

Title: Impact Assessment for the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill Lead department or agency: Home Office Other departments or agencies: Ministry of Justice	Impact Assessment (IA)
	IA No: HO0028
	Date: 29/11/10
	Stage: Final
	Source of intervention: Domestic
	Type of measure: Primary legislation

Summary: Intervention and Options

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The Bill addresses a number of problems requiring government intervention:

- Policing governance has become distorted and over-centralised, removed from the public view;
- The Licensing Act is unbalanced and makes it difficult for local communities, through “Licensing Authorities” and the police, to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder;
- The risk of social harm caused by new psychoactive substances, so-called “legal highs”;
- The permanent encampments that have created an eye-sore around Parliament Square and prevented its use by members of the public and other protestors; and,
- The issue of private arrest warrants for offences where successful prosecution is unlikely.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

To give more power to local areas in police accountability and tackling alcohol-related crime and to ensure the correct balance of freedom and social responsibility in dealing with “legal highs”, protest in Parliament Square and arrests for universal jurisdiction offences by:

- Replacing police authorities with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs);
- Overhauling the Licensing Act and give licensing authorities powers to introduce a late night levy;
- Introducing a system of temporary bans for so-called “legal highs”;
- Restoring the right to non-violent protest whilst retaining public access to Parliament Square; and,
- Amending the procedure for issuing private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

- 1) Retain the current position and not introduce the changes outlined in the Bill (Do nothing).
- 2) Implement the Bill in part - to do this would only realise some but not all of the benefits from the proposed reforms.
- 3) Implement the Bill in full – this would allow us to move forward on delivering the reforms that are needed to address the lack of empowerment for local areas in holding the police to account and in tackling alcohol-related crime and the social harms caused by “legal highs”, misuse of Parliament Square and the issue of private arrest warrants in cases where successful prosecution is unlikely. (This is our preferred option).

When will the policy be reviewed to establish its impact and the extent to which the policy objectives have been achieved?	Implementation and delivery plans for individual provisions of the Bill will be developed in due course.
Are there arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review?	See individual policy IAs.

Ministerial Sign-off For final proposal stage Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that (a) it represents a fair and reasonable view of the expected costs, benefits and impact of the policy, and (b) the benefits justify the costs.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

Nick Herbert

Date: 29/11/10

Summary: Analysis and Evidence

Policy Option 3

Description: Implement the Bill in full

Price Base Year 2010	PV Base Year 2010	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate: -201

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	5	49	447

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

These costs relate to the Police and Crime Commissioner provisions and the alcohol provisions of the Bill. For the PCCs provisions, the best estimate is an average annual cost of £12m. For the alcohol provisions, the best estimate is an average annual cost (although not to the public purse) of £37m. The other provisions in the Bill have not been subject to full impact assessment on the grounds that they primarily affect the public sector and each provision will not impose costs of more than £5m (annual equivalent costs). The temporary banning power for so-called "legal highs" is an enabling power and therefore has no direct impact.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

See costs and benefits section and individual IAs for PCCs and alcohol.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate	N/A	29	246

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

The monetised benefits relate to the alcohol provisions of the Bill only. For more detail, please see the separate impact assessment on the alcohol measures in the Bill. It has not been possible to quantify the monetised benefits of the PCCs provisions or other provisions.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

See costs and benefits section. Whilst the benefits of the PCCs provisions are non-monetary, they are expected to drive value for money and efficiency of the police whilst increasing democratic accountability. The alcohol provisions are expected to reduce alcohol related crime and disorder; anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related harm to health.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5

1. Costs for PCCs have been deflated from 2012 prices to 2010.
2. Costs and benefits shown may not sum when compared to individual IAs due to rounding.

See individual IAs for PCCs and Alcohol for further assumptions.

Impact on admin burden (AB) (£m):			Impact on policy cost savings (£m):	In scope
New AB: 3.5	AB savings: 0.5	Net: -3	Policy cost savings: -20	Yes

Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?			England and Wales for all provisions; UK for drugs provisions.		
From what date will the policy be implemented?			Various dates depending on provision.		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?			Various depending on provision.		
What is the annual change in enforcement cost (£m)?			Marginal		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?			Yes		
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			No		
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)			Traded: N/A	Non-traded: N/A	
Does the proposal have an impact on competition?			Yes (alcohol provisions)		
What proportion (%) of Total PV costs/benefits is directly attributable to primary legislation, if applicable?			Costs: 100 (alcohol)	Benefits: 100 (alcohol)	
Annual cost (£m) per organisation (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Micro N/K	< 20 N/K	Small N/K	Medium N/K	Large N/K
Are any of these organisations exempt?	No	No	No	No	No

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Set out in the table below where information on any SITs undertaken as part of the analysis of the policy options can be found in the evidence base. For guidance on how to complete each test, double-click on the link for the guidance provided by the relevant department.

