

Appendix 2 – Table of responses received

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
001	3/9/15	Association of British Bookmakers SW1W	<p>The Association of British Bookmakers (ABB) represents over 80% of the high street betting market. Our members include large national operators such as William Hill, Ladbrokes, Coral and Paddy Power, as well as almost 100 smaller independent bookmakers. Please see below for the ABB's response to the current consultation on the Council's review of its gambling policy statement. This sets out the ABB approach to partnership working with local authorities and details any areas of concern within the draft statement, including our views on the implementation of the new LCCP requirements, from April 2016, relating to operators' local area risk assessments and their impact on the licensing regime.</p> <p>We are concerned to ensure these changes are not implemented in such a way as to fundamentally change the premises licence regime through undermining the "aim to permit" principle. In our view the current regime already adequately offers key protections for communities and already provides a clear process (including putting the public on notice) for objections to premises licence applications. The recent planning law changes effective since April 2015 have also already increased the ability of licensing authorities to review applications for new premises, as all new betting shops must now apply for planning permission.</p> <p>We note that in the introduction to the draft policy statement the Borough raises concerns about the number of betting shops and we would refer to recent statistics showing that over recent years betting shop numbers have been relatively stable at around 9,000 nationally, but more recently a trend of overall downwards decline can be seen. The latest Gambling Commission industry statistics show that numbers as at 31 Mar 2015 were 8,958 - a decline of 179 from the previous year, when there were 9,137 recorded as at 31 March 2014. As stated in the Council's introduction Hackney is a densely populated London borough, and we would point out that the number of betting shops in an area is reliant on demand, like any other retail business, and 84% of betting shops are located in commercial centres. Far from conflicting with the Borough's vision for sustainable communities, as stated in the introduction, we would point out that betting shops bring significant economic benefits to a local area and have a positive social impact.</p> <p>Where shops may have relocated onto the high</p>	<p>Current number of gambling premises in Hackney reflected in revised Foreword.</p> <p>Amended text to welcome further consideration of current stakes and prizes limits.</p> <p>Amendment to Paragraph 4.2.3 in response to comments in relation to Appendix E (Crime hotspot map).</p> <p>Amendment to Paragraph 4.5.8 to state that "regard may be given to" from "regard will be given to" in relation to the proximity of the types of premises mentioned.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.9 now includes reference to any policies accompanying applications.</p>

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>street from side streets, due to falling rents or following the removal of the demand test, they are helping ensure the economic viability of those high streets and town centres through filling vacant premises, paying business rates and providing local employment. We note that Hackney's population has a large quota of young people; 24% of betting shop staff are aged 18 – 24.</p> <p>Over 8 million customers visit a betting shop nationally and they do so to enjoy spending their leisure time, placing a bet in a highly regulated socially responsible environment, where they can interact with staff and socialise with other customers. Whilst betting shops are a retail offering this important social aspect should also be considered.</p> <p>With regards the statement in the introduction calling for a reduction in B2 stakes and prizes, we would remind the Council that the maximum stake level is set by the government, who recently rejected a proposal from a number of local councils to reduce the maximum stake on B2 machines to £2 saying they did not support the proposal and that "we are not convinced that local authorities have yet made the most of the powers that are already available to them under either planning or gambling law". There is no evidence that stake size is related to problem gambling, and indeed, important research into gaming machines in betting shops published by the Responsible Gambling Trust in December 2014 concluded that "evidence from this study shows that focusing on one element of gambling alone—such as the reduction of stake size—will not provide a better prediction of problem gambling or decrease the rates of gambling harm".</p> <p>Working in partnership with local authorities The ABB is fully committed to ensuring constructive working relationships exist between betting operators and licensing authorities, and that where problems may arise that they can be dealt with in partnership. The exchange of clear information between councils and betting operators is a key part of this and we welcome the opportunity to respond to this consultation.</p> <p>We welcome that the Council has committed in its draft statement to ensuring the three licensing objectives are continued to be addressed through "meaningful consultation" and promotion of "a consistent and fair approach to regulation", and that "nothing in this policy will undermine the rights of any person to apply under the Act for a variety of</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>permissions and have the application considered on its individual merits”.</p> <p>LGA – ABB Betting Partnership Framework In January 2015 the ABB signed a partnership agreement with the Local Government Association (LGA), developed over a period of months by a specially formed Betting Commission consisting of councillors and betting shop firms, which established a framework designed to encourage more joint working between councils and the industry. Launching the document Cllr Tony Page, LGA Licensing spokesman, said it demonstrated the <i>“...desire on both sides to increase joint-working in order to try and use existing powers to tackle local concerns, whatever they might be.”</i></p> <p>The framework builds on earlier examples of joint working between councils and the industry, for example the Ealing Southall Betwatch scheme and Medway Responsible Gambling Partnership. In Ealing, the Southall Betwatch was set up to address concerns about crime and disorder linked to betting shops in the borough. As a result, crime within gambling premises reduced by 50 per cent alongside falls in public order and criminal damage offences.