

Department for Culture, Media and Sport	Impact Assessment of Premises Licences (Mandatory and Default Conditions) Regulations
---	---

Stage	Draft for consultation	Related Publications Consultation documents: Gambling Act 2005 Mandatory and Default Regulations Gambling Act 2005 Premises Licences Regulations
		Gambling Act 2005 Mandatory and Default Regulations Regulatory Impact Assessment

Available to view or download at: www.culture.gov.uk

Contact name for enquiries: Rosalind Saper

Contact telephone number: 0207 211 6420

Summary

- The Gambling Act 2005 allows for two kinds of conditions to be attached to premises licences by the Secretary of State by means of regulations: these are mandatory conditions and default conditions.
- Mandatory conditions can only be removed by the Secretary of State; the licensing authority has no power to remove or vary them. These conditions set the basic minimum requirements to which the licence holder must adhere.
- Default conditions can be amended or removed by licensing authorities on issue of a premises licence or as a result of an application for a variation or a review of the licence.
- These conditions are most appropriate where a general industry or sector wide approach is desirable in order to assist national consistency but where licensing authorities ought to be able to respond to local circumstances as necessary.
- Licensing authorities and the Gambling Commission will charge fees in order to recover their costs. The costs of local authority fees to the industry will be included in the impact assessment accompanying the forthcoming Gambling Act Premises Licences Fees Regulations 2006. The cost to industry of the Gambling Commission's fees will be covered by the impact assessment accompanying The Gambling Act (Fees) Regulations 2006

Chief Economist's sign-off

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am content the evidence base supports the proposed costs, benefits and impact of the policy options.

Signed by the Chief Economist:

Date:

Ministerial sign-off

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that the benefits justify the costs.

Signed by the responsible Minister:

Date:

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Automated gaming tables limits

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; enabling public to make rational decisions; aiming in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators to prevent problem play.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs	Some profit from gambling forgone – not quantifiable			

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative)	non- monetary benefit as above
--	---------------------------------------

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not currently available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>Some restriction on competition by casinos compared with other types of gambling</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>The Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>The Gambling Commission will recover costs through fees charged for operating licences, see summary note above</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting	<i>None</i>

measure?	
<p>When will you review the policy to establish:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual costs and benefits • Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes? 	<p><i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local authorities.</i></p> <p><i>The Gambling Commission will produce a prevalence study in 2011 which will look at the volume of gambling.</i></p>

Evidence Base

The Act requires regulations to be made in relation to casino premises licences limiting the numbers of player positions available for automated table games. Ministers announced during the Gambling Bill second reading debate in the Lords that the maximum number of automated table game player positions in a casino will be 40. This is in order to regulate products such as automated versions of roulette, the game of sic bo and new automated games, e.g. blackjack, that were not covered by the existing legislation. Rather than controlling these products through the new regulatory regime for gaming machines, the Government decided to establish a bespoke system of regulation, which would enable casinos to offer a set number of these products in addition to their gaming machine entitlement.

The Government believes that setting a maximum number of player positions for wholly automated table games is important for a number of reasons:

- *wholly automated table games lack the direct human intervention of a real casino game operated by a casino employee, trained to spot the warning signs of problem gambling;*
- *the speed of play for automated versions of table games can be faster than for the normal versions of such games;*
- *If no limit were set, there would be nothing to prevent the development of large numbers of terminals all connected to a single automated table, which the Government believes would be at odds with the precautionary principle.*

As these are automated versions of table games, the intention is that they should be regulated along broadly similar lines to table games. To help distinguish these wholly automated table games from gaming machines, it is proposed that a minimum number of four player positions per wholly automated table is set. This requirement is designed to prevent the development of wholly automated table games designed only for one player, which would blur the distinction between wholly automated table games and gaming machines, and undermine the rationale for the exemption of such equipment from the regulations in Part 10 of the Act.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: ATM position

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits	0	0	0	0
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; enabling public to make rational decisions; in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators, preventing problem play.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs	Some loss of profit from gambling – not quantifiable			

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos, Bingo halls, FECs, AGCs, Betting premises</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations? What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	<i>Not currently available</i>
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>The Gambling Commission and licensing authorities</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>Costs will be recovered through fees charged to industry. Industry costs are subject to separate impact assessments.</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting	<i>none</i>

measure?	
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual costs and benefits • Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes? 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement. The Gambling Commission will produce a prevalence study in 2011</i>

Evidence Base

Under the current Gambling Commission guidelines for casinos, ATMs must be positioned so that a customer has to physically leave the gaming table or machine in order to use them. A similar requirement is included in the bingo handbook – ATMs in licensed bingo premises must be positioned so that a customer has to physically leave the bingo game or gaming machine in order to use them. We believe that these are important safeguards in giving people some time to reflect away from the gambling facilities, before they are tempted to gamble money which they might not be able to afford.

