## **GAMBLING CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

| Date<br>Received        | Agency/<br>Respondent                         | Method of response | Summary of Response to Consultation   | Action Taken  |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|---|---|
| 17<br>September<br>2024 | Betting and<br>Gaming<br>Council –<br>Point 1 | Written            | Section 5.2. figures omit that 0.3% of the adult population engage in problem gambling is omitted from these figures. Instead, the statement of principles states that 2.8% of adults were identified as at-risk or problem gamblers. The authority appears therefore to be overstating the issue which can only be pejorative as far as applicants are concerned. There is no place or justification for these figures in a local statement of principles and these figures should therefore be omitted. | Added a sentence regarding 0.3% the adult population engage in problem gambling.  |
|                         | Betting and<br>Gaming<br>Council –<br>Point 2 | Written            | Estimated costs of harm associated with gambling in England" contained within the table in paragraph 5.3.4 should be deleted along with the text of the paragraph. None of this information is relevant in the context of the licensing authority's duty to aim to permit gambling premises in Brent.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  The intention of this paragraph is to highlight the impact on the harm associated with gambling in England, and has been incorporated as the Health and Wellbeing Brent Council asked this to be included last year |
|                         | Betting and<br>Gaming<br>Council –<br>Point 3 | Written            | Paragraphs 7.1 to 7.5.9 explain the council's approach to premises licence conditions. This section would be assisted by the insertion of a clear statement that the mandatory and default conditions are intended to be, and usually are, sufficient to ensure consistency with the licensing  | Inclusion of paragraph suggested.   |

|   |         | objectives and that additional conditions will only be considered where there is clear evidence of a risk to the licensing objectives which is not adequately addressed by the applicant's local risk assessment.  |  |
|---|---------|--|--|
| Betting and<br>Gaming<br>Council –<br>Point 4 | Written | Paragraph 7.1.7 should be deleted as this demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the requirements of Gambling Act 2005 applications. This states that, "Applicants shall offer conditions to the Licensing Authority as part of their application."  | Wording will be changed to reflect this to "Applicants may offer". |
|   |         | Unlike Licensing Act 2003 applications where an applicant is required to indicate the steps to be taken to promote the licensing objectives with these steps then being converted into premises licence conditions, there is no such requirement under Gambling Act 2005 applications as the mandatory and default conditions coupled with the local risk assessment will detail how the premises will operate consistently with the licensing objectives. The risk assessment will outline local risks and the policies, procedures and measures to be implemented to ensure consistency with the licensing objectives. There is no anticipation that these |  |

|                  |   |         | measures etc will then be "converted" into conditions.   |  |
|------------------|---|---------|--|--|
|                  | Betting and<br>Gaming<br>Council –<br>Point 5 | Written | The "menu" of proposed conditions in paragraph 7.2 to 7.5 should be deleted. Issues such as staff training, the recording of refusals are issues for the Gambling Commission through the LCCP and Operating Licence. These are not matters for the Licensing Authority.                        | Noted but no policy revision required.  This section pertains to the conditions that operators may offer during the application process. |
| 7 August<br>2024 | GamCare –<br>Point 1                          | Written | We welcome the position Brent Council is taking to go beyond the mandatory and default conditions of the Gambling Act 2005 in its statement of principles.   | Noted but no policy revision required.   |
|                  | GamCare –<br>Point 2                          | Written | Local authorities can play a greater role in reducing gambling harm, particularly for those of our clients who experience harm in land-based gambling venues, due to council's licensing responsibilities.   | Noted but no policy revision required.   |
|                  | GamCare –<br>Point 3                          | Written | It is vital that Brent Council develops a local picture of the level of gambling harms, in order to best target resources and tailor service provision. This could be achieved by gathering data from the National Gambling Helpline, as well as those already providing services in the area. | Noted but no policy revision required.  Brent Public Health are currently drafting a Gambling Needs Assessment.                          |
|                  | GamCare –<br>Point 4                          | Written | Building on the proactive approach<br>the council is already taking, we<br>would like to see Brent Council<br>commit in its statement of principles<br>to a public health approach to<br>gambling.   | Noted but no policy revision required. Brent Public Health are currently drafting a Gambling Needs Assessment.                           |

