



UK Government

Licensing Reform Programme: call for evidence

Analysis of responses to questions relating to policy announcements

November 2025

Home Office and the Department of Business and Trade

Contents

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	4
Headline findings	4
Findings	5
National Licensing Policy Framework (NLPF)	5
Licensing Condition Amnesty	12
Temporary Event Notices (TENs)	16
Impacts	20
Impact on Licensing Authorities	20
Public safety and crime impacts	21
Public health impacts	22
Equalities impacts	25
Characteristics of call for evidence respondents	26

Foreword

The government would like to thank all those contributing to the Licensing Reform call for evidence, which has shaped the development of the first version of the National Licensing Policy Framework (NLPF) and will be used to take forward further reforms.

Work on the initial NLPF began following the Licensing Taskforce's report in June, with the clear understanding that the framework would need to evolve in response to feedback from the call for evidence. Each submission – over 2,000 in total – was carefully read and considered, and the decision to publish a non-statutory NLPF as a first step directly reflects the diversity of views received. It is in recognition of the concerns of wider stakeholders that the NLPF does not seek to conduct a radical overhaul of the licensing system.

The framework is designed to clarify intent, address restrictive practices, and support well-managed venues, while maintaining robust enforcement against irresponsible operators. Importantly, the NLPF applies only to hospitality and leisure venues, not off-sales or online delivery, and is intended as a living document. Over the next 6 months, the government will continue to work with stakeholders to refine the framework and progress further recommendations.

We want the framework to improve licensing outcomes for hospitality and leisure businesses, but do so in a light-touch, collaborative way. However, we will consider statutory changes in future if the NLPF does not deliver the impact we hope to see.

Executive Summary

The government conducted a 4-week call for evidence (8 October to 6 November 2025) as part of the Licensing Reforms Programme. This exercise sought stakeholder views on a series of proposed reforms intended to modernise the licensing regime and ensure its continued effectiveness in supporting public policy objectives. The call for evidence comprised 60 structured questions organised under 10 thematic areas, addressing issues such as the potential impact of the proposed reforms on licensing authorities, crime and public safety, public health, and equality considerations.

In total, the call for evidence generated over 2,000 responses, including 1,984 submissions via an online survey platform and approximately 40 responses received by email. This report presents an initial synthesis of the evidence gathered, focusing on respondents' perspectives in the following key areas:

- the National Licensing Policy Framework (NLPF) – views on its scope, coherence, and alignment with broader regulatory objectives
- the Licensing Conditions Amnesty – stakeholder assessments of its potential benefits and risks
- the proposed increase in Temporary Event Notices (TENs) – implications for operational flexibility and enforcement
- the anticipated impacts of the proposed policy changes – including economic, social, and administrative dimensions

This report offers high-level insights into the findings providing an overview of the stakeholder groups engaged in the consultation process. These insights will inform subsequent stages of policy development and evaluation.

It is important to note that, due to time constraints, a comprehensive analysis of all qualitative responses has not yet been undertaken. Consequently, the findings reported should be regarded as preliminary and subject to change. A subsequent publication will provide a more detailed and systematic analysis, incorporating thematic coding and deeper exploration of stakeholder views.

Headline findings

Support for National Licencing Policy Framework

- 62% of respondents agreed with the overarching objective of a consistent, transparent system licensing system which empowers local authorities while promoting economic growth, cultural development, public safety and community wellbeing
- While hospitality/leisure organisations supported the overarching objective (87% agreed with overarching objective), public health organisations disapproved of the overarching objective (81% disagreed with overarching objective).
- Most respondents disagreed with the proposal of promoting economic growth as a statutory licensing objective (51%).

- Public safety and crime prevention was the theme most commonly selected by respondents to be included in the NLPF (89%)

Licensing Condition Amnesty

- 54% of respondents disagreed that there should be an amnesty for licensing conditions.
- There is evidence to suggest that the proposal was misinterpreted by respondents, which we believe partially explains the high % of respondents who disagreed with the proposed reform
- Most respondents stated that they did not see any benefits associated with the licensing condition amnesty (43%)
- Increased risk or noise or public nuisance was the most commonly selected challenge associated with the amnesty (66%)

Temporary Event Notices (TENs)

- 46% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to increase the annual maximum number of TENs per licensed premises
- Whilst 81% of hospitality/ leisure organisations supported increasing the annual number of TENs, 77% of public health respondents disagreed with the proposal
- 63% of respondents agreed with the proposal to retain the 24-hour gap between TENs at licensed premises
- 57% of respondents agreed with the proposal that premises licence conditions should apply automatically.