Please note this checklist is not intended to list each and every statutory consideration that departments should take into account when deciding which policy option to follow. It is the responsibility of departments to make sure that their duties are complied with.

Does your policy option/proposal have an impact on...?	Impact	Page ref within IA
Statutory equality duties ¹ Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test guidance	No	
Economic impacts		
Competition Competition Assessment Impact Test guidance	Yes	See alcohol IA.
Small firms Small Firms Impact Test guidance	Yes	See alcohol IA.
Environmental impacts		
Greenhouse gas assessment Greenhouse Gas Assessment Impact Test guidance	No	
Wider environmental issues Wider Environmental Issues Impact Test guidance	No	
Social impacts		
Health and well-being Health and Well-being Impact Test guidance	Yes	See alcohol IA.
Human rights Human Rights Impact Test guidance	No	
Justice system Justice Impact Test guidance	Yes	See individual IAs.
Rural proofing Rural Proofing Impact Test guidance	No	
Sustainable development Sustainable Development Impact Test guidance	No	

¹ Race, disability and gender Impact assessments are statutory requirements for relevant policies. Equality statutory requirements will be expanded 2011, once the Equality Bill comes into force. Statutory equality duties part of the Equality Bill apply to GB only. The Toolkit provides advice on statutory equality duties for public authorities with a remit in Northern Ireland.

Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes

Use this space to set out the relevant references, evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Please fill in **References** section.

References

Include the links to relevant legislation and publications, such as public impact assessment of earlier stages (e.g. Consultation, Final, Enactment).

No.	Legislation or publication
1	Impact Assessment of Police and Crime Commissioners provisions
2	Impact Assessment of Alcohol provisions
3	Impact Assessment for Alcohol consultation stage http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/cons-2010-licensing-act/
4	The Coalition: Our Programme for Government (2010) http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/409088/pfg_coalition.pdf
5	The Conservative Manifesto 2010 http://media.conservatives.s3.amazonaws.com/manifesto/cpmanifesto2010_lowres.pdf
6	The Liberal Democrat Manifesto 2010 http://www.libdems.org.uk/our_manifesto.aspx
7	Policing in the 21 st Century: Reconnecting the police and the people (2010) http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/policing-21st-century/
8	Rebalancing the Licensing Act:: a consultation empowering individuals, families and local communities to shape and determine local licensing (2010) http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/consultations/cons-2010-licensing-act/
9	Consultation on a proposal to amend the Licensing Act 2003 to simplify the procedures for Licensing Statements; Interim Authority Notices; and Temporary Event Notices: Impact Assessment (2009)
10	Proposals for changing the law on arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction crimes (2010) http://www.justice.gov.uk/publications/arrest-warrants.htm
11	The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2005/15/contents
12	The Licensing Act 2003 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/17/contents
13	The Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1971/38/contents

Evidence Base

Ensure that the information in this section provides clear evidence of the information provided in the summary pages of this form (recommended maximum of 30 pages). Complete the **Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits** (transition and recurring) below over the life of the preferred policy (use the spreadsheet attached if the period is longer than 10 years).

The spreadsheet also contains an emission changes table that you will need to fill in if your measure has an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits* - (£m) constant prices

	Y ₀	Y ₁	Y ₂	Y ₃	Y ₄	Y ₅	Y ₆	Y ₇	Y ₈	Y ₉
Transition costs	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Annual recurring cost	85	37	37	37	85	37	37	37	85	37
Total annual costs	90	37	37	37	85	37	37	37	85	37
Transition benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Annual recurring benefits	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
Total annual benefits	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

* For non-monetised benefits please see summary pages and main evidence base section

