

From the Chair of the Safer and Stronger Communities Board
Cllr Mehboob Khan

July 2013



Dear Community Safety Portfolio Holder

Licensing: 2 relevant court decisions

I am writing to you following the outcome of two court cases that have significant implications for all licensing fee regimes, ranging from taxis and street trading, to alcohol and gambling licences. Both cases are already resulting in increased scrutiny and challenge of the fees charged by councils for licences and permits, and the process which leads to the granting of a licence. Both have potential implications for enforcement activity.

Alcohol licensing

Most significantly, the decision of the Court of Appeal in the Hemming vs Westminster has raised the possibility that fees charged since the European Services Directive of 2009 are invalid. This is particularly likely to affect nationally set fees, as under the Licensing Act, but locally set fees could also be affected if the procedure for setting them has not been correctly followed and does not accurately reflect the true costs incurred each year. A full briefing note on the case is in Annex A, but in short it establishes that enforcement activity against unlicensed traders cannot be recovered through the fee process for licensed premises. We are aware that many councils have not included this cost within their licensing fee since 2009, but there are also a number that have continued to do so.

Taxi licensing

In the second case, Aylesbury Vale District Council's prosecution of a local taxi operator was dismissed because of alleged procedural failures in the adoption process. The council believed it was in a position to prosecute following the adoption, twenty four years ago, of part of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976. However, because Aylesbury Vale was unable to show that they had sent the notice of adoption to every parish council in their area, the court determined that the resolution was procedurally invalid.

I am writing to you to share our briefing on the issue, but to also establish the impact that these decisions may have on your council as a licensing authority. The LGA is considering what support we might provide to our member authorities and to do this we need to know:

- If your council is likely to be affected by either decision

- The likely financial impact if this is the case
- If you would consider providing support to Westminster and/or Aylsebury Vale as they challenge their respective court decisions.

Please can you provide a response to these three questions to ian.leete@local.gov.uk by **2 August**.

These developments potentially add significant weight to our view that a locally-set fee system is the fairest and most effective way of managing regulation. However, it is important that we can assure businesses that this will genuinely be the case and that our processes are in place to manage this.

The next fee system to be localised is the Scrap Metal Dealers Act licences, beginning in September. The LGA is producing a fees toolkit to help councils assist with this, which will ensure that they comply fully with the Services Directive, and will be applicable to any fee-paying licence system affected by the EU Services Directive.

Yours sincerely,



Councillor Mehboob Khan

LGA briefing on the implications of Hemming v Westminster City Council on locally set licence fees



10th July 2013

This briefing aims to provide councils with a summary of the recent Hemming v Westminster City Council case and the implications for councils more widely.

The case impacts on the type of costs that councils can recover through locally set licence fees and the processes councils have in place to ensure fee setting is transparent and open to scrutiny. We recommend that legal services and licensing departments use this brief to discuss the impact of the case for their council.

The LGA is interested in hearing directly from members that have concerns about the implications of the Hemming v Westminster case for their council, particularly in relation to cost recovery or where any outstanding legal issues have not been resolved by this paper. Please do contact gwyneth.rogers@local.gov.uk or ian.leete@local.gov.uk to ensure we can act effectively on your behalf.

Summary of Hemming v Westminster City Council

Timothy Hemming, owner of Simply Pleasures Ltd, led a case on behalf of various sex shops contesting the level of licence fees for sex shops charged by Westminster City Council on the basis they could not be considered reasonable.

The original court ruling was given in May 2012, but this was subject to appeal and it is the Court of Appeal judgment made on 24th May 2013 that has now been established as the leading law on what costs can be taken into account when setting local licence fees.

The key issue addressed was whether the fees set by Westminster City Council complied with the requirements of the European Services Directive 2009 and the interpretation of Article 13(2) of the Directive. The Services Directive aims to make it easier for service providers to set up or offer their services anywhere within Europe and introduced a range of requirements on those issuing licences to the service and retail sector, including the provision of online applications and payments. The Services Directive also makes it clear that licence fees covered by the Directive can only be used to recover costs and should not be used to make a profit or deter service providers from entering a market.