|                         | GamCare –<br>Point 5                        | Written | This commitment should include training frontline and primary care staff to recognise the signs of gambling harm and develop referral pathways to the National Gambling Helpline or local treatment providers. GamCare has worked with Haringey Council to implement a similar system, that has received widespread support.            | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|-------------------------|---|---------|---|---|
|                         | GamCare –<br>Point 6                        | Written | In the absence of Cumulative Impact Assessments as a method by which the "aim to permit" approach can be challenged, Brent Council should continue to pursue a Local Area Profile approach that specifically analyses gambling risk, and use this data as a basis from which to scrutinise and possibly oppose a licensing application. | Noted but no policy revision required.  Decision makers are required to determine each gambling application on its individual merits and the draft policy enables the licensing authority to do this. |
|                         | GamCare –<br>Point 7                        | Written | The changes to Brent Council's statement of principles should be viewed in the context of the Gambling Act Review and subsequent process of white paper consultations, so take account of the rapidly changing regulatory environment.  | Noted but no policy revision required. Reviews of the Council's statement of principles will takes place, when revisions of legislation or changes to codes of practices occur.                       |
| 30<br>September<br>2024 | Brent<br>Environment<br>al nuisance<br>team | Written | Our Nuisance Control data does not contain any information against either statutory nuisance or public nuisance necessitating our concern or input into this revision.  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
| 6 August<br>2024        | Hough and<br>Bollard                        | Written | Thank you I have no comments to make.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  |

| 2<br>September<br>2024 | Luxury<br>Leisure –<br>point 1 | Written | Para 4.5.4 We note the suggestion that accessing gambling facilities late at night is a "potential indicator of gambling harms". However, as leisure venues with a purely adult  | Wording amended to take into account variety of different users.             |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--|
|                        |                                |         | customer base, AGCs are part of the<br>night time economy and cater to a<br>wide variety of adults, such as those<br>finishing night shifts, those in the<br>hospitality trade and taxi and bus  |  |
|                        |                                |         | drivers. The suggestion that just because those customers play at night there is a potential indicator of harm, is, we believe, misplaced and suggest that the wording is amended.   |  |
|                        | Luxury<br>Leisure –<br>point 2 | Written | Para 6.11.2 With respect, it is not correct that an applicant "should" make an application for a provisional statement in the circumstances described – although they "may" do so. We refer to the 2008 case of R (on the application of Betting Shop Services Limited) –V– Southend on Sea Borough Council, in which it was held that an applicant could apply for a premises licence (without the need for a provisional statement) even though the premises were not fully constructed – the applicant is not restricted to making an application for a provisional statement. It was held by the court that the then current | This section will be amended to reflect the change and the amended guidance. |
|                        |                                |         | Guidance issued by the Commission was wrong. The Guidance was subsequently amended. As such, we suggest that the wording of these  |  |

|                        |                                |         | paras be amended to make it clear that applications for premises licences can be made regardless of whether the building in question is complete or finished or needs to be altered. An applicant may apply for a provisional statement if the building is not complete, but it does not have to do so and can instead apply for licence. |  |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|
|                        | Luxury<br>Leisure –<br>point 3 | Written | Para 6.13.1 On the same theme as at 2 above, we think it more accurate for the first sentence to read" When dealing with a premises licence application for <u>any</u> building" - not simply " <u>finished</u> buildings".   | Change made to reflect this.   |
|                        | Luxury<br>Leisure –<br>point 4 | Written | Para 7.1.7 We do not think it correct for the Statement to presuppose that in every case conditions must be offered by applicants ("Applicants shall offer"). There are many mandatory and default conditions and it will not always be the case that further conditions are necessary or required.                                       | Noted but no policy revision required.  Wording of paragraph changed from "shall" to "may".  |
| 6<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 1-<br>Harlesden       | Online  | More emphasis should be given to protecting vulnerable residents  | Noted but no policy revision required.  A number of revisions have been made to the policy regarding the protection of vulnerable people. To make further changes, it would be useful to have specific details/ examples of what could be implemented to better protect vulnerable people. |
|                        | Resident 1-<br>Harlesden       | Online  | There are too many gambling establishments in Harlesden and these are a source of crime and disorder  | Noted but no policy revision required.  As mentioned in other parts of this report, the policy cannot decrease the number of gambling establishments.  |

