

Three responses were received to the consultation.

The first is from Gamcare, a charity helping those with gambling problems. It is a general response to the policy, and does not comment on the content. It makes some general recommendations about what councils may want to include in statements of Gambling Policy.

A number of the suggestions are already included in the Local Area Profile for the authority's area. A recommendation is made that the council primarily consider applications from Gamcare Certified operators. The Gambling Act requires that each application is considered on its own merits, and therefore this proposal cannot be included in the statement.

The second response is from Novomatic UK, a gaming and amusement machine manufacturer and provider. They make a number of comments in respect of the policy which are taken in turn.

1. It is suggested that there should be reference to the Regulators Code, which authorities are subject to in matters of regulation. The requirements for regulators are set out separately in this code, and the authority considers that to repeat it here would be duplication.
2. Amendment made to wording
3. It is suggested that the detail regarding public nuisance be clearer. Having reviewed the wording officers are satisfied that no change is needed. The paragraph clearly states that public nuisance, whilst not a licensing objective is not excluded from consideration if it is caused by, or associated, with gambling.
4. Officers do not feel that clarification is needed here as a list of the responsible authorities are listed both in the Act and in Appendix B of the document.
5. It is suggested that part of the wording in relation to location of premises is contradictory. Officers have considered the wording of these paragraphs and have removed the reference to applications not normally being granted. They are satisfied that with the removal of this single sentence the section is not contradictory.
6. It is suggested that there should be the addition of similar considerations of conditions by applicants for Bingo, Betting and Casino premises as is listed under FEC and AGC sections. Officers have reviewed the section and added this information.

The third response is from Bristol City Council's Public Health team. Initially they comment that the policy is legalistic in places, and plain English in others. Because the policy is a statutory requirement and must include certain information it is

required to be legalistic in some areas. We have tried to include plain English where possible. They also comment that the use of 'may' makes the policy appear weak in places. The policy is guidance and must not be implemented without consideration for the merits of any individual case, and therefore the use of 'may' rather than 'must' is appropriate in some instances. Officers do not consider this dilutes the intention or effect of the policy.

It is suggested that the third licensing objective defined in the policy should also include young people in its definition. The licensing objectives are set in the Act and cannot be amended. This change has therefore not been made.

It is suggested that more reference is given to the Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice (LCCP) set by the Gambling Commission. This is administered by them and the codes must be complied with by operators. The Gambling Commission regulate and enforce the LCCPs. To include further reference in the Council's Policy would be duplication and this is not considered necessary.

Comments are made on the location of premises, in particular in relation to schools. The LAP will be a key tool for the council to assess whether the appropriate considerations have been made in respect of new premises, however officers have removed a line in the relevant paragraph stating that applications near schools will not normally be granted as it was contradictory to the next paragraph on the risk assessments and LAP. It is not therefore considered that any further change is required in relation to this section.

The response also makes comments in relation to the Local Area Profile. The Local Area Profile is referred to in the policy, but is a separate document. This is in order that the LAP can be updated and amended when necessary to reflect changes in the statistical information, and risk information included in it. The comments suggest that additional facilities should be included, however on reviewing the language officers are satisfied that they are already listed in the LAP.

Officers have therefore made a number of small changes to the policy as consulted upon, as detailed above.