Summary of Responses to Consultation on Draft Statement of Principles

Name of responder shown in **bold**, summary of response in normal text and officer opinion shown in *italic*.

Gosschalks (on behalf of Association of British Bookmakers)

Statement should state the door staff will only be required where there is a proven need.

The draft statement makes no reference to door staff. It will be for the Police to make representation where they feel it is appropriate to have door staff and the Licensing Authority can make judgements in each case. We see no need to make specific statements about the circumstances in which the Licensing Authority either will or will not require door supervision.

Betting machines should only be restricted in number where there is clear evidence of a need to do so.

The draft statement makes no reference to betting machines. Theses are a relatively new development and it is suggested that no specific statements are made in respect of betting machines unless and until there is clear evidence of a need to do so. In the meantime The Licensing Authority should not fetter its discretion under Section 181 to control the number, type or conditions of use of such machines.

The Licensing Authority should encourage or give sympathetic consideration to resiting in the same locality where this allows improvements in facilities.

That improvements to facilities may be made when re-siting occurs will undoubtedly be one of the factors put forward by operators when making applications. As each case will be looked at on its own merits we see no reason to introduce any form of presumption into the Statement of Principles.

That operators be asked to give the Licensing Authority a single point of contact for the premises in their area.

This would clearly be good operational practice and would be what this authority would do in any case. There is no need to include it in a Statement of Principles.

Gamcare (National Association for Gambling Care Educational Resouces and Training)

Note: This response is a standard response to all Licensing Authorities and acknowledges that not all issues apply to all authorities. The issues raised are all requests for consideration of conditions to be applied to licences rather than amendments to the Statement of Principles, no changes are, therefore, required.

Mr Mayo

Statement should define vicinity more specifically.

The definition of vicinity has deliberately been drawn in the way it has to allow anyone who can demonstrate a significant impact on themself to make a representation. A resident from a surrounding village may be able to make a representation about a premises in Chippenham if they are able how that particular premises will have a direct effect on them. This does not mean that anyone could make a representation about any premises in North Wiltshire irrespective of where they live.

Gambling Commission

Information about the role of the responsible authorities and how to contact them should be included in the Statement.

The role of the responsible authority is determined by the Act and the Licensing Authority has no discretion to exercise in this regard. Information regarding the role of the responsible authorities and how to contact them will be included separately in guidance to applicants and interested parties.