Impact of reforms

- 46% of respondents stated that they believe the reforms will have a negative/ very negative impact on public safety or crime
- 47% % of respondents stated that they believe the reforms will have a negative/ very negative impact on public health
- 34% of respondents stated they did not know the whether the call for evidence raised any equalities concerns

Findings

National Licensing Policy Framework (NLPF)





This section examines stakeholder perspectives on the proposed NLPF, a central component of the Licensing Reforms Programme. The NLPF seeks to establish a consistent and transparent approach to licensing across England and Wales, while enabling local authorities to exercise discretion in addressing local priorities. The

framework aims to balance multiple objectives: promoting economic growth and cultural development, safeguarding public health and safety, and enhancing community wellbeing.

The analysis presented draws on quantitative and qualitative evidence which explored respondents' views on the overarching purpose of a national framework, the inclusion of economic growth as a statutory licensing objective, and the priority themes that should underpin national guidance. It also considers suggestions for evaluating the effectiveness of such guidance over time.

Views on overarching licensing objectives

At an aggregate level, there was broad support for the overarching objective of creating a consistent and transparent licensing system that empowers local authorities while promoting economic growth, cultural development, public safety, and community wellbeing. Overall, 62% (1,235 respondents) agreed with the overarching objective, while 27% (532 respondents) disagreed with the overarching objective.

7. Do you agree or disagree with the overarching objective of a consistent, transparent licensing system which empowers local authorities while promoting economic growth, cultural development, public safety and community wellbeing?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree		62%	1235
2	Disagree		27%	532
3	Don't know		7%	136
4	Prefer not to say		4%	81

When examining subgroups, support varied. Hospitality/ leisure organisations (87%) saw the largest proportion in favour, followed by trade bodies (76%) and individual respondents (63%). Public health organisations (81%) and resident's groups (77%) saw the largest proportions opposed to the overarching objective.

Do you agree or disagree with the overarching objective of a consistent, transparent licensing system which empowers local authorities while promoting economic growth, cultural development, public safety and community wellbeing?				
Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/	Sample Size

			Not Stated	
Hospitality/Leisure	87	8	5	83
Trade Body	76	15	9	33
Individual	63	25	12	1,418
Police/Enforcement	60	35	5	43
LA/Council	57	34	9	192
Residents' Group	14	77	9	22
Public Health	12	81	7	43

Table notes: it should be noted that this table only provides insights into thoughts of a subset of groups who responded to the call for evidence.

The qualitative evidence provided more nuanced detail on stakeholder perspectives, illustrating how priorities and concerns varied across groups. This analysis identified several themes as follows.

Consistency and simplification

Hospitality and leisure respondents emphasised the need for a more consistent and simplified licensing regime. They described the current system as fragmented and unpredictable, with significant variation between local authorities. This theme was closely linked to calls for licensing to support business viability, investment, and high street regeneration. Respondents also highlighted the importance of flexibility for local authorities to assist small and independent businesses, alongside frustration with administrative burdens under the existing framework.

Public safety and enforcement

Law enforcement respondents consistently prioritised public safety and crime prevention. A dominant concern was that deregulation or an emphasis on economic growth could increase alcohol-related harm, crime, and anti-social behaviour, placing additional strain on enforcement resources. This theme reflects a strong preference for maintaining robust safeguards within the licensing system.

Health and wellbeing

Public health respondents focused on harm reduction and the protection of community health. They raised concerns about rising alcohol-related harms, health inequalities, and the consequent burden on public services. This theme underscores a tension between economic objectives and public health priorities.

Community voice and local impact

Residents' groups placed high value on transparency, consultation, and the right to object. They advocated for open and accessible processes that provide meaningful opportunities for community input. Concerns centred on the impact of licensing on health, safety, and quality of life, particularly in areas with high concentrations of licensed premises. Issues such as noise, anti-social behaviour, and loss of amenity were frequently cited.

Economic growth as a statutory licencing objective

When exploring whether respondents agreed that promoting economic growth should become a statutory licensing objective, alongside existing objectives relating to public safety – the majority (51%, 1,006) of respondents disagreed with the proposal.

8. Do you agree or disagree that promoting economic growth should be a statutory licensing objective alongside the existing public safety objectives? A statutory objective is one that is defined in law and that licensing authorities are required to consider.

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree	38%	759
2	Disagree	51%	1006
3	Don't know	8%	163
4	Prefer not to say	3%	56

When examining subgroups, levels of agreement varied. Support was highest among hospitality and leisure organisations and trade bodies (89% and 64% agreed with the proposal respectively). By contrast, public health organisations and residents' groups recorded the strongest opposition, with 95% and 91% disagreeing with the proposal respectively.

