

Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

AGENDA

This meeting will be recorded and the video archive published on our website

Licensing and Regulatory Committee
Tuesday, 13th December, 2016 at 6.30 pm
The Council Chamber - The Guildhall, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA

Members:

- Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne (Chairman)
- Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Gillian Bardsley
- Councillor Sheila Bibb
- Councillor David Cotton
- Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
- Councillor Angela Lawrence
- Councillor Mrs Pat Mewis
- Councillor Richard Oaks
- Councillor Judy Rainsforth
- Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers
- Councillor Lewis Strange

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Public Participation

Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each

3. Minutes of Previous Meetings

a) Licensing and Regulatory Committee

Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee meeting of 9 June 2016 (PAGES 1 - 6)

b) Licensing Sub Committee

(i) Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 11 July 2016 (PAGES 7 - 12)

Agendas, Reports and Minutes will be provided upon request in the following formats:

Large Clear Print: Braille: Audio: Native Language

- (ii) Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on
26 August and 2 November 2016

4. Declarations of Interest

5. Public Reports

a) Public Space Protection Orders

Appendix B will be presented as a slide show.

(PAGES 13 - 20)

M Gill
Chief Executive
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

5 December 2016

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held in the Council Chamber at the Guildhall, Gainsborough on Thursday 9 June 2016 commencing at 6.35 pm.

Present: Councillor Jessie Milne (Chairman - In the Chair)
Councillor Owen Bierley (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Gill Bardsley
Councillor Sheila Bibb
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan
Councillor Angela Lawrence
Councillor Pat Mewis
Councillor Di Rodgers
Councillor Lewis Strange

In Attendance:

Phil Hinch Licensing Team Manager
Lesley Beevers Regulatory Team Manager
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present: Four members of the public

Apologies : Councillor Mrs Judy Rainsforth

Membership : No substitutes were appointed for the meeting

7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PERIOD

Four members of the public attended to ask questions of the Committee.

Sharon Allen asked why there was one rule for one pub and another for others. She made reference to a premise in Gainsborough claiming that it had lock-ins until the early hours, played loud music, the staff were rude, and bouncers took patrons down a side alley. There were frequently police outside, but nothing was ever done.

The Committee Chairman informed Ms Allen that further details needed to be submitted to the Licensing team, but that work was underway to address reported issues. Answers to all questions would be provided in writing by the Licensing Team Manager.

David Priestfield then questioned what experience the Licensing and Regulatory Committee had, and whether it was necessary for a licensed premise to hold a valid licence. Mr Priestfield stated that an incident had

recently taken place which was public knowledge on Facebook but that no action had been taken. The said premise was trading without a valid licence.

The Chairman verified that the Committee underwent training on a regular basis, and that the reported incident was being investigated through the appropriate channels.

Steve Dyke then questioned whether the Council made regular checks to verify that regulations were being complied with, and asked whether there was a time limit for names on licences to be changed. Mr Dyke also asked if weights and measures came under the remit of Licensing legislation.

The Chairman informed Mr Dyke that any evidence or information should be passed to the Licensing Team Manager, but that weights and measures were not within Licensing jurisdiction.

Sharon Hopkinson then stated that she had reported the premise in question regarding operating without a valid licence, and being the landlord of the White Hart, she felt she was being victimised. She was a member of the Town Council and had invested a lot of time, effort and money in Gainsborough. Ms Hopkinson expressed dismay that the minutes of the private hearing of which she had been part were now public and that the local press now knew of the matter. Ms Hopkinson stated that she had telephoned a Councillor and that she had not known what a DPS was, and if this was the case then the council needed a new Committee. Ms Hopkinson stated that she was going to fight the outcome of her hearing decision.

8 MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

- a) Meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 15 March 2016 (LR.02 16/17)
- b) Meeting of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 9 May 2016 (LR.03 16/17)

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Meetings of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 15 March and 9 May 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

9 MINUTES FOR NOTING

- c) Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 12 May 2016 (LR.04 16/17)
- d) Meeting of the Taxi & General Licensing Sub-Committee held on 9 May 2016

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 12 May 2016 and the Taxi and General Licensing Sub-Committee held on 9 May be received and noted.

