

APPENDIX TO THE BUNDLE
SECTION 6

Subsequently Developed Parked Casino Licences and Acquisitions (Converted Casino Licence Applications in 28 Licensing Authority Areas)

Key:

* Developed as an electric casino straight away

+ Licences that have been parked pending development at another site

+ * Parked and developed as an electric casino at a later date

Licences developed at their final site

1	2008	Manchester Hard Rock closed Casino to G Casino	Grosvenor+*	Manchester City Council
2	2008	Ladbrokes Paddington Casino to Cumberland Hotel	Clermont Leisure+ (on acquisition)	City of Westminster Council
3	2008	Scarborough to E Casino	Grosvenor+*	North Yorkshire Council (formerly Scarborough Council)
4	2008	Genting closed Luton International to Skimpot Road	Genting* (on acquisition)	Luton Borough Council
5	2008	Gala Glasgow Rotunda to Gala Merchant City	Gala+*	Glasgow City Council
6	2008	Gala closed Bristol to new Bristol Casino	Gala*	Bristol City Council
7	2008	Gala closed Nottingham to Maid Marian Way	Gala*	Nottingham City Council
8	2009	Leeds closed Moortown to Leeds Merrion Way	Grosvenor*	Leeds City Council
9	2009	Genting undeveloped new Glasgow St Enoch's to Genting Sauciehall Street	Genting* (undeveloped new licence to new electric)	Glasgow City Council

10	2009	Grosvenor closed Liverpool to E Casino	Grosvenor+*	Liverpool City Council
11	2009	Gala closed Piccadilly to London Park Lane Hilton Hotel	Gala+	City of Westminster Council
12	2009	Blue Chip Walsall to Walsall Grosvenor	Grosvenor* (on acquisition)	Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
13	2009	Development of Manchester parked licence to create separate electric casino	Grosvenor	Manchester City Council
14	2010	Grosvenor Manchester Whitworth Street to Manchester G Casino	Grosvenor+	Manchester City Council
15	2010	Connoisseur Club to Gloucester Road Casino	Grosvenor+*	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
16	2010	50 St James Mayfair to Empire Poker Club creating separate casino within same building with a dividing passage way	LCI*	City of Westminster Council
17	2010	Parked Reading Mecca to initial Reading G	Grosvenor+	Reading Borough Council
18	2011	Nottingham Victoria to Maid Marion Way	Gala* (on acquisition)	Nottingham City Council

19	2011	Parked Stockton Mecca to extension to form Stockton Casino	Grosvenor (implementation)	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
20	2011	G Casino Manchester to new Didsbury development	Grosvenor (implementation)	Manchester City Council
21	2011	Parked Birkenhead Mecca to New Brighton development	Grosvenor (implementation)	Metropolitan Borough of Wirral
22	2012	Reading Genting Racino to Genting Richfield Avenue	Genting+*	Reading Borough Council
23	2012	Parked Southend Mecca to new Park Hotel development	Grosvenor (implementation)	Southend-on-Sea Council
24	2012	Clermont Cumberland to Victoria Training Room	Grosvenor+ (on acquisition)	City of Westminster Council
25	2012	Reading parked licence to new Reading G development	Grosvenor (implementation)	Reading Borough Council
26	2012	Grosvenor closed Casino Hove to basement of Brighton Casino	Grosvenor+	Brighton and Hove City Council

27	2012	Swansea Mecca parked licence moved to High Street Casino to create second electric casino	Grosvenor+* (implementation as Electric Casino)	City and County of Swansea Council
28	2012	Southampton closed Harbour House to Genting Southampton	Genting* (on acquisition)	Southampton City Council
29	2012	Hilton Hotel to Park Lane Casino	Silverbond Limited (on acquisition from Gala)	City of Westminster Council
30	2012	Victoria Training Room to new separate poker room casino on 2 nd floor (accessed via unlicensed reception and staircase and landing lobbies)	Grosvenor (implementation of additional licence)	City of Westminster Council
31	2013	Liverpool E to Leo Grosvenor Casino	Grosvenor* (on acquisition)	Liverpool City Council
32	2013	Edinburgh Mecca parked casino licence to Corinthian parked venue	Corinthian+ (sale of licence required by CMA)	City of Edinburgh Council
33	2013	Bristol closed Triangle Independent to Genting Bristol	Genting+ (on acquisition)	Bristol City Council
34	2013	Clermont Glasgow to Mecca Bingo Glasgow	Grosvenor+ (on acquisition)	Glasgow City Council

35	2013	Clermont Bradford to Mecca Bingo Bradford	Grosvenor+ (on acquisition)	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
36	2013	Clermont Wolverhampton to Mecca Bingo Bilston	Grosvenor+ (on acquisition)	City of Wolverhampton Council
37	2013	Kingdom Casino Sheffield to Grosvenor Sheffield	Grosvenor+* (on acquisition)	Sheffield City Council
38	2013	Parked Oldbury Mecca to reduced size casino	Grosvenor+* (implementation as Electric)	Sandwell Council
39	2014	Genting closed Derby to Derby Riverlights	Genting*	Derby City Council
40	2014	Gala New Coventry (undeveloped) to Ricoh G Casino	Grosvenor* (on acquisition)	Coventry City Council
41	2014	Gala New Northampton (undeveloped) to Grosvenor Regent Road	Grosvenor* (on acquisition)	West Northamptonshire Council (formerly Northampton Council)
42	2015	Grosvenor closed Southsea to Portsmouth Gunwharf	Grosvenor*	Portsmouth City Council

43	2015	Genting closed Leith to Genting Edinburgh Fountainbridge	Genting*	City of Edinburgh Council
44	2015	Grosvenor Princes Glasgow on closure to Grosvenor Merchant City	Grosvenor*	Glasgow City Council
45	2015	Mecca Bradford (former Clermont) to Grosvenor Bradford	Grosvenor*	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
46	2016	Mecca Glasgow (former Clermont) to Grosvenor Riverboat	Grosvenor*	Glasgow City Council
47	2016	Genting closed Coventry to Genting Coventry Arena	Genting*	Coventry City Council
48	2016	Genting closed Manchester to Genting Portland Road	Genting*	Manchester City Council
49	2018	Napoleons closed Sheffield Eccleshall to Owlerton	A and S+	Sheffield City Council
50	2018	Parked former Hove licence developed as electric casino	Grosvenor	Brighton and Hove City Council

51	2018	Closed Clermont Club to Cumberland Hotel	Clermont Leisure+	City of Westminster Council
52	2018	Grosvenor closed Leeds Merrion to former Gala Westgate	Grosvenor*	Leeds City Council
53	2019	Golden Nugget to Empire Casino London	LCI+	City of Westminster Council
54	2019	Cumberland Hotel back to re-developed Clermont Club by new owners	Clermont Leisure (UK) Ltd	City of Westminster Council
55	2020	Ritz closed Casino to basement cellar of Hard Rock Café Piccadilly	Hard Rock CC London Limited+	City of Westminster Council
56	2021	Maxims/Palace Gate closed Casino (in administration)	Coastbright Limited in administration+	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
57	2023	Birmingham Clockfair (in administration) to Metropolitan	Metropolitan Gaming+	Birmingham City Council

List of Licensing Authority Areas

	Local Authority	Number
1	Manchester City Council	5
2	Westminster City Council	10
3	North Yorkshire Council (formerly Scarborough Council)	1
4	Luton Borough Council	1
5	Glasgow City Council	5
6	Bristol City Council	2
7	Leeds City Council	2
8	Liverpool City Council	2
9	Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council	1
10	Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	2
11	Birmingham City Council	1
12	Reading Borough Council	3
13	Brighton and Hove City Council	2
14	City and County of Swansea Council	1
15	Southampton City Council	1
16	Metropolitan Borough of Wirral	1
17	Southend-on-Sea Council	1
18	City of Edinburgh Council	2
19	Portsmouth City Council	1
20	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council	2
21	City of Wolverhampton Council	1
22	Sheffield City Council	2
23	Sandwell Council	1
24	Derby City Council	1
25	Coventry City Council	2
26	West Northamptonshire Council (formerly Northampton Council)	1
27	Nottingham City Council	2
28	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	1

Total: 57

CASINO LICENCES GRANTED UNDER THE GAMING ACT 1968 AND GRANTED AS CONVERTED CASINO LICENCES UNDER TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS INCLUDING LICENCES THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN OPERATED UNDER THE 2005 ACT AND THOSE CLOSED AND PARKED IN THEIR ORIGINAL LOCATION IN OTHER LICENSING AUTHORITY AREAS

CATEGORY 1:

Closed in the early 2000's and not operated under the 2005 Act:

- Genting Walsall
- Genting Lytham St Annes
- Genting Great Yarmouth

CATEGORY 2:

Closed after 2005 Act was implemented but not re-located – all post 2010:

- Swansea Aspers
- Swansea Aspers second licence
- LCI Southend
- Glasgow Corinthian

CATEGORY 3:

Closed as a result of the opening of Victoria Gate (Large) Casino Leeds:

- LCI Leeds
- Grosvenor second Merrion Way Licence
- Grosvenor Casino Bradford
- Grosvenor second Casino Bradford

CATEGORY 4:

Closed as a result of the impact of the pandemic:

- Ritz Club in Ritz Hotel (acquired by Hard Rock CC London Limited and parked in basement of Hard Rock Café)
- Maxims Casino, Kensington (currently in administration)
- Genting Margate
- Genting Bristol
- Genting second licence Bristol parked at same site
- Genting Southport
- Genting Torquay
- Genting Nottingham
- Clockfair Birmingham (fell into administration and acquired recently by Metropolitan Gaming and parked)

- Grosvenor Russell Square
- Double Diamond Cardiff

CATEGORY 5:

1968 Act licences not as yet developed and implemented:

- Cheshire Sporting Club Manchester (parked and recently re-located)
- Aspers Bournemouth
- State Casino Liverpool
- Genting Hull
- Corinthian Edinburgh

Casino Licences that have not been maintained:

- International Casino Aberdeen
- Bannatynes Newcastle
- Soul Casino Aberdeen
- Gala Casino Dundee
- Gala Casino Wolverhampton
- Reds Casino Huddersfield
- Grosvenor Acocks Green

Cookies on Legislation.gov.uk

The cookies on legislation.gov.uk do two things: they remember any settings you've chosen so you don't have to choose them on every page, and they help us understand how people browse our website, so we can make improvements and fix problems. We need your consent to use some of these cookies.