Do you agree or disagree that promoting economic growth should be a statutory licensing objective alongside the existing public safety objectives?				
Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/Not Stated	Sample Size
Hospitality/Leisure	89	11	0	83
Trade Body	64	21	15	33
Individual	39	49	12	1,418
Police/Enforcement	16	79	5	43
LA/Council	13	81	6	192
Residents' Group	5	91	5	22
Public Health	0	95	5	43

Table notes: it should be noted that this table only provides insights into thoughts of a subset of groups who responded to the call for evidence.

The qualitative evidence provided further depth, highlighting how stakeholder perspectives were shaped by underlying priorities and concerns. Analysis identified 3 dominant themes:

Reducing bureaucracy and supporting growth

Hospitality and leisure respondents often strongly endorsed the proposal, framing economic growth as integral to a more streamlined and business-friendly licensing environment. Their accounts emphasised the potential for reduced administrative burdens, greater consistency across local authorities, and improved conditions for investment and sector viability.

Balancing economic objectives with public protection


Individual respondents expressed mixed views, with many opposing the proposal on the grounds that economic growth could undermine public safety, community wellbeing, and residents' rights. Concerns centred on increased noise, anti-social behaviour, and diminished local control. Resistance to removing public notice requirements was common, alongside a belief that licensing should primarily safeguard the public. Notably, some supportive responses were conditional, stressing that economic growth should not override existing statutory objectives. A recurring theme was uncertainty about the proposal's intent, with several respondents describing the question as vague or leading.

Protecting health and community interests

Law enforcement, local authorities, public health bodies, and residents' groups frequently raised objections, citing risks that a statutory growth objective could weaken protections against crime, nuisance, and alcohol-related harm. Public health respondents highlighted potential negative impacts on health outcomes and inequalities, while residents' groups emphasised threats to quality of life in areas with high concentrations of licensed premises. Some respondents also questioned the influence of the hospitality industry on government decision-making, suggesting concerns about policy capture.

Priority themes for a National Licencing Policy Framework

When asked to identify priority themes for inclusion in the NLPF, the most frequently selected themes were public safety and crime prevention, chosen by 89% (1,775 respondents) and community health and wellbeing selected by 71% (1,399 respondents). By contrast, themes relating to economic considerations were less prominent: supporting growth, high streets and night-time economies was selected by 39% (776 respondents), and economic growth and reducing business burdens by 33% (663 respondents). These results indicate that respondents placed greatest emphasis on public safety and health-related objectives.

10. What priority themes should be included in a National Licensing Policy Framework?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Public safety and Crime Prevention		89%	1775

10. What priority themes should be included in a National Licensing Policy Framework?






2	Economic Growth and Reducing Business Burdens		33%	663
3	Culture & Community Cohesion		54%	1069
4	Community Health and Wellbeing		71%	1399
5	Supporting Growth, Highstreets and Night-Time Economies		39%	776
6	Others		13%	250

Table notes: respondents could select multiple categories therefore percentages don't add up to 100%.

The qualitative evidence provided further insight into stakeholder priorities for inclusion in the NLPF. Analysis identified 4 key themes:

Public safety and crime prevention

This was the most frequently cited priority across responses. Law enforcement and local authority respondents emphasised that statutory licensing objectives should remain central to the regime, framing public safety as the core purpose of licensing. Many respondents viewed crime prevention as non-negotiable in any national framework.

Community health and wellbeing

Public health respondents and a significant proportion of individuals highlighted the need for measures that address alcohol-related harm and health inequalities. This theme reflects strong concern about the social and health impacts of licensed premises, particularly in areas with high outlet density.

Economic viability and proportionate regulation

Hospitality and leisure respondents focused on proportionate regulation that supports business viability and growth. Their responses linked licensing reform to sector sustainability and competitiveness, with calls for flexibility to enable investment and innovation.

Residential amenity and enforcement

Individuals and residents' groups consistently raised issues relating to anti-social behaviour, noise, and the impact of late-night economies on residential areas. Many stressed the importance of robust enforcement and protections for vulnerable groups, including children and women, in the context of licensed premises.

Assessing the impact of national guidance: measurement approaches

This question asked respondents how the government could assess whether national licensing guidance is working effectively. The most frequently selected measures lower rates of crime and anti-social behaviour, chosen by 78% and lower rates of alcohol-related harm, selected by 74% (1,437 respondents). By contrast, growth in the size of the sector and number of businesses was identified by 38% (731 respondents). These results indicate that respondents prioritised outcomes related to public safety and health over economic indicators when assessing the effectiveness of national guidance.

