

APPENDIX 1(a)

Response from Chair of Birmingham Safeguarding Children Board (BSCB)

From: Jane Held

Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 9:37 AM

To: Licensing

Cc: Simon Cross; Jane Held

Subject: response to consultation on Gambling Act statement of principles

Please remove Birmingham Safeguarding Children Board from the list of responsible authorities. We are unable to fulfil that function as we are not a legal body in the relevant meaning of the term. We do not have any operational responsibilities. Our position is exactly the same as it is with licensing.

Jane

Jane Held

Independent Chair

Birmingham Safeguarding Children Board

Room B54, Council House Extension, Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BU

Tel: 0121 464 2612 mob: 07771 556391

Fax: 0121 303 8427

Email: jane.held@birmingham.gov.uk; jane@held1.wanadoo.co.uk

Web: www.lscbbirmingham.org.uk

Birmingham Basics:

- Always see the child first
- Never do nothing
- Do with, not to, others
- Do the simple things better
- Have conversations, build relationships
- Outcomes not inputs



Right Service, Right Time
Delivering effective support for children
and families in Birmingham

For more information visit www.lscbbirmingham.org.uk



Response from Planning Authority

Dear Emma

Thank you for your enquiry

You may use this email address to update your records

The amendments for Planning and Regeneration as a responsible authority, and have no comments.

I hope this information is of assistance to you

Kind regards

Planning and Regeneration

Click I planningandregenerationenquiries@birmingham.gov.uk I Visit I 1 Lancaster Circus I Birmingham B4 7DJ

planningportal.gov.uk I Check if you need planning permission I make planning applications online

birmingham.gov.uk/planning I Comment on planning applications I search for planning applications and appeals I policy information I Regeneration

PLEASE REPLY TO: planningandregenerationenquiries@birmingham.gov.uk AND NOT TO INDIVIDUALS



Response from Novomatic UK for Luxury Leisure

From: elizabeth speed [<mailto:elizabethspeed@luxuryleisure.co.uk>]

Sent: Friday, September 18, 2015 1:04 PM

To: Licensing

Subject: Gambling Act 2005 - Statement of Principles Consultation

Dear Sirs

Re: Gambling Act 2005 – Statement of Principles Consultation

On behalf of Luxury Leisure, I make the following comments in response to the above consultation draft (the "Draft"):-

1. As the Authority will appreciate, in matters of regulation under the Gambling Act 2005 (the "Act"), it is subject to the Regulators' Code. That code imposes a number of obligations on the Authority, including one that it should carry out its activities in a way that supports those they regulate to comply and grow. Additionally, when designing and reviewing policies, the Authority must, among other things, understand and minimise the negative economic impact of its regulatory activities and regulate and minimise the costs of compliance of those it regulates. Further, the Authority should take an evidence-based approach in determining priority risks and recognise the compliance record of those it regulates. We suggest the Draft be amended to include a statement that the Authority recognises that it is subject to and will comply with the Regulators' Code in relation to matters of gambling licensing and enforcement.
2. The Draft refers on page 11 to the Gambling Commission's concept of Primary Use and the "indicators of betting activity". The Authority will be aware that this concept does not feature in the Gambling Act 2005, that the Commission has been successfully challenged on this issue and that it faces further formal challenges in the coming months.
3. In the first bullet point on page 12 the Draft states that the 3rd licensing objective means that children must be prevented from closely observing or being in close proximity to gambling. Nowhere does the legislation say this and indeed children are permitted to take part in some form of gambling. As such they are plainly permitted to be in close proximity to it and to observe it. This error is repeated on page 16 of the Draft.
4. The suggestion at page 13 that the fact that neighboring premises may not have separate rates registration means that the premises are in fact one for the purposes of the Gambling Act 2005, is with respect, without foundation. The concept of premises under the gambling legislation has nothing to do with rates or ownership and we suggest that this passage should be corrected.
5. As the Draft states, the Authority must avoid duplication with other regimes. On this basis it must avoid duplication of the conditions imposed by the LCCP or through the mandatory conditions imposed by statutory instrument. The Draft nonetheless repeats those provisions, suggesting that it might impose conditions:-

- In relation to Category C machines (page 17) – these are already dealt with by mandatory conditions;
- In relation to AGCs (page 18) – these are already covered by LCCP and mandatory conditions;
- In relation to FECs (page 19) – these are already covered by LCCP and mandatory conditions;
- In relation to Bingo premises (page 21) – these are already covered by LCCP and mandatory conditions; and
- In relation to Betting premises (page 22) – these are already covered by LCCP and mandatory conditions.

