

APPENDIX 2

Gambling Policy Statement of Principles consultation | ABB response

August 2015

Introduction

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 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. 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.

It is important that this is also set within the context of declining betting shop numbers. 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.

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.

- **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

"...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 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.

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:

"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

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.

Licensees must take into account relevant matters identified in the licensing authority's statement of licensing policy 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 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.

- **Evidence based approach**

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.

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 particularly comment on this in relation to paragraph 1.10 in the Council's statement: "Should any specific policy be decided upon with regard to areas where gambling premises should not be located, this statement will be updated. It should be noted that any such policy would not preclude any application being made and that each application will be decided on its merits, with the onus being upon the applicant to show how potential concerns can be overcome."

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.

- **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**

It is our view 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.

- **Operators' risk assessments**

As indicated, any exposition of risk in the Statement of Principles should not be based on anything less than empirical evidence and proportionality needs to be applied to all licensing decisions. For example successive prevalence surveys and health surveys tells us that problem gambling rates in the UK are stable (0.6%) and possibly falling.

Although our 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 would be against better regulation principles with operators being allowed to gear risk assessment to their own operational processes; informed by Statements of Principle and the local area profile.

- **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.

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 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.

Contact: For any responses or requests for additional information please contact [REDACTED], Public Affairs Executive [REDACTED].

Response from: The Bingo Association

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 August 2015 15:26
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Revision of Gambling Policy 2016-2019

Dear Mr [REDACTED]

Thank you for informing The Bingo Association of Sunderland City Council draft Gambling Policy document.

The Bingo Association has not been called the British Bingo Association since the 1990s, when the current name was adopted.

I note that the section below, copied from 12.1 of the draft policy purports to refer to paragraph 18.8 of the fifth edition of the Gambling Commission's guidance to LAs. However, the wording below comes from the third edition of this advice and this particular section was deleted in the GC's e-bulletin to LAs dated 7th September 2012.

This authority also notes the Guidance at paragraph 18.8 regarding the unusual circumstances in which the splitting of pre-existing premises into two adjacent premises might be permitted, and in particular that it is not permissible to locate eight categories B3 gaming machines in one of the resulting premises, as the gaming machine entitlement for that premises would be exceeded.

The entitlement to category B3 machines was increased in 2011 to 20% of the total machine estate in both bingo licensed premises and AGCs. Please see attached S.I. and explanatory letter from DCMS setting out the particular circumstances for businesses licenced after the introduction of this change in 2011.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Company Secretary



Licensing Section
Sunderland City Council
Jack Crawford House
Commercial Road
Sunderland
SR2 8QR

Sent by e-mail

14th August 2015

Dear Sir

Consultation on Sunderland 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.

We have detailed below our response:-

Coral Racing Limited are 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'. We kindly suggest that it is worth noting that the Local Authority should not take into account any moral objections to gambling either when judging applications.

Whilst it is not detailed within the consultation document, Coral Racing Limited recognise the requirement to supply risk assessments with future applications following the consultation completion and seek to clarify an area which the Council will take into account when considering applications for Premises Licences. Specifically and in relation to the note that the Licensing Authority will take into account 'the proximity of the application whereby its location may impact on children & vulnerable persons being harmed or exploited by gambling'. Whilst the list of such locations is yet to be created by the Council, we would like to point out the following:-

- 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.
- Coral knows of no evidence that children coming from schools for example are gaining access to betting offices. Coral's general experience, in common with every bookmaker, is that children are not



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. 641800
Tel: 020 3288 7000 Fax: 020 3288 7050



company

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.

The reason for Coral's caution against making such 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.

For example:

- 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.

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 specific locations (as there is no evidence that there is a link between such venues and a betting office), however notwithstanding this, such locations would automatically be included with the operators risk assessment submitted when the application is considered.

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

Yours faithfully,


Director of Development – Coral Retail