11. How could the government assess whether national guidance is working effectively? Please suggest ways we could measure if national guidance is making a positive difference.				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Growth in the size of the sector and number of businesses		38%	731
2	Lower rates of crime and ASB		78%	1513
3	Lower rates of alcohol-related harm		74%	1437
4	Fewer people appeal decisions		28%	538
5	Other (please tell us below)		12%	237

Table notes: Respondents could select multiple categories therefore percentages don't add up to 100%.

The qualitative evidence adds nuance to these findings and highlights variation in stakeholder perspectives. 3 key themes emerged:

Crime and public safety as core indicators

There was broad agreement across respondent groups that reductions in crime and anti-social behaviour should be a primary measure of effectiveness. This theme reflects a shared view that licensing policy should maintain its core function of protecting communities and reducing harm.

Alcohol-related harm and health outcomes

Many respondents supported using indicators related to alcohol-related harm to evaluate success. Public health stakeholders emphasised this strongly, framing harm reduction as integral to licensing objectives. However, hospitality and leisure respondents were more sceptical, questioning whether health outcomes should be central to performance assessment.

Economic growth as a contested metric

Views diverged on whether growth in the on-trade sector should be considered an indicator of success. Hospitality and leisure respondents, along with some local authorities, supported this measure, linking it to business viability and regeneration. In contrast, public health respondents and residents' groups opposed its inclusion, arguing that economic growth should not outweigh health and safety considerations.

Licensing Condition Amnesty

This section examines the proposal for a licensing condition amnesty, which is intended to simplify the process for removing outdated or unnecessary licence conditions. The policy aim is to encourage greater use of the existing minor variation process, reducing administrative burdens while maintaining licensing objectives.

The call for evidence sought views on whether this proposal should be introduced, its potential benefits, and its associated challenges.




It is important to note that evidence was identified to suggest that the licensing condition amnesty may have been misinterpreted by respondents. In conversations with the police forces and local governments, they stated they had perceived this to be similar to the dictionary definition of an amnesty where infringements of the law are forgiven such as with a knife amnesty. By contrast, the licensing condition amnesty in this context was proposed to encourage use of the existing minor variation process.

For this reason, we believe that the licensing condition amnesty results from the call for evidence should be interpreted with caution and to avoid confusion, future references will describe this reform as a 'licence simplification process', which better reflects its purpose.

Amnesty licensing conditions

At an aggregate level, most respondents (54%) disagreed with the proposal of having a licensing condition amnesty. However, this varied by respondent type with hospitality/leisure organisations and trade bodies were strongly in favour of the proposal (77% and 70% agreed with proposal respectively), whilst resident groups and public health organisations strongly opposed the proposal (82% and 81% disagreed with proposal respectively). Law enforcement and local authority respondents were more divided on the proposal.

12. Do you agree or disagree that there should be an amnesty for licensing conditions as described above?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree		31%	615
2	Disagree		54%	1081
3	Don't know		12%	240

12. Do you agree or disagree that there should be an amnesty for licensing conditions as described above?

4	Prefer not to say		2%	48
---	-------------------	---	----	----





Do you agree or disagree that there should be an amnesty for licensing conditions as described above?

Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/ Prefer not to Say	Sample Size
Hospitality/Leisure	77	14	8	83
Trade Body	70	9	21	33
Police/Enforcement	40	53	7	43
LA/Council	39	54	8	192
Individual	26	60	15	1,418
Public Health	5	81	14	43
Residents' Group	5	82	14	22

Perceived benefits and challenges of an amnesty

The most commonly identified benefits of a licensing condition amnesty were the potential to remove outdated minor conditions dating prior to 2005 (32%) and to encourage better relationships between premises and authorities (32%). However, 43% of respondents stated that they saw no benefits, indicating mixed views on the proposal.

13. What would you see as the main benefits of an amnesty? Minor conditions are small changes that do not significantly impact licensing objectives.

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Removing minor conditions dating prior to 2005		32% 595
2 Removing minor conditions since 2005		21% 397
3 Removing non-minor conditions		6% 114
4 Reducing costs to businesses		28% 514

13. What would you see as the main benefits of an amnesty? Minor conditions are small changes that do not significantly impact licensing objectives.











5	Reducing costs to consumers		14%	252
6	Reducing non-compliance with conditions		22%	407
7	Encouraging better relationships between premises and authorities		32%	584
8	Other		12%	221
9	None		43%	801

Table notes: respondents could select multiple categories therefore percentages don't add up to 100%.

The main challenges identified by respondents centred on risks to licensing objectives. The most frequently cited concern was an increased risk of noise or public nuisance (66%), followed by crime and disorder (61%) and public safety (59%). These findings indicate that respondents were primarily worried about potential harms and enforcement burdens rather than administrative inconvenience.

