

**Statement of Gambling Act Policy
Gambling Act 2005 Draft Policy Consultation**

End of Consultation Period Comments

| Consultee | Comment |
|--|---|
| Policy Development Officer Gambling Commission | Update Section 9 with commission's new address:- Gambling Commission Victoria Square House, Victoria Square, Birmingham, B2 4BP Tel: 0121 2306500 |
| Burley Parish Meeting | Thinks the Council should prohibit casinos in Rutland, as the problems with gambling outweigh any good such as employment. |
| Ketton Sports Association | No comments other than that they are happy with the contents, as far as they affect the Sports Association. |
| Wing Parish Council | Thinks the Council should prohibit casinos in Rutland |
| Ashwell Parish Council | Casinos should be prohibited in Rutland |
| Market Overton Bowls Club | Casinos should be prohibited in Rutland as they would not be a good idea in Rutland |
| Langham Parish Council | Casinos are not required in rural Rutland, have a negative response. |
| Leicestershire Constabulary | No particular comment – In their view professionally run casinos in appropriate locations can make a positive contribution to night time economies. Premises that utilise gaming machines as the main source of entertainment, if not strictly managed and monitored they can become a local magnet for young people and spawn anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance, aware that no such premises exist in Rutland at the moment but would be pleased to comment on individual applicants as they arise. |
| Oakham Bowling Club | Do not wish to comment on the draft policy. |
| Rutland Together 'Leisure, Sports and the Arts Sub Group' | No specific comments. |
| Lyddington Parish Council | Not in favour of casinos or other gambling establishments in Rutland, urges the Council to prohibit casinos in Rutland. |
| Ryhall Parish Council | Not in favour of a casino in the county |
| Greetham Parochial Church Council | Against a casino in the county due to problems that can arise with debt and addiction, and associated mental and physical health impacts on families affected. Experience of problems gained through church work, work with prisoners and the CAB. |
| Web site results | Should Rutland County Council include a 'no casino' resolution in the statement of Gambling Policy? (this would mean that Rutland County Council would not issue any casino licences) Results Yes 39 No 25 |

Bond Pearce LLP
3 Temple Quay, Temple Back East
Bristol, BS1 6DZ

On behalf of The Association of British
Bookmakers

Welcomes the new legislation
Door Supervision Paragraph 9.26 policy be reflected
by stating
*“there is no evidence that the operation of betting offices
has required door supervisors for the protection of the
public. The authority will make a door supervision
requirement only if there is clear evidence from the history
of trading at the premises that the premises cannot be
adequately supervised from the counter and that door
supervision is both necessary and proportionate”*
Betting Machines section 181 suggested the policy
state

*“While the authority has discretion as to the number,
nature and circumstances of use of betting machines,
there is no evidence that such machines give rise to
regulatory concerns. This authority will consider limiting
the number of machines only where there is clear
evidence that such machines have been or are likely to be
used in breach of the licensing objectives. Where there is
such evidence, this authority may consider, when
reviewing the licence, the ability of staff to monitor the use
of such machines from the counter”.*

Re-site applications

It is requested that the policy positively encourage, or
at least state that the authority will give sympathetic
consideration to, re-sites with the same locality and
extensions in order to enhance the quality of the
facility provided for the benefit of the betting public.

Enforcement, it is requested that the policy includes
wording along the following lines

*“The authority recognises that certain bookmakers have a
number of premises within its area. In order to ensure that
any compliance issues are recognised and resolved at the
earliest stage, operators are requested to give the
authority a single named point of contact, who should be a
senior individual, and whom the authority will contact first
should any compliance queries or issued arise”.*

Miscellaneous Paragraph 1.8

Under the heading “Transitional Arrangement” not
sure what the basis is for the suggestion in the last
sentence of that paragraph that the police can make
a representation in relation to conversion of an
existing licence. (it may be transposed from a policy
statement in relation to the Licensing Act 2003) will
you kindly clarify the position.

Paragraph 2.5

The final paragraph states *“non compliance with other
statutory requirements may be taken into account in
reaching a decision about whether to grant a licence, but
only if relevant representations are received”* can the
statement be amended so as to make it clear that the
existence or otherwise of planning permission is not
something that can be taken into account even is a
representation is raised in relation to it.