes, but should always be checked against the relevant piece of legislation. If councils have any concerns they should seek the advice of their in-house legal department.

Initial application costs could include:

Administration – this could cover basic office administration to process the licence application, such as resources, photocopying, postage or the cost of handling fees through the accounts department. This could also include the costs of specialist licensing software to maintain an effective database, and printing licences.

Initial visit/s – this could cover the average cost of officer time if a premises visit is required as part of the authorisation process. Councils will need to consider whether the officer time includes travel. It would also be normal to include 'on-costs' in this calculation. Councils will need to consider whether 'on-costs' include travel costs and management time.

Third party costs – some licensing processes will require third party input from experts, such as veterinary attendance during licensing inspections at animal related premises.

Liaison with interested parties – engaging with responsible authorities and other stakeholders will incur a cost in both time and resources.

Management costs – councils may want to consider charging an average management fee where it is a standard process for the application to be reviewed by a management board or licensing committee. However, some councils will include management charges within the 'on-costs' attached to officer time referenced below.

Local democracy costs – councils may want to recover any necessary expenditure in arranging committee meetings or hearings to consider applications.

On costs – including any recharges for payroll, accommodation, including heating and lighting, and supplies and services connected with the licensing functions. Finance teams should be able to provide a standardised cost for this within each council.

Development, determination and production of licensing policies – the cost of consultation and publishing policies can be fully recovered.

Web material – the EU Services Directive requires that applications, and the associated guidance, can be made online and councils should effectively budget for this work.

Advice and guidance – this includes advice in person, production of leaflets or promotional tools, and online advice.

Setting and reviewing fees – this includes the cost of time associated with the review, as well as the cost of taking it to a committee for approval.

Further compliance and enforcement costs could include:

Additional monitoring and inspection visits – councils may wish to include a charge for risk based visits to premises in between licensing inspections and responding to complaints. As with the initial licensing visit, councils can consider basing this figure on average officer time, travel, administration, management costs and on costs as suggested above.

Local democracy costs – councils may want to recover any necessary expenditure in arranging committee meetings or hearings to review existing licences or respond to problems.

Registers and national reporting – some licensing schemes require central government bodies to be notified when a licence is issued. The costs of doing this can be recovered.

Charging for action against unlicensed traders

Councils' ability to charge for these costs as part of a licensing scheme depends on the licensing scheme in question. In Hemming v Westminster (see page 13), the Supreme Court ruled that the Services Directive made no mention of enforcement costs. Councils' ability to charge these costs to applicants for licences is therefore dependent on the UK legislation.

The Court ruled that licensing authorities are entitled under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 to impose fees for the grant or renewal of licences covering the running and enforcement costs of the licensing scheme; in this case, the licensing scheme for sex shops.

However, legal interpretation of taxi and PHV licensing suggests that councils do not have the power to recover the costs of any enforcement against licensed or unlicensed drivers at all, although they may recover the costs of enforcement against vehicles[7]. The LGA believes that section 70(1) of the 1976 Act makes it clear that the costs of enforcement against licensed operators can also be recovered through a fee; however, the position on recovering these costs is contested.

Home Office guidance under the Scrap Metal Dealers Act, which councils must have regard to, prevents the recovery of enforcement costs against unlicensed dealers only. Great care must therefore be taken when setting fees to check what is and is not permitted under that specific licensing regime.

Unrecoverable costs

It is worth considering that the costs of defending appeals in the magistrate's court or via judicial review can be recovered through the courts. Including these costs within the fees regime could lead to recovering the costs twice, which would be inconsistent with the Services Directive.

7 http://www.guildford.gov.uk/cHttpHandler.ashx?id=6647&p=0

Do	Don't	Maybe
Check the relevant legislation	Use a surplus from one fee to subsidise another	Include the costs of enforcement against unlicensed traders
Calculate processing costs and enforcement costs separately and ensure that any fees covered by the Services Directive are charged to applicants and new licensees in two stages	Allow fees income to be drawn into the council's general fund	Include a condition on the issued licence that requires the payment of the enforcement part of the fee, where this is not charged upfront
Clearly communicate to applicants the elements that make up the fee	Allow fee levels to roll-over each year without a review	
Ensure fees are determined by the right person	Forget to ask the courts to award costs during a prosecution	
Include staff on-costs		
Include training costs for officers and councillors		

Further support

The practical approach to designing a local licensing service, allocating costs accurately and considering legal implications can be a difficult task; therefore it is strongly recommended that licensing teams work with their legal advisors and finance teams to make the best use of all expertise.