14. What challenges do you associate with an amnesty?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Costs to businesses in making applications		25%	471
2	Costs to local government and policing in reviewing and advising on applications		45%	859
3	Increased risks to public safety		59%	1114
4	Increased risk of noise or public nuisance		66%	1250
5	Increased risk of crime and disorder		61%	1150

14. What challenges do you associate with an amnesty?




6	Challenges to protect children from harm		45%	848
7	Other		15%	290
8	None		9%	169

Table notes: respondents could select multiple categories therefore percentages don't add up to 100%.

Qualitative findings showed that participants expressed divergent views on the practical value of the proposed reform, with 3 key themes identified:

Perceived redundancy

A dominant theme was perceived redundancy, with many respondents arguing that the existing minor variation process is already well-established and widely utilised. From this perspective, the amnesty was seen as offering limited additional benefit, given that most licensed businesses have historically sought variations when needed.

Flexibility and modernisation

In contrast, a countervailing theme of flexibility and modernisation emerged, particularly among some licensed businesses. These respondents framed the proposal as an opportunity to remove outdated conditions that constrain operational adaptability. Illustrative accounts highlighted the evolving nature of business models and suggested that conditions imposed years earlier, often in response to specific incidents, may no longer serve their intended purpose once risk has diminished.

Risk and harm

A third theme centred on risk and harm, voiced strongly by public health stakeholders and individual respondents. Here, the amnesty was interpreted as a potential relaxation of safeguards, raising concerns about increased alcohol-related harms and the ease of access to alcohol. This moral and public health framing underpinned much of the opposition to the proposal.

Despite the Licensing Taskforce's endorsement, participants struggled to identify concrete examples of conditions suitable for removal, signalling a lack of clarity around what constitutes a "minor" versus "major" variation. Where examples were provided, they clustered around obsolescence, such as conditions referencing videotapes, analogue CCTV, handwritten logs, late-night levies, saturation zones, and boiler certification – markers of regulatory language that has not kept pace with technological and policy change.

Finally, an evidence gap was noted: hospitality sector bodies are currently gathering further examples, suggesting that stakeholder engagement and clearer guidance will be critical to shaping any future licence simplification process.





Temporary Event Notices (TENs)

This section explores proposed changes to the rules governing Temporary Event Notices (TENs), which allow short-term events involving licensable activities without a full premises licence. The call for evidence sought views on 4 key issues:

- increasing the annual maximum number of TENs per licensed premises
- aligning the limit with the temporary Covid arrangements (20 events over 26 days)
- retaining the 24-hour gap between consecutive TENs at the same premises
- automatically applying existing premises licence conditions to TENs

Increasing Maximum TENs per License

When asked whether the annual TEN's limit should be increased, 46% of respondents opposed the change. Views varied significantly by stakeholder type: the hospitality and leisure sector expressed strong support (81%), whereas public health stakeholders were strongly opposed (77%). Local authorities and individual respondents generally opposed an increase, while police and enforcement bodies tended to support it.

28. Do you support increasing the annual maximum number of TENs per licensed premises?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		36%	718
2	No		46%	919
3	Don't know		15%	297
4	Prefer not to say		3%	50





Do you support increasing the annual maximum number of TENs per licensed premises?				
Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/ Prefer not to Say	Sample Size
Hospitality/Leisure	81	12	7	83
Trade Body	64	15	21	33
Police/Enforcement	53	42	5	43
LA/Council	38	51	11	192

Individual	32	49	18	1,418
Public Health	2	77	21	43
Residents' Group	0	100	0	22

Increasing TEN's limit to 20 events over 26 days

46% of respondents disagreed with the proposal to increase the annual maximum number of TENs to 20 events over 26 days. Once again, opinions on the proposal varied according to stakeholders who responded to the call for evidence. Whilst the hospitality/ leisure sector (77%) and trade associations (67%) were strongly in favour of the proposal, resident groups (100%) and public health organisations (79%) were overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal.

29. Do you agree or disagree with increasing the annual maximum number of TENs to 20 events over 26 days (the same limit that applied during Covid)?

Answer Choices		Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree		34% 674
2	Disagree		46% 916
3	Don't know		17% 344
4	Prefer not to say		3% 50





Do you agree or disagree with increasing the annual maximum number of TENs to 20 events over 26 days (the same limit that applied during Covid)?

Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/ Prefer not to Say	Sample Size
Hospitality/Leisure	77	11	12	83
Trade Body	67	9	24	33
Police/Enforcement	58	40	2	43
LA/Council	41	47	12	192
Individual	29	50	21	1,418

Public Health	2	79	19	43
Residents' Group	0	100	0	22

Retaining the 24-hour gap between temporary events





There was strong overall support for retaining the 24-hour gap, with 63% of respondents agreeing with this proposal. This view was particularly prevalent amongst resident groups (95%) public health organisations (79%) and local authorities/ councils (77%). Conversely, the hospitality/ leisure sector (55%) and trade bodies (42%) were more likely to oppose this requirement.