|                        | Resident 1-<br>Harlesden | Online | The policy leaves too much temptation on the streets for those who are struggling with a gambling problem.  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------|---|---|
|                        | Resident 1-<br>Harlesden | Online | No, I believe the voices of residents often go unheard.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|                        |                          |        |   | All interested parties can objective or review a gambling licence, but objections or reviews are only valid if the reasons demonstrate that the licensing objectives are not being, or are unlikely to be, met. |
| 7<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 2-<br>Kilburn   | Online | The fact that local authorities are extremely constrained by central government regulations when it comes to allowing these socially damaging "local businesses" onto their high streets reflects the influence of the gambling industry at Westminster, particularly in the Conservative party. Lobbying for a change in these iniquitous rules ought to be a priority for the new administration. | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Council have written to Minister requesting changes to the Act to include 'Cumulative Impact assessments'.  |
|                        | Resident 2-<br>Kilburn   | Online | Without a change in the regulations,<br>Brent's policy is as strong as it can be<br>but their hands are unacceptably tied.  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|                        | Resident 2-<br>Kilburn   | Online | It's a problem that needs addressing but with the police as stretched as they are, again local authority policy is necessarily a secondary consideration  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
| 7<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 3-<br>Roundwood | Online | There are far too many gambling shops on the Harlesden High Road and they have become a magnet for alcohol and drug addicts who hang around outside for hours, often acting in a very anti-social way. It drives shoppers from the High Road as it's  | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Council have written to Minister requesting changes to the Act to include 'Cumulative Impact assessments'.  |

|                        |                            |        |  | <del>-</del>   |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------|--|--|
|                        |                            |        | not a nice place to be. The policy needs to address this and the council needs to lobby central government so that they have the power to veto gambling shops from opening and make positive choices for the shops that are allowed to open on the High Street.  |  |
|                        | Resident 3-<br>Roundwood   | Online | The policy does not give the council the power to turn down applications from gambling companies and thereby make positive choices for Harlesden and the High Street. The High Street is becoming a no go area because of the number of gambling shops and the people who congregate outside.  | Noted but no policy revision required.   |
|                        | Resident 3-<br>Roundwood   | Online | The policy clearly does not address protecting gambling addicts, young people or the ordinary people who are affected by the anti-social behaviour of the gambling shop customers.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  There has been an increased emphasis on ensuring that operators are responsive to crime and disorder issues related to their premises within the policy. |
|                        | Resident 3-<br>Roundwood   | Online | What is on place is clearly not working as there are many people on the high street who are addicts and display anti-social behaviour. It's scary for children and adults alike, to be around that and we avoid the High Street because of this. We prefer to spend our money elsewhere as it is not a nice experience to be on the High Street. | Noted but no policy revision required.  There has been an increased emphasis on ensuring that operators are responsive to crime and disorder issues related to their premises within the policy. |
| 9<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 4-<br>Craven Park | Online | It doesn't because it does not consider school superzones, deprivation, or plans to improve the vitality of certain areas.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Local Area Profile takes deprivation into consideration and considers it within the policy. If an area is already                                    |

