

LICENSING & PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30th June, 2026
Time of Commencement: 7.00 pm

[View the agenda here](#)

[Watch the meeting here](#)

Present: Councillor Simon Kasperowicz (Chair)

Councillors:	Barber	Machin	Stevenson
	Casey-Hulme	Sedgley	Whieldon
	Downs	Sparks	Whitmore

Apologies: Councillor(s) Jellyman, Bailey, Clarke, Heesom and Parker

Substitutes: Councillor David Hutchison (In place of Councillor Gill Heesom)
Councillor Susan Beeston (In place of Councillor Andrew Parker)

Officers:	Matthew Burton	Licensing Lead Officer
	Geoff Durham	Civic & Member Support Officer
	Nesta Barker	Service Director - Regulatory Services
	Anne-Marie Pollard	Solicitor
	Gareth Harvey	Environmental Health Manager
	Michelle Hopper	Mobile Multi-Functional Manager

1. MINUTES OF A PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March, 2026 be agreed as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN RELATION TO PUBLIC PROTECTION MATTERS

There were no declarations of interest stated.

3. RENEWAL OF PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER: PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

Consideration was given to a report seeking permission to consult residents on a renewal of the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for parks and open spaces in relation to dog control and anti-social behaviour.

The Mobile Multi-Functional (MMF) Manager presented the report, advising that following the twelve week consultation a final report would be brought back to Committee ahead of the current proposals expiring in November.

Licensing & Public Protection Committee - 30/06/26

Ongoing issues had been reported in relation to dog fouling, dog on dog attacks and attacks on wildlife.

A breach of a PSPO could result in a fine of £100.

If the PSPO was not renewed the Council would have less enforcement powers which could result in an increase in dog fouling and anti-social behaviour.

Councillor Whieldon asked if there was any provision in the consultation for professional dog walkers with 5-6 dogs.

The MMF Manager stated that there had been previous conversations in regard to controls around the number of dogs prohibited as part of the PSPO and the question would be proposed as part of the consultation. Research had been carried out with neighbouring authorities and this Council's proposals aligned with a lot of the neighbouring authorities.

Councillor Whieldon stated that, within the Borough, the number of dog waste bins were limited and asked what the thoughts of the MMF Manager were on that.

The MMF Manager advised that there were some designated dog waste collection bins and all of the waste bins in the Borough were dual collection and therefore litter bins could be utilised for dog waste. There had been a substantial review in regard to bins around the Borough in terms of streamlining the service and Members could request that that be looked at.

Councillor Whieldon if the positions of the dog waste bins had been mapped to see if they were equally distributed. This was confirmed.

Councillor Whieldon referred to the signage for dogs/fouling stating that it was worn down and also, too high up on the posts to which they were attached and were therefore not doing their job.

The MMF Manager stated that there was currently a review in regard of the signage. The Council's Communications Team would also do some work around educating people of the PSPO and the rules that must be followed. Officers would continue to patrol parks and open spaces – especially any hotspot areas.

Councillor Sedgley asked what the phrase 'reasonable excuse' referred to, as mentioned in the agenda report.

The MMF Manager advised that it was a legal term. When officers witnessed an offence, the offender was given the opportunity to correct their behaviour. An example was given as, should a person be observed not picking up dog waste, they would be asked to clean it up. However, if that person did not have waste bags with them, it would be classed as a breach and the appropriate action would be taken.

Councillor Sedgley asked if the PSPO applied in his ward. This was confirmed as the PSPO covered all of the Council's parks and open spaces.

Councillor Casey-Hulme asked if a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) had been issued for the unauthorised encampment on London Road.

The MMF Manager advised that, as the encampment was on private land and therefore not a breach of the PSPO. The landowner was required to undertake their

own civil proceedings. The Council would work in conjunction with landowners to guide them and encourage the cleaning up once the encampment had been removed.

Councillor Hutchison raised concerns regarding the 5-6 dogs for professional dog walkers stating that the size/breed of dog should be taken into consideration and asked if there was any provision to mention specific breeds.

The MMF Manager advised that, as part of the consultation, specific reference would be made around the number of dogs.

Councillor Beeston asked if the rules were enforced in cemeteries as in Newcastle Cemetery she had observed loose dogs running around the graves. Councillor Beeston also asked how often they were patrolled.

The MMF Manager stated that there was a team of enforcement officers that conducted park patrols along with their other roles of enforcement activity. The parks and open spaces were patrolled as often as possible and Members were encouraged to report incidents with as much information as possible.

Councillor Beeston stated that the 5-6 dog limit were not just dogs on leads but loose at times.

The MMF Manager stated that the PSPO was around the control of dogs also.

Councillor Beeston asked if the Council would have to justify why it went for 5-6 dogs.

The MMF Manager stated, on the back of the consultation, if there was reasonable evidence to show that the public were in support of it.