31. Do you agree or disagree with retaining the 24 hour gap between temporary events at licensed premises?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree		63%	1256
2	Disagree		15%	293
3	Don't know		19%	370
4	Prefer not to say		3%	65

Do you agree or disagree with retaining the 24 hour gap between temporary events at licensed premises?				
Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/ Prefer not to Say	Sample Size
Residents' Group	95	0	5	22
Public Health	79	2	19	43
LA/Council	77	9	14	192
Individual	66	11	22	1,418
Police/Enforcement	58	37	5	43
Hospitality/Leisure	30	55	14	83
Trade Body	9	42	48	33

Applying premises licence conditions to TENs

A majority of respondents (57%) agreed that conditions attached to premises licences should automatically apply to TENs. Support was highest among resident groups (100%) and police/ enforcement bodies (84%). Conversely, hospitality/ leisure organisations (49%) and trade associations (45%) were generally opposed to this proposal.

33. Do you agree or disagree that conditions placed on premises licences should automatically transfer to TENs granted to those premises? Conditions placed on premises licences currently do not automatically apply to TENs. This question asks whether you think they should in future.				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Agree		57%	1130
2	Disagree		19%	382
3	Don't know		21%	413
4	Prefer not to say		3%	59
			answered	1984
			skipped	0




Do you agree or disagree that conditions placed on premises licences should automatically transfer to TENs granted to those premises? Conditions placed on premises licences currently do not automatically apply to TENs. This question asks whether you think they should in future.				
Respondent Type	% Agree	% Disagree	% Don't Know/ Prefer not to Say	Sample Size
Residents' Group	100	0	0	22
Police/Enforcement	84	12	5	43
Public Health	74	5	21	43
LA/Council	72	17	11	192
Individual	57	18	25	1,418
Hospitality/Leisure	35	49	16	83
Trade Body	21	45	33	33

Impacts

The following section summarises views on the impacts of the 3 proposed reforms. Data on the impacts of the other 7 proposals will be published in the full analysis report produced at a later date.

Impact on Licensing Authorities

A similar percentage of respondents stated that the 3 licensing reforms to be announced at the budget would place a significant burden on licensing authorities, although the licensing condition amnesty was more frequently selected than the other 2 proposals.

54. Which, if any, of the Licensing Taskforce recommendations do you expect to place the most significant burden on licensing authorities' capacity and ability to fulfil their usual function?						
Answer Choices				Response Percent	Response Total	
1	National Licensing Policy Framework			30%	597	
2	Licensing Condition Amnesty			32%	630	
5	Increase TENs Entitlement			29%	571	

Preliminary analysis of the qualitative responses revealed a dominant theme of resource strain, with responses consistently emphasising the anticipated pressure reforms would place on licensing authorities. This concern was framed not only as a practical challenge but as a risk to the integrity of the licensing system, with respondents warning that without mitigation, authorities may struggle to fulfil statutory duties effectively.

A second theme, funding as a prerequisite for implementation, emerged strongly. Respondents repeatedly called for financial support through mechanisms such as new burdens allocations, higher licence fees, and cost recovery models. These recommendations were underpinned by a shared perception of chronic under-resourcing and recruitment difficulties within local authorities. Several participants articulated a causal link between funding and capacity, arguing that without additional investment, councils would be unable to attract and retain qualified officers, jeopardising enforcement and compliance.

Beyond financial measures, a third theme of systemic modernisation was evident. Respondents advocated for structural improvements, including a national licensing case management system, streamlined digital processes, and clearer statutory guidance. These suggestions reflected a desire to reduce administrative complexity and enhance efficiency. Policy-level adjustments – such as annual licence reviews, localised conditions, and stricter application requirements – were proposed to strengthen oversight and manage long-term burdens.

Finally, a theme of implementation safeguards emerged, with respondents recommending phased roll-out, enhanced staff training, and increased enforcement capacity, including more police licensing officers. These views suggest that stakeholders perceive reform as feasible only if accompanied by robust infrastructure and workforce development.

Public safety and crime impacts




Most respondents felt the reforms would negatively affect public safety or crime, with 46% rating the impact as negative or very negative compared to 20% positive or very positive. When asked which reform posed the greatest concern, a similar % of respondents selected each of the 3 licensing reforms to be announced at the budget, although the NLPF was most frequently selected (11%).

