

Licensing Committee

Thursday 11 August 2016 at 2.00 pm

**To be held at at the Town Hall,
Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors David Barker, Alan Law, Andy Bainbridge, Jack Clarkson, Neale Gibson, Kieran Harpham, Adam Hurst, George Lindars-Hammond, Anne Murphy, Andy Nash, Moya O'Rourke, Josie Paszek, Vickie Priestley, Bob Pullin and Cliff Woodcraft

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

The Licensing Committee carries out a statutory licensing role, including licensing for taxis and public entertainment.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday.

You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked * on the agenda.

Recording is allowed at Licensing Committee meetings under the direction of the Chair of the meeting. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information please contact Harry Clarke on 0114 273 6183 or email harry.clarke@sheffield.gov.uk.

FACILITIES

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

**LICENSING COMMITTEE AGENDA
11 AUGUST 2016**

Order of Business

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest**
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting.
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings**
To approve the minutes of the meetings held on:-

19 April 2016
26 April 2016
12 May 2016
16 May 2016
18 May 2016
2 June 2016
7 June 2016
9 June 2016
14 June 2016
- 6. Request for Increase in Hackney Carriage Fares**
Report of the Chief Licensing Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
 - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
 - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
 - the landlord is your council or authority; and
 - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
 - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
 - (b) either -
 - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 19 April 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Anne Murphy and Vickie Priestley

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Neale Gibson.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LICENSING ACT 2003 - WADSLEY HOUSE SOCIAL CLUB, THE DRIVE, SHEFFIELD, S6 4AL

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application for a Premises Licence made under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as Wadsley House Social Club, The Drive, Sheffield, S6 4AL.

4.2 Present at the meeting were Mike Royles (Director, Wadsley House Social Club, Applicant), Dennis Law (Chairman, Wadsley House Social Club, Applicant), Alan Antcliff, Tony May, Stephen Rhodes, Helen Robertshaw and Matthew Rush (Objectors), Georgina Hollis (Licensing Enforcement and Technical Officer), Marie-Claire Frankie (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and John Turner (Democratic Services).

4.3 Marie-Claire Frankie outlined the procedure which would be followed during the hearing.

4.4 Georgina Hollis presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that representations in respect of the application comprised two letters of support from local residents and 21 objections from members of the public, including a petition containing 162 signatures, details of which were attached at Appendix 'C' to the report.

4.5 Matthew Rush, who was speaking on behalf of a number of the objectors, stated that he was objecting to the application on the grounds that there would potentially be an increased risk of anti-social behaviour and crime, as well as public nuisance, and that there could be potential harm to children. He stated that the premises were close to a number of residential properties, as well as being situated near Marlcliffe Primary School and the Corner House private nursery. There had

already been a number of incidents of public disorder and crime that had occurred when events had been held at the Club and, on the basis that the main entrance is only a short distance from a number of houses on The Drive, residents often suffered noise nuisance, which included music, people leaving the premises to go outside to smoke and drink and people talking loudly when waiting for taxis late at night. As the car park was not very big, a number of visitors parked outside residents' houses, which created noise issues when they were leaving after events had ended. Neighbours had complained about having glasses left outside their properties, people sitting on their garden walls and it was believed there had been damage caused to cars on The Drive after events. He stated that extending the opening hours at the Club would increase the potential for problems associated with the Club. Mr Rush stated that, whilst he and other residents had held back in terms of making formal complaints, mainly due to the expectation of having to put up with a certain level of disruption in living so close to a social club, he and a number of other residents had had cause to complain to the Club and the Licensing Service in connection with incidences of anti-social behaviour. Mr Rush stated that his family were frequently woken by the noise, and that he understood that there had been an argument and fight, involving several adults, on The Drive, following an event at the Club. He was particularly concerned for the safety and wellbeing of his children, as were a number of other residents. He stressed that he was happy to have a successful social club near his property, as long as the conditions of any Premises Licence were adhered to, but expressed some level of concern at the fact that, as there had been issues in the past, he envisaged that extending the opening hours would only make the problems worse. Mr Rush also stated that he did not consider that the Club did enough to reach out to the local community, such as organising an open day, or encouraging local residents to become members. In terms of the opposition to the application, Mr Rush stated that only two letters of support had been submitted, one of which was from a member of the Club, and that 15 of the 17 residents on The Drive had signed the petition objecting to the application. Neither he or any other residents had maintained any form of log, registering the incidents, as they did not wish to appear to be making life difficult for the Club. Mr Rush also made the point that the objectors had had very little time to prepare their representations. He stated that, on the basis that the application for the extension of hours was being made partly to make the Club more financially viable, he believed that the Club could try more imaginative ways of increasing its income, such as changing its constitution and having more daytime activities. He concluded by stating that he simply wanted what was best for the local community, and believed that the application would be counterproductive for both the Club and the local community.

- 4.6 Prior to further comments from the objectors, Georgina Hollis stated that following a complaint to the Licensing Service in terms of the operation of the Club under its existing licence, it was suggested to the Club's Directors that a change to the Premises Licence would be the best way forward. Following an inspection of all social club certificates in Sheffield, it became apparent that the Directors were wanting to have more private functions, presumably to maximise income, and the Service had therefore advised them to submit an application to amend the existing Premises Licence. Licensing Officers visited some Club members to discuss this issue. The Officers did not find any evidence of a breach of the terms of the existing Club Premises Certificate as they did not visit the Club itself.

- 4.7 Helen Robertshaw stated that she had lived next door to the Club for just under 11 years, and considered that, if the application to extend the opening hours was granted, this would result in more alcohol being consumed which, in turn, would have the potential for increasing noise levels, anti-social behaviour and crime. The local residents did not have confidence in the Club, in terms of taking any pro-active approach to tackling problems of noise nuisance, on the grounds that promises had been made before, and not adhered to. Whilst noise levels reduced when doors and windows at the Club were kept closed, most residents living within the immediate vicinity of the premises could still hear a certain amount of noise when private functions were being held. In addition to this, residents had been led to believe that the music would stop when the doors opened, which had not been the case. Ms Robertshaw stated that she was aware that a number of residents had visited the Club, requesting that the music be turned down. She also believed that the Directors should explore alternatives in terms of increasing the Club's income.
- 4.8 Tony May stated that, as with the other objectors in attendance, he was supportive of the Club, but considered that there had to be limits, as well as a level of reasonableness in terms of the activities it carried out. He stated that a number of people worked shifts and a number of families had young children, who would all suffer in terms of lack of sleep due to noise levels. Mr May also stated that he considered the Club's Directors could utilise the premises as a community centre during the day, such as arranging activities for older people, and also had the view that the Club's Directors did not do enough to involve the local community.
- 4.9 Stephen Rhodes, who had lived very close to the premises for 29 years, stressed that he would wish the Club to remain open and be successful, on the condition that it worked alongside the local community, and was more pro-active in terms of dealing with any residents' concerns. He also believed that if the application was granted, there would be a likely increase in noise nuisance. He believed there were issues in terms of the people attending private functions not being members of the Club. In terms of the private functions, he stated that he was aware of local residents being affected by the noise, and by people, usually children, climbing on, or over boundary walls, and considered this to be a serious issue as he, like many other families, liked to enjoy the privacy of his garden. Mr Rhodes was concerned with regard to the safeguarding of children, who were often left to play in the Club's grounds, sometimes unsupervised. He concluded by stating that he supported all the other comments made by the other objectors.
- 4.10 In response to questions from members of the Sub-Committee, Marie-Claire Frankie, Georgina Hollis and the applicants, it was stated that, whilst there was no formal log or record, local residents had attended the premises on a number of occasions to raise the issue of, or to complain about, noise nuisance. The residents had put up with a number of issues regarding noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour, partly due to the acceptance of living close to a social club and as they did not want to cause any friction. Some residents had made telephone calls directly to the Club, but had not called at the premises for fear of reprisals. Reference was made to a mass brawl outside the premises some time ago, which had resulted in a resident contacting the police. There had also been incidences of

flowers being removed from residents' gardens. The residents envisaged that there would be continuing problems of noise nuisance, particularly when there were private functions at the Club, which not only ended when the music stopped playing, but continued when people left the premises, when further noise nuisance was suffered from people either getting in their cars, waiting for taxis or walking home. Some residents had called the '101' number, but had been met with frustration due to the long delays in getting through. Others had visited the Club to complain about the noise, and had written to the Licensing Service to complain about people stood outside using foul language. Reference was made to the fact that the other people who had raised objections, and who had not been able to attend the meeting, had also been forced to make contact with the Club, or complain to one of the responsible authorities. Of the objectors in attendance at the meeting, two had indicated that they had joined the Club as members when they first moved into the area, but both memberships had now lapsed, and both indicated that they didn't particularly feel welcome. Two of the other objectors indicated that they had never joined as members, one indicating that he was not aware of any attempts to increase membership which, in his opinion, made it feel like local residents were not welcome. All the objectors present made it clear that they did not wish the Club to fail in any way, but considered that more could be done, specifically in terms of letting the Club out for more community activities, like at Wadsley Church Hall. It was considered that if the Club changed its constitution, it would be able to do a lot more, and make better use of the space. They also considered that if they had taken the trouble to discuss their plans with local residents prior to submitting the application, there may not have been any need for this meeting. The problems of noise nuisance usually only occurred when there were private functions at the Club, which were usually held most weekends. Due to the close proximity of a number of houses to the premises, it was considered that the application to extend the opening hours was not suitable. There were also other times during the day, when there were incidences of increased noise levels, such as during bowling matches and when football matches were televised. Noise levels would generally increase when the weather was better, with more people taking their drinks outside and more children playing in the play area. Noise levels had increased over the years as a number of residents had tidied their gardens by cutting down trees and shrubbery back, which used to act as a sound buffer. In terms of engagement with local residents, it was reported that, apart from flyers being posted through the doors of residents some time ago, inviting them to become members of the Club, nobody from the Club had visited any residents living within its immediate vicinity. The three objectors who lived on The Drive suffered particular problems regarding noise nuisance, as well as problems regarding access and egress to their properties when functions were held at the Club due to people parking on the highway. Apart from the noise caused by the music, several people who attended functions often congregated outside the main entrance, which faced straight down The Drive, and the noise from them talking, particularly late at night, travelled straight down the road. There were rarely any issues regarding noise nuisance when there were no private functions at the Club, but when there was a private party, with the resident DJ, most of the residents living within the immediate vicinity of the Club were affected by the noise. The objectors pointed out the location of their properties on an aerial photograph circulated at the meeting. The applicants also circulated a number of photographs in order to assist the Sub-Committee. One of the objectors indicated that, on

occasions, his children had played on the play equipment on the Club's premises. He also stated that he had booked two parties at the Club, one when he was a member and the other when his membership had lapsed.