</p> <p>In December last year, the Medway Responsible Gambling Partnership was launched by Medway Council and the ABB. The first of its kind in Britain, the voluntary agreement allows anyone who is concerned they are developing a problem with their gambling to exclude themselves from all betting shops in the area. The initiative also saw the industry working together with representatives of Kent Police and with the Medway Community Safety Partnership to develop a Reporting of Crime Protocol that is helpful in informing both the industry, police and other interested parties about levels of crime and the best way to deal with any crime in a way that is proportionate and effective. Learnings from the initial self-exclusion trial in Medway have been incorporated into a second trial in Glasgow city centre, launched in July this year with the support of Glasgow City Council, which it is hoped will form the basis of a national scheme to be rolled out in time for the LCCP deadline for such a scheme by April 2016. Jane Chitty, Medway Council’s Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth & Regulation, said: <i>“The Council has implemented measures that work at a local level but I am pleased to note that the joint work we are doing here in Medway is going to help the development of a national scheme.”</i> Describing the project, Glasgow’s City Treasurer and Chairman</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>of a cross-party Sounding Board on gambling, Cllr Paul Rooney said: <i>"This project breaks new ground in terms of the industry sharing information, both between operators and, crucially, with their regulator."</i></p> <p>Primary Authority Partnerships in place between the ABB and local authorities All major operators, and the ABB on behalf of independent members, have also established Primary Authority Partnerships with local authorities. These Partnerships help provide a consistent approach to regulation by local authorities, within the areas covered by the Partnership; such as age-verification or health and safety. We believe this level of consistency is beneficial both for local authorities and for operators. For instance, Primary Authority Partnerships between Milton Keynes Council and Reading Council and their respective partners, Ladbrokes and Paddy Power, led to the first Primary Authority inspection plans for gambling coming into effect in January 2015.</p> <p>By creating largely uniform plans, and requiring enforcing officers to inform the relevant Primary Authority before conducting a proactive test-purchase, and provide feedback afterwards, the plans have been able to bring consistency to proactive test-purchasing whilst allowing the Primary Authorities to help the businesses prevent underage gambling on their premises.</p> <p>Local area risk assessments From April 2016, under new Gambling Commission LCCP provisions, operators are required to complete local area risk assessments identifying any risks posed to the licensing objectives and how these would be mitigated.</p> <p>Licensees must take into account relevant matters identified in the licensing authority's statement of licensing policy and local area profile in their risk assessment, and these must be reviewed where there are significant local changes or changes to the premises, or when applying for a variation to or a new premises licence.</p> <p>The ABB supports this requirement as set out in the LCCP, as this will help sustain a transparent and open dialogue between operators and councils. The ABB is also committed to working pro-actively with local authorities to help drive the development of best practice in this area.</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>Evidence based approach</p> <p>It is important that any risks identified are supported by substantive evidence. Where risks are unsubstantiated there is a danger that the regulatory burden will be disproportionate. This may be the case where local authorities include perceived rather than evidenced risks in their local area profiles and licensing policy statements. This would distort the aim to permit principle set out in the Gambling Act 2005 by moving the burden of proof onto operators. Under the Act, it is incumbent on licensing authorities to provide evidence as to any risks to the licensing objectives, and not on the operator to provide evidence as to how they may mitigate any potential risk. A reversal of this would represent a significant increase in the resource required for operators to be compliant whilst failing to offer a clear route by which improvements in protections against gambling related harm can be made.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Council has recognised the aim to permit in its draft statement, and that neither moral objections nor demand may be taken into account in licensing decisions. However, we object to the inclusion of and reference to Appendix E (crime hotspots map), as no empirical evidence is provided to show a causal link between betting shops and crime. Betting shops may be victims of crime, but are not shown to be drivers of crime; therefore the location of a shop in a known crime hotspot should not be considered when taking into account if the licensing objectives can be upheld. Operators already have stringent policies in place to ensure their operations remain free of crime, as per the licensing requirement under the Act.</p> <p>We similarly object to the paragraphs 4.5.8 and 4.5.9. There is no evidence that proximity of young or vulnerable people to a betting premises would impact the ability of the shop to uphold the licensing objectives. This is because all operators already have strict policies and procedures in place to prevent the access of under-age people to the premises and to ensure the protection of vulnerable people. The mere increased proximity of either of those groups to the premises would not affect this.</p> <p>The industry fully supports the development of proportionate and evidenced based regulation, and is committed to minimising the harmful effects of gambling. The ABB is continuing to work closely with the Gambling Commission and the government to further evaluate and build on the measures put in place under the ABB Code for Responsible Gambling,</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>which is mandatory for all our members.</p> <p>Concerns around increases in the regulatory burden on operators Any increase in the regulatory burden would severely impact on our members at a time when overall shop numbers are in decline, and operators are continuing to respond to and absorb significant recent regulatory change. This includes the increase to 25% of MGD, changes to staking over £50 on gaming machines, and planning use class changes which require all new betting shops in England to apply for planning permission.