It should be noted that the percentages are lower than the % listed in the burdens on licensing authorities' question. This is because, unlike for the licensing authorities burden question, respondents could only choose one response option. Many respondents indicated they would have preferred to choose multiple reforms in answer to this question and as such the call for evidence results likely underrepresent the breadth of concern across proposals from a public safety or crime perspective.

55. In your view what impact will the proposals for reform included in this call for evidence have on public safety or crime?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very positive		5%	94
2	Positive		15%	307
3	None		12%	229
4	Negative		25%	504
5	Very negative		21%	413
6	Don't know		20%	387
7	Prefer not to say		3%	50

Table notes: respondents were asked to answer this question in relation to all of the reforms across the 10 themes outlined in the call for evidence.

56. Which, if any, of the reforms described in this call for evidence, in your view, pose public safety or crime concerns?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	National Licensing Policy Framework		11%	227
2	Licensing Condition Amnesty		10%	195
5	Increase TENs Entitlement		8%	155

Preliminary analysis of qualitative responses revealed a dominant theme of alcohol as a driver of harm, with participants repeatedly linking proposed reforms to increased risks of crime, anti-social behaviour and domestic abuse. This framing positioned alcohol not merely as a commodity but as a regulated substance for “good reason”, reinforcing the perceived necessity of a robust licensing regime.

A second theme, prioritising public protection over commercial interests, emerged strongly. Respondents articulated a normative stance that preventing crime should take precedence over business profits, signalling a tension between economic liberalisation and safeguarding objectives. This discourse reflects underlying values about the role of licensing in balancing public health and commercial freedoms.

The third theme centred on inequalities and vulnerability, with several respondents highlighting that deprived areas and lower socioeconomic groups already experience disproportionate alcohol-related harms. These harms were seen as likely to be exacerbated by reforms perceived as weakening controls, raising concerns about widening social and health inequalities.

Finally, a theme of unintended enforcement consequences was evident. Respondents warned that relaxing licensing rules could necessitate more intensive law enforcement if irresponsible operators exploit a less stringent regime. This anticipatory concern underscores the perceived interdependence between regulatory strength and policing capacity.

Public health impacts

When asked about the overall impact of the proposed reforms on public health, respondents indicated that they had significant concerns with the impact that the proposed reforms would have on public health. Nearly half of respondents anticipated that the proposed reforms would have a negative effect on public health, with 47% rating the potential impact to be either negative (27%) or very negative (20%). In contrast, only 13% of respondents stated that they expected the reforms to have a positive impact on public health (10% positive, 3% very positive).

57. In your view what impact will the proposals for reform included in this call for evidence have on public health?

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Very Positive		3%	60
2	Positive		10%	207
3	None		16%	322
4	Negative		27%	536
5	Very Negative		20%	396
6	Don't Know		20%	406
7	Prefer not to say		3%	57

Table notes: respondents were asked to answer this question in relation to all of the reforms across the 10 themes outlined in the call for evidence.

When asked which specific reforms raised public health concerns, responses were relatively evenly distributed across the 3 proposals.

58. Which, if any, of the reforms described in this call for evidence, in your view, pose public health concerns.

Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	National Licensing Policy Framework		21%	424
2	Licensing Condition Amnesty		27%	539
5	Increase TENs Entitlement		28%	565

Analysis of the 550 qualitative responses revealed strong concerns that the proposed reforms would lead to an escalation in alcohol-related harms. Respondents predicted that all the reforms would lead to easier and extended access to alcohol which would result in higher levels of acute and chronic alcohol-related health harms, exacerbate health inequalities, and increase alcohol-related crime. These concerns extended to gendered violence and child safeguarding, highlighting intersections between licensing policy and

broader social protection agendas. They stated that the reforms would place further pressure on already stretched public services.

Many participants also framed the reforms as a significant departure from the current licensing regime and this shift was interpreted as leading to the unnecessary deregulation of what is already perceived to be a permissive licensing system. There was a belief that the reforms would weaken safeguards designed to protect public health and community wellbeing.

A second theme which emerged centred on community disruption and anti-social behaviour. Respondents linked the proposed changes, particularly the increase in TENs entitlement and the amnesty of licensing conditions, to increased noise disturbances and disorder, particularly in residential areas. This discourse positioned licensing as a mechanism through which social order is maintained, and respondents feared that the introduction of the NLPF which would impact their ability to shape their local areas.

A further theme of economic and public protection tensions was evident. Some respondents argued that the reforms would inadvertently benefit the off-trade sector, undermining intended support for hospitality businesses and negatively impacting deprived communities. This was coupled with thoughts that these reforms would prioritise business interests over public safety and that on-trade and off-trade premises needed to be treated differently.