Yes, these cookies are OK

Find out more or set individual cookie preferences

No, I want to reject all cookies

Cymraeg

[Home](#) [Browse Legislation](#) [New Legislation](#) [Coronavirus Legislation](#) [Changes To Legislation](#)

[Search Legislation](#)

Title: Year: Number: Type: [Search](#)

[Advanced Search \(including Welsh legislation in Welsh language\)](#)

The Gambling Act 2005 (Transitional Provisions) Order 2006

UK Statutory Instruments 2006 No. 1038 Article 2

[Table of Contents](#) [Content](#) [Explanatory Memorandum](#) [More Resources](#)

[Previous: Provision](#) | [Next: Provision](#)

[Plain View](#) | [Print Options](#)

Status: This is the original version (as it was originally made). This item of legislation is currently only available in its original format.

Modification of the powers of the Gambling Commission to issue certificates of consent

2.—(1) This article applies to the exercise by the Gambling Commission(1) of its powers to issue a certificate of consent under paragraph 4 of Schedule 2 to the 1968 Act during the period beginning on the date on which this Order comes into force and ending on the date on which the repeal of that paragraph by section 356(3)(g) and (4) of, and Schedule 17 to, the Gambling Act 2005 takes effect for all purposes.

(2) Where a consent application in respect of a casino licence is made on or after 29th April 2006, the Gambling Commission may only issue a certificate of consent on that application in the circumstances specified in paragraph (3).

(3) The circumstances are that—

- (a) the person making the application holds one or more casino licences in respect of premises in the same licensing area; and
- (b) the Gambling Commission is satisfied that the applicant intends to relinquish such a casino licence if the casino licence in respect of which the consent application is made is granted.

(4) In paragraph (3)(a) the reference to the same licensing area is—

- (a) where the premises to which the consent application relates are in England or Wales, to the local justice area in which those premises are situated; and
- (b) where the premises to which the consent application relates are in Scotland, to the licensing board area in which those premises are situated.

(1) The Gaming Act 1968 confers this function on the Gaming Board for Great Britain, but by virtue of the Gambling Act 2005 the function is now exercisable by the Gambling Commission. The Gambling Commission is established by section 20 of the Gambling Act 2005. Section 21 of that Act provides for the transfer of functions, rights and liabilities of the Gaming Board for Great Britain to the Gambling Commission. Sections 20 and 21 were brought into force by S.I. 2005/2455 on 1st October 2005. Schedule 5, paragraph 4, to the Gambling Act 2005 provides for a reference to the Gaming Board in any enactment to be treated after the commencement of section 21 as a reference to the Gambling Commission.

[Previous: Provision](#) | [Next: Provision](#)

[Help](#) [About Us](#) [Site Map](#) [Accessibility](#) [Contact Us](#) [Privacy Notice](#) [Cookies](#)

[Back to top](#)

OGL All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](#) except where [otherwise stated](#). This site additionally contains content derived from EUR-Lex, reused under the terms of the [Commission Decision 2011/833/EU](#) on the reuse of documents from the EU institutions. For more information see the [EUR-Lex public statement on re-use](#).

© Crown and database right

1.1.1 - Cooperation with the Commission

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences

1. As made plain in its Statement of principles for licensing and regulation, the Commission expects licensees to conduct their gambling operations in a way that does not put the licensing objectives at risk, to work with the Commission in an open and cooperative way and to disclose anything which the Commission would reasonably need to be aware of in exercising its regulatory functions. This includes, in particular, anything that is likely to have a material impact on the licensee's business or on the licensee's ability to conduct licensed activities compliantly. Licensees should have this principle in mind in their approach to, and when considering their compliance with, their obligations under the conditions attached to their licence and in relation to the following provisions of this code.

1.1.2 - Responsibility for third parties – all licences

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Licensees are responsible for the actions of third parties with whom they contract for the provision of any aspect of the licensee's business related to the licensed activities.
2. Licensees must ensure that the terms on which they contract with such third parties:
 - a. require the third party to conduct themselves in so far as they carry out activities on behalf of the licensee as if they were bound by the same licence conditions and subject to the same codes of practice as the licensee
 - b. oblige the third party to provide such information to the licensee as they may reasonably require in order to enable the licensee to comply with their information reporting and other obligations to the Commission
 - c. enable the licensee, subject to compliance with any dispute resolution provisions of such contract, to terminate the third party's contract promptly if, in the licensee's reasonable opinion, the third party is in breach of contract (including in particular terms included pursuant to this code provision) or has otherwise acted in a manner which is inconsistent with the licensing objectives, including for affiliates where they have breached a relevant advertising code of practice.

2.1.1 - Anti-money laundering – casino

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All remote and non-remote casino licences

1. In order to help prevent activities related to money laundering and terrorist financing, licensees should act in accordance with the Commission's guidance on anti-money laundering, The Prevention of Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism - Guidance for remote and non-remote casinos.

3.1.1 - Combating problem gambling

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Licensees must have and put into effect policies and procedures intended to promote socially responsible gambling including the specific policies and procedures required by the provisions of section 3 of this code.
2. Licensees must make an annual financial contribution to one or more organisation(s) which are approved by the Gambling Commission, and which between them deliver or support research into the prevention and treatment of gambling-related harms, harm prevention approaches and treatment for those harmed by gambling.

3.2.1 - Casinos SR code

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Licensees must have and put into effect policies and procedures designed to prevent underage gambling, and monitor the effectiveness of these.
2. Licensees must ensure that their policies and procedures take account of the structure and layout of their gambling premises.
3. Licensees must designate one or more supervisors for each casino entrance.
4. A supervisor's responsibilities include ensuring compliance with this section of the code.
5. A supervisor must implement the following procedures:
 - a. checking the age of customers who appear to be, or are suspected of being, underage
 - b. refusing entry to anyone unable to produce an acceptable form of identification, ie one which:

- i. contains a photograph from which the individual can be identified
 - ii. states the individual's date of birth
 - iii. is valid
 - iv. is legible and shows no signs of tampering or reproduction
 - c. taking action when there are unlawful attempts to enter the premises, including removing anyone who appears to be underage and cannot produce an acceptable form of identification.
- 6. Licensees must not deliberately provide facilities for gambling in such a way as to appeal particularly to children or young people, for example by reflecting or being associated with youth culture.
- 7. In premises restricted to adults, service must be refused in any circumstances where any adult is accompanied by a child or young person.
- 8. Licensees must take all reasonable steps to ensure that all staff understand their responsibilities for preventing underage gambling. This must include appropriate training which must cover all relevant prohibitions against inviting children or young persons to gamble or to enter gambling premises, and the legal requirements on returning stakes and not paying prizes to underage customers.
- 9. Licensees must conduct test purchasing or take part in collective test purchasing programmes as a means of providing reasonable assurance that they have effective policies and procedures to prevent underage gambling, and must provide their test purchase results to the Commission, in such a form or manner as the Commission may from time to time specify.

Read additional [guidance on the information requirements](#) contained within this section.

3.2.2 - Casinos ordinary code

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. There should be a sufficient number of supervisors at casino entrances to enable a considered judgement to be made about the age of everyone attempting to enter the casino and to take the appropriate action (for example checking identification) whilst at the same time not allowing others to enter unsupervised. The nature of this task means that it cannot be properly accomplished only by using CCTV; it will require a physical presence. Heavily used entrances may require more than one designated supervisor.
2. Supervisors may be assisted by other door keepers provided the supervisor retains the responsibility for compliance with this section of the code and deals personally with any case where there is any doubt or dispute as to someone's eligibility to enter.
3. The Commission considers acceptable forms of identification to include: any identification carrying the PASS logo (for example Citizencard or Validate); a military identification card; a driving licence (including provisional licence) with photocard; or a passport.
4. Licensees should put into effect procedures that require their staff to check the age of any customer who appears to them to be under 21.

5. Licensees should consider permanent exclusion from premises of any adult accompanied by a child or young person on more than one occasion to premises restricted to adults, or if there is reason to believe the offence was committed knowingly or recklessly.
6. Procedures should be put into effect for dealing with cases where a child or young person repeatedly attempts to gamble on premises restricted to adults, including oral warnings, reporting the offence to the Gambling Commission¹ and the police, and making available information on problem gambling.
7. In providing training to staff on their responsibilities for preventing underage gambling, licensees should have, as a minimum, policies for induction training and refresher training.