Background

1. In May 2010, the Government announced its commitments, as part of the Coalition Agreement, to:
 - Introduce measures to make the police more accountable through oversight by a directly elected individual;
 - Overhaul the Licensing Act and give licensing authorities powers to introduce a late night levy;
 - Introduce a system of temporary bans on new 'legal highs' while health issues are considered by independent experts; and,
 - Restore rights to non-violent protest.
2. The Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill, announced in the Queen's Speech, provides for these commitments along with an additional provision to amend the process for the issue of private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences. This latter provision was announced in a Written Ministerial Statement by the Secretary of State for Justice on [date].
3. Specifically, the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill will introduce provisions to:
 - **Make the police service more accountable to local people:** by replacing police authorities with directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners for each police force in England and Wales;
 - **Overhaul the Licensing Act to give more power to local authorities and police to tackle alcohol-related crime:** by giving stronger powers to remove or refuse licenses, allowing them to shut down any premises that is repeatedly selling alcohol to children, doubling the maximum fine for persistently selling alcohol to minors, and allowing councils to charge more for late night licences to pay for extra policing;
 - **Reduce the risk of harm from new psychoactive substances, so called "legal highs":** by introducing a system of temporary bans while the health issues are considered by independent experts;
 - **Restore the right to non-violent protest whilst ensuring that public spaces remain accessible:** by repealing sections 132-138 of the Serious Organised Crime and Policing Act (SOCPA) and allowing long-term encampments to be dealt with quickly and effectively; and,
 - **Ensure an appropriate procedure for issuing private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences:** by requiring the Director of Public Prosecutions' consent for issue of an arrest warrant. This will ensure that private individuals retain the important right to apply, but that warrants will be issued only where there is a prospect of successful prosecution.
4. This overarching Impact Assessment has been developed to provide an overview of the benefits, costs and savings provided by the Bill.
5. Individual impact assessments have been produced for the Police and Crime Commissioners and Alcohol provisions in the Bill and will be published upon introduction. The provision in the Bill that will provide for the temporary control of drugs is an enabling power and, as such, has not been subject to an impact assessment. Individual impact assessments will be published each time the power is exercised, in the same way they are when a drug is brought under permanent control under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 (the 1971 Act) .
6. Some of the provisions have been the subject of Government consultations. A list of these is included in the references section above. The provision in the Bill for the temporary control of drugs has been subject to consultation with the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Devolved Administrations. It was also referred to the public consultation on the Future Drugs Strategy.

Summary of key provisions

Making the police service more accountable to local people

7. The police reform measures in the Bill will abolish police authorities and introduce directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs); a key Coalition commitment. The objective is a complete revision of policing governance arrangements so that in 2012, the public can elect new

PCCs at the level of each police force in England and Wales. PCCs will entirely replace the existing police authorities and will have the remit to hold the Chief Constable of their force to account for the full range of their responsibilities. They will, in turn, have to demonstrate the outcome of their work to the public who elected them.

8. The aim is for PCCs to hold three key roles: setting the force budget (agreeing the local strategic plan and priorities for the force); playing a role in wider questions of community safety; and, appointing (and, where necessary, removing) the Chief Constable. The intended overall effect is of greater public engagement and confidence in local policing and a service freed up to concentrate on frontline issues.
9. PCCs will have a duty to collaborate and a role in ensuring forces are working to deliver best value for money by meeting local policing priorities and testing the impact of resource allocation on crime. They will also help to ensure that the existing local delivery landscape for crime prevention and community safety is de-cluttered and that Community Safety Partnerships can work together with Criminal Justice Service partners to deal with force-wide community safety issues, without being pulled in separate directions by differing agendas.
10. The overriding principles for the implementation of PCCs are democratic accountability and transparency. PCCs will be elected by the public to represent their policing interests. The public, particularly in the current climate, will expect to see their PCC seeking every opportunity to eradicate unnecessary spend and to reduce bureaucracy and administrative costs, in order to protect frontline policing. Should they fail to do this, the public will expect answers from their PCC and apply pressure for change. Ultimately, if they are dissatisfied with their PCC and do not believe they are representing or reflecting satisfactorily their needs and the needs of the community, they will have the democratic right to vote for an alternative PCC through the election process.
11. For further detail on the police reform provisions, please see the separate Police and Crime Commissioners impact assessment.

