

<p>Title:Review of the Safety of Sports Grounds (Designation) Order 2015</p> <p>PIR No: N/A</p> <p>Original IA/RPC No: N/A</p> <p>Lead department or agency: DCMS</p> <p>Other departments or agencies: Sports Grounds Safety Authority</p> <p>Contact for enquiries: saskia.mukerji@dcms.gov.uk</p>	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 08/09/2020
	Type of regulation: Secondary legislation.
	Type of review: Post Implementation Review
	Date measure came into force: 2015
	Recommendation: Renew
	RPC Opinion: N/A - No Impact Assessment was written for The Safety of Sports Grounds (Designation) Order 2015, so the impact of this PIR was deemed too small for RPC scrutiny

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure? (Maximum 5 lines)

The Prime Minister launched a Red Tape Challenge in 2011 which sought to reduce the overall burden of regulation where possible, including by improving existing regulation through consolidation and removing regulation where it no longer remains necessary. In response, DCMS committed to consolidating the 51 Orders that designated the sports grounds requiring a safety certificate issued by a local authority, into one single Order with up-to-date names and addresses of the grounds, called "The Safety of Sports Grounds (Designation) Order 2015".

The aim was to clearly set out, in one place, which grounds are designated, with up-to-date and accurate information to improve clarity.

2. What evidence has informed the PIR? (Maximum 5 lines)

Policy officials led an internal and external consultation to inform the PIR. DCMS Legal colleagues were consulted, and externally, the Sports Grounds Safety Authority and five Local Authorities from across England and Wales.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved? (Maximum 5 lines)

The Order has accomplished what the Red Tape Challenge sought to do in consolidating all pre-existing Orders into one single order. The consolidation also allowed DCMS to review the information included in those Orders, and rectify anything that was outdated. However, the ongoing accuracy of the information contained in the Order is reliant on timely information provided by the SGSA, sports clubs and local authorities, which regulate the grounds in their areas.

There are two ways in which the need for designation arises: a stadium can accommodate more than 10,000 fans, or a stadium can accommodate more than 5,000 fans and (i) hosts football games and (ii) is occupied by a club that is a member of either the Premier League or the Football League.

We can spot when a team has been promoted to the Football League, but need others to supply information as to its capacity. Other factors are not as easy for us to identify, like a change in a ground's capacity, or if a ground ceases to operate which would make the designation redundant.

It is the responsibility of the local authorities to formally notify the government of the need for de/designation of a sports ground, and if they do not, the information in the Order may not be up-to-date. The Order gets amended to remove or add sports grounds as and when required, so that it accurately reflects which grounds are designated. Reasons for sports clubs and local authorities not fulfilling their responsibility is due to operational and administrative issues, rather than anything to do with the Order. Local authorities and sports clubs may not be aware of their responsibility, the sports grounds safety function in local authorities may not be a priority amongst other roles, or due to frequent movement of football clubs in and out of the Football League which would result in frequent de/designation.

The SGSA is proactive in notifying the government of which football grounds need designation as it is responsible for issuing licences to admit spectators each year to all clubs in the Premier League, Football League and Wembley and the Principality stadium. DCMS officials are working with the SGSA to identify ways to ensure local authorities and clubs are aware of their responsibilities for designations.

The most appropriate option for going forward is to renew the Order, as it is a necessary legal directive and no alternatives that are less burdensome to business have been identified. Additionally, as the Order only resulted in very minor changes, no costs of benefits estimates or actuals were observed. DCMS is working with the SGSA on mitigations to the operational and administrative issues which may affect the Order, so the next review should consider how effective these have been.

Sign-off for Post Implementation Review: Chief economist/Head of Analysis and Minister

I have read the PIR and I am satisfied that it represents a fair and proportionate assessment of the impact of the measure.

Signed: Matthew Scott-Clark (Senior Economist for Sport and Gambling)

Date: 29/09/2020

Signed: Nigel Huddleston (Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Sport, Tourism and Heritage)

Date: 29/09/2020

Further information sheet

Please provide additional evidence in subsequent sheets, as required.

4. What were the original assumptions?(Maximum 5 lines)

None, except that the Order would consolidate all existing Orders into one to achieve the objectives laid out by the Red Tape Challenge.

5. Were there any unintended consequences? (Maximum 5 lines)

No

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business? (Maximum 5 lines)

No

7. For EU measures, how does the UK's implementation compare with that in other EU member states in terms of costs to business? (Maximum 5 lines)

Not applicable