10 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor Pat Mewis declared a personal interest in the Food and Health and Safety Plan 2016/17 as being the proprietor of a Bed and Breakfast establishment.

Councillor Howitt-Cowan declared a personal interest in the Food and Health and Safety Plan 2016/17 as being the Chairman of Gainsborough House which included Zena's Top Nosh.

11 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE (LR.05 16/17)

It was noted that there were no Matters Arising from previous meetings.

RESOLVED that progress on the Matters Arising Schedule as set out in report LR.05 16/17, be received and noted.

12 FOOD AND HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAN 2016/17 (LR.06 16/17)

The Regulatory Team Leader presented the 2016/2017 Food, Health and Safety Service Plan, which had been produced in line with the Food Standards Agency Framework Agreement and the Health and Safety Commission's approved guidance, for consideration and approval by the Committee.

The aims and objectives of the Service were set out as being:

- To protect and improve the health, wellbeing and safety of our residents, visitors to and workers in the district, ensure the economic prosperity of businesses and provide for the sustainable improvement of our local environment.
- To strive for continuous improvement in the delivery of efficient and effective customer focused services.
- To protect public health and ensure businesses comply with the relevant legislation, through advice, education and enforcement.

The intention was to create a level playing field for establishments by providing advice and education and then enforcement where necessary. As well as 430 premises requiring inspections other work needed to be undertaken. Sampling was carried out where it was considered necessary and complaints were investigated.

Those premises which gained four stars or fewer could request re-inspections to improve their ratings. Rating was assessed on cleanliness, record keeping and food preparation.

Some investigations took longer than others, a major problem such as a mouse infestation could require a great deal of officer time to resolve. Accident investigations were dependent upon circumstances and severity. An establishment with repeated incidents would require inspection. The performance achieved by the team was much improved to the position of three years ago.

Members of the Committee posed a number of questions to the Regulatory Team Leader, such as which parts of establishments were checked. Inspectors usually requested the facility to wash their hands on arrival at a premise which gave a good indication of cleanliness.

Committee Members commended the work of the team and felt that it did a good job. A number of questions were asked about the statistics in the tables set out in the report. The Regulatory Team Leader clarified the rating inspection categories and explained the Food Standards Agency's inspection requirements. Approved Premises fell outside of the scheme due to the nature of the businesses and their higher risk due to the food preparation methods.

Verification was sought that the team had capacity to deal with the incidents and inspections required. It was noted that performance monitoring was reported quarterly through the regular Performance and Delivery reports to the Council's other Committees. Any major incident such as an infestation or an outbreak of food poisoning would have an impact on the routine work of the service.

The recommendation in the report was moved and seconded, and on being voted upon it was:

RESOLVED that the Food and Health and Safety Service Plan be received, noted and approved.

13 COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

The Governance and Civic Officer introduced the Committee Workplan noting that a report was to be submitted to the September meeting on a Public Space Protection Order.

RESOLVED that the Committee Workplan be noted.

14 TRAINING

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Members that two training sessions had been arranged for 27 June and 12 July and that it was hoped as many Members as possible would be able to attend.

Licensing and Regulatory Committee – 9 June 2016

The meeting concluded at 7.15 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held in the Council Chamber at The Guildhall, Gainsborough on Monday 11 July 2016 at 9.30am

Present:
Councillor Jessie Milne
Councillor David Cotton
Councillor Paul Howitt-Cowan

In Attendance:
Phil Hinch Licensing Team Manager
Tracy Gavins Licensing and Enforcement Officer
Kim Newbould-Robertson Lincs Legal Services
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer

Also Present:
Ashok Mistry Licensee
Stuart Gibson Licensee's legal representative
Sgt Kim Enderby Lincolnshire Police
PC Gina McConville Lincolnshire Police

One member of the public

4 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED that Councillor Cotton be elected Chairman of the Licensing Sub-Committee for this meeting.

Councillor Cotton took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting and round the table introductions were made.