Read additional guidance on the information requirements contained within this section.

3.3.1 - Responsible gambling information

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences, except gaming machine technical, gambling software, host, ancillary remote bingo, ancillary remote casino and remote betting (remote platform) licences

1. Licensees must make information readily available to their customers on how to gamble responsibly and how to access information about, and help in respect of, problem gambling.
2. The information must cover:
 - a. any measures provided by the licensee to help individuals monitor or control their gambling, such as restricting the duration of a gambling session or the amount of money they can spend
 - b. timers or other forms of reminders or 'reality checks' where available
 - c. self-exclusion options
 - d. information about the availability of further help or advice.
3. The information must be directed to all customers whether or not licensees also make available material which is directed specifically at customers who may be 'problem gamblers'.
4. For gambling premises, information must be available in all areas where gambling facilities are provided and adjacent to ATMs. Information must be displayed prominently using methods appropriate to the size and layout of the premises. These methods may include the use of posters, the provision of information on gambling products, or the use of screens or other facilities in the gambling premises. Information must also be available in a form that may be taken away and may also be made available through the use of links to be accessed online or using smart technology. Licensees must take all reasonable steps to ensure that this information is also readily accessible in locations which enable the customer to obtain it discreetly.

¹ These matters are to be reported to us online via our 'eServices' digital service on our website.

3.3.2 - Foreign languages

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences, except gaming machine technical, gambling software, host, ancillary remote bingo and ancillary remote casino licences

1. Licensees who market their services in one or more foreign languages should make available in that, or those, foreign languages:
 - a. the information on how to gamble responsibly and access to help referred to above
 - b. the players' guides to any game, bet or lottery required to be made available to customers under provisions in this code
 - c. the summary of the contractual terms on which gambling is offered, which is required to be provided to customers as a condition of the licensee's operating licence.

3.4.1 - Customer interaction

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences, except non-remote lottery, gaming machine technical, gambling software and host licences

1. Licensees must interact with customers in a way which minimises the risk of customers experiencing harms associated with gambling. This must include:
 - a. identifying customers who may be at risk of or experiencing harms associated with gambling.
 - b. interacting with customers who may be at risk of or experiencing harms associated with gambling.
 - c. understanding the impact of the interaction on the customer, and the effectiveness of the Licensee's actions and approach.
2. Licensees must take into account the Commission's guidance on customer interaction.

3.5.1 - Self exclusion – Non-remote and trading rooms SR code

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote licences (except lottery, gaming machine technical and gambling software licences) and remote betting intermediary (trading rooms only) licences

1. Licensees must have and put into effect procedures for self-exclusion and take all reasonable steps to refuse service or to otherwise prevent an individual who has entered a self-exclusion agreement from participating in gambling.
2. Licensees must, as soon as practicable, take all reasonable steps to prevent any marketing material being sent to a self-excluded customer.
3. Licensees must take steps to remove the name and details of a self-excluded individual from any marketing databases used by the company or group (or otherwise flag that person as an individual to whom marketing material must not be sent), within two days of receiving the completed self-exclusion notification.
4. This covers any marketing material relating to gambling, or other activities that take place on the premises where gambling may take place. However, it would not extend to blanket marketing which is targeted at a particular geographical area and where the excluded individual would not knowingly be included.
5. Licensees must close any customer accounts of an individual who has entered a self-exclusion agreement and return any funds held in the customer account. It is not sufficient merely to prevent an individual from withdrawing funds from their customer account whilst still accepting wagers from them. Where the giving of credit is permitted, the licensee may retain details of the amount owed to them by the individual, although the account must not be active.
6. Licensees must put into effect procedures designed to ensure that an individual who has self-excluded cannot gain access to gambling. These procedures must include:
 - a. a register of those excluded with appropriate records (name, address, other details, and any membership or account details that may be held by the operator);
 - b. photo identification (except where the Licensee can reasonably satisfy themselves that in the circumstances in which they provide facilities for gambling an alternative means of identification is at least as effective) and a signature;
 - c. staff training to ensure that staff are able to administer effectively the systems; and
 - d. the removal of those persons found in the gambling area or attempting to gamble from the premises.
7. Licensees must ensure that their procedures for preventing access to gambling by self-excluded individuals take account of the structure and layout of the gambling premises.
8. Licensees must, when administering the self-exclusion agreement, signpost the individual to counselling and support services.

3.5.2 - Self-exclusion – non-remote ordinary code

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote licences and remote betting intermediary (trading rooms only) licences, but not gaming machine technical and gambling software licences

1. Self-exclusion procedures should require individuals to take positive action in order to self-exclude. This can be a signature on a self-exclusion form.

2. Individuals should be able to self-exclude without having to enter gambling premises.
3. Before an individual self-excludes, licensees should provide or make available sufficient information about what the consequences of self-exclusion are.
4. Licensees should take all reasonable steps to extend the self-exclusion to premises of the same type owned by the operator in the customer's local area. In setting the bounds of that area licensees may take into account the customer's address (if known to them), anything else known to them about the distance the customer ordinarily travels to gamble and any specific request the customer may make.
5. Licensees should encourage the customer to consider extending their self-exclusion to other licensees' gambling premises in the customer's local area.
6. Customers should be given the opportunity to discuss self-exclusion in private, where possible.
7. Licensees should take steps to ensure that:
 - a. the minimum self-exclusion period offered is of a duration of not less than 6 nor more than 12 months
 - b. any self-exclusion may, on request, be extended for one or more further periods of at least 6 months each
 - c. a customer who has decided to enter a self-exclusion agreement is given the opportunity to do so immediately without any cooling-off period. However, if the customer wishes to consider the self-exclusion further (for example to discuss with problem gambling groups), the customer may return at a later date to enter into self-exclusion
 - d. at the end of the period chosen by the customer, the self-exclusion remains in place for a further 6 months, unless the customer takes positive action in order to gamble again
 - e. where a customer chooses not to renew the self-exclusion, and makes a positive request to begin gambling again during the 6 month period following the end of their initial self-exclusion, the customer is given one day to cool off before being allowed access to gambling facilities. The contact must be made via telephone or in person
 - f. notwithstanding the expiry of the period of self-exclusion chosen by a customer, no marketing material should be sent to them unless and until they have asked for or agreed to accept such material.
8. The licensee should retain the records relating to a self-exclusion agreement at least for the length of the self-exclusion agreement plus a further 6 months.
9. Please note that the Commission does not require the licensee to carry out any particular assessment or make any judgement as to whether the previously self-excluded individual should again be permitted access to gambling. The requirement to take positive action in person or over the phone is purely to a) check that the customer has considered the decision to access gambling again and allow them to consider the implications; and b) implement the one day cooling-off period and explain why this has been put in place.
10. Licensees should have, and put into effect, policies and procedures which recognise, seek to guard against and otherwise address, the fact that some individuals who have self-excluded might attempt to breach their exclusion without entering a gambling premises, for example, by getting another to gamble on their behalf.
11. Licensees should have effective systems in place to inform all venue staff of self-excluded individuals who have recently attempted to breach a self-exclusion in that venue, and the licensees neighbouring venues.

12. In providing training to staff on their responsibilities for self-exclusion, licensees should have, as a minimum, policies for induction training and refresher training.

3.5.6 - Multi-operator non-remote SR code

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino, bingo and betting licences (except in respect of the provision of facilities for betting in reliance on a track premises licence) and holders of gaming machine general operating licences for adult gaming centres

1. Licensees must offer customers with whom they enter into a self-exclusion agreement in respect of facilities for any kind of gambling offered by them at licensed gambling premises the ability to self-exclude from facilities for the same kind of gambling offered in their locality by any other holder of an operating licence to whom this provision applies, by participating in one or more available multi-operator self-exclusion schemes.

3.5.7 - Multi-operator non-remote ordinary code

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino, bingo and betting licences (except in respect of the provision of facilities for betting in reliance on a track premises licence) and holders of gaming machine general operating licences for adult gaming centres

1. Licensees should contribute to and participate in the development and effective implementation of multi-operator self-exclusions schemes with the aim of making available to customers the ability to self-exclude from facilities for gambling provided by other licensed operators within their local area(s).

3.6.3 - Casino

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Licensees who employ children (under-16-year-olds) and young persons (those aged 16 and 17) should be aware that it is an offence:
 - a. to employ them to provide facilities for gambling;
 - b. if gaming machines are sited on the premises, for their contracts of employment to require them, or for them to be permitted, to perform a function in connection with a gaming machine at any time; and

- c. to employ them to carry out any other function on casino licensed premises while any gambling activity is being carried on in reliance on the premises licence (except that they can be employed on a part of regional casino premises when that part of the premises is not being used for the provision of facilities for gambling).
2. As to 1b, it should be noted that in the Commission's view the relevant provision of the Act applies to any function performed in connection with a gaming machine. This includes servicing or cleaning such a machine.
3. Accordingly, licensees should have and put into effect policies and procedures designed to ensure that:
 - a. children and young persons are never asked to perform tasks within 1a or 1b above
 - b. all staff, including those who are children or young persons themselves, are instructed about the laws relating to access to gambling by children and young persons.
4. Licensees should consider adopting a policy that:
 - a. children and young persons are not employed to work on casino licensed premises (other than in an area of a regional casino where gambling does not take place) at any time when the premises are open for business
 - b. gaming machines are turned off if children and young persons are working on the premises outside the hours when the premises are open for business.

