

Schedule of Responses in relation to Statement of Licensing Policy (Gambling)

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
GP/1	Councillor S G	Supports continuation of 'No casino' Policy. Wants regulation strengthened in relation to fixed odd betting terminals.	Agreed. Local Authority no control over FOBT however report to Cabinet to propose Government consider issue further	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required
GP/2	D M (Member of the Public)	Believes 'no casino' policy should be removed as would offer employment in the area.	Damage is far greater than any employment that would be created	No change to Policy required
GP/3	T S (Member of the Public)	Does not agree with betting shops or any premises where slot machines are utilized.	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this.	No change to Policy required
GP/4	S S (Member of the Public)	Totally against gambling in North Tyneside	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this.	No change to Policy required
GP/5	A S (Member of the Public)	Wishes 'no casino' policy in North Tyneside to remain	Agreed.	No change to Policy required
GP/6	J M (Member of the Public)	Believes Fixed Odd Betting Terminals need more control and the ability to bet up to £100 per spin is excessive	As per GP/1	No change to Policy required

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
GP/7	John Barton, Legal Department	Additional paragraph following recommendations made by Overview & Scrutiny to outline what the Council is not responsible for	Agreed.	Policy amended as proposed
GP/8	C J (Member of the Public)	Wishes a limit on the amount of gambling locations in the town centres and no more than two betting outlets. Any betting premises should not be allowed to open another betting outlet within two-three miles of one of their existing locations.	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this. Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this.	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required
GP/9	D B (Member of the Public)	Wishes gambling licences and premises to be restricted as much as possible, and for the no casino policy within North Tyneside to remain. Does not want FOBT terminals within betting establishments.	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this. Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this.	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required
GP/10	Gambling Operator	Do not believe risk assessment should be prescriptive in nature in relation to specifying a certain distance between education or vulnerable adult establishments and gambling premises	Believe distance of 200 metres is appropriate	Further examples of vulnerable person establishments to be given in Policy to assist

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
		Wishes for clarification in relation to Paragraph 3.3 pg 30 in relation to the bullet point which prevents children from being in close proximity to gambling premises.	Revised Gambling Commission Guidance to Local Authorities just published (29.9.15)	Policy wording clarified in relation to this
GP/11	A S (Member of the Public)	Supports Council position of not allowing Casinos in the borough particularly Tynemouth	Agreed.	No change to Policy required
GP/12	A J (Member of the Public)	Wants local authority to limit the number of Gambling Licences. Wants no casino policy to continue.	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this Agreed.	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required
GP/13	Registered Charity	Supports no casino policy. Reduce number of FOBT in the borough. Policy in relation to protection of children should be strengthened	Agreed. Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required No change to Policy required

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
		<p>Believes Category C machines should be completely obscured from view from children</p> <p>Risk assessment should take into account children and vulnerable persons who pass premises</p> <p>Does not believe an annual inspection is sufficient and if complaints that this should be increased</p> <p>Encourages consultation with local churches</p>	<p>to this</p> <p>Believe distance of 200 metres as stated in the Policy and the wording of this is appropriate</p> <p>Inspections done on a risk rating basis and can be increased if necessary</p> <p>Believe consultation wide enough</p>	<p>No change to Policy required</p> <p>No change to Policy required</p> <p>No change to Policy required</p>
GP/14	P B (Member of the Public)	<p>Supports no casino policy.</p> <p>Where possible prevent excessive gambling and act responsibly to limit gambling in the area.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this</p>	<p>No change to Policy required</p> <p>No change to Policy required</p>
GP/15	Gambling Operator	<p>Consultation should have waited for GC document</p>	<p>Not possible due to timescales involved. Revised Guidance has now been published</p>	<p>No change to Policy required</p>

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
		<p>Compliance should be based on evidence and risk</p> <p>Paragraph on vulnerable adult establishments too vague in Policy</p> <p>Believes crime mapping and neighbourhood websites is disproportionate</p> <p>If Licensing Authority receives information which amounts to a significant change and requires the operator to review their risk assessment is unworkable</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Don't agree and believe responsible operators would want this information to assist them</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Reference is now made to Regulator's Code at paragraph 7.3 (pg 18) to take account of this</p> <p>Policy wording amended to include but (not limited to) treatment centres, hostels or other establishments of similar characteristics where such persons regularly meet added for clarity</p> <p>No changes to Policy required</p> <p>Policy wording amended to include that if information is received that this will be shared with the Applicant/Licence</p>

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
		<p>Suite of conditions too prescriptive.</p> <p>Does not agree with comments made in para 3.3 (pg 30) regarding children being prevented from being in close proximity to gambling</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Revised Gambling Commission Guidance to Local Authorities just published (29.9.15)</p>	<p>Holder as soon as reasonable practicable</p> <p>Conditions now on Gambling Commission website. Wording amended accordingly.</p> <p>Policy wording clarified in relation to this</p>
GP/16	J H (Member of the Public)	<p>Wants no casino policy maintained</p> <p>Would prefer limit of risk assessment to be extended to 300-400 metres</p> <p>Believes there are sufficient betting premises</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Believe distance of 200 metres is appropriate</p> <p>Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this</p>	<p>No change to Policy required</p> <p>No change to Policy required</p> <p>No change to Policy required</p>

Reference	Respondent	Comments	Appraisal by Member Working Group	Response
GP/17	Residents' Association	Believes distance of 200 metres is insufficient in relation to risk assessment Supports views of GP/16	Believe distance of 200 metres is appropriate	No change to Policy required
GP/18	J J (Member of the Public)	Asks no casino policy to remain	Agreed	No change to Policy required
GP/19	J L (Member of the Public)	Believes there should be no relaxation or controls and no expansion of premises where gambling is permitted Believes wider consultation should have taken place	Local Authority limited by Gambling Act 2005 in relation to this Believe consultation wide enough	No change to Policy required No change to Policy required
GP/20	H W (Business)	Believes risk assessment should include consideration of the resident population and their specific characteristics (Report attached to e-mail)	Have sufficient information available without the need for this	No change to Policy required