Overhauling the Licensing Act

12. The alcohol measures in the Bill will amend the Licensing Act 2003 and associated changes to the Statutory Guidance. The following proposals are specific Coalition commitments:
 - Double the maximum fine for under-age alcohol sales to £20,000;
 - Overhaul the Licensing Act to give local authorities and the police much stronger powers to remove licences from, or refuse to grant licences to, any premises that are causing problems; and,
 - Permit local councils to charge more for late-night licences to pay for additional policing.
13. Given the specific nature and wording of the commitments, legislation and regulation are necessary to deliver them. The following policies will deliver these commitments and rebalance the licensing regime:
 - a) Giving licensing authorities the power to refuse licence applications or call for a licence review without requiring relevant representations from a responsible authority;
 - b) Lower the evidential hurdle for licensing authorities when making licensing decisions by requiring that they make decisions which are “appropriate” rather than are “necessary” for the promotion of the licensing objectives;
 - c) Increase the opportunities for local residents or their representative groups to be involved in licensing decisions;
 - d) Enable more involvement of local health bodies in licensing decisions by designating health bodies as a responsible authority;
 - e) Extend Early Morning Restriction Orders so they can be applied flexibly between midnight and 6am;
 - f) Permit licensing authorities to introduce an additional charge for late night licences to pay for additional policing;
 - g) Double the maximum fine for persistent underage sales from £10,000 to £20,000;

- h) Change the minimum period of voluntary closure that can be given for persistent underage sales to 48 hours and the maximum to 2 weeks;
 - i) Enable licensing authorities to suspend licences due to non-payment of fees; and,
 - j) Update the list of “relevant offences” in Schedule 4 of the Act to include offences of attempting to commit and conspiracy to commit existing relevant offences and failure to cooperate with a preliminary test in relation to alcohol, impairment or drugs.
14. Furthermore, the provisions will substantially overhaul the system for Temporary Event Notices (TENs) so that existing loopholes can no longer be exploited by unscrupulous operators, but they are light touch for small voluntary and community groups. The provisions will:
- l) Extend the right to object to a TEN to the environmental health authority;
 - m) Allow the police and environmental health officers to object to a TEN on the basis of all of the licensing objectives;
 - n) Give the police and environmental health officers 3 working days to object to a TEN; and,
 - o) Give licensing authorities discretion to apply existing licence conditions to a TEN.
15. The regulatory burden of these proposals on businesses will be countered by deregulating the following areas:
- p) Allow late TENs (i.e. those submitted less than ten working days before the beginning of the event), unless the police or environmental health officers object;
 - q) Relax the statutory limits on the duration of a single temporary event from 96 hours to 168 hours and on the total periods covered by a TEN in a single premises from 15 days to 21 days per year;
 - r) Change the requirement for a licensing authority to publish their Licensing Policy Statement every 3 years to every 5 years (if they have not done so in the interim); and,
 - s) Extend deadlines for Interim authority notices and reinstatement on transfer;
16. For further detail and background on the alcohol provisions, please see the separate alcohol impact assessment.

Reducing the risk of harm from new psychoactive substances, so-called “legal highs”

17. The Coalition Government set out a commitment in the Coalition Agreement to “...introduce a system of temporary bans on new “legal highs” whilst health issues are considered by independent experts”.
18. New psychoactive substances are a relatively new phenomenon, having risen to prominence over the life of the last Parliament. Young people are taking new legal substances, often better described as chemicals, instead or as well as other drugs. Most of these substances have never been tested for use by humans. The immediate risks they pose or the long term damage they are doing are often not immediately apparent as their harms are unknown. These types of substances present particular challenges, no more so that for our drug legislation to stay responsive to these new emerging substances, the manufacturers and suppliers of which look to subvert our drug laws and sell potentially harmful substances, advertising them on the internet as “legal” and “safe”. Following the control of mephedrone in April 2010, the next generation of new “legal highs” are already emerging.
19. Under the current arrangement for bringing a drug under control of the 1971 Act, the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) is consulted to provide advice as to whether a drug should be brought under permanent control of the 1971 Act. The ACMD undertake a full assessment of a drug’s individual and societal harms, which can necessarily take between three and six months. In addition, the current method of Parliamentary control can take at least 2 months unless Parliament expedites in view of the public health concerns.
20. As the UK experienced with mephedrone a drug can gain a substantial foothold within a very short space of time and cause significant harm. A faster legislative response aims to reduce the likelihood of either a criminal market or dependence developing with associated enforcement and treatment costs respectively.
21. The provisions for the temporary banning power do not replace the current process by which a

drug is brought under permanent control of the 1971 Act but will complement it. The provisions are based on the principles that we must be able to legislate fast; be informed by expert advice and give our experts the time and space to make a full assessment of harm; be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny; target supply and not unnecessarily criminalise young people, particularly when the true nature of the substance is in question. The offences established by the 1971 Act (and associated legislation as they relate to “controlled drugs” within the definition of the 1971 Act) will apply in full with the exception of the possession offence. The maximum penalties for the offences established by the 1971 Act will be 14 years on indictment and/or an unlimited fine which is aligned to the current Class B and Class C maximum penalties.