3.8.1 - Money-lending – casinos

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Licensees should take steps to prevent systematic or organised money lending between customers on their premises.
2. While the nature of those steps will depend to some extent on the layout and size of the premises, they should cover matters such as:
 - a. systems for monitoring for such activity;
 - b. instructions to staff concerning what they should do if they spot what they believe to be significant money lending and to managers about the ways in which they should handle and act on any such lending; and
 - c. excluding from the premises, either temporarily or permanently as appropriate, any person whom the evidence suggests has become involved in organised or systematic money lending.
3. There should be appropriate arrangements in place to cover any cases where it appears that the lending may be commercial in nature or may involve money laundering. In the latter case, the requirements in respect of reporting suspicious transactions must be followed. In all cases where the operator encounters systematic or organised money lending, a report should be made to the Commission.²

² These matters are to be reported to us online via our ['eServices'](#) digital service on our website.

4.1.1 - Fair terms

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences, except gaming machine technical and gambling software licences

1. Licensees must be able to provide evidence to the Commission, if required, showing how they satisfied themselves that their terms are not unfair.

4.2.1 - Display of rules – casino

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. In complying with any condition on a casino premises licence requiring the display of rules about gaming, licensees must ensure that the following are included:
 - a. the rules of each type of casino game available to be played
 - b. a player's guide to the house edge
 - c. a player's guide to the rules of any equal chance games which are made available.

4.2.5 - Supervision of games

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Licensees must have and put into effect policies and procedures designed to ensure that proper supervision of gaming at tables is carried out by supervisors, pit bosses and croupiers in order to ensure the integrity of the gaming is not compromised. Such policies and procedures must take into account, but need not be limited by, any mandatory premises licence conditions relating to the layout of premises.

5.1.1 - Rewards and bonuses – SR code

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences (including ancillary remote licences), except gaming machine technical and gambling software licences

1. If a licensee makes available to any customer or potential customer any incentive or reward scheme or other arrangement under which the customer may receive money, goods, services or any other advantage (including the discharge in whole or in part of any liability of his) ('the benefit') the scheme must be designed to operate, and be operated, in such a way that:
 - a. the circumstances in which, and conditions subject to which, the benefit is available are clearly set out and readily accessible to the customers to whom it is offered;
 - b. neither the receipt nor the value or amount of the benefit is:
 - i. dependent on the customer gambling for a pre-determined length of time or with a pre-determined frequency; or
 - ii. altered or increased if the qualifying activity or spend is reached within a shorter time than the whole period over which the benefit is offered.
 - c. if the value of the benefit increases with the amount the customer spends it does so at a rate no greater than that at which the amount spent increases; and further that:
 - d. if the benefit comprises free or subsidised travel or accommodation which facilitates the customer's attendance at particular licensed premises the terms on which it is offered are not directly related to the level of the customer's prospective gambling.
2. If a licensee makes available incentives or reward schemes for customers, designated by the licensee as 'high value, 'VIP' or equivalent, they must be offered in a manner which is consistent with the licensing objectives.

Licensees must take into account the Commission's guidance on high value customer incentives.

5.1.2 - Proportionate rewards

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences (including ancillary remote licences), except gaming machine technical and gambling software licences

1. Licensees should only offer incentive or reward schemes in which the benefit available is proportionate to the type and level of customers' gambling.

5.1.3 - Alcoholic drinks

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote bingo and casino licences

1. If licensees offer customers free or discounted alcoholic drinks for consumption on the premises they must do so on terms which do not in any way link the availability of such drinks to whether, or when, the customer begins, or continues, to gamble.
2. Licensees must not make unsolicited offers of free alcoholic drinks for immediate consumption by customers at a time when they are participating in gambling activities.

5.1.4 - Promotion by agents

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Where a licensee employs agents to promote its business (wherever that business is conducted), it must ensure that its agreement with any agent makes clear that the agent must not encourage players to play longer or wager more than the player might otherwise do. In particular, payments should not be directly dependent upon, nor directly calculated by reference to, the length of time for which, or frequency with which, the customer gambles. If the payment to the agent increases with the amount the customer spends it must do so at a rate no greater than that at which the amount spent increases.

5.1.6 - Compliance with advertising codes

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences, except lottery licences

1. All marketing of gambling products and services must be undertaken in a socially responsible manner.
2. In particular, Licensees must comply with the advertising codes of practice issued by the Committee of Advertising Practice (CAP) and the Broadcast Committee of Advertising Practice (BCAP) as applicable. For media not explicitly covered, licensees should have regard to the principles included in these codes of practice as if they were explicitly covered.
3. The restriction on allowing people who are, or seem to be, under 25 years old (ie: those in the 18-24 age bracket) to appear in marketing communications need not be

applied in the case of non-remote point of sale advertising material, provided that the images used depict the sporting or other activity that may be gambled on and not the activity of gambling itself and do not breach any other aspect of the advertising codes.

5.1.8 - Compliance with industry advertising codes

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Licensees should follow any relevant industry code on advertising, notably the Gambling Industry Code for Socially Responsible Advertising.

5.1.9 - Other marketing requirements

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Licensees must ensure that their marketing communications, advertisement, and invitations to purchase (within the meaning of the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008) do not amount to or involve misleading actions or misleading omissions within the meaning of those Regulations.
2. Licensees must ensure that all significant conditions which apply to marketing incentives are provided transparently and prominently to consumers. Licensees must present the significant conditions at the point of sale for any promotion, and on any advertising in any medium for that marketing incentive except where, in relation to the latter, limitations of space make this impossible. In such a case, information about the significant conditions must be included to the extent that it is possible to do so, the advertising must clearly indicate that significant conditions apply and where the advertisement is online, the significant conditions must be displayed in full no further than one click away.
3. The terms and conditions of each marketing incentive must be made available for the full duration of the promotion.

5.1.10 - Online marketing in proximity to information on responsible gambling

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Licensees should ensure that no advertising or other marketing information, whether relating to specific offers or to gambling generally, appears on any primary web page/screen, or micro site that provides advice or information on responsible gambling

5.1.11 - Direct electronic marketing consent

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences

1. Unless expressly permitted by law consumers must not be contacted with direct electronic marketing without their informed and specific consent. Whenever a consumer is contacted the consumer must be provided with an opportunity to withdraw consent. If consent is withdrawn the licensee must, as soon as practicable, ensure the consumer is not contacted with electronic marketing thereafter unless the consumer consents again. Licensees must be able to provide evidence which establishes that consent.

6.1.1 - Complaints and disputes

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences (including ancillary remote licensees) except gaming machine technical and gambling software licences

1. Licensees must put into effect appropriate policies and procedures for accepting and handling customer complaints and disputes in a timely, fair, open and transparent manner.
2. Licensees must ensure that they have arrangements in place for customers to be able to refer any dispute to an ADR entity in a timely manner if not resolved to the customer's satisfaction by use of their complaints procedure within eight weeks of receiving the complaint, and where the customer cooperates with the complaints process in a timely manner.
3. The services of any such ADR entity must be free of charge to the customer.
4. Licensees must not use or introduce terms which restrict, or purport to restrict, the customer's right to bring proceedings against the licensee in any court of competent

jurisdiction. Such terms may, however, provide for a resolution of a dispute agreed by the customer (arrived at with the assistance of the ADR entity) to be binding on both parties.

5. Licensees' complaints handling policies and procedures must include procedures to provide customers with clear and accessible information on how to make a complaint, the complaint procedures, timescales for responding, and escalation procedures.
6. Licensees must ensure that complaints policies and procedures are implemented effectively, kept under review and revised appropriately to ensure that they remain effective, and take into account any applicable learning or guidance published by the Gambling Commission from time to time.
7. Licensees should keep records of customer complaints and disputes and make them available to the Commission on request.

In this Code, 'ADR entity' means

- a. a person offering alternative dispute resolution services whose name appears on the list maintained by the Gambling Commission in accordance with The Alternative Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes (Competent Authorities and Information) Regulations 2015 and,
- b. whose name appears on the list of providers that meet the Gambling Commission's additional standards found in the document 'Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in the gambling industry – standards and guidance for ADR providers'.

Both lists are on the Commission's website and will be updated from time to time.

Read additional [guidance on the information requirements](#) contained within this section.

7.1.1 - Gambling staff – casinos

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino licences

1. Licensees must have and put into effect policies and procedures to manage relationships between staff and customers, based on the principle that in carrying out their duties staff must not engage in any conduct which is, or could be, likely to prejudice the licensing objectives.

7.1.2 - Responsible gambling information for staff

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All licences, including betting ancillary remote licences, but not other ancillary remote licences

1. Licensees must take all reasonable steps to ensure that staff involved in the provision of facilities for gambling are made aware of advice on socially responsible gambling and of where to get confidential advice should their gambling become hard to control.