- 4.11 Dennis Law, on behalf of the applicants, stated that he had been Chairman of the Social Club for around 30 years, and that the Club, which had around 173 members, aged between 30 and 85, had been operating for 95 years, and was a well-managed facility. He made the point that if the Club had not been well-managed during this time, it would not be open today. It was not the intention of the Directors to run the Club as a public house, and they had only applied for the extended hours to increase the opportunity for maximising income. Mr Law stated that the Club usually only opened at 10:30 hours for special occasions, such as weddings, funerals, christenings and key bowling matches, and that the extended opening hours would only apply when private functions had been booked at the Club. In response to comments raised by the objectors regarding the Club not being welcoming to local residents, Mr Law stated that it was a private club, therefore they were not allowed to advertise for members. He further apologised to the objectors if they considered that they had not been welcomed. In terms of noise nuisance outside the premises, he stated that it was not entirely the Club's fault in that, following the change in policy by the Government some time ago, with regard to smoking, people were now forced to go outside to smoke. The majority of the Club's members lived in the area and the aim was to provide a social function for members, rather than operate it as a public house. The Club's management made every attempt to keep noise levels down and did not wish to be viewed as being obstructive to local residents. With regard to the petition objecting to the application, Mr Law stated that he believed that a number of people who signed it were under the impression that the Club was planning to change how it operated, and run like a public house, and believed that a number of such people would not have signed the petition if they knew exactly what the plans were.
- 4.12 In response to questions from members of the Sub-Committee, Marie-Claire Frankie, Georgina Hollis and the objectors, it was stated that whilst a number of local groups and organisations had hired out the premises in the past, including the Women's Institute and a Keep Fit group, they were no longer willing or able to pay the rental charges. Generally, the Club did not open during the day, particularly during the week, and would only open for bowling matches, and even then, the bar would not be open unless it was a key match. In terms of the safeguarding of children, the parents attending the Club were asked to supervise their children, and it was made clear that children should not play on or around the bowling green. Every attempt was made to keep noise levels down in order not to disrupt the lives of the local residents and, on a number of occasions when private functions had been held at the Club, staff had asked the DJ to turn the music down when they considered it too loud. It was very rare for there to be any problems with regard to noise nuisance or anti-social behaviour when there were no private functions. There were notices on the doors, and all around the Club, reminding people to keep noise levels down, particularly when leaving late at night. Mr Law stated that, unless the management had any particular concerns about a particular person, any member of the public was able to book a private function at the Club, and if they wanted a disco, they would be required to use the Club's resident DJ. Whilst there has not been any official testing of noise levels in neighbouring properties, the

Club's management had carried out noise level testing from outside the premises. In terms of noise breakout, every attempt was made to keep the door to the bowling green closed, and there was a double-door lobby at the front entrance to the premises and, again, every effort was made to ensure that at least one of these doors was closed, particularly when there was music playing. In terms of other controls, it was stated that officers from the Council's Environmental Protection Service and the Fire Service had visited the premises to provide advice in terms of the maximum number of people allowed to be present at the Club. He stressed that they would not book a function if it was apparent that large numbers of people would be attending, and if there were any issues in connection with this, the Club's bar staff would be expected to deal with them. The Club would generally host one private function a week, usually on a Friday or Saturday night but, of course, this was not guaranteed. The Club was expensive to run, and the income raised from such functions comprised a large proportion of the Club's income. The management had been advised by the police to undertake a risk assessment in connection with each private function, including whether any door staff were required but, to date, this had not been considered necessary. The Club's car park could accommodate approximately 30 cars and, apart from some events and functions, when there had been instances of people having to park on surrounding roads, there was usually sufficient space. In terms of provision for smokers, it was stated that there was a purpose-built shelter, which the management encouraged people to use, but not everyone used it. The vast majority of people who booked private functions at the Club lived within walking distance of the premises. A number of members had also booked functions at the Club. Thirty-one private functions had been held at the Club, from October 2014 to September 2015, mostly on Friday or Saturday nights. When booking private functions, the organiser was told that they should only be using the function room and whilst there were notices in the Club indicating this, it was very difficult for staff to stop people going outside. There was a switch-off mechanism linked to the music system, which turned the music off when noise levels reached a certain level, but this was not working at the present time. Staff carried out regular checks in terms of volume levels, from the car park. When there was a bowling match being held on the premises, the bar would generally be open from 10:30 hours to 18:00 hours. It was stated that, if the application was granted, the management would take steps to improve the running of the Club, to include ensuring that the automatic switch-off in terms of amplified music was operational, ensuring that at least one of the two doors at the main entrance and the doors to the conservatory were closed whilst music was playing and ensuring that the premises were wheelchair accessible. It was rare that a private function would be held at the Club following a bowling match during the day. The Club would be aware of the dates and venues for all bowling matches, which usually took place on Saturday or Sunday afternoons. There would generally be one bar open when there was a bowling match on, but if it was considered necessary, due mainly to the numbers in attendance, the second bar would be opened.

- 4.13 In response to further questions, it was stated that it was very difficult for the Club to manage the behaviour of its members outside the Club's premises, but if management were aware, or were informed by local residents of any of its members causing trouble outside the premises, appropriate action would be taken. There were four CCTV cameras operating on the premises, with images being kept

for a week, and were available for inspection by the responsible authorities. There was a monitor behind the bar, but it was not being watched all the time. The Club would determine, as part of its risk assessments in connection with private functions, whether door staff were required but to date, there had been no need to hire any such staff. Although the management had applied to extend the opening hours on Fridays and Saturdays to 01:00 hours, it was not expected that the Club would remain open until this time very often and, alcohol would not be served up to this time. The reason for making the application had predominantly been as a result of discussions with the Council's Environmental Health Service and the police, but the management had also taken residents' considerations into account.

- 4.14 At this point in the proceedings, Georgina Hollis provided advice on the application and consultation process.
- 4.15 In response to further questions, it was stated that all members and guests should be required to sign in when attending the Club, including guests attending private functions. The only time when the Club would have the option of opening until 03:00 hours would be on New Year's Eve. In terms of local residents having someone to contact in the light of any problems, one of the Club's Directors was usually present at the Club during opening times. The Club's management had not explored any other options in terms of maximising the use of the premises on the basis that it was a limited company, and they were happy with the model they had got. In terms of the monitoring of noise levels, it was stated that officers from the Council's Environmental Health Service visited the residents at 18 The Drive some years ago, to undertake testing from the property, and found the noise levels to be too high. This had consequently resulted in the Club being required to install double-glazing and air conditioning. It was believed that no further such testing had been undertaken since then.
- 4.16 The applicants indicated that they had nothing further to add in terms of summarising their case.
- 4.17 RESOLVED: That the attendees involved in the application be excluded from the meeting before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, if those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 4.18 Marie-Claire Frankie reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.
- 4.19 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the attendees.
- 4.20 RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committee agrees to grant a Premises Licence in respect of Wadsley House Social Club, The Drive, Sheffield, S6 4AL, in the terms detailed below and in accordance with the modified operating schedule and additional conditions, as follows:-
- (a) No alcohol is to be sold or supplied otherwise than to the following persons:-

- (i) members;
 - (ii) bonafide guests of members, provided that such a member enters the name and address of the guest in a book kept by the Club for that purpose;
 - (iii) persons attending private, previously organised, functions, which are not open to the public at large; and
 - (iv) any member of the Club, team or sports body, in an organised game or contest on the Club premises, in a pre-arranged match, game or contest and any official attending the premises in connection with such a match, game or contest;
- (b) Names and addresses of all members to be kept on site and made available for inspection;
 - (c) Persons under 16 must be accompanied and supervised by a responsible adult at all times and be off the premises by 22:00 hours unless attending a private, pre-booked function;
 - (d) Smoking is to take place in the designated smoking area only;
 - (e) Amplified music is to be passed through a noise limiter, at an agreed set level by the Environmental Protection Service to ensure that noise from the premises shall not cause a nuisance to any local residents;
 - (f) Noise or vibrations shall not emanate from the premises so as to cause a nuisance to nearby properties;
 - (g) When a function is underway, the conservatory doors are to be used to access the smoking area;
 - (h) Windows and doors must be closed, save for access and egress, after 18:00 hours;
 - (i) No alcohol shall be taken outside during functions;
 - (j) All regulated entertainment for functions is to be booked through the premises;
 - (k) The Challenge 25 scheme will be adopted and used in the premises;
 - (l) A CCTV system, to the specification of South Yorkshire Police, will be fitted, maintained and in use at all times whilst the premises are open (in line with specification August 2013);
 - (m) The CCTV images will be stored for 28 days and the police and authorised officers of the Council will be given access to the images for purposes in connection with the prevention and detection of crime and disorder; further, members of the management team will be trained in the use of the system;
 - (n) All under 18 year olds attending private parties are to be signed in by a

responsible adult:

- (o) Clearly visible notices shall be placed on all exits reminding patrons to respect the neighbours;
- (p) A phone number is to be placed on a noticeboard where a Director in charge can be contacted at all times the premises are open;
- (q) A list of functions shall be maintained on the noticeboard detailing the date, time and nature of the event; and
- (r) The hours the premises are open to the public shall be:-

Sunday - Thursday 10:00 hours - 00:00 hours

Friday and Saturday 10:00 hours - 01:00 hours the following morning

Hours for the sale of alcohol:-

Sunday - Thursday 11:00 hours - 23:00 hours

Friday and Saturday 11:00 hours - 00:00 hours

(NOTE: The full reasons for the Sub-Committee's decision will be included in the written Notice of Determination.)