We believe that it is confusing and inappropriate to refer to these matters in the Draft as they are already dealt with by legislation.

6. At pages 14 and 15, the Draft suggest that the proximity of premises to a range of stated establishments may not be consistent with the licensing objectives. With respect, this is pre-judging the issue. As the Authority will be aware, from April 2016, operators must have risk assessments in place for their premises - dealing with risks posed to the licensing objectives by the premises in the local area. If any risks arise from the proximity of the types of building the Draft refers to, the operator will deal with it in their risk assessment. The mere fact that such a building is close by does not automatically present a risk – to suggest otherwise would be to pre-judge an application and thereby be in conflict with the Authority's obligations.

We hope the above will prove helpful.

Yours faithfully
 Elizabeth Speed
 Group General Counsel
Novomatic UK
For Luxury Leisure

Response from Gosschalks for the Association of British Bookmakers

Birmingham City Council
Licensing Section
PO Box 17013
Birmingham
B6 9ES

Please ask for: Richard Taylor
Direct Tel: 01482 590216
Email: rt@gosschalks.co.uk
Our ref: RJT / JULIEGA /
097505.00004
#GS419220
Your ref:
Date: 14 October 2015

Dear Sirs,

Re: Gambling Act 2005 Policy Statement Consultation

We act for the Association of British Bookmakers (ABB) and have received instructions to respond on behalf of our client to the current consultation on the Council's review of its gambling policy statement.

The ABB represents over 80% of the high street betting market. Its members include large national operators such as William Hill, Ladbrokes, Coral and Paddy Power, as well as almost 100 smaller independent bookmakers.

This response will explain the ABB approach to partnership working with local authorities, it will detail its 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 and will then make specific comment with regard to any statement(s) of concern that are welcomed in your draft policy.

The ABB is concerned to ensure that any changes are not implemented in such a way as to fundamentally change the premises licence regime through undermining the "aim to permit" principle contained within s153 Gambling Act 2005.

The current regime already adequately offers key protections for communities and already provides a clear process (including putting the public on notice) for representations/objections to premises licence applications. The recent planning law changes effective since April 2015 have also already increased the ability of local authorities to consider applications for new premises, as all new betting shops must now apply for planning permission.

It is important that any consideration of the draft policy and its implementation at a local level is put into context. There has recently been press coverage suggesting that there has been a proliferation of betting offices and a rise in problem gambling rates. This is factually incorrect.

Queens Gardens, Hull, HU1 3DZ T 01482 324252 F 0870 600 5984
E info@gosschalks.co.uk W www.gosschalks.co.uk DX 11902 – Hull

A list of partners is available for inspection at the above address.
This firm is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority under number 6121

Lexcel
Legal Practice Quality Mark
Law Society Accredited

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 far as problem gambling is concerned, successive prevalence surveys and health surveys reveal that problem gambling rates in the UK are stable (0.6%) and possibly falling.

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.

There are a number of examples of the ABB working closely and successfully in partnership with local authorities.

LGA – ABB Betting Partnership Framework

In January 2015 the ABB signed a partnership agreement with the Local Government Association (LGA). This was developed over a period of months by a specially formed Betting Commission consisting of councillors and betting shop firms and 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 *“...desire on both sides to increase joint-working in order to try and use existing powers to tackle local concerns, whatever they might be.”*

The framework built 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.

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.

Lessons learnt 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:
"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."

Describing the project, Glasgow's City Treasurer and Chairman of a cross-party Sounding Board on gambling, Cllr Paul Rooney said:
"This project breaks new ground in terms of the industry sharing information, both between operators and, crucially, with their regulator."

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.

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.

Local area risk assessments

With effect from 6th 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.

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.

The ABB is concerned that overly onerous requirements on operators to review their local risk assessments with unnecessary frequency could be damaging. As set out in the LCCP a review should only be required in response to significant local or premises change. In the ABB's view this

should be where evidence can be provided to demonstrate that the change could impact the premises' ability to uphold the three licensing objectives.

Although ABB members will be implementing risk assessment at a local premises level, we do not believe that it is for the licensing authority to prescribe the form of that risk assessment. We believe that to do so would be against better regulation principles. Instead operators should be allowed to gear their risk assessments to their own operational processes informed by Statements of Principles and the local area profile.

The ABB supports the 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.