5 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6 LICENCE HEARING RE:
Licence Number: 32UHB90014
Hearing Type: Review of a Premises Licence
Applicant: Lincolnshire Police
Premises: Bells Newsagents
Premises Licence Holder: Ashok Mistry

Additional documentation had been circulated to all parties prior to the meeting: a form requesting the transfer of the Premises Licence to Mark Raisborough; and a witness statement from PC Evans.

The Council's legal representative set out the procedure that would be followed, as detailed in Appendix A to the Agenda.

The Licensing Team Manager was requested to present the report which set out the background leading to the application for review. Appended to the report were the premises licence; Home Office guidance on the sale of alcohol; and witness statements from the police.

The circumstances leading to the application for review were presented to the Sub-Committee by Sgt Enderby, which, following a licence compliance check had revealed a number of issues of concern. The licence itself was not on display, as was required by law. It was not possible to view any CCTV footage as no-one knew how to work the equipment. The level of training undertaken by staff was ambiguous. A number of bottles of wine were seized as being of questionable origin, due to them being sold at 'two for £5', which was below the HMRC mandatory selling price, leading to the assumption that duty had not been paid, and also some of the labels were branded Casal Divino which was a well-known smuggled brand. On being interviewed on site the Licensee appeared unknowledgeable regarding the requirements and responsibilities of his position.

The police were sceptical regarding the transfer of the licence to Mr Raisborough, and his subsequent statements that he would not be involved in the business financially and that he was merely helping a friend, whilst Mr Mistry was out of the country for an indefinite length of time.

The Licensee's representative, Mr Gibson, on being given the opportunity to ask questions of the police, asked if the provenance of the wine in question had been verified, and whether this did constitute a risk to public safety. It was ascertained that no testing had been carried out at that point. Mr Gibson further questioned the requirements of the availability of CCTV footage as stipulated on the licence, it was agreed that this was vague. There was no requirement on the licence to have an operator on the premises. It was acknowledged by the Licensee and his representative that the requirement to have the premises licence on display had not been complied with, however, given the lack of evidence on the other matters, the lack of the licence display was no reason for a review of the licence. A case could not be made based on assumptions.

The Licensee's representative then presented the case for the Licence Holder, describing Mr Mistry's marriage had broken down some months ago and it had been his wife who had handled all the paperwork. In the absence of anyone undertaking that side of the business Mr Mistry admitted he had let matters get into a mess, and hence the reason for Mr Raisborough agreeing to help sort things out. No deceit had been intended by Mr Mistry. It was agreed with the police that 24 hours would be a reasonable time to produce CCTV footage, and

had this been requested at the time, the provider of the system would have been able to undertake this. It had been stated that no training records were available, however a brief summary had since been produced. Mr Mistry then explained that he had to sell some alcohol cheaply in order to compete with other shops, but he was unable to verify the cost price or the supplier, due to a lack of paperwork. He agreed that he was probably making a loss on the wine.

The documentation provided by Lincolnshire Police for their case had included information regarding legal highs, and Mr Gibson admitted on his client's behalf that these had been sold by Mr Mistry some time ago, but since some had been made illegal and also since warnings regarding their safety, these items had been withdrawn from sale.

On being questioned by the Police and Members of the Sub-Committee, it was agreed by the Licensee and his representative that there had been a lack of responsibility and a degree of naivety but that steps were being taken to address the issues that had been allowed to get into a mess.

In summing up, Mr Gibson agreed that Mr Mistry had been out of his depth since being left to run the business alone and that he had made mistakes, some of which were not serious enough on their own to warrant a review of the licence, and errors had been made regarding the sale of the wine, however there was no concrete evidence to prove criminal intent.

In the Police summing up there was a lack of credence in the claim of naive mistakes by a person who had been in business for so many years, and deliberate criminal activity was a more plausible explanation.

The Sub-Committee then retired to consider their decision. The meeting was therefore adjourned at 10.25am.

The meeting reconvened at 12.49pm.

The Chairman then read out the sub-committee's decision and the reasons for reaching said decision.