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 26 April 2016

PRESENT: Councillors Geoff Smith (Chair), George Lindars-Hammond and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received. Councillor Neale Gibson attended the meeting as a reserve Member, but was not required to stay.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on item 4 on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING - INDIVIDUAL CASES

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted details in respect of three cases relating to hackney carriage and private hire licensing.

4.2 The applicant in Case No. 31/16 attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.3 The applicant in Case No. 32/16 did not attend the hearing and, on the grounds that there had been no notice in terms of his non-attendance, the Sub-Committee considered the application in his absence.

4.4 The applicant in Case No. 33/16 attended the hearing with a representative and they both addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.5 RESOLVED: That the cases now submitted be determined as follows:-

<u>Case No.</u>	<u>Licence Type</u>	<u>Decision</u>
31/16	Application to renew a Private Hire Vehicle Licence	Refuse to grant a licence on the grounds that the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to convince the Sub-Committee that there are exceptional reasons to deviate from the current policy relating to

the age limit of vehicles.

- | | | |
|-------|---|---|
| 32/16 | Application to renew a Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence | The Sub-Committee determined to grant a licence to 28 th June 2016, being the date on which the vehicle becomes nine years of age. |
| 33/16 | Application to renew a Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence | Refuse to grant a licence on the grounds that the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to convince the Sub-Committee that there are exceptional reasons to deviate from the current policy relating to the age limit of vehicles. However, in the light of the exceptional personal circumstances, as demonstrated by the applicant, and the Hackney Carriage Limitation Policy currently in place, the applicant be afforded until 8 th July 2016, to purchase a newer vehicle. |

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Committee

Meeting held 12 May 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Jack Clarkson, Dianne Hurst, Josie Paszek, Vickie Priestley, Zoe Sykes and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Neale Gibson, George Lindars-Hammond and Anne Murphy.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 The minutes of meetings of (a) the Committee held on 18th February and 24th March, 2016 and (b) the Sub-Committee held on 23rd and 29th February, and 8th and 22nd March 2016, were approved as correct records.

5. LICENSING FEES REVIEW (DETERMINATION OF FEES) - 2016/17 FINANCIAL YEAR

5.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report on the Licensing Fees Review (Determination of Fees) for the 2016/17 Financial Year and, attaching as appendices, a breakdown of the Licensing Service's budget for 2016/17, the proposed fees for the different Licensing systems, details of the statutory fees and a schedule of fees relating to the safety of sports grounds.

5.2 In response to questions from members of the Committee, Steve Lonnia, Chief Licensing Officer, stated that when the new IT system was fully operational, it was hoped that the Service would achieve some significant savings. This would enable the Service to invest more resources into enforcement work, customer service improvements and new facilities/equipment. It was acknowledged that there had been a lengthy delay, and a number of problems associated with the introduction of the new IT system. However, the Service could only continue to push Capita and IDOX in terms of what it wanted. It was hoped that customers would benefit from the new system, and would be able to start using electronic forms and making electronic payments with effect from August, 2016. In terms of consultation, as well as the proposed fees being widely circulated via correspondence prior to the report being submitted to the Committee, in relation to

the increase in Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Carriage vehicle fees, these were required to undergo a further 28 day statutory consultation period. A more than envisaged rise in the number of people making electronic applications could potentially result in a loss of income to the Service. It was stated that regular monthly monitoring of the income would take place. There were no significant licensing services or functions that the Council had chosen not to adopt, although a number of services or functions had been de-regulated over the years. If there was sufficient funding in the Service's contingency budget, this could be used to fund the unmet demand survey in respect of the Council's Hackney Carriage Vehicle Licence Limitation Policy. If there was not sufficient funding in this budget, such costs would be met by the Hackney Carriage vehicle licencees.

- 5.3 RESOLVED: That the public and press and attendees be excluded from the meeting before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, if those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 5.4 Marie-Claire Frankie reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the report.
- 5.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:
- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the responses provided to the questions raised; and
 - (b) in the light of the contents of the report now submitted, authorises the Chief Licensing Officer to:-
 - (i) impose the fees for 2016/17, as detailed in the report now submitted, with effect from 1st June, 2016; and
 - (ii) advertise the fee increases relating to Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicles, and as now agreed by the Committee, in accordance with legislative requirements.

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 16 May 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Dianne Hurst and Josie Paszek

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1982 (AS AMENDED) - SEXUAL ENTERTAINMENT VENUES - SPEARMINT RHINO, 60 BROWN STREET, SHEFFIELD S1 2BS

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application for the renewal of a Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence made under Schedule 3, Section 10, of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, as amended, in respect of the premises known as Spearmint Rhino, 60 Brown Street, Sheffield, S1 2BS.

4.2 Present at the meeting were Philip Kolvin QC (Counsel for the Applicants), Robert Sutherland (Solicitor for the Applicants), John Specht, Andy Foster and Pete Mercer (for the Applicants), Charlotte Mead, Emma Sposato, Shelley Roche-Jacques, Giselle Brook, Alison Boyde, Lisa Markham, Lesley James, Vivienne Hutching, Tony Maltby, Eleanor Willcocks, Lizz Tuckerman, Loveday Herridge and Vivien Ratcliffe (Objectors), Matt Proctor (Licensing Enforcement and Technical Officer), Marie-Claire Frankie (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and Jennie Skiba (Democratic Services).

4.3 Marie-Claire Frankie outlined the procedure which would be followed during the hearing, as set out in Appendix F to the report.

4.4 Matt Proctor presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that written representations had been received from 71 interested parties, 13 of whom were in attendance and would address the Sub-Committee, and details of all the representations were attached at Appendix 'B' to the report.

4.5 Charlotte Mead stated that, in her opinion, venues like Spearmint Rhino should be consigned to history in that a club of this nature directly discriminates against

women by normalising the sexualisation and objectification of women. She further stated that the Club was located in a key gateway to the City Centre, and within the City's Cultural Industries Quarter. It was a short walk from the main bus and train stations, as well as a number of cultural venues, which were open to the public, such as art spaces, the Site Gallery and the Showroom Cinema, a place of worship, two colleges and also Sheffield Hallam University Students' Union building. She further stated that when walking around the area, women feel nervous and change their behaviour by looking around them to see if anyone is leaving the venue or changing route completely so that they do not have to go past. The students visiting the Union building are very often impressionable young people, sometimes vulnerable, being away from home for the first time. Charlotte Mead referred to the Council's Sexual Entertainment Venue Licensing Policy, which indicated that the Council wished to support both the local community and businesses by ensuring that sexual entertainment venues were properly managed and that they should integrate, where possible, into the local community. She considered that Spearmint Rhino did not integrate at all with any of the other venues in the immediate vicinity and is completely contradictory to everything in the policy and everything the Council says it stands for with regard to equality. Charlotte Mead referred to all the great things that Sheffield as a City had done over recent years to promote the Cultural Industries Quarter and that this venue undermines this. She made reference to the fact that in the last few years, Leeds City Council has successfully defended a refusal to renew two SEV licences and felt that Sheffield City Council should take a fresh look at its policy with regard to SEV licences.

- 4.6 Emma Sposato strongly reiterated the points made by Charlotte Mead and added that the venue is open on some evenings until 4.30 a.m. the following day and from as early as 7.00 p.m. with a ready supply of cheap alcohol. This, combined with the long opening hours, could result in heightened anti-social behaviour and a real danger to members of the public and indeed the workers themselves being harassed by the patrons and felt that there was a real danger of stalking. She added that, through experience, she was all too aware that stalking is an obsessive type of behaviour that can cause significant distress to the person on the receiving end of it. Emma Sposato stated that she had reports of students feeling unsafe in the area and felt that they should be able to walk around freely without the fear of being threatened. In response to questions, Emma said that although she didn't know of anyone that had actually been approached, she had friends at Hallam University who said that they felt uneasy in the vicinity of the premises and that as far as she was aware, no incidents had been reported to the Police. She added that 1,480 students had taken part in a survey but as yet she did not have any data on its outcome.
- 4.7 Shelley Roche-Jacques stated that she is a lecturer at Hallam University and knows that a number of students feel uncomfortable about the presence of Spearmint Rhino. Shelley added that she is unhappy that Spearmint Rhino promoted "student nights" offering free entry with NUS cards, discounted drinks and dances. She considered that, in the context of a society in which there was widespread violence against women, and in the light of the recent National Union of Students research findings regarding 'lad culture' in universities, this was something the City Council should be taking very seriously. Shelley Roche-

Jacques also made reference to the Council's policy regarding SEV licences and reiterated the need for change in the policy. She went on to say that when the club was first granted its licence, a number of charities and businesses were not there but that now the area is packed with artistic and cultural institutions, charities supporting vulnerable young people and victims of domestic violence, it was time the club was closed.