8.1.1 - Ordinary code

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All licences

1. As stated earlier in this code, the Commission expects licensees to work with the Commission in an open and cooperative way and to inform the Commission of any matters that the Commission would reasonably need to be aware of in exercising its regulatory functions. These include in particular matters that will have a material impact on the licensee's business or on the licensee's ability to conduct licensed activities compliantly and consistently with the licensing objectives.
2. Thus, licensees should notify the Commission, or ensure that the Commission is notified, as soon as reasonably practicable and in such form and manner as the Commission may from time to time specify³, of any matters which in their view could have a material impact on their business or affect compliance. The Commission would, in particular, expect to be notified of the occurrence of any of the following events in so far as not already notified in accordance with the conditions attached to the licensee's licence⁴:
 - a. any material change in the licensee's structure or the operation of its business
 - b. any material change in managerial responsibilities or governance arrangements
 - c. any report from an internal or external auditor expressing, or giving rise to, concerns about material shortcomings in the management control or oversight of any aspect of the licensee's business related to the provision of gambling facilities.

³ These matters are to be reported to us online via our 'eServices' digital service on our website.

⁴ Events which must be reported, because the Commission considers them likely to have a material impact on the nature or structure of a licensee's business, are set out in general licence condition 15.2.1

Read additional [guidance on the information requirements](#) contained within this section.

9.1.3 - Casino

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino operating licences, except 2005 Act operating licences

1. Gaming machines may be made available for use in licensed casino premises only where there are also substantive facilities for non-remote casino games and/or games of equal chance, provided in reliance on this licence, available in the premises.

22 Facilities for gambling must only be offered in a manner which provides for appropriate supervision of those facilities by staff at all times.

3. Licensees must ensure that the function along with the internal and/or external presentation of the premises are such that a customer can reasonably be expected to recognise that it is a premises licensed for the purposes of providing facilities for casino games and/or games of equal chance.

10.1.1 - Assessing local risk

Social responsibility code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino, adult gaming centre, bingo, family entertainment centre, betting and remote betting intermediary (trading room only) licences, except non-remote general betting (limited) and betting intermediary licences.

1. Licensees must assess the local risks to the licensing objectives posed by the provision of gambling facilities at each of their premises, and have policies, procedures and control measures to mitigate those risks. In making risk assessments, licensees must take into account relevant matters identified in the licensing authority's statement of licensing policy⁵.
2. Licensees must review (and update as necessary) their local risk assessments:
 - a. to take account of significant changes in local circumstances, including those identified in a licensing authority's statement of licensing policy;
 - b. when there are significant changes at a licensee's premises that may affect their mitigation of local risks;
 - c. when applying for a variation of a premises licence; and
 - d. in any case, undertake a local risk assessment when applying for a new premises licence.

⁵ This is the statement of licensing policy under the Gambling Act 2005.

10.1.2 - Sharing local risk assessments

Ordinary code

Applies to:

All non-remote casino, adult gaming centre, bingo, family entertainment centre, betting and remote betting intermediary (trading room only) licences, except non-remote general betting (limited) and betting intermediary licences

1. Licensees should share their risk assessment with licensing authorities when applying for a premises licence or applying for a variation to existing licensed premises, or otherwise on request.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, M, Volberg, R Bellringer, M, Reith, G (2004). The Auckland Report Responsibility in Gambling Trust see pages 114–116 for a full discussion on adolescent gambling
- Breen, R B. 2004. “Rapid onset of pathological gambling in machine gamblers: A replication.” *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction* 2 (1): 44–49.
- Clark, Luke, Andrew J, Lawrence, Frances Astley-Jones, and Nicola Gray. 2009. “Gambling Near-Misses Enhance Motivation to Gamble and Recruit Win-Related Brain Circuitry.” *Neuron* 61 (3) (February 12): 481–490. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2008.12.031.
- Disley, E, Pollitt, A, Culley, D M, Rubin, J (2011). Map the Gap a critical review of the literature on gambling-related harm RAND Technical Report on www.rgfund.org.uk/Research-Publications or www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2011/RAND_TR1013.pdf
- Downs, C (2009). “Young People Playing with Risk Social networking and the normalisation of gambling behaviours”—Academia.edu/mht
- Fisher, S 1999. “A prevalence study of gambling and problem gambling adolescents.” *Addiction Research* 7: 509–538.
- Griffiths, Mark. 2002. *Gambling and gaming addictions in adolescence*. Leicester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Griffiths, M. 2003. “Adolescent gambling: Risk factors and implications for prevention, intervention, and treatment.” In *Reducing Adolescent Risk: Toward an Integrated Approach*, ed. Daniel Romer, 223–238. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Griffiths, M. 2007. Special report: gambling addiction in the UK. Breakthrough Britain: Ending the Cost of Social Breakdown. London: The Centre for Social Justice. www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/client/downloads/gambling.pdf.
- Griffiths, M. 2008. “Adolescent gambling in Great Britain.” *Education Today* 58 (1): 7–11.
- Ipsos MORI. 2009. British survey of children, the National Lottery and gambling 2008–09: report of a quantitative survey. London: National Lottery Commission. www.natlotcomm.gov.uk/publications-and-research/research-programme/underage-play/british-survey-of-children-the-national-lottery-and-gambling-2008-09.
- Moodie, C, and Frances Finnigan. 2006. “Prevalence and Correlates of Youth Gambling in Scotland.” *Addiction Research and Theory* 14 (4): 365–385. doi:10.1080/16066350500498015.
- Ólason, Daníel Thor, Guðmundur A Skarphedinsson, Johanna Ella Jonsdottir, Mikael Mikaelsson, and Sigurdur J Gretarsson. 2006. “Prevalence estimates of gambling and problem gambling among 13- to 15-year-old adolescents in Reykjavik: An examination of correlates of problem gambling and different accessibility to electronic gambling machines in Iceland.” *Journal of Gambling Issues* 18 (October): 39–55. doi:10.4309/jgi.2006.18.7.
- Olason, D. et al (2011) Internet gambling and problem gambling among 13–18 year old adolescents in Iceland *Int Journal Mental Health Addiction* 7 257–263
- Planzer, S. and Wardle, H. (2011) *The Comparative Effectiveness of Regulatory Approaches and The Impact of Advertising on Propensity for Problem Gambling*. The Responsible Gambling Fund
- Productivity Commission. 2010. *Gambling: Public Inquiry*. Melbourne: Commonwealth of Australia. www.pc.gov.au/projects/inquiry/gambling-2009.
- Valentine, G. (2008). *Literature Review of Children and Young People’s Gambling*. Gambling Commission. www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/UploadDocs/publications/Document/LitReviewChildrenYoungPeople.PDF.
- January 2012

Supplementary written evidence submitted by National Casino Industry Forum (NCiF)

During the oral evidence session which my NCiF colleagues attended your Committee members raised a couple of points that we promised to answer. The NCiF response is contained herewith.

TAXATION

The issue of taxation is immensely complicated. There is no consolidated research focused on tax rates. Another problem is in comparing like with like; a lot of countries have different approaches to taxing casinos than that used in the UK, some have a Gross Gaming Yield (GGY) base with other fixed cost bands attached dependent on other factors and some use very different ways of calculating GGY. For example, German casinos are taxed at an apparently punitive rate of between 45% and 80%. However online gambling is illegal and German operators are state-run. This means a very different competitive environment exists for German casinos

than that in the UK; also there is an element of supernormal profit from the effective monopoly that suggests a higher tax rate is appropriate. There is a similar picture in other Germanic countries such as Austria and Switzerland.

The approach in the US varies across states. Most have a gross gaming revenue base with rates that are on average between 20 and 30% although Nevada has a rate of 6.75%. Colorado, Illinois, Indiana and Iowa have graduated rates with a max ranging from 20% to 50% (and with admission taxes in some instances on top); New Jersey has an 8% rate plus an investment alternative obligation graduated across different rates. Again though, this in a place where the scale of geography of the United States means the casinos (other than the clusters in Nevada and other high roller destinations) are not necessarily competing with each other, and where online gambling is illegal.

Macau has introduced a GGY based tax of 35% with additional fixed charges of up to 2% and 3% for “social and economic purposes.”

Our concern is that as well as being subject to one of the highest tax rates in the world, the UK casino industry has its products and pricing mechanisms strictly but poorly controlled (the current review is three years late and is set to take more than 18 months) and is increasingly disadvantaged in its ability to compete with a mature domestic gambling market and the on-line market that this neither controlled in terms of product or price, nor subject to UK taxes.

THE PROFITABILITY OF GAMING MACHINES

The profitability of gaming machines is again a complex area. In the United States slot machines can contribute around 70% of a casino’s revenue. However, in the UK the situation is very different, in most high end, London casinos, the machine’s stakes and prizes are considered not to have any commercial value and therefore gaming machines are simply not even offered. Where machines are offered, they contribute on average around 10% of revenue.

Determining relative profitability, in relation to other generators of gaming revenue, ie table games is very difficult, depending on complex calculations around floor space, staff numbers, varying levels of taxation, machine cost, depreciation etc. However, to help the committee, we estimate that on the basis of 20 machines occupying an equivalent space as four mixed gaming tables in a similar operating environment with a similar customer base, there is almost parity on profitability.

Another proxy that could be used is to equate gaming machine revenues to “between 10–15%” of a casino’s total revenues [gaming and ancillary].

NCiF is concerned that our key messages regarding providing a modern innovative industry and meeting some of the Chancellors asks around the “growth agenda” are being stifled and failing to be acknowledged by DCMS.