</p> <p>Moving away from an evidence based approach would lead to substantial variation between licensing authorities and increase regulatory compliance costs for our members. This is of particular concern for smaller operators, who do not have the same resources to be able to put into monitoring differences across all licensing authorities and whose businesses are less able to absorb increases in costs, putting them at risk of closure.</p> <p>Such variation would in our opinion also weaken the overall standard of regulation at a local level by preventing the easy development of standard or best practice across different local authorities.</p> <p>Employing additional licence conditions It is our view that additional conditions should only be imposed in exceptional circumstances where there are clear reasons for doing so and we welcome reference in paragraph 7.5.1 that “the starting point in determining applications will be to grant the application without attaching conditions”.</p> <p>Additional concerns We would also request that where a local area profile is produced by the licensing authority that this be made clearly available within the body of the licensing policy statement, where it will be easily accessible by the operator and also available for consultation whenever the policy statement is reviewed.</p> <p>Conclusion The ABB and our members are committed to working closely with both the Gambling Commission and local authorities to continually drive up standards in regulatory compliance in support of the three licensing objectives: to keep crime out of gambling, ensure that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way, and to protect the vulnerable. Indeed, as set out, we already do this successfully in</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>partnership with local authorities now. This includes through the ABB Code for Responsible Gambling, which is mandatory for all our members, and the Safe Bet Alliance (SBA), which sets voluntary standards across the industry to make shops safer for customers and staff. We would encourage local authorities to engage with us as we continue to develop both these codes of practice which are in direct support of the licensing objectives.</p>	
002	4/9/15	Campaign for Fairer Gambling	<p>As leader of the council, you will know that Licensing Authorities are required under the Gambling Act 2005 (the Act) to publish a statement of the principles which they propose to apply when exercising their functions in respect of gambling activity within their borough.</p> <p>Under the Act, Licensing Authorities are required to consult those who represent the interests of persons who are likely to be affected by the exercise of the authority's functions. The <u>Campaign for Fairer Gambling</u> in conjunction with its more focused <u>Stop the FOBTs campaign</u> has prepared this consultation submission for the consideration of all Local Authority licensing committees with particular regard to dealing with the contentious issue of betting shops and Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs/B2 classified gaming machines).</p> <p>We would appreciate if you could share the important contents of this mailing with your Chief Licensing Officer.</p> <p>Under the Act, Licensed Betting Offices (LBOs) are allowed a maximum of four B2 category gaming machines offering game content defined as B2 with stakes up to £100 per spin, B3 with stakes up to £2 per spin and category C with stakes up to £1 per spin. Also, the bookmakers have merged two game categories (B2 and B3), so in betting shops you can play a low stake £2 capped slot game that suddenly introduces the player to £10, £20, £30 plus stakes per spin.</p> <p>Despite increasing evidence of the destructive social impact of high speed, high stake casino gaming in betting shops at stakes up to £100 per spin, the previous coalition government and the current Conservative government have failed to take either decisive or effective action to curb FOBTs.</p> <p>The recent government response to <u>93 Councils led by Newham</u> calling for the stakes on FOBTs to be cut to £2 per spin laid the blame for the issue of proliferation of betting shops in town centres and</p>	Noted.

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>consequently FOBTs, at the door of licencing authorities. Marcus Jones MP, Minister for Local Government, wrote:</p> <p><i>"It is perhaps an uncomfortable reality that every one of the betting shops that collectively have given rise to the concern at the heart of the submission relies on a premises licence granted by the local authority itself".</i></p> <p>He goes on to advise councils of their existing powers under the licensing process, which many local authorities already recognise as limited in scope.</p> <p>However, he points to "few" local authorities having so far "made effective use of a provision of the Act that we see as being absolutely critical in managing the local gambling landscape". With this statement he is referring to the three year review of local gambling policy now under way across England, Scotland and Wales by local authorities such as yours.</p> <p>In his letter to Newham, Marcus Jones MP, criticises councils for drafting "generic" and "template" based statements and that the Gambling Commission "will be placing much greater emphasis on the importance of the statements".</p> <p>The Campaign for Fairer Gambling has prepared this submission for consideration as part of your review, taking into account the Minister's advice and focusing on the most prominent issue of contention for licensing authorities – licensed betting offices and the Fixed Odds Betting Terminals they operate.</p> <p>Enforcement</p> <p>The main enforcement and compliance role for a licensing authority in terms of the Act is to ensure compliance with the premises licences and other permissions which it authorises. One strategic methodology to measure compliance is to commission <u>test purchasing</u> of premises and staff employed on those premises to transact gambling.</p> <p>The Gambling Commission (the Commission) notes that <i>"it is the responsibility of operators to manage the risks to the licensing objectives that their activities may present"</i>. Licencing authorities are rightly empowered to undertake test purchasing to ensure measures are being implemented effectively. Under guidance from the Commission, test purchasing to evaluate the effectiveness of measures in place on licensed premises concerning</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>self-exclusion, under age controls, anti-money laundering policies and procedures are within the remit of a licensing authority.</p> <p>However, in the period 2013/2014 across the whole of England, Scotland and Wales, of the two most highly represented licensed premises in high street locations – licensed betting offices (LBO) and adult gaming centres (AGC) - just 825 instances of test purchasing were recorded as being carried out by licensing authorities. To put this in context 599 (6%), of the 9,137 betting shops (to March 2014) and 226 (14%) of the 1,618 AGCs were subject to test purchasing by licensing authorities. Only 37 Councils carried out test purchasing last year.