In essence, the Hemming case questioned the lawfulness of Westminster's licence fees for sex establishments as 'charges' under the Directive and whether these were 'reasonable and proportionate to the cost of the authorisation procedures...' and did 'not exceed the cost of the procedure'.

Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ
Email info@local.gov.uk
Tel 020 7664 3000 Fax 020 7664 3030
Information centre 020 7664 3131 www.local.gov.uk

The court ruling

While the Services Directive may be clear that any charges for licences covered by the Directive must be reasonable and not exceed the costs associated with the authorisation procedures, there is no more detail on what costs can or not be included when calculating a fee.

The original hearing also considered whether Westminster City Council had made a valid determination of the licence fee for any year after the year ending on 31 January 2006, which was the last occasion that the fees were considered by the Licensing sub-committee. The judgement, accepted by the Court of Appeal, 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.

In the *Hemming V Westminster* case, the Court of Appeal specifically considered whether the cost of investigating and prosecuting those who operate without a licence can be recovered through the licence fee paid by those operating within the system. Ultimately, was it lawful to set licence fees which reflected the council's costs of enforcing the system against *unlicensed* operators, as well as those which were licensed?

Unfortunately for Westminster, the Court of Appeal upheld the earlier decision of the Administrative Court from May 2012. It ruled that the fees set must be not exceed the costs of administering the process. As such, the council was no longer able to include the cost of enforcement against unlicensed sex establishment operators when setting the licence fee.

This confirmed the change of approach from what was the accepted position prior to the Regulations coming into force in 2010. Then, the setting of a fee for sex establishment licences was regulated by the Local Government (Misc. Provisions) Act 1982. A 'reasonable' fee under that Act was accepted as including enforcement costs so that the system was, in effect, self-financing.

Whilst the council had sought to argue that there should be no distinction between the enforcement of licensed and unlicensed operators, particularly as licensed businesses ultimately benefit from action to tackle rogue traders and ensuring there is a level playing field in place for responsible businesses, the Judge did not agree.

He commented at paragraph 70 as follows:

"It is difficult to see how even a strained interpretation enables the cost of authorisation procedures and formalities to include the cost of prosecuting unlicensed operatives who have not applied for authorisation".

However, the Judgment makes it clear that the costs of compliance monitoring and enforcement against an applicant who has been given a license can fall within the costs of the council's authorisation procedures. Further, costs associated with monitoring the continued suitability of operators during license renewals (and, potentially, reviews) may also be included as part of the compliance process given that they relate to the terms of their licenses previously granted.

It should be noted that it is not yet clear whether this will be tested in further litigation, possibly with a reference to Europe for a definitive ruling on the meaning of the Directive.

What does this mean for councils?

The LGA recommends that all councils review the costs covered by locally set licence fees in light of this judgment and ensure that they no longer reflect costs of addressing unlicensed business activity. It is clear that not being able to recover costs associated with addressing unlicensed sex establishments will have significant long term financial repercussions for Westminster City Council, however, we do recognise that the financial impact for councils more widely will vary depending on the local economy, the licensed activity and the approach taken to local fee setting in the past.

The LGA also recommends that councils take the opportunity to ensure that all locally set licence fees are based on an up to date cost recovery approach, which is established and regularly reviewed in a transparent manner that can be understood by both businesses and residents. The LGA will be publishing guidance on what can be included in locally set licence fees during the Summer 2013.

Further information

Original court ruling for Hemming V Westminster

<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2012/1260.html>

Court of Appeal ruling for Hemming V Westminster – 24th May 2013

<http://cornerstonebarristers.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Hemming-APPROVED-Judgement.pdf>

EU Services Directive

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:376:0036:0068:en:pdf>

BIS guidance on the EU Services Directive

<https://www.gov.uk/eu-services-directive>