The NCiF has demonstrated the following through the Ernst and Young report:

1. Current (casino) machine entitlements are not keeping pace with customer demand.
2. Less than 1% of all gaming machines in the UK are in the most controlled environment ie casinos.
3. The sector is not intending to replace table games with machines.
4. Machine entitlements (numbers, stakes and prizes) within UK casinos are amongst the lowest in the wider casino world.
5. Ireland is on the verge of asking for a 10:1 machine table ratio possibly capping tables at 15.
6. UK casinos are safe, fully supervised, well regulated and the most appropriate environments for socially responsible, leisure machine gambling.
7. Social policy is driving unmet customer demand for safe, leisure machine gambling, into less well supervised environments and into online environments where little to no supervision exists and where there are no common machine standards, stakes or prize limits.

LOCAL AUTHORITY CASINO NETWORK (LACN)

We listened carefully to the evidence of the Local Authority Casino Network (LACN), the group representing the 16 areas that have been given the power (by virtue of the 2005 Act process) to issue new Large or Small licences. Some of the evidence the witnesses gave was verifiably inaccurate and we have sought briefly to correct the errors. I hope you will find this useful.

CASINO DEVELOPMENT

A witness from the LACN said all but one of the 16 local authorities they represented had got through to Stage 2, or the Competition Stage of the licensing process and witnesses indicated a satisfactory level of interest in the process. This was an inaccurate misrepresentation of progress. *The latest verified information is that seven of the 16 new licensing authorities have yet to set a date for the commencement of Stage 1 of the process.*

Since September 2007, when the Act passed into law, only one Large casino has opened in Newham, one further Large licence has been granted in Solihull and a single open ended “Provisional Statement” has been issued in Hull for which there was *no* competition. No date has yet been identified for the opening of the Hull casino the *earliest* date cannot be envisaged before 2014. No Small casino licences have been granted and one in Scarborough is currently subject to a legal challenge. The process has been pushed back “*indefinitely*” by a number of authorities. Meanwhile, the existing industry is expected to wait the outcome of this process before the Minister will consider any of its proposals.

The LACN stated in their written submission at Para 30 that:

“ in no case has an authority determined not to proceed with its casino project.”

We understand this is incorrect as the position in Dumfries and Galloway has stated that a public referendum would be required before the process could continue.

Para 31(2) of the LACN submission refers to three further cases where Stage 2 was in process—of these Solihull was subsequently granted without competition to the one remaining applicant; Middlesbrough has still not closed the date for lodging Stage 2 applications as there is believed to now be only one applicant; and Great Yarmouth has extended the licence process to a total of 18 months so there will be no award until the spring. The indication the LACN clearly intended to give in July last year was that a further three licences would be awarded in 2011 (making it six of the 16) but there are still only three.

Para 31(5) is also misleading as this refers to another seven commencing the process within six months,—none have, with only Luton and Leeds about to commence Stage 1 six months later. Swansea and Wolverhampton show no sign of being anywhere near launching the process. Southampton is on record as saying the economic climate is not suitable to progress and Torbay and East Lindsey are reviewing whether to proceed at all.

At paragraph 55 of their written evidence the LACN state that the number of operating casinos has only increased in recent years as a result of the opening of small electronic casinos. This is also incorrect. During the period between April 2007 and March 2010 there had been a considerable number of closures and between April 2007 and March 2011 a total of 10 full-scale new additional casino licences opened. The number of operating casinos further increased in 2010–11 was as a result of several electronic casinos opening to replace small uneconomic casinos that had closed as a result of the increases in gaming duty. A further four new additional casino licences granted under the 1968 Act are currently being fitted out and will be opening within the next 12 months with the Hippodrome London to open in the spring 2012.

CASINO NETWORK SUBMISSIONS ON IMPACT OF PORTABILITY

The LACN at Para 56 states:

“the current picture of no fewer than 40 dormant casino licences demonstrates that casino operators took advantage of a window of opportunity afforded to them by government in the final days of the Gaming Act 1968 regime to bank licences which they had little or no immediate intention of using and for which there was no or inadequate local demand.”

The argument advanced by the LACN may have some substance in relation to new entrants to the industry but in relation to the established operators only six of the licences obtained under the 1968 Act (five of which were granted before the guillotine on applications was announced) have not as yet been implemented, almost in every case as a result of the 1968 Act licence having been granted in areas that were subsequently negatively impacted by the award to the local authority of the ability to grant another, and more valuable, licences, under the 2005 Act. However, nine of the licences granted under the 1968 Act in other areas (including the four mentioned above) are currently in the course of development as full-scale casinos.

In the following paragraphs of their written evidence the LACN suggest that existing operators would wish to use the proposals on portability to move licences to areas that form the wider catchment areas for the 16 new licences. NCIF’s members argue for very sound economic reasons in contradiction to the LACN opinion, that, it is the position whereby 10 of the 16 areas chosen by the last Secretary of State overlap with existing casino areas that gives rise to a strong case for allowing the unused licences to be moved away from the areas of the new 2005 Act licences, providing those “new casino” areas a greater chance to provide the regeneration benefits that will accrue from what is likely to be a reduced number of 2005 Act licences that will be developed. The fact that it is in the overlapping geographical areas that unimplemented licences have not been developed or are not currently operated provides cogent evidence that the LACN is flawed in its conclusions.

In paragraph 62 the LACN made the following statement:

“The Network is seriously concerned that permitting operators to move existing licences across boundaries will not only compete with 2005 Act casinos, but will provide a major disincentive to such operators to compete for the new licences, where to win the licence they will need to promise to provide benefits to the area of the licensing authority. Furthermore, the Network is concerned that the prospect of competition from portable licences will reduce the amount of benefit which competitors are prepared to offer in order to win the 2005 Act licensing competition. Even if operators decide not to compete with the 2005 Act licences with substantial casinos, they may decide

to operate low-cost, low-staff, highly mechanised e-casinos, producing little benefit for the area but reducing the potential profitability of 2005 Act casinos, and therefore the benefits which competitors can offer for those licences.”

One of our main arguments is that the selection of 10 of the 16 being in existing areas means that there are considerable numbers of casinos that will not be able to compete against the new style casinos—so to suggest that existing operators will all want to move into the new casino areas has no economic or commercial foundation—indeed exactly half of the unimplemented 68 licences are in or immediately border one of the new casino areas—so if there is any evidence that the opposite is true we have it from the existing industry not developing its existing licences in those areas.

Taking this and Para 61 of the LACN’s written submission into account demonstrates their lack of comprehension of the Portability issue.

NCiF questions why 16 local authorities are permitted to prevent and effectively put a strangle hold on other Local Authorities, many that previously expressed an interest in having a casino (during the 2005 CAP process) and which still may wish to benefit from the re-generative elements ie jobs, revenue and construction which those 30 existing licences could provide.

THE STAKE AND PRIZE TRIENNIAL REVIEW

NCiF would like to draw to the Committee’s attention that at the time NCiF gave evidence to the Committee, no announcement had been made regarding a stake and prize review. In December the Minister announced a long overdue review. However, the anticipated time scale is 18 months. The industry will do all it can to speed up the process by responding promptly with data. However, we are astounded that a simple increase in the stakes and prizes on slot machines is a 19 stage process expected to involve four government departments and the European Union. This compares very unfavourably with the previous five stage process, which took between six and nine months. It is also inconsistent with both the process the Commission undertook to review its fee structure and the Treasury’s process for increasing machine gaming duty. By the time the review will have been concluded it will be approaching eight years since the casino industry had a pricing review.

There is a total imbalance in the business equation with the cost side—represented by fees and taxes—increasing, whilst the revenue side—stakes and prizes, is anchored by bureaucracy and political inertia.

January 2012

Supplementary written evidence submitted by William Hill

William Hill has commissioned both a legal and regulatory analysis on the online gambling market and economic modelling concerning the effect of a point of consumption tax (at various levels) on that market.

At the point the Select Committee called for evidence and at the time William Hill gave oral evidence to the Committee, this work had not been fully completed, the first report being used by Deloitte as a reference source for their later report.

Furthermore, we are aware that the Committee has received views from other gambling sectors and companies which make the case for harmonisation of gambling taxes (online and retail), on the basis that imposing the same tax rate for retail and online would in some way “level the playing field” between retail and online and in some way alleviate the regulatory, tax and commercial problems of the retail sector.

We are clear that the above proposition is a complete misnomer which will give no boost to retail and only serve to damage the online industry (certainly as far as sports betting and gaming is concerned). William Hill has both a substantial UK retail business (75% of group revenues) and an online business. We are clear that whilst there is some limited overlap between retail and online currently the two businesses have largely different demographics.

Most importantly, it is important to note that online margins are around half those of retail because of the highly competitive nature of the online market.

Whilst DCMS policy to regulate offshore online operators is predicated on the basis of “increased public protection”, these two reports demonstrate that a double figure rate of taxation attached to regulation would increase rather than decrease public protection risk.

At a 15% rate what is currently a highly competitive and broadly well regulated online market (with margins half those in retail) would experience significant market disruption.

A number of smaller online operators would see their operating margins eroded to the point where market exit was almost inevitable. This could lead to some two fifths of UK consumers (at a 15% tax rate) migrating to the grey or black market as firms would still be able to target the UK market.