“Considering the foregoing above we have concluded that there were breaches of the licensing act and undermining of the licensing objectives of crime and disorder. Public safety being undermined has not been proven. However to avoid any avoidance of doubt in the future, consider it appropriate to amend the licence in the following ways:

1. We will remove Mr Mistry as the DPS as he has shown a lack of understanding of the licensing objectives, of the requirements of his licence and requirements in the pricing of the sale of alcohol;
2. A condition is put in place requiring staff on the premises to be able to operate the CCTV system fully and demonstrate that to be the case if required by the police or the licensing authority;
3. The business shall obtain and retain invoices for purchase of all alcohol, these to be produced on request;

4. The CCTV system should be able to export video and stills to a removable storage medium within a period not exceeding 24 hours from receipt of request by Lincolnshire Police or the Licensing Authority. Following export the images shall be capable of being played on a DVD or PC without any additional software.

The committee reminds the business that it is a requirement in law to display a copy of the licence at all times.”

The Chairman advised that all parties would be notified of the decision in writing within five working days of today’s hearing and reminded those present of the right to appeal to the Magistrates’ Court within 21 days of receiving such notice.

The meeting closed at 12.55 pm.

Chairman

Public Document Pack

Licensing Sub Committee - 16 August and 2 November 2016

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Licensing Sub Committee held in the Ancholme Meeting Room - The Guildhall on 16 August and 2 November 2016 commencing at 12.37 pm.

Present:
Councillor Sheila Bibb
Councillor Mrs Pat Mewis
Councillor Mrs Diana Rodgers

In Attendance:
Phil Hinch Licensing Team Manager
Dinah Lilley Governance & Civic Officer
Kim Newbould-Robertson Lincs Legal

7 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED that Councillor Bibb be elected Chairman of the Licensing Sub-Committee for this meeting.

Councillor Bibb took the Chair for the remainder of the meeting and round the table introductions were made.

9 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest

10 LICENCE HEARING

9 LICENCE HEARING RE:
Licence Number: 32UHB14001

Hearing Type: Review of a Premises Licence

Applicant: Lincolnshire Police

Premises: The Gate of India, 5 King Street, Market Rasen, LN8 3BB

Premises Licence Holder: Mr Mohammed Jillul Haque

The Licensing Team Manager set out for Members that the Licence Holder's representative had sent an email regarding conflicting PAYE evidence, and further information was being sought. Members were therefore advised that an adjournment should take place to allow the additional information to be presented to all parties concerned.

RESOLVED that the hearing be adjourned and reconvened at a time and date convenient for all parties.

The meeting adjourned at 12.51 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 12.37pm on 2 November 2016.

Present: Councillor Sheila Bibb
Councillor Pat Mewis
Councillor Di Rodgers

In Attendance:

Phil Hinch Licensing Team Manager
Tracy Gavins Licensing and Enforcement Officer
Dinah Lilley Governance and Civic Officer
Sgt Kim Enderby Lincolnshire Police
Michael Kheng Licence Holder's representative

10 INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman requested round the table introductions.

11 LICENCE HEARING (continued)

The Council's legal representative advised the Committee that whilst further information had been received in defence of the review of the establishment, the Police had no further evidence at this point in time, however investigations were ongoing.

Legislation did not permit the applicant to withdraw the request for review, however it would not be in the public interest to adjourn the meeting for a second time.

It was therefore proposed that no action be taken at this time and a further application for review be submitted once further evidence be established. All parties were in agreement.

RESOLVED that no action be taken at the present time.

The meeting concluded at 12.42 pm.

Chairman



**Licencing and Regulatory
Committee**

Date 13 December 2016

Subject: Public Space Protection Orders – authority to consult

Report by:

Kathryn Hearn

Contact Officer:

Kathryn Hearn
Senior Community Safety Officer
01427 675181
Kathryn.hearn@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To outline proposals relating to three Public Space Protections Orders, and to gain consent from Committee to consult in line with the proposed consultation plan.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Elected members are asked to:

- 1. Give authority to consult on Proposal 1 – District Wide PSPO for dog fouling**
- 2. Give authority to consult on Proposal 2 – PSPO on Trinity Arts Centre Grounds**
- 3. Give authority to consult on Proposal 3 – PSPO on land belonging to Gainsborough Town Council**
- 4. Approve the suggested consultation plan and timeline**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: These Orders are made under section 59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. A minimum 30 day consultation period is required by Legislation.