- 4.8 Giselle Brook stated that she feels it is time for the Council to take a fresh look at this type of venue and that there are only five Spearmint Rhino clubs throughout the country. She reiterated many of the points already mentioned by other objectors i.e. it being within the cultural hub of the city, pedestrianized areas, artspace, bars etc. She stated that there is an empty building alongside the venue and asked the question "who would want to be at the side of Spearmint Rhino". She also referred to the fact that a local MP was also objecting to the licence being renewed and asked what price dignity and equality.
- 4.9 Alison Boydell reiterated many of the points already stated by other objectors to the application. She stated that she had attended the hearing last year and felt that the whole process was weighted towards the applicants in that there had been very little time to respond to the application and had only discovered the outcome in the local media. She added that Sheffield City Council wished to support both the local community and businesses by ensuring that SEV's are properly managed and integrated into the local community, but she failed to see how a business of this nature could possibly integrate. Alison Boydell stated that the logo for the club was like the "Playboy" logo and felt that this too was totally inappropriate. Alison also made reference to the colleges, businesses and other organisations within the vicinity and said that, by granting a licence, this would be contradictory to the work the Council does to identify and tackle inequalities within the City Council and the City as a whole.
- 4.10 Lisa Markham stated that she was speaking on behalf of Zero Option, group of local people opposed to sexual entertainment venues (SEVs) in the City, who believe that SEVs not only project a negative image of Sheffield, but are also harmful to women, girls, boys and men. Lisa stated that she came to the City to work with those who had been sexually abused or raped, so was aware of what was happening to young people, particularly in schools where there was evidence to suggest an increase in sexual assault, harassment and other sexual activities. Lisa Markham also reiterated the points made by other objectors regarding the locality of the club in relation to other establishments in the vicinity, the fear women have of walking in the area and their avoidance of it so as not to walk past the venue and also the procedure followed at last year's hearing at not been able to stay to hear the applicant's case and she also asked when there was to be a review of the Council's policy regarding this type of licence. Lisa Markham further stated that she had no wish for the club to be moved to another part of the City and asked what financial contribution it made to the City. In response, Matt Proctor informed the hearing that there was to be a review of the Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence policy before the end of this year.
- 4.11 Lesley James, a resident of the City stated that she felt the venue was totally inappropriate within the Cultural Industries Quarter (CIQ) but that the CIQ had

been established after Spearmint Rhino was opened 14 years ago. She asked what does such a club say about Sheffield's values and stated that she felt ashamed that visitors passing by from the station must be appalled to walk past such a venue. Lesley James stated that parents visiting their student daughters must worry for their safety. She added that she regularly attends the Showroom Cinema, which is a praised arthouse which hosts national events like DocFest and that people attending such Festivals must wonder what sort of place Sheffield is.

- 4.12 Vivienne Hitchings stated that her grandmother had been a suffragette and feels that in 2016 women should not still be treated in this way.
- 4.13 Loveday Herridge stated that she was aware that licences for Spearmint Rhino have been granted in the past but was hopeful that the members would look at the application with fresh eyes and not grant this time. She referred to the Council's policy and reiterated the views of the other objectors regarding the position of the venue within the CIQ and directly opposite the Site Gallery, which the City Council and the Arts Council firmly support. Ms Herridge felt that the Council failed to treat everyone with respect and that the female population of the City should not be subjected to the objectification and sexualisation of women. She also felt that the Council has a duty under the Equality Act to work to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation of women.
- 4.14 Tony Maltby stated that he had been a doctor and lecturer at Birmingham University and had pastoral care of students who attended there. He added that he fully supported all the arguments already made and that he totally objected to the sexualisation of women and that granting the licence would be contradictory to the other work that the Council does, funds or promotes, for example the SheFest, the Equalities Hub Network, the Social Cohesion strategy and the campaign "Our Fair City" which arose out of the Sheffield Fairness Commission. He felt that the Council has a duty under the Equality Act to work to eliminate the unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation of women in this way.
- 4.15 Eleanor Willcocks stated that the City Council had the opportunity to decide that there should be no sexual entertainment venues in the City and that it should take the lead on this moral issue, as it had done with the City of Sanctuary initiative. She asked the Sub-Committee members if they would be happy to allow their daughters to work in an establishment of this nature which directly discriminates against women. Eleanor Willcocks also made reference to the venue being within the Cultural Industries Quarter.
- 4.16 Lizz Tuckerman stated that she moved to Sheffield some 20 years ago, and is very familiar with the area as she has a studio in Persistence Works. She added that she has exhibited her own work and organised exhibitions, some of which were funded by the Arts Council and feels that Sheffield has an increasingly successful and vibrant cultural community and that the Spearmint Rhino club does not fit well within that community. She went on to add that the area is busy at night, there being a number of bars and restaurants in the area and that a club of this kind does not fit well within the CIQ.
- 4.17 Philip Kolvin paid tribute to the objectors and felt that they had been given every

opportunity to get their objections across. He then provided a brief history of the venue, indicating that it opened as Spearmint Rhino in 2002, originally under the Public Entertainments Licence having formerly been a nightclub, and had traded successfully since that time. The venue employed 55 people and opened at 22:00 hours on Mondays to Fridays and at 21:00 hours on Saturdays, not opening at all on Sundays unless there is a bank holiday. He added that there are 12 years left on the lease at a rental of £165,000 per annum and that Pete Mercer has been the Designated Premises Supervisor for the past 12 years. Mr. Kolvin added that the club never trades during the day, that there is no cross-over between the day-time and night-time use within the area. Mr. Kolvin further stated that there were no objections from the police with regard to crime and disorder, nor had there been anything from the Licensing Service or the Environmental Health Service. Mr. Kolvin said that this was the fourth time the licence had been brought before the Sub-Committee and that it had been considered appropriate to grant on those occasions and that this year was no different in that there had been no changes since last year.

4.18 Philip Kolvin referred to one of the objectors referring to stalking in the area but he stated there was no evidence to support this. Crime levels on Brown Street and in the surrounding area were very low. In terms of the internal operation of the venue, there would usually be around 100 customers on a busy weekend night, with as few as 20 people attending on a quiet night during the week. The management worked strictly in accordance with the licensing conditions attached to the licence and there was a very strict set of codes in terms of what the dancers and customers were allowed to do. There were security staff and CCTV in order to monitor any problems and, as a result of this, the venue experienced very few problems. He stated that customers are advised of the rules when entering the premises. He further stated that there is no evidence that the premises are detrimental to the locality, that the facade has been approved by the Council and that, if anything, the presence of two security guards, external lights and CCTV have a positive impact in keeping crime levels down in the area. He added that there is never any queuing outside the venue and patrons leave at various times, rather than a mass exodus experienced from nightclubs. Mr. Kolvin stated that the Council's policy details the cultural hub as the Peace Gardens and Tudor Square and that the venue was a long way away from Howard Street and could not be seen by people walking up or down that street. Mr. Kolvin said that whether the City should have any lap dancing club was not the issue and that there will always be objections to it, but the company will always work to ensure that the club is a discreet, well controlled, well regulated venue with no impact on the surrounding area.

4.19 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, Philip Kolvin explained the ratio of staff to customers and that the dancers themselves were self-employed and would work on busier nights of the week. Pete Mercer, the Designated Premises Supervisor, added that there was no membership for the club and no fixed closing time as the club is totally different to a nightclub. He added that taxis are provided for the dancers and they are escorted to the taxi. In response to further questions, John Specht, Vice President for Spearmint Rhino UK, stated that rules and laws have changed over the years and that Spearmint Rhino as a company has changed with it.

- 4.20 Matt Proctor outlined the options open to the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.
- 4.21 The meeting was then closed to all parties in accordance with the agreed hearing procedure.
- 4.22 Marie-Claire Frankie reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.
- 4.23 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the public and press and attendees.
- 4.24 RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committee agrees to grant the application for the renewal, for a period of 12 months, of the Sexual Entertainment Venue Licence, in respect of the premises known as Spearmint Rhino, 60 Brown Street, Sheffield, S1 2BS.

(The full reasons for the Sub-Committee's decision will be included in the written Notice of Determination.)

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Committee

Meeting held 18 May 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker, Jack Clarkson, Michelle Cook, Neale Gibson, Kieran Harpham, Alan Law, George Lindars-Hammond, Abtislam Mohamed, Anne Murphy, Andy Nash, Moya O'Rourke, Josie Paszek, Vickie Priestley, Bob Pullin and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

2. APPOINTMENT OF THE JOINT CHAIRS

2.1 RESOLVED: That Councillors David Barker and Alan Law be appointed as Joint Chairs of the Committee.

3. DATES AND TIMES OF MEETINGS

3.1 RESOLVED: That meetings of the Committee be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays weekly at 10.00am, and as and when required.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 2 June 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Josie Paszek and Vickie Priestley

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on item 4 on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING - INDIVIDUAL CASES

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted details in respect of four cases relating to hackney carriage and private hire licensing.

4.2 The applicant in Case No. 37/16 attended the hearing with a representative and they both addressed the Sub-Committee

4.3 The licence holder in Case No. 38/16 attended the hearing with a representative and they both addressed the Sub-Committee

4.4 The applicant in Case No. 39/16 attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.5 The applicant in Case No. 40/16 attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.6 RESOLVED: That the cases now submitted be determined as follows:-

<u>Case No.</u>	<u>Licence Type</u>	<u>Decision</u>
37/16	Application for a new Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	Refuse to grant the licence on the grounds that the Sub-Committee considers that the applicant is not a fit and proper person to hold a licence in light of the conviction reported.

38/16	Review of a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	In light of the information contained in the report and the responses to the questions raised, the licence holder be issued with a final warning to remain in place for the length of his current licence.
39/16	Application for a new Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	Grant for a period of one year as requested in his application.
40/16	Renewal of a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	Grant for the term of one year, as requested in the application, with a written warning issued as to the licence holder's future conduct.

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 7 June 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Anne Murphy and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on item 4 on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LICENSING ACT 2003 - APPLICATION FOR A PERSONAL LICENCE

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application for a Personal Licence made under Section 117 of the Licensing Act 2003 (Case No. 41/16).

4.2 Present at the meeting were Benita Mumby (South Yorkshire Police, Objector), Clive Stephenson (Licensing Enforcement and Technical Officer), Marie-Claire Frankie (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and Jennie Skiba (Democratic Services). The applicant did not attend the hearing and it was decided to hear the case in his absence.

4.3 Marie-Claire Frankie outlined the procedure which would be followed during the hearing.

4.4 Clive Stephenson presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that representations had been received from South Yorkshire Police and were attached at Appendix 'B' to the report.

4.5 Benita Mumby made representations on behalf of South Yorkshire Police, referring to the applicant's offences and convictions. She made specific reference to the fact that the applicant had been sentenced to serve time in a young offenders institute due to the seriousness of the crime.