In addition, councils should consider working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities to provide mutual support. Working with other councils and reviewing fees set by similar authorities can be an extremely valuable way of ensuring that fees are not perceived to be disproportionate by businesses.

This document sets out high-level, over-arching principles for fee setting that apply across most licensing regimes. It is always important to check the specific details of the regime in question.

The All Wales Licensing Expert Panel has compiled a series of helpful documents to assist councils with the practical aspects of setting fees, including data capture guidance and a basic time recording method. They can be accessed at:
http://www.npt.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=11958

The following links will take you to relevant legislation or guidance for the most common licensing regimes, current at the time of publication:

Licensing Act 2003
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/alcohol-licensing-fee-levels

Gambling Act 2005
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/19/section/212
and
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2007/479/contents/made

Scrap Metal Dealers 2013
http://tinyurl.com/SMDAfees

Taxis and PHV Licensing (Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1976)
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1976/57/section/70

Sexual Establishments (Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1982)
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1982/30/schedule/3

Street Trading (Local Government Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1982)
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1982/30/schedule/4

Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (The UK legislation applying the EU Services Directive to UK law)
https://www.detini.gov.uk/publications/guidance-business-provision-services-regulations

Case law

Hemming v Westminster

The Hemming v Westminster case tested the degree to which fees and processes must be proportionate, as well as the administrative processes for calculating fees, in the context of licensing sex establishments. The case established a number of key points about setting fees under the Services Directive.

The case has passed through a number of courts, including the Court of Appeal, Supreme Court and European Court of Justice, with different elements of the case being settled at different stages.

In 2013[8], the Court of Appeal ruled that the fees set must not exceed the costs of administering the licensing regime. This meant that the council was no longer able to include the cost of enforcement against unlicensed sex establishment operators when setting the licence fee. The Court of Appeal held that such costs could not be deemed to fall within the EU Services Directive 2006 and associated UK Provision of Services Regulations 2009.

The Directive states that charges levied by a competent body on applicants under an authorisation scheme must be reasonable and proportionate to the cost of the 'procedures and formalities' of the scheme and must not exceed these costs. However, the cost of visits to licensed premises to monitor compliance could be recovered through fees.

The judgement also found that the annual reviews conducted by an officer of Westminster City Council were no substitute for determinations by the council. The judge rejected the council's submission that the fee had been fixed on an open-ended basis in 2004 so that the fee rolled over from one year to the next. Westminster City Council was consequently ordered to repay fees charged over that period.

The judgement would have left Westminster, and potentially other councils, liable to refund the proportion of sex shop licence fees deemed to be unlawful, dating back to the introduction of the Regulations in 2009.

Westminster appealed the Court of Appeal's judgement on the recovery of enforcement costs, and the case was heard by the Supreme Court in January 2015. Other matters determined by earlier hearings, such as the need to review fees annually and the requirement for councils to ring-fence income from licensing fees so that any surplus or deficit is carried forward to the next year's budget, were not contested.

The council's position that it was lawful for it to seek to recover all enforcement costs was supported by the LGA, which submitted written interventions to the Supreme Court. A range of regulatory bodies, as well as HM Treasury, also submitted written interventions in the case.

8 Court of Appeal ruling for Hemming v Westminster – 24 May 2013 http://cornerstonebarristers.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Hemming-APPROVED-Judgement.pdf

The Supreme Court ruled[9] that licensing authorities are entitled under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 to impose fees for the grant or renewal of licences covering the running and enforcement costs of the licensing scheme. Crucially, it reasoned that the Services Directive deals only with the issue of authorisation procedures and fees relating to applications to exercise a service activity (such as operating a sex shop). The Supreme Court sought an opinion from the European Court of Justice regarding how such fees should be levied. It identified two different approaches to charging fees:

- whereby a council charged a fee upon application (covering the costs of authorisation procedures) and a subsequent fee to successful applicants (covering the cost of administering and enforcing the framework) - the 'type A' approach, or
- where a council charged a single fee on application covering all costs, on the basis that the relevant proportion of the fee would be refunded to unsuccessful applicants – the 'type B' approach.

