

# GOSSCHALKS

BY EMAIL ONLY  
LICENSING SECTION  
GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Please ask for:** Richard Taylor  
**Direct Tel:** 01482 590216  
**Email:** rjt@gosschalks.co.uk  
**Our ref:** RJT / MJM / 123267.00001  
#GS4117608  
**Your ref:**  
**Date:** 27 September 2021

Dear Sirs,

## **Re: Gambling Act 2005 Policy Statement Consultation**

We act for the Betting and Gaming Council (BGC) and are instructed to respond on behalf of the BGC to your consultation on the review of your Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles.

### **The Betting and Gaming Council**

The Betting and Gaming Council (BGC) was created in 2019 as the new standards body for the UK's regulated betting and gaming industry. This includes betting shops, online betting and gaming businesses, bingo and casinos. Its mission is to champion industry standards in betting and gaming to ensure an enjoyable, fair and safe betting and gaming experience for all of its members' customers.

BGC members support 119,000 jobs and account for £4.5 billion to the Treasury annually in tax. Recent study also showed that BGC members contributed around £7.7 billion in gross value added to the UK economy in 2019.

The gambling industry is integral to the survival of sport. Betting companies spend over £40 million a year on the English Football League (EFL) and its clubs. Horse racing, an industry estimated to be worth £3.5 billion a year to the UK economy and which generates 85,000 jobs receives over £350 million per annum through the Horse Racing Industry Levy, media rights and sponsorship. Darts and Snooker receive in excess of £10 million per annum which represents 90 % of all sponsorship revenue.

The BGC has four principal objectives. These are to –

- **create a culture of safer gambling throughout the betting and gaming sector, with particular focus on young people and those who are vulnerable**
- **ensure future changes to the regulatory regime are considered, proportionate and balanced**

---

Queens Gardens, Hull, HU1 3DZ    **T** 01482 324252    **F** 0870 600 5984    **W** [www.gosschalks.co.uk](http://www.gosschalks.co.uk)    **DX** 11902 – Hull

Gosschalks is the trading name of Gosschalks LLP, a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales with number OC431300. Our registered office is at Queen's Gardens, Hull, HU1 3DZ. We use the term "Partner" to refer to a member of the LLP or an employee or consultant who is a lawyer or with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of the members of Gosschalks LLP is available for inspection at the above address.

Gosschalks LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors' Regulation Authority under number 670570.



- **become respected as valuable, responsible and engaged members of the communities in which its members operate**
- **safeguard and empower the customer as the key to a thriving UK betting and gaming industry**

Before we comment on your draft policy document, it is important that the backdrop against which the comments are made is established.

### **Betting and Gaming in the UK**

Betting and gaming is an incredibly important part of the UK leisure and hospitality industry, employing over 70,000 people, including 50,000 in betting, 13,000 in casinos and 10,000 people directly employed online. The betting and gaming industry contributes £8.7 billion Gross Value Added to the UK economy & contributes £3.2 billion to HM Treasury. In addition, casinos contribute over £120 million to the tourism economy each year.

Betting and gaming is widely enjoyed in the UK. Around 30 million people participate in some sort of gambling, whether that is on the National Lottery, placing a bet in betting shops, playing in casinos or at bingo. The overwhelming majority of these people do so safely without reporting any problems.

Any consideration of gambling licensing at the local level should also be considered within the wider context.

- the overall number of betting shops is in decline. The latest Gambling Commission industry statistics show that the number of betting offices (as of March 2020) was 7681. This is reducing every year and has fallen from a figure of 9137 in March 2014. Covid 19 had a devastating effect on the betting industry. The number of betting offices in June 2020 was down to 6461.
- planning law changes introduced in April 2015 have increased the ability of licensing authorities to review applications for new premises, as all new betting shops must now apply for planning permission.
- In April 2019 a maximum stake of £2 was applied to the operation of fixed odds betting terminals
- successive prevalence surveys and health surveys tells us that problem gambling rates in the UK are stable and possibly falling.