4.6 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, Benita Mumby stated that as far as she was aware, the applicant had not attended any

rehabilitation courses.

- 4.7 RESOLVED: That the attendees involved in the application for a Personal Licence be excluded from the meeting before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, if those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 4.8 Marie-Claire Frankie reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.
- 4.9 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the attendees.
- 4.10 RESOLVED: That the application for a Personal Licence be rejected on the grounds that, in the light of the representations now made and the serious nature of the offences now reported, the Sub-Committee considered that granting a Personal Licence in this case (Case No. 41/16) would undermine the licensing objective to prevent crime and disorder.

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 9 June 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Kieran Harpham, Josie Paszek and Bob Pullin

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. LICENSING ACT 2003 - ASLAN GO LOCAL, 218 WEST STREET, SHEFFIELD, S1 4EU

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted a report to consider an application for a Premises Licence made under Section 17 of the Licensing Act 2003, in respect of the premises known as Aslan Go Local, 218 West Street, Sheffield, S1 4EU.

4.2 Present at the meeting were Colin Bell (Ben Davis Associates, for the Applicant), Fahrettin Aslan (Applicant), Metin Arslan (Applicant), Tim Renshaw (Objector, representing the Drugs and Alcohol Co-ordination Team (DACT)), Graham Cadlaw (Objector, representing the Sheffield City Centre Residents' Action Group (SCCRAG)), Stuart Barkworth (Objector, local resident), Councillor Douglas Johnson (Objector, representing residents in the City Ward), Naomi Saxton (South Yorkshire Police), Georgina Hollis (Licensing Enforcement and Technical Officer), Marie-Claire Frankie (Solicitor to the Sub-Committee) and John Turner (Democratic Services).

4.3 Marie-Claire Frankie outlined the procedure which would be followed during the hearing.

4.4 Georgina Hollis presented the report to the Sub-Committee and it was noted that representations had been received from the Sheffield City Centre Residents' Action Group (SCCRAG), the Drugs and Alcohol Co-ordination Team (DACT), one local business and four members of the public, and were attached at Appendix 'B' to the report.

4.5 Councillor Douglas Johnson stated that the West Street area was deemed very sensitive at the present time in the light of increasing problems, mainly alcohol-

related, and which had been recognised by the City Council and other relevant agencies. Councillor Johnson considered that this was a cumulative impact issue in that another off licence on West Street would 'tip the balance' in terms of the number of venues and outlets selling alcohol. Councillor Johnson, who also spoke on behalf of Stuart Barkworth, one of his constituents, stated that, in his opinion, another off licence on West Street was likely to result in an increase in anti-social behaviour and crime and disorder. He believed that the applicants should be well aware that it was a sensitive area, particularly as they were already involved in businesses on West Street, and believed that there was not sufficient detail in the application to enable the Licensing Sub-Committee to make an informed decision. He related specifically to the fact that there should be more detail in terms of how the applicants planned to address all the concerns now raised, and that there was a general lack of detail in terms of how they intended to manage the premises.

- 4.6 Graham Cadlaw, speaking on behalf of the SCCRAG, stated that, whilst he accepted the difficulties in providing evidence against the premises on the basis that they had yet to open, he objected to the long opening hours, specifically in terms of the sale of alcohol. He did not consider that there was a need to sell alcohol with effect from 07:00 hours, and believed that having alcohol available for sale at this time would only encourage the street drinkers to purchase more, resulting in a potential increase in anti-social behaviour and crime and disorder.
- 4.7 Tim Renshaw, speaking on behalf of DACT, made specific reference to a number of people, who were known to the Council and other relevant agencies, who were very difficult to manage as a result of their dependency on drugs and alcohol. He considered that having a further off licence on West Street would exacerbate the problems in that it would provide a further outlet for such people to purchase cheap alcohol. A number of the street drinkers would also beg from members of the public, earning considerable amounts a day, which provided them with the means to purchase more alcohol. Mr Renshaw himself had witnessed and verified incidents of violence on West Street on a regular basis and stressed that a number of these people lived outside the normal 'moral code', therefore were not concerned about the damage they were doing to themselves, and the harm and upset their behaviour caused to others.
- 4.8 Stuart Barkworth stated that the situation on West Street was getting worse, and it was becoming more and more uncomfortable for him and other local residents to walk down West Street. He stated that he had lived in the City Centre for some time, and had never felt threatened before, but this had now changed. He also made the point that the proposed shop would be on the other side of West Street to the other off licences, which could potentially result in street drinkers hanging around on both sides of the road, increasing problems for residents and visitors to the City Centre to walk up and down the road without feeling threatened or being abused.
- 4.9 Naomi Saxton stated that the police were well aware of the current problems on West Street, and would continue to target the area in terms of resources. She also stated that the police were not aware of any problems linked to the other off licence and restaurant on West Street, managed by the applicants.

- 4.10 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee, Marie-Claire Frankie and Colin Bell, it was stated that whilst the concept of 24-hour drinking should be welcomed in some respects, such as in bars and pubs which were managed and policed adequately, it brought problems in terms of people purchasing cheap, strong alcohol from off licences at all hours of the day. It was considered that there could be safety issues for the staff working in the shop, particularly when faced with street drinkers, demanding to be served, and who were already either drunk or under the influence of drugs. Mr Renshaw indicated that at the Archer Project, they were often faced with the issue of having to evict people, which required a number of staff, who had all been properly trained to deal with such matters, and he considered that having only two members of staff in the shop would not be sufficient. The problems associated with the street drinkers had got worse over the last four or five years, and could occur at any time of the day or night. Whilst it was accepted that there were similar problems in another area of the City, such problems in that area were contained and well-managed by the police. The street drinkers were attracted to this area due to the number of outlets selling cheap alcohol, as well as their being many other services they accessed, such as chemists, GP surgeries, Ben's Centre and the Archer Project. In addition, there was a large footfall on West Street, which resulted in beggars being able to maximise the amount of money they could obtain, particularly from students, who felt more intimidated and/or more sympathetic to their cause. Whilst it was envisaged that there could be problems, in terms of reactions from the street drinkers when they find out that the shop did not sell cheap, high strength alcohol, the general feeling was that such people were not fussy, and would simply go elsewhere to purchase their alcohol. It was not known whether the other off licences on West Street put identification labels on their products, so that the alcohol could be traced to a specific outlet. Tesco opened between 07:00 and 23:00 hours, so the street drinkers could go there to purchase alcohol from 07:00 hours. It was accepted that there were other people who wished to purchase alcohol late at night or early in the morning, but it was the street drinkers that gave the off licences on West Street a bad name. The street drinkers would generally visit those shops selling the cheapest alcohol.
- 4.11 Colin Bell, on behalf of the applicants, stated that the shop would be a convenience store, selling a range of produce, as well as alcohol. The proposed Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) was Fahrettin Aslan, who was previously the owner of West Street Off Licence, therefore has had experience in the trade. He had also lived and worked in the area for around 20 years, and was well aware of the problems on West Street. He had not experienced any trouble at the West Street Off Licence in the two years he owned it, and had passed all test purchases undertaken at that store. Also, following accusations of illicit alcohol sales, officers from Customs and Excise visited the premises and found nothing untoward. Mr Bell stated that, although there had been a number of objections to the application, the majority of the comments raised by the objectors was conjecture, and did not contain any firm evidence. He added that, if there were any problems relating to the operation of the shop, the Council could review the Premises Licence. In terms of security, there was good quality CCTV in the shop, and following an inspection by Health and Safety Officers, the shop had passed all relevant checks. Mr Bell stressed that there was no evidence to suggest that the

owner would sell alcohol to street drinkers. It was stated that, in light of the level of objections raised, the owner would be willing to limit the sale of alcohol to between 09:00 and 03:00 hours.

- 4.12 In response to questions from Members of the Sub-Committee and Marie-Claire Frankie, it was stated that, in terms of staffing and training, Fahrettin Aslan would be the DPS, and that he had managed licensed premises elsewhere for a number of years, therefore was well aware of what was required of him. He stated that training would be cascaded down to all staff employed in the shop, and Mr Bell added that he would be able to assist with the training if required. There would be two members of staff in the shop at all times. A refusals book would be kept in the shop, and staff usually dealt with one or two refusals a week, usually street drinkers. A considerable amount of money had been put into the shop in order to make it health and safety compliant. The plan was to operate the shop along similar lines as the previous shop owned by Mr Aslan, in that street drinkers or beggars would not be allowed in as Mr Aslan did not want his shop to have a bad reputation. In addition to this, there were no plans to sell cheap alcohol, therefore this was likely to result in less street drinkers visiting the shop. All staff working in the shop would receive relevant training. Although the applicants were applying to sell alcohol until 03:00 hours, the shop would only stay open until this time if it was considered financially viable. In terms of becoming involved in local initiatives to look at and hopefully resolve the problems being experienced on West Street at the present time, although no one from any of the relevant agencies had been to visit him to discuss the issues, he would be more than willing to become involved. It was confirmed by the Police Officer in attendance that there had been no issues in terms of the operation of his other shop. The shop would be selling sweets and groceries, as well as alcohol, but would not be selling high strength alcohol. Whilst it was acknowledged that agent sales of alcohol took place, every effort would be made to monitor this in order to stop alcohol getting into the wrong hands.
- 4.13 RESOLVED: That the public and press and attendees involved in the application be excluded from the meeting before further discussion takes place on the grounds that, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, if those persons were present, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 4.14 Marie-Claire Frankie reported orally, giving legal advice on various aspects of the application.
- 4.15 At this stage in the proceedings, the meeting was re-opened to the public and press and attendees.
- 4.16 RESOLVED: That the Sub-Committee agrees to grant a Premises Licence in respect of Aslan Go Local, 218 West Street, Sheffield, S1 4EU, in the terms now requested, and subject to the amended application in that the supply of alcohol will only be allowed between 09:00 and 03:00 hours.

(The full reasons for the Sub-Committee's decision will be included in the written

Notice of Determination.)