The Supreme Court found the type A approach of charging two fees is permissible under the Services Directive but considered that the type B approach of charging a single fee was more problematic.

The ECJ published its ruling on the issue on 16 November 2016, following an earlier opinion by the Advocate General in July 2016, and concluded that only type A fees are permissible under the Services Directive.

However, the opinion of the Advocate General and the commentary contained in the judgement of the ECJ went beyond the specific issues that had been referred to it. Of particular concern, both the opinion and the commentary in the ruling appeared to reopen the issue of whether including the costs of administering and enforcing licensing regimes within licence fees is compatible with the Services Directive, with a strong indication that the Advocate General and ECJ believed that it is not. **While the Supreme Court's view on this issue remains in place at the current time, meaning councils can continue to include these costs in their licence fees**, it seems inevitable that there will be a further challenge on this issue at some point in future.

Where councils receive claims for previously paid type B licence fees on the grounds that they have now been ruled incompatible with the Services Directive, the only legitimate claim for restitution relates to the loss of interest that a licence holder can be deemed to have suffered by virtue of paying the entirety of the fee upfront, rather than the fee being split into two payments on application and on successfully being awarded a licence.

The fact that the opinion expressed by the Advocate Generate in July appears to dissent from the view expressed by the Supreme Court as regards the legality under the Services Directive of including enforcement costs in licence fees is not relevant to claims for reimbursement. The opinion is just that - an opinion - rather than a ruling, and did not form part of the final ECJ ruling on the narrow issue at stake.

The LGA has received legal guidance on the form of words that councils can use in respect of such claims. This is available from rebecca.johnson@local.gov.uk

Cummings v Cardiff[10]

Cardiff Council had proposed a significant increase to hackney carriage and private hire vehicle charges in July 2013. Cummings and other claimants then challenged Cardiff City Council to a judicial review over the way these costs had been calculated. In 2014, Mr Justice Hickinbottom granted the claim for the review on the grounds that:

- the level of fees set failed to have regard to and/or account for any surplus or deficit generated in previous years dating back to 1 May 2009

9 https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2013-0146.html

10 http://www.stjohnschambers.co.uk/dashboard/wp-content/uploads/Cummings-Others-v-Cardiff-11.pdf

- the level of fees set failed to account for any surplus or deficit accrued under each of the hackney carriage and private hire licensing regimes within the regime under which they have accrued
- the level of fee set for hackney carriage licences in 2013 included part of the cost of funding taxi marshals for the Council's administrative area.

The Judge also made declarations that:

(1) A local authority when determining hackney carriage and private hire licence fees under ss.53 and 70 of the LG(MP) Act 1976 must take into account any surplus or deficit generated from fees levied in previous years in respect of meeting the reasonable costs of administering the licence fees as provided by ss.53 and 70 above.

(2) A local authority must:
   - keep separate accounts for hackney carriage and PHV licence fees under ss.53 and 70 of the LG(MP) Act 1976
   - ensure that any surplus or deficit identified under each part of the hackney carriage and private hire licensing regimes is only applied to the part of the system from which it has been raised/lost
   - ensure that any surplus from one licensing regime shall not to be used to subsidise a deficit in another.

Acknowledgments

This document was updated in 2017 to reflect the ECJ decision Hemming v Westminster.

The original document was put out to public consultation between 5 and 29 November 2013 and updated in November 2015 to reflect the Supreme Court decision in Hemming v Westminster. On both occasions it was reviewed and cleared by the LGA's in-house legal team and external Counsel: similar, the amendments in 2017 were based upon guidance from Counsel.

We are very grateful to all those listed below who responded to the consultation exercise:

- The Home Office
- Bolton Council
- Bristol City Council
- Broadland District Council
- Members of the LGA Licensing Forum
- Oxford City Council
- Southampton City Council
- West of England Group of Local Authorities

Local Government Association
Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

Telephone 020 7664 3000
Fax 020 7664 3030
Email info@local.gov.uk
www.local.gov.uk

For a copy in Braille, larger print or audio,
please contact us on 020 7664 3000.
We consider requests on an individual basis.

REF 5.13