

Summary of Key Points from Consultation Responses to the Draft Gambling Policy.

Respondent	Response	Licensing Authority comments (LA)	Change policy?
1. Essex Police	No comment	None	No
2. Association of British Bookmakers (ABB) – focussing on betting shops.	Recognises the importance of the policy focussing on the local environment	None	No
	Believes that any consideration of gambling licensing at the local level should also be considered within the wider context that: betting shop numbers have reduced in recent years, all new betting shops require a specific planning permission, and health surveys show that problem gambling rates are stable and possibly falling.	It is correct that betting shop numbers are in decline. The Act is specific in saying that ‘need’ cannot be considered. Thus the number of betting shops, be that falling or rising, is irrelevant in terms of the policy. Indeed, as the respondent states, all new betting shops require a specific planning permission and this is how the number of shops in a specific area are controlled. The LA naturally welcomes surveys showing problem gambling may be falling but we would be failing in our duty not to include further measures to improve these statistics if at all possible.	No
	Supports Primary Authority Partnerships and feel that they help provide a consistent approach to regulation by local authorities,	The LA have always recognised Primary Authority Partnerships and the revised policy formalises this at 13.6.	No
	Fully supports the need for local area risk assessments which will take into account risks presented in the local area, such as exposure to vulnerable groups and crime. the ABB welcomes the recognition of the need for an evidential basis for any consideration with regard to the location of a new premises (14.9) and the	The LA is fully supportive of the concept of Local Area Risk Assessments which were introduced by the Gambling Commission in version 5 of their guidance to local authorities. We believe it is right that levels of deprivation should be considered but requiring operators to include this in their assessments doesn’t automatically mean that it will be found that such areas have a	No

	<p>recognition that the mandatory and default conditions that attach to all Gambling Act 2005 premises licences are normally sufficient to regulate gambling premises. However it questions that the licensing authority expects whether the premises are in an area of deprivation should be considered within a risk assessment. Stating “It is difficult to see how the relative affluence of a location could be a material consideration as far as the licensing objectives are concerned” and requesting removal of this requirement</p> <p>Want the local area profile to a) be included as part of the policy and b) be available for consultation whenever the policy is consulted on.</p>	<p>different number of vulnerable people in it. However to simply dismiss it because the ABB cannot see a link would not be appropriate.</p> <p>The Local Area Profile (LAP) will naturally be an evolving document and cannot be included as part of the policy because it would create requirement to review the whole policy every time local circumstances required an amendment of the LAP. (For example new premises included in part of the LAP open or others close). Therefore, it was proposed (and accepted by Council in the draft policy) to publish it as a standalone document which is referred to within the policy. This approach is also supported in 6.51 of the Gambling Commissions guidance and by the LGA</p> <p>The LAP will be available on the Council Website at all times not just during policy consultation periods.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>3.The Licensing Committee</p>	<p>Change the words “Criminal Record Bureau (CRB)” to Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS)</p> <p>Supports that the licensing authority expects whether the premises are in an area of deprivation should be considered within a risk assessment. Stating that it is essential that it is included.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>None</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>

	Resolved to recommend the revised policy to Cabinet with the exception that CRB is amended to DBS	None	N/A
4. Leigh-on-Sea Town Council	Support the revisions to the Policy	No	No
5. Local Resident	<p>Seeks certain matters to be addressed on a planning decision as follows:</p> <p>for betting shops including limits on size and refusal if another betting shop is already in existence and</p> <p>for casinos consideration to be given to natural light access.</p> <p>Comments on design of gambling premises, in particular toilet provision , facilities for the disabled and escape provisions</p> <p>Would like to see numbers of fixed odds betting terminals reduced and access limited to 10.00 to 17.00.</p>	<p>These matters are planning considerations and there are no provisions within the Gambling Act to deal with them.</p> <p>These matters are dealt with under other legislation and are not part of the Gambling Policy</p> <p>S172(8) of the Act provides that the holder of a betting premises licence may make available up to four gaming machines. This permission includes fixed odds betting terminals. In deciding whether to impose conditions to limit the number of betting machines, each application will be on its own merits and account will be taken of Codes of Practice or Guidance issued under the Act.(see 19.5 of the policy)</p> <p>The Act prohibits gambling facilities in betting shops between 22.00 and 07.00. the Authority has no power to limit machine availability times outside those hours.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>