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Licensing Sub-Committee

Meeting held 14 June 2016

PRESENT: Councillors David Barker (Chair), Vickie Priestley and Bob Pullin

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received. Councillor Cliff Woodcraft attended the meeting as a reserve Member, but was not required to stay.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 RESOLVED: That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on item 4 on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING - INDIVIDUAL CASES

4.1 The Chief Licensing Officer submitted details in respect of four cases relating to hackney carriage and private hire licensing.

4.2 The applicant in Case No. 42/16 attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.3 The applicant in Case No. 43/16 attended the hearing with a representative and they both addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.4 The licensee in Case No. 44/16 attended the hearing and addressed the Sub-Committee. The complainant in this case also attended the meeting and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.5 The licensee in Case No. 45/16 attended the hearing with a representative and they both addressed the Sub-Committee. The complainants in this case also attended the meeting and addressed the Sub-Committee.

4.6 RESOLVED: That the cases now submitted be determined as follows:-

<u>Case No.</u>	<u>Licence Type</u>	<u>Decision</u>
42/16	Application to	Agree to grant a licence for a period of three

	renew a Private Hire Vehicle Licence	months on the grounds that the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to convince the Sub-Committee that there are exceptional reasons to deviate from the current policy relating to the age limit of vehicles.
43/16	Application for a first Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	Grant a licence for a term of 12 months, in accordance with the applicant's request.
44/16	Review of a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	After consideration of the evidence provided by the licensee and the complainant, the Sub-Committee agrees to take no action.
45/16	Review of a Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Driver's Licence	After consideration of the evidence provided by the licensee and the complainants, the licensee be issued a written warning with regard to his future conduct, to remain on his licence for the remainder of his current term.



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Committee Report



Report of: Chief Licensing Officer, Head of Licensing

Date: 11th August 2016

Subject: Hackney Carriage Fares.

Author of Report: Clive Stephenson – 27 36933

Summary: To consider an application for the review of Hackney Carriage Fares.

Recommendations: That member's carefully consider the application for review along with any other representations made.

Background Papers: Attached documents

Category of Report: OPEN

Report of the Chief Licensing Officer and Head of Licensing to the Licensing Committee on 11th August 2016

Request for increase in Hackney Carriage Fares

1.0 Purpose

- 1.1 To consider a request made by the GMB Union & Sheffield Taxi Trades Association on behalf of their members to increase the fares for journeys in Hackney Carriage Vehicles.
- 1.2 The last review of this policy took place in April 2013. The current fares table is attached at appendix A.
- 1.3 At the last review no changes were made to the table of fares and charges, this fare structure was last varied in October 2010.

2. Background

- 2.1 Under Section 65 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

"A Council may fix the rates or fares within the district as well for time as distance, and all other charges in connection with the arrangements for hire of a vehicle, to be paid in respect of the hire of the hackney carriages by means of a table made or varied in accordance with the provisions of this section"

- 2.2 If the Council vary the fares (rates) in anyway then they have to advertise those changes and allow 14 days for objections to the variations. If no objections are received the new fares will take effect not less than 14 days from when the advert was placed.

3. Requested Changes

- 3.1 After a joint consultation meeting with the GMB & STTA they have agreed to make a request for an increase to fares and changes to the fares chart. An outline of their request is attached as appendix B.
- 3.2 The proposal makes changes to the fares in numerous ways;
 - 3.2.1 The initial fare drop tariff will be at 100 yards, and then a further fare drop at 160 yards. There is no change to the initial start-up fares.
 - 3.2.2 The yardage after the initial 2 drops is reduced to 220 yards up to 10 miles, (17600) and then reduced further to 195 yards.
 - 3.2.3 The proposal is to also alter the night time tariff start hour from 20.00 hours to 19.00 hours lasting 12 hours until 07.00am
 - 3.2.4 There is a request to change the charges for use of credit and debit cards, removing the static 50p per transaction charge to a % charge of the fare. A 5% to 10% extra would appear to be more than sufficient to cover the costs of administration of such schemes.

3.2.5 Waiting time charges to change to 20p and to increase to the equivalent of £14.00 per hour, this would mean a change in the waiting time of 20p charged for every 51 seconds the cab is kept waiting.

4.0 Fare Calculations

4.1 Hackney Carriage fare calculations are fairly complex in nature. Fares are calculated by a meter within the vehicle. The meter charges on yards travelled by the vehicle.

4.2 The meter uses the signal (or distance) pulses from the vehicle, which comes from a transducer (a unit that converts movement to electrical pulses) which is connected to some part of the drive mechanism. The transducer in the vehicle converts vehicle movement to distance pulses which is used to show speed/distance on the speedometer / odometer

4.3 Fares are charged in a way that the charge is added prior to the distance or part distance travelled by each "pulse".

A simple equation of this is: If the fares were 10p per 100 yards and if the vehicle travelled up to 100 yards the cost would be 10p. If the vehicle travelled 101 yards the cost would be 20p for any distance between 101 – 200 yards.

4.3 The increases are calculated by reducing the yards travelled before the next "drop" of the meter. If the proposals in section 3 were accepted and the increments moved from 30p to 20p the amount of yards travelled per pulse would reduce from 346 yards, up to 10 miles to 225 yards and reduces the over 10 miles from 285 yards to 193 yards.

4.4 In Appendix D are some examples of calculations of fares, and the differences of reduction of yardage per pulse and increments would affect the costs of hiring a hackney carriage vehicle.

4.5 Percentage increases are very difficult to calculate as can be seen from the proposed increase and the examples given in the appendices.

Using the proposal by the trades as an example (appendix B) the percentage increase per mile has been calculated and is shown on the documents in the appendices.

In the example shown you can see that as the new charges are front loaded the initial early costs are around 7% higher but then move down to below 1% on longer journeys, resulting in an average increase of around 3.5% to 3.7%

4.6 If the waiting time was to be calculated in 20p increments then the time for the waiting period for that cost would be 55 seconds. There would be no increase in the current waiting time costs which equate to £13.20 per hour.

5.0 Financial implications

5.1 Any variations to the fares chart would have to be advertised in a local paper, current costs of the advertisement is approximately £1500.00; this cost would have to be borne out of the current licensing service budget.

- 5.2 There will be a small charge levied on drivers/owners of licensed hackney carriages to have their meters in the vehicle altered to reflect any change in the fare charging systems. The Licensing Service maintains a list of authorised companies/persons who are the area agents for the meter manufacturers. A copy of the current list is attached in Appendix D.
- 6.0 Consultation
- 6.1 The report has been circulated and meetings held with the Trade representatives. Trade representatives have been invited to attend this meeting.
- 6.2 The GMB and STTA trade members attended a meeting with the Licensing Service on the 19th July 2016, where they agreed on the joint proposal as detailed in section 3.
- 7.0 Recommendations
- 7.1 The Chief Licensing Officer, Head of Licensing Service recommend the proposal as stated in section 3 and attached at appendix B to the Licensing Committee for approval.
- 7.2 The application is for a 3.70% increase (average) in day tariff and 3.50% increase (average) in the night tariff only and will be if accepted the first increase in fares since 2010.
- 8.0 Options
- 8.1 Vary the hackney carriage fares as requested.
- 8.2 Consider the report and evidence given, and vary fares other than requested giving details of the variations and reasons.
- 8.3 Make no changes to the current fares, giving reasons as to the decision.

Steven Lonnia
Chief Licensing Officer
Head of Licensing Service

APPENDIX A

Current Table Of fares

TABLE OF FARES

The fares detailed below are the **MAXIMUM** fares, which may be charged.

FIRST 160 YARDS (146.3 metres)

DAY	(6.00 AM UNTIL 8.00 PM)	£2.60
NIGHT	(8.00 PM UNTIL 6.00 AM)	£3.10

Then 30p for every 346 yards (316 m) travelled up to 17600 yards (16093 m) - approx. 10 miles: -

After (10 miles) 17600 yards (16093m) 30p for every 285 yards (260m) travelled: -

AVERAGE COST (not including any waiting time)

	DAY	NIGHT
1 Miles (1.6km)	£4.00	£4.50
5 Miles (8.0km)	£10.10	£10.80
10 Miles (16.1Km)	£17.80	£18.30
15 Miles (24.1km)	£27.10	£27.60

Waiting time

For every 1 minute 22 seconds the cab is kept waiting **30p**
Waiting time is calculated once the vehicle is stood or travelling at less than 8 miles per hour.

Extras

Each hiring begun between 6.00 pm on 24th December **£2**
 and 6.00 am on 27th December and between 6.00 pm on 31st December and 6.00 am on 2nd January.

Fouling the vehicle - MAXIMUM charge **£50**

Drivers can apply a charge of **50p per transaction**, when payment is made by debit or credit card where this facility is made available by the driver.

Notes for passengers:

The driver of this vehicle must produce a copy of the byelaws to you on request. The driver of this vehicle should always be wearing a current badge issued by Sheffield City Council, and should also display the interior identification as issued by Sheffield City Council.

Enquiries or complaints about taxis or their drivers should be made to:-
 The Licensing Section, Sheffield City Council, Block C, Staniforth Rd Depot.
 Staniforth Road, Sheffield, S9 3HD. Telephone 2734005.