### **Problem Gambling**

Problem gambling rates are static or possibly falling. The reported rate of 'problem gambling' (according to either the DSM-IV or the PGSI) was 0.8% of the adult population in 2015, in 2016 it was 0.7% and in 2018 it was 0.5% of the adult population.

This is termed statistically stable but is encouraging that we might finally be seeing a reduction in problem gambling due to the raft of measures that have been put in place recently both by the

industry, the Gambling Commission and the Government – from a ban on credit cards, restrictions to VIP accounts, new age and identity verification measures and voluntary restrictions on advertising. These rates have remained broadly the same since the introduction of the Gambling Act 2005.

Whilst one problem gambler is too many, both the Government and regulator both say there is no evidence that problem gambling has increased in recent years.

During the Covid-19 period of lockdown, both the Gambling Commission and Government have acknowledged that problem gambling levels have not increased.

In June 2020, the BGC's five largest members committed to increasing the amount they spend on research, education and treatment (RET) services from 0.1 per cent to 0.25 per cent of their annual revenue in 2020, 0.5 per cent in 2021, 0.75 per cent in 2022 and 1 per cent in 2023. The five operators confirmed they will provide £100 million to GambleAware charity to improve treatment services for problem gamblers.

Rates of 'problem gambling' in the UK are low by international standards – compared to France (1.3%), Germany (1.2%), Sweden (2.2%) and Italy (1.27%).

The BGC supported the creation of the new NHS gambling treatment clinics who have promised 22 clinics, 3 of which are open now. We are pleased that the NHS have committed to work to increase the number of clinics in the UK in addition to existing serviced delivered by Gordon Moody Association and GamCare's 120 treatment centres located throughout the UK.

The BGC welcomes the Gambling Commission's National Strategy was a way of accelerating progress on responsible gambling and tackling problem gambling. Our members are fully committed to meeting this challenge and are working tirelessly to deliver new responsible gambling initiatives including technology that tackles problem gambling and supporting a statutory levy and increased funding for problem gambling clinics.

Underage participating by those aged 11-16 in any gambling activity has declined from 22% to 11% over the past decade; here, 'gambling activity' mainly relates to personal betting (e.g. playing cards with friends) and legal play of lotteries (e.g. participating with consent of parents / guardians). BGC members have a zero tolerance to those under the age of 18 attempting to use their products.

### **Working in partnership with local authorities**

The BGC is fully committed to ensuring constructive working relationships exist between betting operators and licensing authorities, and that where problems may arise that they can be dealt with in partnership. The exchange of clear information between councils and betting operators is a key part of this and the opportunity to respond to this consultation is welcomed.

### **Differentiation between Licensing Act 2003 and Gambling Act 2005 applications**

When considering applications for premises licences, it is important that a clear distinction is made between the regimes, processes and procedures established by Gambling Act 2005 and its

regulations and those that are usually more familiar to licensing authorities – the regimes, processes and procedures relating to Licensing Act 2003.

Whilst Licensing Act 2003 applications require applicants to specify steps to be taken to promote the licensing objectives, those steps being then converted into premises licence conditions, there is no such requirement in Gambling Act 2005 applications where the LCCP provide a comprehensive package of conditions for all types of premises licence.

It should continue to be the case that additional conditions in Gambling Act 2005 premises licence applications are only imposed in exceptional circumstances where there are clear reasons for doing so. There are already mandatory and default conditions attached to any premises licence which will ensure operation that is consistent with the licensing objectives. In the vast majority of cases, these will not need to be supplemented by additional conditions.

The LCCP require that premises operate an age verification policy. The industry operates a policy called “Think 21”. This policy is successful in preventing under-age gambling. Independent test purchasing carried out by operators and submitted to the Gambling Commission, shows that ID challenge rates are consistently around 85%.