Councillor Whieldon stated that there appeared to be an overlap with protecting public spaces and fly tipping that occurred and it would be useful to keep it in mind.

The MMF Manager stated that there were separate powers to deal with fly tipping offences and Members were encouraged to report incidents.

Resolved: That a public consultation to be initiated for a 12 week period on the renewed PSPO, as detailed in Appendix A.

[Watch the debate here](#)

4. AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN 2026-2030

Members were advised that this item had been deferred to a future meeting.

5. PUBLIC PROTECTION SUB-COMMITTEE ARRANGEMENTS

The Licensing Administration Team Leader presented a report informing Members of the dates and arrangement for the 2026-27 Public Protection Sub-Committee meetings.

Licensing & Public Protection Committee - 30/06/26

The programme of meetings for the next municipal year was shown at paragraph 2.4.

- Resolved:**
- (i) That the report be received and the frequency of meetings of once per month, be retained.
 - (ii) That the date and time that each Member is proposed to attend sub-committee, be noted.
 - (iii) That Democratic Services be notified of an available substitute in the event that they are unable to attend a meeting that they are due to attend

[Watch the debate here](#)

6. FOOD SAFETY SERVICE PLAN 2026/2027 AND REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IN 2025/2026

Consideration was given to a report advising Members of work planned by the Food and Safety Team in 2026/27 and a review of the previous years' performance. Copies of the work planned and last years' performance were attached at Appendix A. A copy of the Food Sampling Plan for 2026/27 was attached at Appendix B.

The Environmental Health Manager presented the report and stated that there were just over 1000 food businesses in the Borough and consisted of different types of take-away, restaurant, retail shops, nursery schools and others.

Any new food business would be required to register with the Council, at least 28 days prior to opening and it would be the food business' duty to comply with the food law.

The Council's food team would carry out inspections against the Food Hygiene Regulations and at the end, the business would be given a Priority Risk Rating of A to E and that would dictate the frequency of future inspections. In addition, part of the risk rating would be used to generate the National Food Hygiene Rating.

The food team have legal powers of entry to carry out unannounced inspections at any reasonable time and it would be an offence to obstruct an officer. There was also a reactive workload that could not be planned for – for example, complaints regarding purchased food or premises.

Last year, the team completed 100% of the risk inspections and also had 222 of new food business registrations, whose inspections were all completed.

Regarding Food Hygiene Ratings from last year, 774 businesses were rated 5 and only a small number rated 0 and 1. For businesses rated 0 and 1, the Council would make numerous revisits and work with them to try to help improve their performance.

Councillor Hutchison referred to the table on page 45 of the agenda, where in 2023 premises rated 1 totalled 1 and last year the total had risen to 18 and asked what the reason was for the increase and should the Council be worried.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that premises with that rating would receive more visits so it was nothing to be concerned about. The Environmental Health Manager was unsure as to the reason for the increase in poor performers.

Councillor Hutchison asked if those premises improved and the proprietor paid for another visit – could their Food Hygiene rating be improved.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that once a premise had a revisit which improved their score, they could apply for a new rating for a small fee.

Councillor Sedgley stated that the food rating stickers were not always visible and some that were visible were out of date. Councillor Sedgley suggested that the Welsh system should be adopted where display/visibility was compulsory.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that the law in Wales was different to England. However, the Food Standards Agency were looking to ask Parliament to consider the matter. At present, all scores were displayed on the Council's website.

If a wrong rating was being displayed, the Council would work with Trading Standards who would take appropriate action.

Councillor Whieldon asked if primary and secondary visits were spot check or was notice given in advance.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that the aim was to carry out all inspections without an appointment. Occasionally an appointment would be made if the intention was to meet a particular person.

Councillor Whitmore asked about three premises that were rated '0', would they be closed down and given the opportunity to improve.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that some premises when rated '0' would close voluntarily and make improvements. Once improvements had been made, a re-score could be requested.

Councillor Machin referred to twenty two unrated premises that were due for inspection this year and asked, how long after opening did they have to be inspected.

The Environmental Health Manager stated that the intention was to carry out inspections within twenty-eight days.

Councillor Machin stated that, in Stoke it had sometimes been much longer than twenty-eight days.

As that was a different local authority it was hard to comment on that but would be subject to producing a Service Plan similar to that of this Authority.

Resolved: That the Food Safety Service Plan for 2026/2027 be received and endorsed.

[Watch the debate here](#)

7. MINUTES OF PUBLIC PROTECTION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Resolved: That the Minutes of the meetings held on 11 March and 22 April be received.

8. DISCLOSURE OF EXEMPT INFORMATION

Licensing & Public Protection Committee - 30/06/26

There were no confidential items.

9. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

**Councillor Simon Kasperowicz
Chair**

Meeting concluded at 7.55 pm