Local Area Profiles – Need for an evidence based approach

It is important that any risks identified in the local area profile 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Employing additional licence conditions

The ABB believes that additional conditions should only be imposed in exceptional circumstances where there are clear reasons for doing so - in light of the fact that there are already mandatory and default conditions attached to any premises licence. The ABB is concerned that the imposition of additional licensing conditions could become commonplace if there are no clear requirements in the revised licensing policy statements as to the need for evidence.

This would further increase variation across licensing authorities and create uncertainty amongst operators as to licensing requirements, over complicating the licensing process both for operators and local authorities.

Specific Policy Comments

Part B – General Principles

The first paragraph under this heading indicates that “licensing authorities are able to exclude default conditions and also attach others, where it is believed to be appropriate”. The draft statement of principles needs to be clear that conditions in addition to the mandatory and default conditions will only be imposed where there is evidence of a particular risk in the circumstances of that particular case such that the mandatory and default conditions need to be supplemented. The imposition of conditions must be evidence based and conditions should not be imposed where there are mere concerns, a perceived need or whether it is otherwise felt appropriate.

This part of the policy indicates that moral objections and unmet demand are not criteria for the licensing authority when considering applications. It is respectfully submitted that this paragraph be expanded to state that issues of nuisance and the likelihood of the grant of planning permission or building regulation approval are not issues that can be taken into account when considering an application for a premises licence.

The following paragraph deals with betting being the primary activity of a licensed premises. Obviously this is only pertinent to betting premises and this paragraph, once redrafted (would be better placed later in the policy in the “betting premises” section in part 6. Irrespective of where this paragraph is placed, it needs to be redrafted to take into account recent case law. The statement of principle ignores the recent case of *Luxury Leisure v The Gambling Commission* – May 2014 in which it was held that condition 16 (primary gambling activity) does not require a contest between over the counter betting and the use of machines. There must be sufficient facilities for betting if gaming machines are to be utilised but the requirement is simply that sufficient facilities are available. The actual use of those facilities is not an issue. There is therefore no need to

demonstrate that betting will “continue to be the primary activity of the premises.” The only requirement is to demonstrate that there are sufficient facilities.

Paragraph (iv) deals with location. Reference is made to the proposed operation of a new premises license potentially not being reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives due to its proximity to schools, a residential area, a centre for children or a centre for children or vulnerable adults. Premises where there are children will be highlighted in the local area risk assessment which will be submitted with new applications and material variations after 6th April 2016. The reference to residential areas, however, needs to be deleted. Betting offices are situated in areas of high footfall or high population. They are usually, therefore, situated in areas where there are children and children will pass betting offices every day. There has been betting regulation for over 50 years. Betting offices are subject to mandatory and default conditions and operators have developed policies and procedures to ensure that those who are not able to bet do not do so. The fact that a proposed premises in a residential area is not a relevant consideration and therefore this should be removed.

The final paragraph of this section suggests that the local authority may implement a policy with regard to areas where gambling premises should not be located. Any such policy may be unlawful and is certainly contrary to the overriding principles of “aim to permit” contained within section 153 Gambling Act 2005. The reversal of the burden of proof in the final sentence which requires the applicants to demonstrate why an application should be granted is similarly contrary to that principle. This paragraph should be removed and replaced with the simple assertion that each application will be determined on its own merits.

Preventing Gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime

This paragraph should be expanded to make it clear that issues of nuisance are not relevant considerations and that the Gambling Commission has defined disorder as intending to mean activity that is more serious and disruptive than mere nuisance.

Conditions

The statement of principles would be assisted by an indication that the starting point for consideration of any application is that it will be granted subject only to the mandatory and default conditions as these are usually sufficient to ensure operation that is reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives. The draft statement of principles should make it clear that additional conditions will only be imposed where there is evidence of a risk to the licensing objectives that requires that the mandatory and default conditions be supplemented. The policy should be clear that conditions will only be imposed where there is evidence of a need to do so and not where there is mere “perceived need” to which there is a reference in this section.

Conclusion

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, which is mandatory for all our members.

ABB and its 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 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.

Yours faithfully,



GOSSCHALKS

Submission from the Campaign for Fairer Gambling

From: Lucy Knighton [<mailto:lucy@bcsagency.com>]

Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 2:50 PM

To: Mark Rogers

Subject: Re: Submission from the Campaign for Fairer Gambling for the review of the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2016/19

Date: 04 September 2015

Dear Council Leader,

Re: Submission from the Campaign for Fairer Gambling for the review of the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2016/19

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.