As part of the call for evidence, respondents were also asked about what measures could be introduced as part of the alcohol licensing reforms programme to promote public health (question 59 of the call for evidence). Preliminary analysis of the 849 qualitative responses to this question identified several measures that could be taken forward. Many responses from individuals, local authorities/ councils and public health organisations advocated for including public health as a licensing objective to advance health considerations and better utilise health data.





Many respondents also felt that there should be separate licensing rules for on-trade and off-trade premises. They argued that this would help to better regulate availability and to address the risks posed by online deliveries and the purchase of alcohol for consumption in unregulated settings. Some respondents felt that if restrictions were applied to the off-trade, then this may lead to more people consuming in on-trade premises

Other suggestions included:

- increases in local authority powers
- introduction of national policies to tackle alcohol-related health harms, for example minimum unit pricing and a ban on the sale of single cans of alcohol
- increases in inspections and enforcement resources
- promotion of capable guardianship schemes in on-trade premises, for example Pubwatch and Best Bar None
- increasing awareness of alcohol-related health harms and promoting non-alcoholic options to the public

Equalities impacts

When asked whether the proposals raised any equalities concerns, such as disproportionate impacts on particular demographic groups, 34% of respondents stated that they did not know.

60. Does this call for evidence raise any equalities concerns such as disproportionate impacts on particular demographic groups?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes		31%	606
2	No		32%	625
3	Don't Know		34%	684
4	Prefer not to say		3%	69

Analysis of qualitative responses revealed contrasting perspectives on whether the proposed reforms raise equalities issues. A dominant theme of divergent stakeholder framing emerged: public health respondents strongly perceived the reforms as exacerbating inequalities, while hospitality and leisure stakeholders largely rejected this view, framing modernisation as a route to fairer conditions. Some hospitality respondents argued that current systems favour larger chains and that reform could level the playing field for smaller operators.





A second theme centred on structural disadvantage and vulnerability, highlighted by local authorities and community organisations. These respondents expressed concern that reforms could worsen health inequalities, particularly in deprived areas, and disproportionately affect vulnerable groups such as older adults, disabled people, and those reliant on community spaces. Smaller, volunteer-led venues were seen as at risk of exclusion if unable to adapt to new requirements.

A third theme, safety and gendered risk, was prominent in responses from police, enforcement bodies, and residents' groups. These participants linked relaxed licensing rules to increased alcohol-related crime, anti-social behaviour, and violence, with particular emphasis on risks for women and girls in night-time settings. Residents also raised concerns about noise and anti-social behaviour impacting older adults and those in social housing, who may lack the means to relocate.







Finally, a theme of conditional support for reform emerged. While some respondents endorsed modernisation, this was contingent on safeguards to protect vulnerable communities. Calls for equality and health impact assessments reflected a desire for evidence-based policymaking that prioritises social protection alongside economic flexibility.

Characteristics of call for evidence respondents







Most respondents to the call for evidence were individuals, accounting for 71% (1,418 responses), while organisations represented 29% collectively.

1. About you Are you responding as:				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	An individual		71%	1418
2	A public sector organisation		15%	288
3	A private sector organisation		9%	173
4	A voluntary sector organisation		5%	105

Among organisational respondents, local authorities and councils were the largest group, contributing to 34% of responses by organisations (192 responses). This was followed by hospitality businesses (15%) and community or charitable organisations (10%).

3. Which of the following best describes the organisation/ business you are responding on behalf of?				
Answer Choices			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Local authority/ council		34%	192
2	Police or enforcement body (e.g. trading standards authority)		8%	43
3	Public health organisation		8%	43
4	Trade body or association		6%	33
5	Community or charitable organisation		10%	57
6	Residents' group		4%	22

3. Which of the following best describes the organisation/ business you are responding on behalf of?

7	Hospitality business (e.g. pub, restaurant, hotel)		15%	83
8	Leisure business (e.g. nightclub, theatre, cinema, sports venue, music venue)		2%	14
9	Retail outlet (e.g. Supermarket or off-licence)		1%	3
10	News organisation (e.g. local newspaper)		5%	29
11	Other (please specify)		8%	45
12	Prefer not to say		1%	3

Legal disclaimer

Whereas every effort has been made to ensure that the information in this document is accurate, the Department for Business and Trade does not accept liability for any errors, omissions or misleading statements, and no warranty is given or responsibility accepted as to the standing of any individual, firm, company or other organisation mentioned.

© Crown Copyright 2025

You may re-use this publication (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence.

To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

Where we have identified any third party copyright information in the material that you wish to use, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holder(s) concerned.

**Published by the Home Office and
Department for Business and Trade**

26 November 2025