</p> <p>In most cases, test purchasing focuses on the “protection of the vulnerable” licensing objective and consists of tests for under age access to gambling on licensed premises. However, the Commission is clear that the scope of test purchasing should include the effectiveness of self-exclusion procedures and anti-money laundering controls as well as under age controls. Money laundering in particular has been repeatedly highlighted as a particular area of concern around FOBTs both <u>low level</u> and more <u>highly-organised incidents</u> that revealed serious weaknesses in operator controls.</p> <p>Premise Licence Conditions</p> <p>The Minister for Local Government, in his negative response to the Newham-led call for stakes on FOBTs to be cut to £2 per spin, said: <i>“The licensing process gives authorities considerable scope to attach conditions to licences where that is necessary to achieve the licensing objectives”</i>.</p> <p>The tenth betting shop to open in London’s China Town was subject to attached conditions by the Licencing Authority following concerns from the local community and representations from the Police. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Seating provided for use by customers whilst playing FOBTs must be secured to the floor – this is viewed as anticipating <u>aggressive behaviour</u> from FOBT players who suffer large losses B. a comprehensive CCTV system covering internal and external frontage with immediate availability to the police must be fitted C. an incident log of all incidents on the 	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>premises must be kept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. minimum 11.5 mm thickness security glass must be fitted to the service area E. a "behind the counter" attack alarm must be fitted and each member of staff must be issued with and required to carry on their person a personal fob attack alarm F. maglocks fitted to entrance and exit points and even toilet doors. G. a minimum of two staff to be present post 8 pm in the evening. <p>Whilst these measures have some merit in addressing the potential incidents that now occur in betting shops, they are indicative of an escalation in anti-social behaviour as a consequence of gambling activity in these licensed premises. In the first nine months of 2014, Police call outs to betting shops were already up by over 20% on the previous year.</p> <p>The one condition that Licencing Authorities seem hesitant to impose and, when they do - as per Westminster - is done in a relatively lack lustre manner, is requiring an adequate number of staff on the premises. The number of people employed in the betting sector has fallen by 9,700 since 2008. The industry now staffs most LBOs with just one person. This is particularly risky for staff and undermines industry claims to be promoting "responsible gambling" and "player protection measures" when they absolve responsibility for their premises to one person, generally young and female, working for not much more than minimum wage levels.</p> <p>No other gambling sector employs lone staffing as a standard policy. It is perceived as irresponsible to leave licensed premises, on which gambling is transacted, under the management and operation of one person. It is within the remit of licencing authorities to impose minimum staffing levels as a condition attached to LBO premises licences.</p> <p>Locally determined conditions are recommended by the Commission who says: <i>"Where there are specific, evidenced risks or problems associated with a particular locality, or specific premises or class of premises, a licencing authority will be able to attach individual conditions to address this. That will be a matter for them in the light of local circumstances."</i></p> <p>However, unlike the conditions attached to the new Soho betting shop that deal with issues that predominantly occur inside the premises, often disturbances occur outside the premises, causing a</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>nuisance for other businesses or residential occupiers. Acts of vandalism against betting premises, youths gathering outside and anti-social behaviour upon leaving betting shops are common cause for concern and complaint. However, Licensing Authorities are unable deal with these issues under their licensing responsibilities. As the Commission notes: <i>“Unlike the Licensing Act, the Gambling Act does not include, as a specific licencing objective, the prevention of public nuisance. Any nuisance associated with gambling premises should be tackled under other relevant legislation.”</i> Hence the imposition of conditions to deal with problems emanating from betting shops but occurring outside of the premises is limited in scope.</p> <p>It is estimated <u>over 100 betting shops per week suffer attacks on FOBTs</u> with very few instances being reported to the Police. These are criminal acts of vandalism always occurring as a consequence of heavy cash losses from FOBT usage. As Licensing Authorities are responsible for gambling activity that takes place on the premises it is perfectly warranted for a condition to be attached to individual or all licensed premises under the licencing authorities' remit, for the recording and reporting of all such incidents. This would not be considered a regulatory burden and is in keeping with the LA responsibility of keeping crime out of gambling.</p> <p>Despite the Minister for Local Government pointing to conditions as providing “considerable scope”, in the area of greatest concern, that of high stake, high speed FOBTs, a Licencing Authority has no control or powers. Section 172(10) of the Act provides that conditions may not relate to gaming machine categories, numbers, or method of operation and section 171 prevents an authority imposing conditions in relation to stakes, fees, winnings or prizes.</p> <p>Section 181 of the Act however contains an express power for licencing authorities to restrict the number of <i>betting machines</i>, their nature and circumstances in which they are made available for, by attaching a licence condition to a betting premises licence. These are not defined under the act as FOBTs. Section 181 of the Act refers to these machines as “accepting bets on real events” and betting operators now refer to them as Self Service Betting Terminals (SSBTs). Like the introduction of FOBTs, no controls over numbers per premises have been agreed and it is left to Licencing Authorities, if they see fit, to control their numbers under guidance pertaining to floor space, service counter positions</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received				Consideration given/action taken