With no government having successfully established effective enforcement mechanisms over their online market (France being the most extreme example of grey market leakage—70%) a policy of imposing tax on top of regulation could open up the UK Government to the prospect of legal challenge under EU law as it

decide whether its arrangements are compliant with the promotion obligation flowing from the mandatory condition in section 95(5) that:

“Where a person purchases a lottery ticket in a lottery promoted by an. non commercial society in reliance on the licence he receives a document which—

- (a) identifies the promoting society,
- (b) states the name and address of a member of the society who is designated, by persons acting on behalf of the society, as having responsibility within the society for the promotion of the lottery, and
- (c) either—
 - (i) states the date of the draw (or each draw) in the lottery, or
 - (ii) enables the date of the draw (or each draw) in the lottery to be determined”.

25. On the face of it this condition might be thought to permit a lottery to be promoted in such a way that it was not until the participant had bought his ticket that he became aware of the identity of the society on whose behalf the lottery was being promoted. However, the Commission considers the better interpretation, given the indications in the Act, including the use of the present tense in section 99(5) itself, which suggest that the purchase and receipt of the document referred to are envisaged as happening at the same time is that it is a requirement of the promotion of a lottery that the potential participant knows (or at the very least has a genuine opportunity to discover) in whose lottery he will be participating before he purchases his chance. Furthermore, it would also be necessary in terms of the second licensing objective for the consumer to know that they were purchasing a ticket for a lottery draw on behalf of a society distinct from the marketing brand.

CONCLUSION

26. In conclusion, the Commission’s legal analysis suggests that when faced with novel developments of this sort what it is required to do is to consider whether the way in which the parties involved are conducting their affairs is in reality as well as formally consistent with the legislation, including the licensing objectives. This is what the Commission has sought, and continues to seek, to do in relation to the Scheme. But, as outlined above, the Commission cannot properly go beyond the legislation, and specifically licensing objective imperatives, to secure objectives such as limiting the proceeds raised for a number of societies by means of a common marketing scheme. The Secretary of State does, however, have the power to impose conditions which go wider than the Act’s licensing objectives.

February 2012

Further supplementary written evidence submitted by the National Casino Industry Forum (NCiF)

Since NCiF gave evidence and the Committee concluded its sessions, Aspers’ new Large casino at the Westfield Shopping Centre in Stratford in East London has opened. We understand that the Committee has visited the casino. This development and some ambiguity in other evidence presented to the committee persuade us that there are a number of points of clarification we should address.

There was written evidence from the “Casino network”—the organisation representing the 16 Local Authorities (LA’s) that hold the right to issue the 16 2005 Act licences, which is blatantly protectionist, wrong in fact and with which we profoundly disagree.

The economic mechanism which controlled the supply of casino licences under the 1968 Act—the “Demand Test”—was effectively abandoned in 2001. This followed the government’s acceptance of the recommendation of Sir Alan Budd’s committee that the demand test should be abolished in favour of a free market approach. In anticipation of broad deregulation the Gaming Board ceased objecting to applications for 1968 Act Casino licences on the basis of an absence of a proven unmet demand. The outcome was that between 2000, when 123 casino licences were in existence, to the end of the 1968 application process in April 2006 around 60 of the extant 186 licences were granted in the 53 permitted Areas without consideration of demand.

Currently, 146 of those 186 licences are in operation. A further 10 of the 40 non-operating licences are in various stages of development and may open in the coming months. Some existing operations may close. At least 18 licences have operated in the Permitted Areas in which they were granted and have closed, trapped in areas where the supply side is saturated, the local demographic has changed or some other factor—including the grant of a 2005 Act licence—has eroded the economic basis for their development. Licences are “locked in” while other interested local authorities are “locked out” causing the market to fail. Only 13 licences have never opened.

Meanwhile, demand for casinos in other non-permitted areas, which would generate investment, jobs and tourism is unmet because licences are not portable.

There was also oral evidence from the Casino Network, in response to a question from the Chair, that is simply not credible.

One witness said:

“...in terms of the process itself, a lot of the authorities are moving forward and we are confident that the 16 will be developed.”

“I think there is one authority that obviously did not get to the competition stage but the rest are all proceeding to stage 2.”

Those statements are at best optimistic in the extreme and at worst totally misleading. At least six of 16 LA's have stated that they have no plan to progress the licence process at all. Only one licence was subject to a proper competition and is operating. Of the remaining nine; two LA's have just begun their process, three have gone to legal challenge, four licences have been granted but have not been developed and of that four only one is in a genuine development process.

Considering the Act passed into law in September 2007, and only one of the 16 licences has opened in over four years, we suggest any optimism is misplaced. The existing industry is being held back to await the outcome of an “experiment” which is never going to be concluded because there never was a realistic mechanism to ensure it would begin.

The failure in the market was compounded by the Independent Casino Advisory Panel process. As Richard Caborn MP, acknowledged this panel was a failure; the industry would say an unmitigated disaster. The ICAP identified the 17, subsequently reduced to 16 areas for new casino developments as part of an ill-defined experiment to test the regenerative benefits of casinos.

The primary criteria for selection of locations as defined by the DCMS were:

- to ensure that locations provide the best possible test of social impact (which may require a range of locations of different kinds such as seaside resorts, edge of town developments or inner city centres);
- to include areas in need of regeneration (as measured by employment and other social deprivation data) and which are likely to benefit in these terms from a new casino; and
- to ensure that those areas selected are willing to license a new casino.

The ICAP included no less than 10 existing Permitted Areas with operating 1968 casinos in the 16 locations it identified.

The outcome of the ICAP choice is negative both to the commercial health of the industry and has proven unfit for on all three of primary criteria of the DCMS published intended purpose.

- No mechanisms have been established, planned or even suggested either by DCMS or the Gambling Commission to determine how a LA is supposed to measure the social impact of a new 2005 Act casino from existing gambling products. Where a new casino is established in an existing Permitted Area with other casinos and licensed betting offices (LBOs) offering the same products—albeit in fewer numbers—any chance of separating out the causal effects is less still.
- Benefit, in terms of investment and employment, can only be identified and quantified if it is incremental and does not displace or replace existing benefits. For that to happen the market must be prepared to make additional investment in the identified areas without damaging existing businesses. That has not happened.
- The willingness to licence must be aligned to both the LA's expectation of economic benefit and the industries willingness to invest. The fact that only one licence has been developed and six LA's have *de facto* opted out of the process is evidence of the failure of the choice to meet the third criteria.

The industry would assert that the evidence is clear: the market has failed, and in our opinion can only be reinstated by introducing the portability of licences and a single style of casino.

This artificially constrained and flawed market also fails the consumer.

The legislation has created within casinos a very limited number of the safest (Richard Caborn's evidence) environments in which to gamble, but has failed to redistribute the most popular products in sufficient numbers to meet the demand. Less than 1% of gaming machines are to be found in the safest place to gamble casinos. Recent changes to legislation mean that the percentage of machines in casinos is likely to decrease further as the betting industry, bingo and the arcade sectors increase the supply of higher stake and prize machines on the high street.

Not only is the percentage decreasing but the offer to consumers is increasingly confusing, with some casinos premises (1968 Act) being able to offer no more than 20 machines, whether or not they offer table games at all and others offering either up to 80 (2005 Act Small) or 150 (2005 Act Large) machines with bewildering ratios of machines to tables.

It cannot be right that a casino in a shopping centre in East London can offer facilities to local shoppers that are significantly different to those attempting to meet the demand of tourists in, for example, Central London.

We believe a simple ratio of five gaming machines to one table for all casinos would clarify the consumer offer and to begin to rebalance the market failure.

We have noted the evidence from on-line operators and other witnesses about the growth in popularity of on-line and other electronic products and repeat that casinos are recognised as the safest places in which to gamble and should therefore have access to the products that are attracting the largest audiences.

The benefits are that casinos offer real, not virtual, environments, in which conduct can be monitored, and consumer protection can be at its most stringent and the return to the exchequer most rewarding.

We believe that casinos should be allowed to offer the most modern gaming products in keeping with other jurisdictions and market forces.

Finally, when the Minister, John Penrose MP gave evidence he said, in response to a question from Damian Collins MP, that the increase in stakes and prizes for B3 machines was a manifesto commitment by the Conservative Party which he felt obligated to honour. It is not clear that such a manifesto commitment exists in the public domain. Our concern is that the hierarchy of values and protections has been eroded unnecessarily.

In our opinion the hierarchy of stakes and prizes and products be re-established, with casinos at the top of the pyramid, and a more appropriate and swifter stake and prize review process be established.

SUMMARY

We believe that if our key proposals outlined below were implemented then the land based casino industry could make a significant contribution to the Government's growth agenda:

- portability of licences and a single style of casino;
- a simple ratio of five gaming machines to one table for all;
- casinos are allowed to offer the most modern gaming products; and
- casinos are re established at the top of the pyramid of stakes and prizes and a more appropriate and swifter review mechanism is established.

February 2012

Written evidence submitted by bet365

We welcomed the opportunity to contribute our thoughts in relation to the Select Committee's Gambling Enquiry in the evidence session in November. In case it is helpful, we are just writing now to set out some further background information about our Company, along with a brief commentary on some of the key issues for bet365 and the industry, which the Committee has been considering.

We would be very grateful, therefore, if this could be treated formally as further evidence to the Committee's enquiry from bet365.