22. The provisions allow for an order of temporary classification to be made by statutory instrument, subject to the negative resolution procedure, with the affirmative resolution with Privy Council order for permanent control. This balances the need to have parliamentary scrutiny over the actions of Government, but enables a swift response once initial advice is provided by the ACMD.
23. In parallel with the calling for advice from the ACMD on a new and emerging substance, the Home Office will also seek parallel advice from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills on its possible legitimate uses. In the event that a legitimate commercial or medical use is identified, the Home Office will take such reasonable steps as necessary to ensure its continued availability for legitimate use under the temporary ban, subject to further consideration if the ban is to be made permanent.”

Restoring the right to non-violent protest whilst ensuring that public spaces remain accessible

24. The Coalition Government committed to restoring the right to non-violent protest, but has made clear that this does not mean allowing the permanent take over of public spaces to the exclusion of others.
25. The provisions repeal sections 132-138 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005, which currently make it an offence to: demonstrate in a designated area around Parliament without the authorisation of the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service; knowingly fail to comply with conditions imposed on a demonstration; use a loudhailer in the designated area. The effect of repeal will be that Section 14 of the Public Order Act 1986 will reapply to the public assemblies held in the area around Parliament, which will bring the policing of protests back in line with the policing of protests in the rest of the country.
26. The provisions create a new legal framework for Parliament Square which will prohibit the erection of any sort of temporary, permanent or semi-permanent structure, subject to express exceptions and the use of any type of amplified noise equipment without the express permission of the Greater London Authority (GLA) or Westminster City Council.

Amending the process for the issue of private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences

27. The United Kingdom has asserted universal jurisdiction over war crimes under the Geneva Conventions Act, and over a few other offences of exceptional gravity, because of our international obligations and our commitment to ensuring that there is no impunity for those accused of such crimes. That commitment is unwavering.
28. It is important, however, that universal jurisdiction cases should be proceeded with in only on the basis of solid evidence that is likely to lead to a successful prosecution – otherwise there is a risk of damaging our ability to help in conflict resolution or to pursue a coherent foreign policy. It is unsatisfactory that, as things stand, an arrest warrant for these grave offences can be issued on the application of a private prosecutor on the basis of evidence that would be insufficient to sustain a prosecution.
29. These provisions will require the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions before an arrest warrant can be issued to a private prosecutor in respect of an offence of universal jurisdiction. This will interfere as little as possible with the existing rights of private prosecutors, and will not prevent them from initiating prosecutions for these offences where the evidence justifies that course.

Groups affected

30. The provisions in the Bill will impact mainly on:

- Public sector organisations (police forces, police authorities, local authorities, licensing authorities and the criminal justice system);
- Premises with premises licences or club premises certificates, those applying for licences or certificates and employees at these premises; and,
- TENs users.