			<p>and ability of staff to monitor their use.</p> <p>There are now estimated to be in excess of 5,000 SSBTs sited in betting shops and this is increasing each month. As with FOBTs, SSBTs are contributing to the further erosion of jobs in betting shops (down 9,700 since 2008) with one operator, Trafalgar Leisure, providing five SSBTs and four FOBTs at each of its licensed premises but they did not offer any human facing over-the-counter betting facilities.</p> <p>The Gambling Commission lost in their attempt to declare these betting premises as providing "insufficient facilities for betting" and the consequence is that a betting shop will still be a betting shop even if it is used for no other purpose than making machines available for use on premises.</p> <p>It is essential that Licensing Authorities have particular concern to the development of SSBTs in betting premises and in particular the content made available on what have been deemed "betting machines" and use their powers under section 181 of the Act to control and monitor their proliferation.</p> <p>Closing note</p> <p>It is clear to Councils and Councillors that their ability to deal with and curb the proliferation of betting shops in town centres and high streets, as well as controlling the quantity of FOBTs available is severely restricted under the 2005 Gambling Act. Despite the Minister for Local Government's view that licencing authorities are not making sufficient use of existing powers.</p> <p>It is proposed to give Scotland the power to vary the number of FOBTs in new betting premises and, subject to amendments in the Scotland Bill, this could be extended as a retrospective power. No such power for Licensing Authorities in England and Wales is proposed just a continual reference to "existing powers".</p> <p>The view of the Campaign for Fairer Gambling is that the power to vary the number of FOBTs should be devolved to all Local Authorities and their Licensing Committees as is proposed for Scotland. However, it is not the quantity of machines that essentially creates the problem as can be seen from the latest Gambling Commission statistics.</p>				
Sector/			Terminals	Yield (millions)	Yield Share		

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken																												
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Machines</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Betting Shops/B2</td> <td>34,874</td> <td>£1,613.60</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bingo B3/4/C/D</td> <td>52,506</td> <td>£292.24</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Casino B1/2/3</td> <td>2,925</td> <td>£166.26</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AGC B3/4/C/D</td> <td>50,530</td> <td>£306.09</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Totals</td> <td>140,835</td> <td>£2,378.19</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Figures from the Gambling Commission Industry Statistics to September 2014</p> <p>All gaming machines other than B2/FOBTs are capped at £2 and under per spin. It is the capacity for large losses that is facilitated by such a high staking capacity (£1 to £100 rather than 25 pence up to £2 as on most other gaming machines) that is the core of the problem regarding the B2 casino content.</p> <p>As part of your Council's gambling policy over the next three years, we recommend you contain a statement supporting further regulatory action against FOBTs, with greater powers of control devolved to councils.</p> <p>We urge all councils to support Newham in their action under the Sustainable Communities Act calling for the stakes on FOBTs to be brought in line with all other high street gaming machines at £2 per spin.</p>	Machines				Betting Shops/B2	34,874	£1,613.60	68%	Bingo B3/4/C/D	52,506	£292.24	12%	Casino B1/2/3	2,925	£166.26	7%	AGC B3/4/C/D	50,530	£306.09	13%					Totals	140,835	£2,378.19		
Machines																																
Betting Shops/B2	34,874	£1,613.60	68%																													
Bingo B3/4/C/D	52,506	£292.24	12%																													
Casino B1/2/3	2,925	£166.26	7%																													
AGC B3/4/C/D	50,530	£306.09	13%																													
Totals	140,835	£2,378.19																														
003	4/9/15	Coral Racing Limited E20	<p>Coral Racing Limited is most grateful to be given the opportunity to respond to this consultation exercise. Coral was one of the first national bookmakers to be licensed under the Betting and Gaming Act of 1960, and so has been operating the length and breadth of the UK for over 50 years. Its premises comprise locations in the inner city, on the high street, in suburbs and in rural areas, and in areas of both high and low deprivation. It now operates 1850 betting offices across Great Britain, which comprise about 20% of all licensed betting offices. It is, therefore, a highly experienced operator.</p> <p>The Foreword to the document contains a number of incorrect assumptions in our opinion, failing to recognise the positive contribution that licensed betting shops make to the locality by way of</p>	<p>Current number of gambling premises in Hackney reflected in revised Foreword.</p> <p>Amended text to welcome further consideration of current stakes and prizes limits.</p> <p>Amendment to Paragraph 4.2.3 in response to comments in relation to Appendix E (Crime hotspot map).</p> <p>Amendment to</p>																												

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>employment and economic benefits. However, for the purpose of clarity, our response focuses on the content of the policy and below we have detailed our feedback:-</p> <p>Coral Racing Limited are pleased to note that the Board when considering applications are still required to 'aim to permit gambling' where this is 'reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives'. We do note that the Board should not take into account of moral objections to gambling in reaching their decision on applications.</p> <p>Coral Racing Limited recognise the requirement to supply risk assessments with future applications & variations following the consultation completion and are pleased to see this detail included within the document. Within paragraph 4.5.8 (page 27) though, it identifies a range of premises which by their inclusion, may suggest that applications near to such locations could be deemed high risk. Notably; schools, vulnerable adult centres and residential areas where there may be a high concentration of families with children. Whilst paragraph 4.5.9 notes that each application will be decided on its merits, the classification of certain venues within the statement, could indicate an assumption of a linked cause.