BET365—BACKGROUND AND MARKET POSITION

Market position

- bet365 provides online Sports and Gaming products and services via its website www.bet365.com.
- bet365 is one of the world's leading online gambling groups with over 7.5 million customers in over 200 different countries.
- bet365 is the largest online sports betting operator in the world, as measured by reference to International Accounting Standard's definition of income.
- Winner of eGaming Review Awards 2010 and 2011, including Operator of the Year, Best Website Performance, Sports Betting Operator of the Year, and In-play Sports Operator of the Year.

Background

- The website was established in 2001 and initially provided Sports betting products only.
- As the business expanded and developed, it introduced various additional types of products and services to its website including poker, casino, games and bingo (together "Gaming" products).
- bet365's Sports products have always, and continue to be, licensed in the UK and run from Stoke-on-Trent.
- Gaming products have always been licensed offshore due to historic restrictions in the UK.

Financials and UK Employment

- For the year ended March 2011, bet365's gross win was £422 million (Sports £316 million) on amounts wagered of £8.5 billion, with full year March 2012 forecasts currently being a gross win of £585 million (Sports £435 million) on amounts wagered of £11.0 billion.
- In terms of revenues, around 75% derives from our Sports products.

MIDDLESBROUGH COUNCIL

COUNCIL REPORT

5th December 2012

GAMBLING ACT 2005: REVIEW OF LICENSING POLICY STATEMENT
--

KEVIN PARKES, DIRECTOR OF NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To seek Council's approval of the Gambling Act 2005: Licensing Policy Statement.

BACKGROUND

2. The Gambling Act 2005 gives powers and responsibilities to licensing authorities to issue licences for gambling premises. This legislation came into full effect on September 2007 and effectively modernised gambling legislation, providing an improved structure for gambling regulation.
3. The Act also created a new independent regulatory body; The Gambling Commission. The Gambling Commission regulates operators and deals with national gambling issues.
4. The Act contains three licensing objectives underpinning the function that the Gambling Commission and local authorities will perform. The objectives are:-
 - Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder, or being used to support crime;
 - Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way; and
 - Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.
5. The Act provides for three types of licences. Operating and Personal licences which are issued by the Gambling Commission. Premises Licences are issued by the Council and they authorise the provision of gambling facilities on certain premises including casino premises, bingo premises, betting premises, adult gaming centres and family entertainment centres. Councils may attach conditions to premises licences.
6. The Council as a licensing authority is required to prepare and publish a Gambling Act 2005: Licensing Policy Statement of Principles that it proposes to apply in exercising its functions under the Act. In December

2006, the Council formally ratified its first Statement of Gambling Licensing Policy. The Policy was again reviewed in 2009, reflecting changes as a result of the Council being approved as one of the Local Authorities permitted to issue a Large Casino Premise License. This Policy was formally ratified by the Council on 2 December 2009.

7. The Licensing Authority is required to keep their Gambling Policy under review and is required as a minimum to review it every three years, or sooner if the authority considers it to be necessary. This authority is required to review its current policy by 31 January 2013. A draft amended Policy was prepared by Officers for consultation. There were no significant amendments proposed to the draft Policy which was prepared for consultation other than some amendments to the wording to reflect:-

- The completion of the process and subsequent award of a Provisional Statement for a Large Casino Premises License.
- Amendments made to the Gambling Commission's 'Guidance to Licensing Authorities, 4th Edition'.
- Separate advice issued by the Gambling Commission in relation to primary gambling activity on betting premises.
- Amendments to contact addresses for Responsible Authorities

8. A summary of the main changes to the draft amended Policy were:

The Casino Application Process

9. The Policy has been amended to reflect that fact that since the last review of the Policy in 2009, the Council has completed the process required for awarding the Large Casino License in Middlesbrough. The casino application process was completed on 30 May 2012 when the successful applicant was awarded a provisional statement for a Large Casino under the Gambling Act 2005. The criteria used and principles applied by the Council during the application process have been removed from the main body of the Policy and have been detailed in separate appendices.

Proposed Amendments to the Gambling Commission's 'Guidance to Local Authorities'

10. In September 2012, The Gambling Commission published amended 'Guidance to Local Authorities, 4th Edition'. This is statutory guidance on the functions of licensing authorities required under the Gambling Act 2005. The guidance was last published in May 2009 and this new edition provides updates on a number of issues. The changes made to the Policy are consistent with the amended guidance and are of a minor nature. These include:-

- Amendments to the definition of a Members Club (in relation to Club Gaming and Club Machine Permits).

- Updates in relation to Categories of Gaming Machines permitted in certain premises.

Primary Gambling Activity on Betting Premises

11. In November 2011, the Gambling Commission issued separate guidance entitled 'Indicators of betting as a primary gambling activity' following a number of applications throughout the Country for betting premises licences from operators who wished to take advantage of the gaming machines entitlement for a betting premises without providing facilities for betting. The draft amended Policy was amended, to reflect this guidance and stated that the Council will not look favourably on such applications where a betting premises licence is sought with little or no provision for betting facilities.

Amendments to contact addresses for Responsible Authorities

12. There have been amendments made to the contact details for a number of the Responsible Authorities.

Consultation

13. A report presented to the Executive Member for Community Protection on 17 July 2012 provided details of the draft Policy and approval was granted for public consultation on the document. A comprehensive consultation was carried out between 23 July 2012 and 1 October 2012. Details of the consultees are shown in the back of the Policy document in Appendix 1.
14. At the end of the consultation period 3 responses/comments were received. Details of these responses and any further amendments proposed to the draft Policy as a result of the responses are as follows:-

a) Association of British Bookmakers

Highlighted that paragraph 55 of the draft Policy made reference to a document published by the Gambling Commission entitled 'Indicators of Betting as a Primary Activity'. The Association of British Bookmakers advised that this document had been withdrawn by The Gambling Commission in November 2011 and that the Gambling Commission are currently consulting with the industry on this issue.

Action – reference to the document removed from the draft Policy.

b) Middlesbrough Council's Development Control Service

Advised of a change of address for the above service.

Action – draft Policy amended to reflect correct address.

c) Mr E Kunonga, Director of Public Health, Middlesbrough Council

The Director of Public Health provided a response which raised a number of issues in respect of the impact of gambling on health and well-being of the local population. In summary, the response raised issues in relation to considering the health impact of gambling premises and how to engage with the industry at a local level in relation to responsible gambling.

In relation to the issues raised, there is limited scope to consider the health and wellbeing impact of gambling premises at a local level, as the licensing objectives under the Gambling Act do not include a public health objective. Any consideration or objection made by a responsible authority or interested party has to link to one of the existing licensing objectives. The third licensing objective: 'protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling' aims to protect children from taking part in gambling/being exploited by gambling and not wider health issues.

These issues in relation to responsible gambling are considered and regulated by the Gambling Commission nationally, through a raft of conditions and codes of practice and through the Operator Licensing process, which is required for all gambling operators prior to them obtaining premises licences from local authorities. Within these codes there are Social Responsibility Codes which all Operators are required to follow and to make commitments to contributions to prevent problem gambling, education on gambling safely and treatment services for problem gamblers.

This response was provided to Mr Kunonga on 12 November 2012 and he was in agreement that no amendment to the policy was necessary.

15. A further report was presented to the Executive Member for Community Protection on 21 November 2012 which provided details of the final draft Policy. A recommendation was made to refer the draft Policy to Council for approval.

The final draft Policy is appended at Appendix 1.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

16. An initial assessment has been carried out and no differential impact on these groups have been identified which would have an adverse impact in this policy.

OPTION APPRAISAL/RISK ASSESSMENT

17. In line with the Gambling Act, 2005, Licensing Authorities are required to review their Gambling Policy every three years. The current Policy was implemented on 31 January 2010, and therefore, must be reviewed and published by 31 January 2013.
18. The process for reviewing the Gambling Act Policy is set down in the Gambling Act and associated Guidance. Failure to follow this process may leave the Council open to future legal challenges against its policy.
19. **Financial Implications** - The ongoing costs of the administration and regulation responsibilities under the Gambling Act 2005 are met through initial application and annual fees.
20. There are 41 betting premises, 2 casinos and 1 bingo hall in Middlesbrough. The Council also issue licences for 11 amusement arcades, 92 pubs, 75 small lotteries and 31 club gaming permits.
21. **Legal Implications** – As stated above, in line with the Gambling Act 2005; Licensing Authorities are required to review their Gambling Policy every three years. The current Gambling Policy was implemented on 31 January 2010 and therefore must be reviewed and published by 31 January 2013.
22. The Licensing Authority is required by the Gambling Act to consult on the revisions to the Gambling Licensing Policy with the police, people who represent gambling businesses in the area and people who represent the interests of people likely to be affected by the Authority's actions in relation to exercising their functions under the Act.
23. Following the consultation, all responses have been duly considered in the production of the final Policy. The final Policy must be ratified by full Council.
24. **Ward Implications** – Gambling establishments are widely dispersed throughout the town in both commercial and residential areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. That the responses to the consultation on the contents of the draft Licensing Policy are noted.
26. That Council approve the Gambling Act 2005: Licensing Policy Statement to enable it to be adopted by 31 January 2013.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

27. Gambling Commission, Guidance to Licensing Authorities, 4th Edition, September 2012.

AUTHOR

**Tim Hodgkinson, Principal Licensing Officer
Tel No. 728720**