Current Mileage Costs

Yards	drop yardage	Start up day	MILES	Start up day	drops per mile	rounded up	Night
1760	1545	1	£4.10	£3.10	4.62	5	£4.10
3520	3275	2	£5.60	£4.60	9.71	10	£5.60
5280	5005	3	£7.10	£6.10	14.80	15	£7.10
7040	6735	4	£8.60	£7.60	19.88	20	£8.60
8800	8465	5	£10.10	£9.10	24.97	25	£10.10
10560	10541	6	£11.90	£10.60	30.06	31	£11.90
12320	12271	7	£13.40	£12.40	35.14	36	£13.40
14080	14001	8	£14.90	£13.90	40.23	41	£14.90
15840	15731	9	£16.40	£15.40	45.32	46	£16.40
17600	17461	10	£17.90	£16.90	50.40	51	£17.90
19360	19171	11	£20.00	£18.40	6.18	58	£18.40
21120	20881	12	£21.80	£20.50	12.35	64	£20.50
22880	22591	13	£23.60	£22.30	18.53	70	£22.30
24640	24586	14	£25.40	£24.10	24.70	76	£24.10
26400	26296	15	£27.20	£25.90	30.88	82	£25.90
28160	28006	16	£29.30	£27.70	37.05	89	£27.70
29920	29716	17	£31.10	£29.80	43.23	95	£29.80
31680	31426	18	£32.90	£31.60	49.40	101	£31.60
33440	33421	19	£34.70	£33.40	55.58	107	£33.40
35200	35131	20	£36.50	£35.20	61.75	113	£35.20
				£37.00			£37.00

First drop 160
 Yardage Drops are 346
 1 - 17600 285
 17601 +

Appendix B
Trade Associations & GMB request

Both the GMB union and the Sheffield Taxi Trade Association make a formal request for an increase in Hackney Carriage Fares, for the licensed vehicles in Sheffield.

The full request details are set out below,

1. A shorter initial first drop to be 100 yards, with a second drop being at 160 yards.
2. The payment drops to be calculated in 20ps.
3. The yardage per drop to reduce to 220 yards from 346 to, this is to accommodate the change to 20p calculations, and give drivers a slight increase in income per journey.
4. The waiting time to be measure in 20ps also and therefore the drop to 51 seconds waiting time per 20p. This is to allow for the change to 20p increments and to give the drivers a rise to £14.20 per hour from the current £13.20
5. Card payments to be calculated in a % of the fare total and not a single payment of 50p per transaction. The use of cards is becoming more frequent and the trade wish to be able to respond to this move in the market but find that the payment for use of the card doesn't cover the cost to the driver for the card machines and administration costs incurred. The % should be able to cover just the administration costs of the system and not an overcharge. (currently awaiting costings of systems and we will present the % amount request to the meeting of the committee.
6. Night time Tariff (2) We wish for the night time Tariff to take affect from 19.00 hours and end at 07.00 hours a change from 20.00 to 06.00.

The overall % of these rises on average are low and we believe it has been some years since the last increase in fares and drivers have absorbed many rises in their costs over the period since 2010.

Fares % rises are Tariff 1 (day) 3.70% Tariff 2 (night) 3.50% on average.

Waiting time is 7.56 % increase.

Appendix C

Proposed Increase

TABLE OF FARES

The fares detailed below are the **MAXIMUM** fares, which may be charged.

FIRST 100 YARDS (91.4 metres)

Tariff 1 (7.00 AM UNTIL 7.00 PM) **Day** **£2.60**

Tariff 2 (7.00 PM UNTIL 7.00 AM) **Night** **£3.10**

Then 20p for every 60 yards (54.86m) travelled up to 160 yards (146.30 metres)

Then 20p for every 220 yards (201.17 meters) yards up to 17600 yards 10 miles (16093 metres)

Then 20p for every 195 yards (178.31 meters) thereafter.

Waiting time

For every 51 Seconds the cab is kept waiting

20p

Waiting time is calculated once the vehicle is stood or travelling at less than 8 miles per hour.

Extras

Each hiring begun between 6.00 pm on 24th December and 6.00 am on 27th December and between 6.00 pm on 31st December and 6.00 am on 2nd January.

£2

Fouling the vehicle - MAXIMUM charge

£50

Credit & Debit Card Charges

~~10~~ 10% may be added to the fare where payments are made using a credit or debit card.

Notes for passengers:

Any journey carried out in this vehicle whether pre booked (private hire) or hailed the driver must engage the meter for each journey.

Journeys that end outside of the district of Sheffield

Drivers may ask for you to agree a fare when the fare ends outside the district of Sheffield. If you agree this fare then the driver **must still engage the meter**. If the metered fare at the end of your journey is less than that agreed then you may pay the metered fare only. (LGMP Act 1976 S66, Byelaw 19 (b) TPC ACT S54 & S55)

The driver of this vehicle must produce a copy of the byelaws to you on request.

The driver of this vehicle must display within the vehicle his identification, and must always wear the badge as issued by Sheffield City Council.

Enquiries or complaints about taxis or their drivers should be made to:-

Licensing Service Sheffield City Council, Staniforth Road Depot, Staniforth Road, Sheffield, S9 3HD. Telephone 0114 2736937 Head of Licensing (August 2016)

Proposal 20p 2 early drops

Yards	MILES	Start up day	Night	drops per mile Rounded	Tariff		day % rise per mile		
					1	2			
100 - 160		£2.80	£3.30		day	night			
161 - 380		£3.00	£3.50						
1760	1	£4.40	£4.90	9	£1.80	£4.40	£4.90	7.31%	6.52%
3520	2	£6.00	£6.50	17	£3.40	£6.00	£6.50	7.14%	6.56%
5280	3	£7.40	£7.90	24	£4.80	£7.40	£7.90	4.22%	3.94%
7040	4	£9.20	£9.70	33	£6.60	£9.20	£9.70	6.98%	6.59%
8800	5	£10.80	£11.30	41	£8.20	£10.80	£11.30	6.93%	6.60%
10560	6	£12.40	£12.90	49	£9.80	£12.40	£12.90	4.20%	4.03%
12320	7	£14.00	£14.50	57	£11.40	£14.00	£14.50	4.48%	4.32%
14080	8	£15.60	£16.10	65	£13.00	£15.60	£16.10	4.70%	4.55%
15840	9	£17.20	£17.70	73	£14.60	£17.20	£17.70	4.87%	4.14%
17600	10	£18.80	£19.30	81	£16.20	£18.80	£19.30	5.03%	4.89%
19360	11	£20.60	£21.10	90	£18.00	£20.60	£21.10	3.00%	2.93%
21120	12	£22.40	£22.90	99	£19.80	£22.40	£22.90	2.75%	2.69%
22880	13	£24.20	£24.70	108	£21.60	£24.20	£24.70	2.54%	2.49%
24640	14	£26.00	£26.50	117	£23.40	£26.00	£26.50	2.36%	2.32%
26400	15	£28.00	£28.50	127	£25.40	£28.00	£28.50	2.94%	2.89%
28160	16	£29.60	£30.10	135	£27.00	£29.60	£30.10	1.02%	1.01%
29920	17	£31.40	£31.90	144	£28.80	£31.40	£31.90	0.96%	0.95%
31680	18	£33.20	£33.70	153	£30.60	£33.20	£33.70	0.91%	0.90%
33440	19	£35.00	£35.50	162	£32.40	£35.00	£35.50	0.86%	0.85%
35200	20	£36.80	£37.30	171	£34.20	£36.80	£37.30	0.82%	0.81%
First Drop is	100							3.70%	3.50%
2nd Drop is	160								
Yardage Drops are									
161 - 17600	220								
17601 +	195								

Appendix D Calculations

How to calculate a hackney carriage fare – and increases

Firstly you need to know the yardage of the 1st drop of the meter.

For this exercise we will use the 100 yards as the first drop.

For instance then the price shown when entering a cab is the price for the first 100 yards for this example that will be £1.00 this is the start-up fare.

To calculate how much a mile and so on will cost in fares you

Minus the start-up yardage 100 yards

From 1 mile – 1760 yards

= 1660 yards you then need to divide this number by the cost per drop (20p in this example

$1660 / 0.20 = 8.3$ drops of the meter per mile, this is always rounded up as the driver gets paid up front for yards to be travelled = 9

To gain the cost of the mile, is $9 \times 0.20 = £1.80$ plus your start-up cost of £1.00 = £2.80 for the 1st mile.

This is then repeated per mile,

$3520 - 100 / 0.20 \times 18 \times 0.20 = £3.60$

Waiting Time Calculations

1 hour in Seconds = 3600 (60 x 60)

Divide the hour seconds by the current waiting time, then times the (rounded) figure by the charge 20p for example. This will give you the current waiting cost per hour.

Currently this is $3600 / 82 = 44 \times 0.30 = £13.20$

$$3600 / 55 = 66 \times 0.20 = £13.20$$

If you wish to increase it to £14.00 per hour you have to calculate the numbers of “drops” in 1 hour to achieve this.

This is done by

$3600 \text{ seconds} / \text{YY seconds} = \text{no drops per hour}$, then x by cost per YY

$3600 / 51 = 70.588$ (71 drops) $\times 0.20\text{p} = £14.20$ per hour

So the charge on the chart would read 20p for every 51 seconds the cab is kept waiting.

Drop Yardage	Yards	How many			
		Day	drops	Night	night
		£2.60	Start up	upto 100	£3.10
	100	£2.80	1	101	£3.30
	160	£3.00	2	160	£3.50
	380	£3.20	3	380	£3.70
	600	£3.40	4	600	£3.90
	820	£3.60	5	820	£4.10
	1040	£3.80	6	1040	£4.30
	1260	£4.00	7	1260	£4.50
	1480	£4.20	8	1480	£4.70
1760	1 mile	£4.40	9	1700	£4.90
	1920	£4.60	10	1920	£5.10
	2140	£4.80	11	2140	£5.30
	2360	£5.00	12	2360	£5.50
	2580	£5.20	13	2580	£5.70
	2800	£5.40	14	2800	£5.90
	3020	£5.60	15	3020	£6.10
	3240	£5.80	16	3240	£6.30
3520	2 miles	£6.00	17	3460	£6.50
	3680	£6.20	18	3680	£6.70
	3900	£6.40	19	3900	£6.90
	4120	£6.60	20	4120	£7.10
	4340	£6.80	21	4340	£7.30
	4560	£7.00	22	4560	£7.50
	4780	£7.20	23	4780	£7.70
	5000	£7.40	24	5000	£7.90
5280	3 miles	£7.60	25	5220	£8.10
	5440	£7.80	26	5440	£8.30
	5660	£8.00	27	5660	£8.50
	5880	£8.20	28	5880	£8.70
	6100	£8.40	29	6100	£8.90
	6320	£8.60	30	6320	£9.10
	6540	£8.80	31	6540	£9.30
	6760	£9.00	32	6760	£9.50
7040	4 miles	£9.20	33	6980	£9.70
	7200	£9.40	34	7200	£9.90