</p> <p>Coral knows of no evidence that the location of a licensed betting office within the proximity of the aforementioned causes harm to the licensing objectives. It involves a four-fold suggestion that a) those using such facilities are inherently problem gamblers, b) that having visited such facilities, users are more likely to visit a betting office than if they had not used such facilities, c) that if they do, that they are more likely to engage in problem gambling, and d) that the protective mechanisms arising from the Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice are insufficient to mitigate the risk. There is no evidence for any of these propositions.</p> <p>Coral knows of no evidence that children coming from schools are gaining access to betting offices. Coral's general experience, in common with other bookmakers, is that children are not interested in betting, and in any case the Think 21 policy operated by Coral is adequate to ensure that under-age gambling does not occur in their premises. There are very many examples of betting offices sited immediately next to schools and colleges and no evidence whatsoever that they cause problems.</p> <p>The reason for Coral's caution against making such</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.5.8 to state that "regard may be given to" from "regard will be given to" in relation to the proximity of the types of premises mentioned.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.9 now includes reference to any policies accompanying applications.</p>

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>perceptions, which we anticipate is similar to that of the other main bookmakers, is that it already operates systems which ensure that the licensing objectives are strongly promoted across its estate.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coral benefits from an operating licence granted by the national regulator, the Gambling Commission. • Therefore, its corporate systems for the promotion of the licensing objectives have been approved by the Commission, which continues to exercise vigilance in this regard through inspections and examination of regulatory returns. • Coral is subject to the Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice, which are effectively the national code of operation to ensure that the licensing objectives are promoted. • It carries out health and safety risk assessments pursuant to its legal obligations. These assessments are shortly to be extended so that formal compliance assessments are conducted. • It conducts risk assessments in relation to Exposure to Violence, Aggression and Conflict (EVAC assessments). • It operates the assessment principles of the Safe Bet Alliance, the national code for safe premises. It was one of the architects of the code. • It operates the ABB's Code for Responsible Gambling, and again was one of the architects of that code. • It operates an extensive compliance manual, upon which all staff members are trained. Copies are available for your inspection if required. • It contributes to the Responsible Gambling Trust, which seems to promote responsible gambling who in-turn contribute to GamCare, the national problem gambling charity. <p>Coral's experience is that, through all it does, it achieves an exemplary degree of compliance, and attracts negligible evidence of regulatory harm. Through the additional local risk assessment to be introduced with future premises licence applications from April 2016, Coral believe that these should be a) to assess specific risks to the licensing objectives in the local area, and b) to assess whether control measures going beyond standard control measures are needed. In other words, there should be no requirement to list the locations that are currently stated (as there is no evidence that there is a link between such venues and a betting office), however</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			notwithstanding this, such locations would automatically be included with the operators risk assessment submitted when the application is considered.	
004	25/8/15	Ladbrokes PLC HA2	<p>We welcome the opportunity to respond to this consultation. As a highly regulated industry, we also devote significant resources to regulatory compliance and fully support both the principle and practice of better working partnerships between local betting operators and local authorities. In our view the current regime already adequately offers key protections for communities and already provides a clear process (including putting the public on notice) for objections to premises licence applications. The recent planning law changes effective since April 2015 have also already increased the ability of licensing authorities to review applications for new premises, as all new betting shops must now apply for planning permission.</p> <p>We are therefore concerned that the guidance as currently drafted aims to alter the premises licence regime from that established in the Gambling Act and either intentionally or unintentionally increases the burdens on an already responsible business and prescribes additional conditions above and beyond what has been currently agreed by the independent regulator.</p> <p>It is also concerning that personal opinions which lack any evidence-based have been included in the introduction of the document around both clustering and the staking amount of B2 machines. This update to the Statement of Principles is an official Council document and should therefore be treated as such in its drafting. There are other avenues for the Council to make their opinions clear but we are disappointed that the opportunity has been taken to include it in an official document which will be in place for the next three years. Whilst we hope this is not the case, it could be seen as an attempt to colour people's judgements in this area, rather than relying on the evidence and advice from the Gambling Commission and independent Responsible Gambling research bodies.</p> <p>We hope that in responding to this consultation we can better support the implementation of an effective, consistent and clear local licensing regime which is mutually beneficial to operators and local authorities.</p> <p>Local Partnerships We welcome the focus on partnership working and</p>	<p>Current number of gambling premises in Hackney reflected in revised Foreword.</p> <p>Amended text to welcome further consideration of current stakes and prizes limits.</p> <p>Amendment to Paragraph 4.2.3 in response to comments in relation to Appendix E (Crime hotspot map).</p> <p>Amendment to Paragraph 4.5.8 to state that "regard may be given to" from "regard will be given to" in relation to the proximity of the types of premises mentioned.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.9 now includes reference to any policies accompanying applications.</p>