When reviewing draft statements of principles in the past, we have seen statements of principles requiring the operation of Challenge 25. Unless there is clear evidence of a need to deviate from the industry standard then conditions requiring an alternative age verification policy should not be imposed.

The BGC is concerned that the imposition of additional licensing conditions could become commonplace if there are no clear requirements in the revised licensing policy statement as to the need for evidence. If additional licence conditions are more commonly applied this would increase variation across licensing authorities and create uncertainty amongst operators as to licensing requirements, over complicating the licensing process both for operators and local authorities

### **Considerations specific to the proposed (unchanged) Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles**

We note that it is not proposed to update the existing (2019-2022) Statement of Principles and the comments below therefore follow a review of that policy.

Part B is headed, “Promotion of the Licensing Objectives.” This should be amended to delete the reference to “promotion” as there needs to be a clear distinction between the Licensing Act 2003 regimes and that deal with by the Statement of Principles. Neither the licensing authority nor operators have a duty to promote the licensing objectives. The only body upon whom Gambling Act 2005 confers such a duty is the Gambling Commission itself.

The first sentence of paragraph 16.3 appears to be incomplete. This reads, “*The council will need to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that the particular location would be harmful to the licensing objectives*” but it does not go on to state what the consequence of being so satisfied would be. This sentence needs redrafting/supplementing in order that its meaning is clear.

Paragraph 16.6 contains a list of matters that the licensing authority recommends are considered by operators when conducting risk assessments. This list should be redrafted to delete matters that are not relevant to any assessment of risk to the licensing objectives.

SR Code Provisions 10.1.1 and 10.2.2 provide for *“relevant matters identified in the licensing authority’s statement of licensing policy”* to be taken into account. The examples of matters that the licensing authority recommends be considered needs therefore only to reflect matters that are relevant to the licensing objectives.

It is impossible to see how issues such as *“known problems in the area such as street drinkers, youths participating in anti-social behaviour, drug dealing activities etc”* could pose a risk to the licensing objectives.

Similarly, *“gaming trends that may mirror reflect benefit payments”* can only be relevant to an assessment of risk to the licensing objectives if the authority’s view is that anyone in receipt of benefits is deemed vulnerable or likely to commit crime as a result of gambling. This cannot be correct and references to any issue that is not relevant to the licensing objectives should be removed.

Paragraph 20.2 needs to be redrafted. This states that applicants will be expected to explain in their applications how their proposals will not exacerbate problems to individuals living in the vicinity or exacerbate any crime problems within the vicinity generally. Furthermore, this paragraph expects *“tailored applications”* and to propose licence conditions. This appears to conflate requirements of Licensing Act 2003 applications and those under Gambling Act 2005 and needs amending so that there is no confusion.

Gambling Act 2005 applications do not require an explanation of how the proposals will not exacerbate any problems to individuals or general crime in the vicinity. Relevant matters are for the local area risk assessment in which an applicant will identify risks to the licensing objectives (rather than problems of crime in the area generally) posed by the provision of the gambling facilities proposed and detail policies, procedures and control measures in place to mitigate the risk.

Furthermore, an applicant will not need to tailor an application nor propose licence conditions as is expected under Licensing Act 2003. The default conditions that attach to all premises licences are designed to be, and usually are, sufficient to ensure operation that is consistent with the licensing objectives. Additional conditions would only be required where there is evidence that the policies, procedures and control measures contained within the risk assessment do not adequately address the risk posed by the provision of gambling facilities proposed.

Appendix D is overly long and refers to matters outside any consideration of risk to the licensing objectives. Maps 5, 8,9,10 all have no relevance as far as an assessment of risk to the licensing objectives is concerned and should therefore be removed.

**Conclusion**

On behalf of the BGC, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft statement of principles and hope that these comments above are useful. The BGC will work with you to ensure that its members' operation of its premises will operate in accordance with the licensing objectives.

Yours faithfully,

**GOSSCHALKS LLP**