Power to make a PSPO has been added to the Terms of Reference of this Committee

Breach of a PSPO may be dealt with by a fixed penalty notice or prosecution. Delegated powers are in place for service of fixed penalty notices.

Appeals against the making of a PSPO can be made in the High Court within 5 weeks of the PSPO being made, on the grounds that the process has not been followed, or that the council did not have the authority to make the Order or put certain restrictions in the Order.

Financial : Fin Ref:FIN/109/17

There will be costs associated with the consultation process, signage and publicity and resource costs. These should be relatively low and met from within existing budget provision.

Fixed penalty notices for breach of a PSPO are set at £75 with a £50 early payment incentive in fees and charges. Income from fixed penalty notices may be used to support the service issuing the FPN.

Staffing :

Staff time will be required to support the consultation process and reporting back to Committee. Staff time will be required to deal with breaches to support the PSPOs. It is intended that multi-skilling enforcement staff will enable this with minimal impact on individual officers by sharing the load.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

The PSPOs will not disadvantage any social groups over another, and the process will be applied fairly. Exemptions for fixed penalty notices for reasons of physical or mental impairment are detailed in the Fixed Penalty Enforcement Strategy.

Risk Assessment :

Challenge in the High Court – reduced by following process and considering reasonableness throughout process

Orders relating to dogs can be controversial and may lead to negative publicity. To be mitigated at consultation stage with careful publicity, reasoned grounds for suggested Orders and multiple options for responding provided.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

Nil

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

x

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

x

1 Introduction

West Lindsey District Council has been asked to consider making, or feels it needs to make, a number of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) on land in the District.

These Orders can be made on any land open to the air that the public have a right or entitlement of access to. This means that the legislation can apply to land belonging to local authorities, as well as, for example, Church grounds and land belonging to a resident owned management company.

To make an Order, the local authority needs to be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the activities carried out, or likely to be carried out, in a public space:

- Have had, or are likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality
- Is, or is likely to be persistent or continuing in nature
- Is, or is likely to be unreasonable
- Justifies the restrictions imposed

A PSPO can require something to happen e.g. requirement to keep dogs on a lead, or ban something from happening e.g. banning drinking alcohol in a public space.

A PSPO lasts for three years, after which it can be removed or extended. A PSPO can be removed or varied within the three year period if no longer needed.

Breach of a PSPO is a criminal offence, punishable by a fixed penalty notice or prosecution.

PSPOs, while a versatile and effective tool, have attracted some negativity nationally due to how they have been applied in some authority areas. It is therefore important to consider what activities the PSPO is aimed at stopping, whether those activities are deemed unreasonable, and whether the requirement or prohibition under the proposed PSPO is justifiable and enforceable.

The legislation requires that a minimum 30 days consultation is carried out prior to a decision being made to make a PSPO or not.

This paper is intended to outline the three current proposed PSPOs, the reasons behind the requests and the requirements or prohibitions suggested, and to ask the Committee to agree for consultation to take place.

Any Dog Control Orders currently in force in the District will remain in force and unchanged by these proposals, excepting those on Gainsborough Town Council owned land.

2 Proposal one – District wide PSPO for dog fouling

2.1 Requirements/ Prohibitions requested:

To require dog fouling to be picked up by the owner/person responsible for the dog(s), on all land which is open to the air and to which the public have a right or entitlement of access whether paid or unpaid.

To require the dog foul picked up to be properly disposed of in a waste bin.

2.2 Land PSPO to apply to:

All land in the District of West Lindsey which is open to the air and to which the public have a right or entitlement of access whether paid or unpaid.

Exemptions: private property that the public do not have right or entitlement of access to, grass verges of roads with a speed limit above 40mph, woodland, heathland and agricultural land (as per the exemptions in the Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996). Footpaths running alongside roads with a speed limit above 40mph would not be exempt.