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>that is one of the reasons we are a leading signatory to the 'ABB-LGA Framework for local partnerships on betting shops' which was published in January this year. We also have Primary Authority agreements with Liverpool Council and Milton Keynes Council which has resulted in greater clarity and consistency of regulation at a local level. In contrast, we are concerned that this guidance as currently drafted would lead to variations and inconsistencies which prove burdensome and costly for a business that operates across a multi-site estate in numerous different local authorities.</p> <p>Local area risk assessments From April 2016, under new Gambling Commission LCCP provisions, we are required to complete local area risk assessments identifying any risks posed to the licensing objectives and how these would be mitigated. As a responsible business, we must take into account relevant matters identified in the licensing authority's statement of licensing policy in their risk assessment, and review our policies where there are significant local changes.</p> <p>It is important that any changes or additional conditions are evidence based and as a result, deemed to have a real impact on the ability of betting operators to uphold any or all of the three licensing conditions. Such a list of factors, as outlined in section 3.5 and 3.7, based on opinion rather than fact, and therefore open to interpretation in many different ways, could result in an inconsistent licencing regime.</p> <p>Operators already take certain factors into consideration to ensure compliance with the licensing objectives, both in relation to new applications and existing licensed premises, and therefore it should be, as it is now, a matter for the local operator to decide how this is determined and what should be included. This being the case, only local risks that are evidence based, would be included in the risk assessment. We would therefore caution against the inclusion of certain named categories which operators are prescribed to take into account by the local authority, including educational establishments and general levels of crime.</p> <p>It is important to note that betting shops are often the victims of crime rather than a source of crime (burglaries, robberies etc). However, as a responsible business we would consider the existing levels of gambling and betting related crimes as well as the measures we can take to mitigate this risk</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>before applying for a local licence. It is unclear and we would expect that other general levels of crime would not affect a licencing application.</p> <p>Instead, each case should be considered on its own merits and therefore we would caution against general statements that gambling premises should automatically face a higher burden of proof in these areas. Without any clear requirements in the revised licencing policy statements that additional licence conditions should be accompanied by robust evidence, this process could lead to unintended consequences and local shop closures and job losses.</p> <p>Existing responsible practices Ladbrokes shops already operate strict age restrictions and we do not promote betting or gambling in our shop windows attractive to young children or vulnerable adults.</p> <p>We accept the importance of the premises design to mitigate risk, which is one of the reasons we install CCTV cameras in specific places to monitor activity (for example at the entrance and exit of the shop) and it is our policy, unless physically impossible, to locate machines in line of sight of our cashiers. Where this is not possible, we implement alternative measures to ensure that shop team are in a position to monitor the activity in the machines area of the shop.</p> <p>Security and health and safety risk assessments already detail control measures in this area which are effective in tackling these issues. Similarly, we do not accept the premise that the proximity of young people to betting shops should be regarded as an additional risk. We have strict policies and procedures in place to ensure that only those who are eligible to bet can do so. We have also invested in colleague training for the Challenge 21 policy, whereby any new customer who does not look old enough to bet is asked to provide identification. If official age verification is not provided, the customer will be asked to leave the premises. Ladbrokes also has a Primary Authority Partnership for age-restricted products.</p> <p>Our policies regarding compliance with the licensing objectives are supported by thorough staff induction training programmes followed by annual refresher training in the higher risk areas such as the prevention of underage gambling (Think 21) and tested through internal audit processes and, in the case of Think 21, test purchasing conducted by a third party service provider and the fact that those</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>results are and other associated information is shared with the Gambling Commission.</p> <p>Who should be an interested party? There is a clear, existing process in place for interested parties or responsible authorities to make representations and we would therefore caution against statements of theoretical risk without any evidence to support the argument.</p> <p>Additional information – duplication of practice Section 4.2.6 states that applicants are encouraged to discuss their crime prevention procedures with licensing officers and the police before making a formal application. Whilst this seems like a reasonable policy, it should be noted that betting operators already do this for licensing applications, therefore this could lead to duplication and unnecessary additional bureaucracy.</p>	
005	17/8/15	Cambridge Heath Salvation Army E8	<p>This letter comes from a simple conviction that the voice of some of those whom we work alongside need to be heard as the Council seek to review its gambling policy.</p> <p>Comments were invited in the Hackney Gazette back in June and whilst I am based at the Salvation Army here in Mare Street I have taken time to consult my colleagues at Clapton, Hoxton and Stoke Newington who have-shared some first-hand experiences with me.</p> <p>My aim is simply to provide you with some genuine local "case studies" who in many ways represent the consequences of local gambling policy and the wider, often unseen, implications of the decisions that are made regarding gambling. There is no agenda on our part other than helping you, we hope, see a broader picture. To give you a little background - I am the Officer in Charge here at the Salvation Army in Mare Street. Whilst my wife and I have only been in post for three years I can claim strong roots in the area with my great grandfather, granddad and dad all growing up and living in Hackney all with experience of east-end gambling traditions! Prior to moving to take charge of the Centre here, we worked for 8 years in Kilburn and so have good grass roots understanding of working in an inner city community and in particular with vulnerable people.</p> <p>You will probably know that the Centre here on Mare Street is a lively hub of the local community with over 800 people passing through our doors in a typical week. We have a daily lunch club with over</p>	Noted