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 [Campaign for Fairer Gambling](#) in conjunction with its more focused [Stop the FOBTs campaign](#) 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).

We would appreciate if you could share the important contents of this mailing with your Chief Licensing Officer.

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.

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.

The recent government response to [93 Councils led by Newham](#) 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 consequently FOBTs, at the door of licencing authorities. Marcus Jones MP, Minister for Local Government, wrote:

"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".

He goes on to advise councils of their existing powers under the licensing process, which many local authorities already recognise as limited in scope.

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.

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".

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.

Enforcement

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 [test purchasing](#) of premises and staff employed on those premises to transact gambling.

The Gambling Commission (the Commission) notes that "*it is the responsibility of operators to manage the risks to the licensing objectives that their activities may present*". Licensing 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 self-exclusion, under age controls, anti-money laundering policies and procedures are within the remit of a licensing authority.

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.

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 [low level](#) and more [highly-organised incidents](#) that revealed serious weaknesses in operator controls.

Premise Licence Conditions

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: "*The licensing process gives authorities considerable scope to attach conditions to licences where that is necessary to achieve the licensing objectives*".

The tenth betting shop to open in London's China Town was subject to attached conditions by the Licensing Authority following concerns from the local community and representations from the Police. They included:

- A. Seating provided for use by customers whilst playing FOBTs must be secured to the floor – this is viewed as anticipating [aggressive behaviour](#) 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 premises must be kept
- 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.

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.

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.

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.

Locally determined conditions are recommended by the Commission who says: *“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.”*

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 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: *“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.”* Hence the imposition of conditions to deal with problems emanating from betting shops but occurring outside of the premises is limited in scope.

It is estimated [over 100 betting shops per week suffer attacks on FOBTs](#) 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.

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.

Section 181 of the Act however contains an express power for licencing authorities to restrict the number of *betting machines*, 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 and ability of staff to monitor their use.

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.

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.

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.

Closing note

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.

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".

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.

Sector/Machines	Terminals	Yield (millions)	Yield Share
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	

Figures from the Gambling Commission Industry Statistics to September 2014

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.

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.

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.

If you would like further information, please visit www.stopthefobts.org or contact us at info@stopthefobts.org to discuss in more detail.

Yours sincerely,
Derek Webb

Adrian Parkinson

Matt Zarb-Cousin

The Campaign for Fairer Gambling
www.fairergambling.org / www.stopthefobts.org

Response from Coral Racing Ltd

Licensing Section
PO Box 15908
Aston Cross Business Village
50 Rocky Lane
Aston
Birmingham
B6 5RQ

23rd October 2015

Dear Sir,

Consultation on Birmingham City Council's Statement of Principles – Gambling Act 2005

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.

Coral Racing Limited are broadly supportive of the document. It again notes that the Board when considering applications are still required to 'aim to permit gambling' where this is 'reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives', additionally noting that it should not take into account of any moral objections to gambling.

Whilst each application will be judged on its merits as mentioned at several points within your statement, we would like to politely highlight that Coral knows of no evidence that the location of a licensed betting office within the proximity of schools or residential areas (contained within your draft statement on Page 15), causes harm to the licensing objectives.

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. Additionally, we have multiple shops placed alongside other high street businesses within communities in residential areas across the country, again with no indication that such premises are causing harm to the licensing objectives.

Coral Racing Limited recognise the requirement to supply risk assessments with future applications & variations following the consultation completion (requirement is from 6th April 2016) and whilst this detail is not currently included within the Statement, we would be pleased to contribute to a consultation when it is.

Coral's experience is that through all it does, it achieves an exemplary degree of compliance already, and attracts negligible evidence of regulatory harm. Through the additional local risk assessment to be introduced,



Coral Racing Limited
One Stratford Place, Montfichet Road, London E20 1EJ
Registered Office: New Castle House, Castle Boulevard, Nottingham NG7 1FT
Registered in England No. 541800
Tel: 020 3288 7000 Fax: 020 3288 7050



a GALAX CORAL company

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. A number of Council's have created long lists of locations which by inclusion are required to be risk assessed & often with strict templates to be completed. Coral are of the opinion that as there is no evidence that the proximity of such locations causes harm to the licensing objectives, it is best left to the operators to provide their own risk assessments. Naturally, if these do not meet the level desired by the Council, we would adjust to suit.

If we can provide any further information, we would be pleased to do so.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'John Liddle', with a stylized flourish at the end.

John Liddle
Director of Development – Coral Retail