		7420	£9.60	35	7420	£10.10
		7640	£9.80	36	7640	£10.30
		7860	£10.00	37	7860	£10.50
		8080	£10.20	38	8080	£10.70
		8300	£10.40	39	8300	£10.90
		8520	£10.60	40	8520	£11.10
8800	5 miles	8740	£10.80	41	8740	£11.30
		8960	£11.00	42	8960	£11.50
		9180	£11.20	43	9180	£11.70
		9400	£11.40	44	9400	£11.90
		9620	£11.60	45	9620	£12.10
		9840	£11.80	46	9840	£12.30
		10060	£12.00	47	10060	£12.50
		10280	£12.20	48	10280	£12.70
10560	6 miles	10500	£12.40	49	10500	£12.90
		10720	£12.60	50	10720	£13.10
		10940	£12.80	51	10940	£13.30
		11160	£13.00	52	11160	£13.50
		11380	£13.20	53	11380	£13.70
		11600	£13.40	54	11600	£13.90
		11820	£13.60	55	11820	£14.10
		12040	£13.80	56	12040	£14.30
12320	7 miles	12260	£14.00	57	12260	£14.50
		12480	£14.20	58	12480	£14.70
		12700	£14.40	59	12700	£14.90
		12920	£14.60	60	12920	£15.10
		13140	£14.80	61	13140	£15.30
		13360	£15.00	62	13360	£15.50
		13580	£15.20	63	13580	£15.70
		13800	£15.40	64	13800	£15.90
14080	8 miles	14020	£15.60	65	14020	£16.10
		14240	£15.80	66	14240	£16.30
		14460	£16.00	67	14460	£16.50
		14680	£16.20	68	14680	£16.70
		14900	£16.40	69	14900	£16.90
		15120	£16.60	70	15120	£17.10
		15340	£16.80	71	15340	£17.30
		15560	£17.00	72	15560	£17.50
15840	9 miles	15780	£17.20	73	15780	£17.70
		16000	£17.40	74	16000	£17.90
		16220	£17.60	75	16220	£18.10
		16440	£17.80	76	16440	£18.30
		16660	£18.00	77	16660	£18.50
		16880	£18.20	78	16880	£18.70
		17100	£18.40	79	17100	£18.90
		17320	£18.60	80	17320	£19.10

17600 10 miles	17540	£18.80	81	17540	£19.30
	17735	£19.00	82	17735	£19.50
	17930	£19.20	83	17930	£19.70
	18125	£19.40	84	18125	£19.90
	18320	£19.60	85	18320	£20.10
	18515	£19.80	86	18515	£20.30
	18710	£20.00	87	18710	£20.50
	18905	£20.20	88	18905	£20.70
	19100	£20.40	89	19100	£20.90
	19360 11 miles	19295	£20.60	90	19295
19490		£20.80	91	19490	£21.30
19685		£21.00	92	19685	£21.50
19880		£21.20	93	19880	£21.70
20075		£21.40	94	20075	£21.90
20270		£21.60	95	20270	£22.10
20465		£21.80	96	20465	£22.30
20660		£22.00	97	20660	£22.50
20855		£22.20	98	20855	£22.70
12 miles		21050	£22.40	99	21050
	21245	£22.60	100	21245	£23.10
	21440	£22.80	101	21440	£23.30
	21635	£23.00	102	21635	£23.50
	21830	£23.20	103	21830	£23.70
	22025	£23.40	104	22025	£23.90
	22220	£23.60	105	22220	£24.10
	22415	£23.80	106	22415	£24.30
	22610	£24.00	107	22610	£24.50
	22880 13 miles	22805	£24.20	108	22805
23000		£24.40	109	23000	£24.90
23195		£24.60	110	23195	£25.10
23390		£24.80	111	23390	£25.30
23585		£25.00	112	23585	£25.50
23780		£25.20	113	23780	£25.70
23975		£25.40	114	23975	£25.90
24170		£25.60	115	24170	£26.10
24365		£25.80	116	24365	£26.30
24640 14 miles		24560	£26.00	117	24560
	24755	£26.20	118	24755	£26.70
	24950	£26.40	119	24950	£26.90
	25145	£26.60	120	25145	£27.10
	25340	£26.80	121	25340	£27.30
	25535	£27.00	122	25535	£27.50
	25730	£27.20	123	25730	£27.70
	25925	£27.40	124	25925	£27.90
	26120	£27.60	125	26120	£28.10
	26400 15 miles	26315	£27.80	126	26315
26510		£28.00	127	26510	£28.50
26705		£28.20	128	26705	£28.70
26900		£28.40	129	26900	£28.90

	27095	£28.60	130	27095	£29.10
	27290	£28.80	131	27290	£29.30
	27485	£29.00	132	27485	£29.50
	27680	£29.20	133	27680	£29.70
	27875	£29.40	134	27875	£29.90
28160 16 miles	28070	£29.60	135	28070	£30.10
	28265	£29.80	136	28265	£30.30
	28460	£30.00	137	28460	£30.50
	28655	£30.20	138	28655	£30.70
	28850	£30.40	139	28850	£30.90
	29045	£30.60	140	29045	£31.10
	29240	£30.80	141	29240	£31.30
	29435	£31.00	142	29435	£31.50
	29630	£31.20	143	29630	£31.70
29920 17 miles	29825	£31.40	144	29825	£31.90
	30020	£31.60	145	30020	£32.10
	30215	£31.80	146	30215	£32.30
	30410	£32.00	147	30410	£32.50
	30605	£32.20	148	30605	£32.70
	30800	£32.40	149	30800	£32.90
	30995	£32.60	150	30995	£33.10
	31190	£32.80	151	31190	£33.30
	31385	£33.00	152	31385	£33.50
31680 18 miles	31580	£33.20	153	31580	£33.70
	31775	£33.40	154	31775	£33.90
	31970	£33.60	155	31970	£34.10
	32165	£33.80	156	32165	£34.30
	32360	£34.00	157	32360	£34.50
	32555	£34.20	158	32555	£34.70
	32750	£34.40	159	32750	£34.90
	32945	£34.60	160	32945	£35.10
	33140	£34.80	161	33140	£35.30
33440 19 miles	33335	£35.00	162	33335	£35.50
	33530	£35.20	163	33530	£35.70
	33725	£35.40	164	33725	£35.90
	33920	£35.60	165	33920	£36.10
	34115	£35.80	166	34115	£36.30
	34310	£36.00	167	34310	£36.50
	34505	£36.20	168	34505	£36.70
	34700	£36.40	169	34700	£36.90
	34895	£36.60	170	34895	£37.10
35200 20 miles	35090	£36.80	171	35090	£37.30
	35285	£37.00	172	35285	£37.50
	35480	£37.20	173	35480	£37.70

Appendix E

Approved Agent List

Sheffield
City Council



Licensing Service
Sheffield City Council
Block C Staniforth Road Depot
Staniforth Road
Sheffield, S9 3HD
Tel: 0114 2734264

E-mail: licensing@sheffield.gov.uk

Website: www.sheffield.gov.uk/licensing

Approved Suppliers of Hackney Carriage Tariff Meters

Information Notes

All Sheffield City Council licensed Hackney Carriage Vehicles must fitted with a taximeter. The need for a taximeter is set out in the Hackney Carriage Byelaws, Section 18:

The proprietor of a hackney carriage shall cause any taximeter with which the carriage is provided to be so constructed, attached, and maintained in a manner approved by an authorised officer of the Council and so as to comply with the following requirements, that is to say: -

- (a) *the taximeter should be fitted with a key, flag or other device, the operation of which will bring the machinery of the taximeter into operation and cause the word "HIRED" to appear on the face of the taximeter;*
- (b) *such key, flag or other device shall be capable of being locked in such a position that the machinery of the taximeter is not in action and that no fare is recorded on the face of the taximeter;*
- © *when the machinery of the taximeter is in action there shall be recorded on the face of the taximeter in clearly legible figures a fare not exceeding the rate or fare which the proprietor or driver is entitled to demand and take for the hire of the carriage by distance or by time in pursuance of the table of fares fixed by the Council;*
- (d) *the word "FARE" shall be printed on the face of the taximeter in plain letters so as to apply to the fare recorded thereon;*
- (e) *the taximeter shall be so placed that all letters and figures on the face thereof are at all times plainly visible to any person being conveyed in the carriage; and for that purpose the letters and figures shall be capable of being suitably illuminated during any period of hiring;*
- (f) *the taximeter and all fittings thereof shall be fixed to the carriage with seals or other appliances that it shall not be practicable for any person to tamper with them except by breaking, damaging or permanently displacing the seals or other appliances.*

All Hackney Carriage Tariff meters must be installed by an approved supplier. An approved supplier must be able to demonstrate to the Council that they have a full technical and working knowledge of the system, as well as the requirements of the Council, including the Hackney Carriage Byelaws, as stated above.

The Council requires all those wishing to become an approved supplier and those wishing to make adjustments to meters to make an application in writing. The Council will consider the application along with the relevant Taxi Trade Associations before a decision is made as to whether to accept as an approved supplier.

Any expenses incurred during the application and consultation process will be met by the applicant.

The below table identifies those suppliers that have been approved by the Council.

Company	Meter Type	Approved	Date
Maltings Garage Sheffield S9 3SE	Cygnus Taximeters	Steve Lonnia Chief Licensing Officer and Head of Licensing	?
	Digitax Taximeters	Steve Lonnia Chief Licensing Officer and Head of Licesing	?

Sheffield City Council does not endorse the suppliers' products, service or reputation. The Council shall not be held liable for any loss howsoever caused arising out of or in anyway connected with the use of the suppliers' products or service.

Office Opening Times

Monday to Friday – 10am – 4pm
 Saturday and Sunday – Closed

This page is intentionally left blank