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>100 members (over 55's) and attract, I'm told, an unusually high number of men between the ages of 55-90. We provide a wide range of activities in a typical week and engage with local people of all cultures and backgrounds from toddlers through to pensioners. We also do a significant amount of work with those who are living locally in squats, hostels and indeed those who are homeless.</p> <p>With regards to the issue of gambling we are able to provide some real "life stories" which are illustrative of the kinds of problems and issues that some people can face. We also aim to note that there is a social and financial "cost" to gambling that needs your consideration.</p> <p>Here then are three simple "stories, (with names changed) followed by some summary points which we hope will provide some insights as you review the gambling policy:</p> <p>Mark is a young man who lives with his mum. He was, for a time, severely addicted to fixed odds gambling machines and would often "blow" his money. When working, it was common for him to take out most of his income and spend it on fruit machines both in pubs and betting shops occasionally winning and seemingly justifying the time and expense. He is now able to look back and say what a "mug" he was. At the time however, he was blind to the damage he was doing unable to put any savings aside and placing pressure on his mum through not contributing to the running costs of the family home.</p> <p>Alfred is and older man in his 80s - who in many ways sees the betting shop as something of a social club. It's where he can find some companionship and a bit of excitement in an otherwise boring day. He sees horse racing as a hobby but each day will spend at least £10 on bets which means that he is not able to buy new clothes or shoes. He at least has the common sense to pay money to our lunch club at beginning of the week because it's quite possible that he might blow his money on a horse with good odds and without setting some aside, it could mean going without food. We work with others who do not have the foresight to set money aside for the basics.</p> <p>Tony - was in a happy marriage but discovered the excitement of gambling. Initial contact was online but it opened up a new world to him that included regular visits to the betting shop. He incurred severe losses which built up and which he tried to keep hidden from his wife. Things went completely pear</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>shaped before he finally came to terms with his addiction and he is now separated from his wife and children with debts still outstanding.</p> <p>Some basic local observations:</p> <p>Normative Culture Gambling is not a problem for all people but it will be a problem for some. The increase in accessibility means that more and more it is seen as "normal" and for some this means blowing their limited income instead of saving it for clothing and in some cases food. Increasingly betting shops are becoming "community centres" for men, somewhere to sit for hours on end. The norm then becomes very sedentary (with long term health implications) - and the observation locally is that betting shops are increasingly attracting a younger generation. Studies show that gambling during adolescence dramatically increases a person's likelihood of developing a gambling dependency.</p> <p>Social Cost The individual cases above are pretty "normal" and are replicated throughout the Borough – in many ways they reflect similar stories of alcohol and drug use. In each case however there is a social cost to family and community relationships. Things were tense for a long time between Mark and his mum who consequently suffered from depression. It meant that Tony had to move out of the family home and find separate accommodation. In other cases we have provided food and clothing for individuals who may have blown their limited income on chasing the dream of a big win. When people become problem gamblers they often disregard their primary responsibilities to family, work and society. Too often gambling leads to financial ruin, dishonesty and criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Financial Costs Given the details above, it is clear that there is a wider cost to gambling. In pure financial terms what might seem a short term Council gain is in reality a long term pain! I would imagine that the income in terms of tax and rental from Licensed Gambling premises across the Borough must be a highly significant source of income for the Council. This must however be seen in wider terms of a longer term loss in terms of debts, mental health, addiction support, housing arrears etc.</p> <p>Chasing an impossible dream! Gambling often preys on the most vulnerable people who seek 'quick and easy money' to alleviate their</p>	

Ref:	Rec'd	Name/ Organisation	Response/Summary of response received	Consideration given/action taken
			<p>problems. Statistics indicate that poor and working class individuals and families are disproportionately affected by the gambling industry.</p> <p>Gambling, for a significant number, is not merely a harmless activity but can become a compulsive dependency. The rates of pathological gambling worldwide range between 0.8% and 1.8% of the population. This translates into millions of individuals and into 100's here in Hackney. It is exceedingly rare for problem gamblers to acknowledge difficulties and to seek treatment until things have gone disastrously wrong.</p> <p>Frequently, it is often here at grass roots level that we begin to identify and support those whom we know may be at risk and indeed support those who have already found gambling to be a problem.</p>	
006	24/6/15	V Costas Hackney	<p>I have read in Hackney Today that you are looking for comments from residents on the Council's Gambling Policy.</p> <p>As a resident for 25 years, there appears to have been an increase in the number of betting shops in the borough which I do not believe is in the borough's interest or local residents, especially those that are vulnerable and have an addiction to gambling.</p> <p>I see no social benefit from gambling and clearly it serves only large scale gambling organisations in search of profiting out of vulnerable individuals and encouraging addiction to gambling.</p> <p>If such institution are continued to be allowed, there should be an additional tax to fund social schemes in the borough.</p> <p>I have no knowledge of any increase in crime levels associated with gambling, but it would be intuitive to believe that gambling addicts will need to find methods to fund their addiction.</p> <p>The council should be looking at all methods to discourage gambling institutions in the borough.</p>	Noted.