31. For further detail on the groups affected, please see individual impact assessments.

Costs and benefits

32. The table below outlines the costs and benefits of the proposed changes.

Summary of estimated costs	Summary of estimated savings / benefits
<p>Making the police service more accountable to local people</p> <p>Transition costs: (£4.8m (£5m in 2012 prices) – first year only) Police and Crime Panels: £2m (£2m in 2012 prices) Police and Crime Commissioners: £5m (£5m in 2012 prices) Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Office roles: £7.6m (£7.9m in 2012 prices) Support Team: £35.4m-£60.4m (£36.9m-£63.0m in 2012 prices)</p> <p>Total estimated annual PCCs costs £50m-£75m (+£4.8m in first year) (£52m-£78m (+5m in first year) in 2012 prices). The current police authority structure that will be abolished is estimated to cost £50m-£75m (£52m-£78m in 2012 prices), offsetting these annual costs (apart from the transition).</p> <p>PCCs elections are an average annual cost of £12m (£12.5m in 2012 prices).</p> <p>Total estimated annual costs £12m (+£4.8m for transition in first year) (£12.5m + £5m for transition in first year in 2012 prices)</p>	<p>It is not possible to quantify the benefits of these provisions. The benefits are non-monetary, but will have an impact on value for money. PCCs will provide a voice for the public to challenge spending at the highest level and will be able to provide stronger challenge to Chief Officers on delivering efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>Through the setting of local priorities, in consultation with the public and the force, PCCs will seek to respond to local concerns, raise good perceptions of policing and observe that trends in particular crimes have improved as a result of cost effective and targeted deployment of resource. This will maximise resources and ensure that the force and the PCC seek to eradicate unnecessary spend, streamline processes and engage effectively with local partners and the public to drive out inefficiency and maximise productivity.</p>
<p>Overhauling the Licensing Act</p> <p>Increased licence refusals: £5.8m-£12.8m Increased conditions: £0.3m-£0.6m More restrictive outcomes of reviews and hearings: £0.4m-£3m More licence revocations: £2.8m-£7.9m Cost of hearings and reviews: £1.7m-£4m Increased admin cost of applications: £0.4m-£0.8m Deterred TENS: £1m-£8m Late night levy: £9m-15m</p> <p>It has not been possible to quantify the cost of restricting provision of licensable activities through Early Morning Restriction Orders and cost of conditions other than security staff. Please note that these “costs” are a regulatory burden on those seeking licenses and TENS, rather than on a cost for the public sector.</p> <p>Total estimated annual costs £21.5m-£52.1m (best estimate £36.8m)</p>	<p>Late night levy receipts: £12.1m “Interim authority notices” (IANs) and “reinstatements of the licence on transfer” (RTs) – turnover: £5.2m-£9.7m IANs and RTs – fees: £0.1m-£0.2m IANs and RTs – admin cost: £0.2m-£0.6m Discretion to accept late TENS: £3.3m-£11.5m Licensing statements – business savings: £0.04m-£0.1m Licensing statements – LA savings: £0.4m-£0.7m Easing of TENS limits: £0.2m-£0.7m</p> <p>In addition, we would expect wider societal benefits as a result of these provisions, including a reduction in alcohol related crime and disorder and anti-social behaviour, a reduction in alcohol-related harm to health (including reduced costs to the NHS) and reduced sales of alcohol to children. It has not been possible to quantify these benefits.</p> <p>Total estimated annual benefits £21.6m-£35.6m (best estimate £28.6m)</p>

<p>Reducing the risk of harm from new psychoactive substances, so-called “legal highs”</p>	
<p>It is not possible to quantify the costs of these provisions. As the provisions introduce an enabling power for temporary bans, rather than controlling any specific substance, it has not been possible to quantify the costs. The use of this provision will depend on the rate at which new potentially harmful “legal highs” are introduced to the UK market. A full Regulatory Impact Assessment will be completed on each occasion that the power is used, taking into account any evidence on prevalence of availability and use, in the same way when a drug is brought under permanent control under 1971 Act.</p>	<p>For the reasons given, it is not possible to quantify the benefits of these provisions. The overarching benefit of a faster legislative response is to reduce the likelihood of a criminal market developing with associated enforcement costs as well as limiting both potential harm to individual users health, including dependency, with associated treatment costs and wider societal harms.</p>
<p>Restoring the right to non-violent protest whilst ensuring that public spaces remain accessible</p>	
<p>It is not possible to quantify the costs of these provisions. As the majority of the provisions will apply only to the area around Parliament, it is expected that any associated costs will be minimal and will fall to a limited group of public sector organisations who are content with the proposals. Any costs should be offset by the repeal of sections 132-138 of SOCPA. The byelaw provisions which extend to England and Wales are an enabling power only and do not in themselves have any direct impact.</p>	<p>It is not possible to quantify the benefits of these provisions. It is expected that there will be societal benefits in restoring the right to non-violent protest and ensuring everyone has the right to use the public spaces around Parliament.</p>
<p>Amending the process for the issue of private arrest warrants for universal jurisdiction offences</p>	
<p>It is not possible to quantify the costs of these provisions. As these provisions only amend the legislative framework for the issue of private arrest warrants, any costs will be minimal and cannot be quantified.</p>	<p>It is not possible to quantify the benefits of these provisions. However, as the provisions will require the DPP to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence for a reasonable chance of successful prosecution before agreeing to issue a private arrest warrants, this is likely to result in more efficient use of the CJS.</p>
<p>Total estimated annual costs of implementing Bill: £49m (best estimate) +£4.8m in first year</p>	<p>Total estimated annual monetised benefits of implementing Bill: £29m (best estimate)</p>
<p>Please note that various assumptions have been made to estimate the costs and benefits, therefore these should be treated as an illustrative example (please see individual PCC and alcohol IAs for further detail).</p>	