

Consultation on Gaming Machines and Social Responsibility Measures
Response from North East Lincolnshire Council

Chapter Seven: Summary of questions

Q1. Do you agree that the maximum stake of £100 on B2 machines (FOBTs) should be reduced? If yes, what alternative maximum stake for B2 machines (FOBTs) do you support?

Yes, we agree the maximum stake should be reduced.

From the options proposed we would support Option 3 - *Maximum stake reduced to £20 on B2 non-slots and £2 on B2 slots*, However, we feel the preferred maximum stake would be somewhere between Option 3 (£20) and Option 4 (£2), ie around £10.

Q2.Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category B1?

Yes.

We don't have any comments on this as we do not have any of the relevant types of Gambling Premises that these machines are available in in our Local Authority Area.

Q3.Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category B3?

Yes.

Q4.Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category B3A?

Yes.

Q5.Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category B4?

Yes.

Q6.Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category C?

Yes. We feel strongly that increasing the maximum stake to £2 would make it comparable to the current maximum stake for B3 gaming machines. This would have a potentially negative impact on players, amplified by the fact that C machines are

permitted in pubs which are much less regulated than the environments B3 machines are found in.

Q7. Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on category D?

Yes. In particular we are greatly concerned about the industry's proposals to increase the maximum stake to £2 for category D non-money prize (crane grab machines) and the potential for harm this increase would have on the children and vulnerable adults which these machines are readily available to, and would be particularly attracted to in a seaside arcade.

We do not feel this proposed increase would promote the 'protection of children and vulnerable adults' gambling objective, particularly as there is an association between early gambling participation and problem gambling in adulthood.

Q8. Do you agree with the government's proposals to increase the stake and prize for prize gaming, in line with industry proposals?

Yes.

We have no serious concerns in relation to prize gaming however if the proposals to increase the stake and prize are brought in we would welcome a Gambling Commission led monitoring regime to ensure that it does not have a negative impact on children and vulnerable adults given the prevalence of prize gaming in seaside arcades which are particularly attractive to these groups.

Q9. Do you agree with the government's proposals to maintain the status quo on allocations for casinos, arcades and pubs?

Yes.

Q10. Do you agree with the government's proposals to bar contactless payments as a direct form of payment to gaming machines?

Yes. We are strongly in support of this. This is the same concept as not having an ATM machine within arm's reach of a player at a gaming machine. Interruptions to the player are beneficial in the prevention of harmful gambling losses.

Q.11 Do you support this package of measures to improve player protection measures on gaming machines?

Yes. We would welcome all of these measures to improve player protection, but would request that all evaluation and reporting elements have timescales included to ensure progress is made.

Q.12 Do you support this package of measures to improve player protection measures for the online sector?

Yes, we support this package in principal, however as it is for the Gambling Commission to regulate this sector we, as a Local Authority, have no particular experience in relation to this sector.

Q.13 Do you support this package of measures to address concerns about gambling advertising?

Yes. In particular, we do not feel that operators should be offering free bet or sign-up offers / proportions and would compare it to similar issues around irresponsible drinks promotions in respect of the Licensing Act 2003. We feel that this type of marketing also encourages people to start gambling who would otherwise not ordinarily do so.

Q.14 Do you agree the Government should consider alternative options including a mandatory levy if industry does not provide adequate funding for RET?

Yes, however consideration needs to be given to who would retain the responsibility for the administration of such a levy which would be required in view of the finite resources available, in particular to Local Authorities.

According to the report "Gambling behaviour in Great Britain in 2015" commissioned by the Gambling Commission, the number of adult problem gamblers in Great Britain is approximately 370,000 according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV) screen, 300,000 according to the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) screen and approximately 430,000 according to either screen.

There is recognition that problem gambling is a Public Health concern in the UK. There is substantial literature on problem gambling and its associations with high-risk behaviours in the UK (eg smoking, alcohol consumption, illicit drug use), various mental health problems (eg anxiety, neurotic symptoms, panic disorders, generalised anxiety disorder), as well as psychosocial risk factors (eg suicidality, financial difficulties, smaller social networks) (Cowlishaw & Kessler, 2016).

We would support the proposal that those who profit from gambling should fund RET through a mandatory levy if industry does not provide adequate funding voluntarily.

Q.15 Do you agree with our assessment of the current powers available to local authorities?

The introduction of CIA's would be potentially beneficial, however in this Local Authority area, we have received very few application for new gambling premises since the introduction to the Gambling Act 2005. In addition, our inspections and test purchasing operations in relation to the compliance with current legislation by the existing gambling premises in our Local Authority area have not uncovered any major problems.

Q16. Are there any other relevant issues, supported by evidence, that you would like to raise as part of this consultation but that has not been covered by questions 1-15?

No.