2.3 Reason for application:

Uncleared dog fouling poses a health hazard, as well as making the streets unsightly. The Dogs (Fouling of Land) Act 1996, which has previously applied, is becoming more difficult to enforce. This PSPO will effectively replace the previous legislation, allow a higher fixed penalty amount, and will give a good opportunity for an educational publicity campaign in the local media, as well as a medium to long term enforcement option to help clear our communities up.

3 Proposal two – PSPO on Trinity Arts Centre grounds

3.1 Requirements/Prohibitions requested:

To prohibit dogs being brought on to the land designated in the Order. This prohibition will not apply to registered guide or medical alert dogs.

To prohibit the consumption of alcohol on the land designated in the Order.

3.2 Land PSPO to apply to:

The outside grounds of the Trinity Arts Centre, and the Pocket Park on Cleveland Street (map provided in Annex A)

3.3 Reason for application:

Frequent reports of groups gathering and drinking alcohol within the grounds of the Trinity Arts Centre and pocket park. Numerous visitors to the centre have commented on this and expressed concern for their safety as a result, as well as TAC staff and local residents. This has been on-going for some

time and various options have been considered for dealing with this, however a resolution has not yet been found. There is a possible negative impact on the TAC as a venue if people do not feel safe attending, as well as local people feeling unsafe at home.

The grounds of the TAC are frequently used by local people for exercising their dogs. This has unfortunately had the effect of the grass being covered in dog foul. While we are looking to tackle the fouling issue itself under proposal one, in discussion with the centre manager a ban on dogs was considered the preferred option. In 2015 a community event on the grounds required several hours clean up prior due to the fouling, and this cannot be accepted on our land. In consultation it is proposed that a full ban on dogs, and a requirement to keep dogs on leads, are put forward as the two options.

4 Proposal three – PSPO on Gainsborough Town Council land

4.1 Requirements/Prohibitions requested

On all areas of land that the PSPO applies to:

- Dogs must be kept on leads
- No alcohol may be drunk except as part of events organised by or with the permission of the Town Council
- No off road vehicles may be used for recreational use. This includes motorbikes, mini motos, cars and quad bikes.

On the areas indicated in blue on the maps, described as designated childrens play areas, dogs will be excluded. Registered guide and medical alert dogs will be exempt from the exclusion.

4.2 Land PSPO to apply to

The PSPO will apply to numerous pieces of land in Gainsborough owned by the Town Council. Annex B shows the areas of land in map format.

4.3 Reason for application

Gainsborough Town Council have requested that a PSPO is put in place on its public land to replace current Dog Control Orders, and extend them to other areas of land, and to encompass wider nuisance behaviours. This is due to frequent problems in the past relating to dog fouling, uncontrolled dogs, use of alcohol, anti-social behaviour and off road vehicles on those areas, negatively impacting the majority of users of its land.

GTC have decided to request a dogs on leads order rather than the outright ban of dogs, except within childrens play areas. The ban would not apply to registered guide or medical alert dogs.

GTC have agreed to hold any required public meeting in relation to this proposal, and to be a point of contact during consultation.

5 Consultation plan

Should approval be given for consulting the following is proposed:

- Consultation to open 16th January 2017, to close 19th February 2017.
- Statutory consultees will be notified by email where possible, and in writing otherwise (statutory consultees include elected members, Parish and Town Councils, the Police and any other person directly affected by the proposal e.g. the Church diocese where the order affects their land)
- A Public Notice will be placed in local press
- A press release will be sent to local newspapers and publications, and placed on the website and social media prior to consultation opening
- Responses will be accepted in paper or electronic format. Paper forms will be available in reception.
- The Citizens Panel will be used if possible to increase reach
- Proposals 1 and 2 will return to Licencing and Regulatory Committee in March 2017. A report will be produced for each proposal giving a recommendation, for the Committee to make a decision.
- Proposal 3 will return either in March or June 2017 for a decision

6 Recommendations

Elected members are asked to:

1. Give authority to consult on Proposal 1 – District Wide PSPO for dog fouling
2. Give authority to consult on Proposal 2 – PSPO on Trinity Arts Centre Grounds
3. Give authority to consult on Proposal 3 – PSPO on land belonging to Gainsborough Town Council
4. Approve the suggested consultation plan and timeline

Map for Proposal two