|                         |                            |        |   | facing high deprivation, any application would be evaluated based on its own merit and any risks posed to the Licensing Objectives.  Several consultation responses have emphasised the need for a local strategy to tackle gambling-related harms. This has emerged as a theme in the consultation process.  Unfortunately, there are limited opportunities to make amendments to the policy, based on this aspect, currently. |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|---|
|                         | Resident 4-<br>Craven Park | Online | It needs to be based on data collected in the last 10 years   | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|                         | Resident 4-<br>Craven Park | Online | It needs to be reinforced, considering child protection and safeguarding children law.  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|                         | Resident 4-<br>Craven Park | Online | Businesses must have a certain kind of responsibility in preventing crime and disorder relating to ASB.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  Greater focus has been placed on ensuring that operators are responsive to issues of crime and disorder related to their premises.  |
| 25<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 5-<br>Craven Park | Online | Honestly, gambling businesses will not help the area to thrive. It causes financial, and mental health problems and contributes to anti-social, hostile and unsafe behaviour in the area - which has a personal and financial cost to residents, the council, but not least, the people who use these gambling businesses. They might not be illegal. But they are immoral. You only need to see who uses these businesses and loiters outside them to see that these people are vulnerable or in need of some kind of help - and by removing and restricting | Noted but no policy revision required.  This issue has been raised throughout the consultation process and engagement exercises. Further clarification has been added regarding operator responsibilities in recognising and mitigating the risks of crime associated with gambling premises.   |

|                            |        | gambling businesses this would go a long way.  |   |
|----------------------------|--------|--|---|
| Resident 5-<br>Craven Park | Online | The policy does not really address these points. For example, it mentions the concept of "designing out" crime and the importance of adequate supervision, but it does not provide specific examples of how these could be or have been achieved anywhere else. If there are no standards or guidelines on how these things should be achieved, then how are the proprietors of these businesses ever going to be held to account? Surely the council is not happy with the anti-social behaviour that gambling already causes in the borough, and there has been no instances of designing out the problems caused by gambling, so how is anyone - the business owners, local residents, council enforcement - able to uphold any kind of sanction when there is no guidance. | Noted but no policy revision required.  This issue has been raised throughout the consultation process and engagement exercises. Further clarification has been added regarding operator responsibilities in recognising and mitigating the risks of crime associated with gambling premises. |
|                            |        | Also, there is a lot of 'should' in this document, but not a lost of 'must'. If a business 'should' do something, then that gives them an opportunity to not do it - 'should' is not mandatory. By stating that they 'must' do things, then that holds them to the principles you are laying down. Without saying that, these policy documents and the findings of these consultations are useless as businesses can ignore them. Residents 'must' pay their   | 'Should' is a legal term which means must.  |

|             |        | council tax, we don't have the luxury   |   |
|-------------|--------|---|---|
|             |        | of deciding whether we 'should' pay it  |   |
|             |        | or not - why do businesses get          |   |
|             |        | leeway to decide which council rules    |   |
|             |        | they should follow?                     |   |
| Resident 5- | Online | Not really? Can gambling ever be        | Noted but no policy revision required.                    |
| Craven Park |        | fair? Gambling businesses don't         |   |
|             |        | make a loss, so it would appear that    |   |
|             |        | they are always the winner - is that    |   |
|             |        | fair?                                   |   |
|             |        | They base their high street branches    |   |
|             |        | in areas like Harlesden and Kilburn     |   |
|             |        | and Wembley instead of Chelsea and      |   |
|             |        | Kensal Green and Hampstead - is if      |   |
|             |        | fair to residents of the former areas   |   |
|             |        | that they target them for gambling?     |   |
|             |        | What do the demographics of those       |   |
|             |        | areas have in common?                   |   |
| Resident 5- | Online | I don't have enough views on this but   | Noted but no policy revision required.                    |
| Craven Park |        | it's obvious that children shouldn't be |   |
|             |        | tempted to gamble and having the        | Greater focus has been placed on ensuring that operators  |
|             |        | volume of these premises around         | are responsive to issues of crime and disorder related to |
|             |        | Harlesden, where there are plenty of    | their premises.   |
|             |        | children around school times and it is  |   |
|             |        | metres away from several different      |   |
|             |        | schools means that the prospect of      |   |
|             |        | gambling is always going to be in their |   |
|             |        | faces.                                  |   |
|             |        | As goes the vulnerable people point,    |   |
|             |        | I reiterate - you only need to look at  |   |
|             |        | the people who are standing around      |   |
|             |        | in the vicinity of these premises in    |   |
|             |        | Harlesden on any day of the week -      |   |
|             |        | there are heavy drinkers, drug          |   |
|             |        | abusers, people who are obviously in    |   |

|                         | Resident 5-<br>Craven Park | Online | financial distress, the mentally ill, people who are lost and lonely these premises are hubs and meeting points for these people and that surely cannot be good or healthy.  The potential measures that licensees could take to address issues related to street drinking that are mentioned in the document are all in place, so what is the point of including these? Aren't these already conditions of running a gambling  | Noted but no policy revision required.  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------|---|---|
|                         | Resident 5-<br>Craven Park | Online | I hope I've already said enough about this in earlier answers to impress on you the fact that these proposals will make no difference to anti-social behaviour in the borough, will provide no responsibility on the part of the business owners to enforce or even take any care or interest about whether this is a problem or not, and many if not all of the things highlighted in the consultation are already in place or exist, so I cannot see how the proposals are meant to be an improvement because they are not. They just confirm business as usual without addressing current issues with the anti-social behaviour that arises from existing gambling establishments. | Noted but no policy revision required.  This issue has been raised throughout the consultation process and engagement exercises. Further clarification has been added regarding operator responsibilities in recognising and mitigating the risks of crime associated with gambling premises. |
| 26<br>September<br>2024 | Resident 6-<br>Harlesden   | Online | There is a gambling centre in Harlesden and they just approved more? Its shocking that the area has allowed multiple casinos to open. They take advantage of vulnerable   | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Gambling Act 2005 places a legal duty on the Licensing Authority to aim to permit gambling in so far as it  |

|                          |        | gambling addicts and nothing to the area except bring it down.  | is considered to be reasonably consistent with the pursuit of the licensing objectives. The Licensing Authority is unable to refuse applications for gambling premises or close premises solely because there are already too many premises, or they are not wanted by the community. We must consider each case on its individual merits.   |
|--------------------------|--------|---|--|
| Resident 6-<br>Harlesden | Online | Not enough is being done to prevent more gambling businesses opening in deprived communities. Clearly its not working when there were multiple protests and yet they are still opening multiple new gambling centers in Harlesden. One is right next to a school?? How can this be allowed? | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Local Area Plan identifies the placement of schools, which gambling operators should consider when conducting their Local Area Risk Assessment. In areas where children are particularly vulnerable, the impact on the licensing objective of protecting children from harm would determine whether a new application is granted and if it aligns with the licensing objectives. |
| Resident 6-<br>Harlesden | Online | There is a new gambling center in Harlesden being built right next to a school. I really don't understand how policy has allowed this. i cant think of a less suitable location. It's right next to a school.   | Noted but no policy revision required.  The Local Area Plan identifies the placement of schools, which gambling operators should consider when conducting their Local Area Risk Assessment. In areas where children are particularly vulnerable, the impact on the licensing objective of protecting children from harm would determine whether a new application is granted and if it aligns with the licensing objectives. |
| Resident 6-<br>Harlesden | Online | The amount of street drinking in Harlesden is wild. Around the town clock which should be a high profile area in the town there are groups of homeless drinkers always there begging and giving the area an unwelcoming, messy and intimidating environment.                                | Noted but no policy revision required.  Greater focus has been placed on ensuring that operators are responsive to issues of crime and disorder related to their premises.   |
| Resident 6-<br>Harlesden | Online | Heard a while ago about a regeneration project on harlesden plaza - but it doesn't look like its  | Noted but no policy revision required.   |

| happening. the area is just begging    |  |
|--|--|
| for investment and its bizarre that    |  |
| with such high housing prices that the |  |
| area is being left behind, growing run |  |
| down and forgotten.                    |  |