We propose to formalise this existing practice as mandatory premises licence conditions for casinos and bingo halls, and to introduce similar requirements for FECs, AGCs and betting premises for the first time. These proposals reflect the importance that Ministers attach to protecting potentially vulnerable people, and the fact that there are existing practices restricting ATM use within sections of the industry which have been working well.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Bet receipt terminals – limits in casino

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	TBC	TBC
Non-monetary benefits	Whilst the industry will benefit through the introduction of betting in certain casinos for the first time, this will be limited to afford player protection (in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators) to prevent problem play and ensure that the precautionary principle is followed.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>Costs will be recovered through fees to operators. Please see note in summary above regarding cost to industry.</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>

When will you review the policy to establish:

- The actual costs and benefits
- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

Betting will be permitted in certain casinos for the first time under the Act. As this combination of different sorts of gambling will be new to this country, Ministers decided to limit the introduction of betting to the 17 new casinos permitted by the Act, so that its impact can be assessed.

Setting a maximum number of player positions for bet receipt terminals in casinos is desirable for similar reasons to those for setting a maximum number of player positions for wholly automated table games:

- *bet receipt terminals lack the direct human intervention of a betting counter staffed by cashier, who may be able to spot the warning signs of problem gambling;*
- *if no limit were set, there would be nothing to prevent the development of casinos packed with large numbers of terminals, which the government believes would be at odds with the precautionary principle.*
- *there is a risk that the casino could become incidental to an unlimited number of bet receipt terminals, which could undermine the nature of the social impact assessment of the new casinos.*

The Government believes it is right to set the same limits on bet receipt terminals as for wholly automated table games so that no one form of wholly automated gambling equipment can predominate.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Bet receipt terminals – supervision at tracks

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; enabling public to make rational decisions; preventing problem play. Protection of children from gambling.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) **0**

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Tracks</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not currently available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>Gambling Commission costs recovered through fees to operators, these are subject to separate impact assessments.</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>

When will you review the policy to establish:

- The actual costs and benefits
- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

The need for conditions specifying the number of bet receipt terminals permitted in betting offices and tracks has been considered. However, as betting offices and tracks, unlike casinos, are licensed primarily for the provision of betting products, it has been judged that there is not the same need to regulate the number of bet receipt terminals. Nevertheless, a separate precautionary measure has been identified, in recognition of the fact that children are permitted on tracks, and that bet receipt terminals lack the direct human intervention of a betting counter staffed by a cashier, who can identify underage gamblers. For this reason, it is proposed that bet receipt terminals on tracks require supervision.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Gambling hours

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; enabling public to make rational decisions; in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators, preventing problem play.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs	May restrict new market development; some profit forgone. Exclusion of FECS and AGS from restrictions may distort competition in their favour.			

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative)	0
---	---

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos, Betting offices, Tracks, Bingo halls</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations? What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>Yes</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>Some impact on sectors other than FEC and AGC</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Licensing authorities</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>Fees based on cost recovery</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>Low in respect of FECs and AGCs compared with other forms of gambling.</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>

When will you review the policy to establish:

- The actual costs and benefits
- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

The new safeguards introduced by the Act mean that the Government believes that it is possible to adopt longer gambling hours and a more flexible approach to gambling hours than has been the case under existing legislation.

The Government proposes to set gambling hours for certain premises by default conditions. These default gambling hours are intended to:

- strike a balance between permitting gambling and pursuing the licensing objectives;*
- establish industry norms intended to promote a level playing field within different sectors of the gambling industry;*
- at the same time, give individual operators the flexibility to apply to extend their gambling hours;*
- lay down a standard for local authorities against which they will be able to consider any applications or representations to extend or reduce default hours; and,*
- take an even-handed approach to the total gambling hours permitted in gambling premises across different sectors.*

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Access between premises

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Sufficient player protection and adherence to precautionary principle and particular protection of children			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	some compliance costs – not quantifiable	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos, Betting premises, Bingo halls, FECs, AGCs</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations? What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	<i>Not available</i>
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>/High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actual costs and benefits 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with t he</i>

- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

The Act already provides that, except in the case of tracks, a single premises may not have more than one premises licence authorising a type of gambling activity. The Government believes that it does need to regulate further to provide additional safeguards for the public and for the industry in order to:

- *prevent operators from seeking to circumvent this requirement of the Act by artificially subdividing their premises and securing separate premises licences for its composite parts;*
- *ensure that operators do not circumvent the rules governing the maximum number of gaming machines of Category B and above permitted in different premises;*
- *ensure that people who have entered a premises for one type of gambling are not exposed to another, potentially harder, form of gambling;*
- *ensure that there is no direct access between gambling premises to which children have access and those to which they are prohibited from entering;*
- *ensure that all gambling premises have publicly accessible entrances, and are not developed in the backrooms of other commercial premises.;*

However, rather than impose a blanket ban on access between licensed premises and premises with permits, a more proportionate response is proposed whereby direct internal access will broadly be permitted between premises to which children are not prohibited from entering by the Act (bingo halls, FECs, alcohol licensed premises).

Against this background, a further protection is required to ensure that children do not gain access to Category B or C gaming machines in bingo halls. It is therefore proposed that where under 18s are permitted to enter a bingo hall, the same rules relating to the over-18 areas of licensed FECs should apply. In summary, this will mean that any Category C and B machines will need to be located in a segregated area to which under 18s do not have access. This rule will not apply to bingo halls which only allow adult access.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Table gaming area

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Sufficient player protection and adherence to precautionary principle			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>Some restriction on competition by casinos with other gambling forms</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actual costs and benefits 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with t he</i>

- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

The requirement for casinos to have a minimum table gaming area is largely non-controversial, and is deemed necessary to help preserve the concept of a British casino, which assumes a table gaming area which is real and operative, and to ensure that casinos do not evolve in to machine shed as they have in other jurisdictions.

If there is a minimum table gaming requirement, it is in the interests of operators and regulators alike that there should be a clear definition of what this area should constitute. It is therefore proposed that the table gaming area should consist of the area that contains table games, whether these be real, wholly automatic or a hybrid of the two.

This requirement will not prevent operators from positioning a gaming machine or other gambling facilities in areas close to table games. It does not in any way fetter the freedom of operators to configure their premises in the way they want. All it would mean is that operators would not be able to count any area containing gaming machines or other gambling facilities towards the minimum table gaming area.

The requirement that no areas counting towards the minimum table gaming area should comprise less than 12.5% of the total minimum table gaming requirement for that casino is to ensure that the new casinos contain readily identifiable table gaming areas, and avoid a fragmented approach e.g. a hotel with a single gaming table in every room.

A number of questions have been raised about where the table gaming area should begin and end, and how it should be measured for the purposes of ensuring that the minimum area requirements are complied with. One operator suggested a minimum circulation of space requirement between the table games and other gambling facilities should be introduced of say 2 to 3 metres. This would provide a clear guide to operators and regulators alike as to where the table gaming area and other gambling areas should begin and end. An additional requirement that there must be a minimum of two meters between table games and any other gambling facilities has therefore been proposed.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Non-gambling area

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Sufficient player protection and adherence to precautionary principle enabling public to make rational decisions; in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators, preventing problem play.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs	Setting up costs may increase in some instances but income may also increase through new non- gambling income streams. Not quantifiable.			

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>/High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual costs and benefits • Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes? 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local</i>

	<i>authorities.</i>
--	---------------------

Evidence Base

The Government continues to believe that providing a non-gambling area in casinos is an important way of ensuring that customers can take a break from gambling and to reflect, if they need to do so. It would be entirely consistent with the licensing objectives of the new Act to introduce such a requirement on all casinos.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Ancillary Activities

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Sufficient player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; enabling public to make rational decisions; in conjunction with social responsibility requirements on operators, preventing problem play.			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>AGCs, FECs Betting offices, casinos, tracks, bingo establishments</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations? What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	<i>Not available</i>
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>may restrict betting offices in competing with other forms of gambling</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>

When will you review the policy to establish:

- The actual costs and benefits
- Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes?

There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local authorities.

Evidence Base

It is judged that the primary purpose of gambling licensed premises should be the provision of facilities for gambling. Any non-gambling activities that take place in gambling licensed premises should:

- *be ancillary to the gambling facilities offered;*
- *should not distract customers who are gambling or adversely affect in some other way fair and open conduct of gambling on the premises; and,*
- *except in the case of FECs where other forms of family entertainment often form part of the core offer, should not of themselves provide an inducement for people to enter the premises for purposes other than gambling.*

In general, the Government does not consider it necessary to set conditions prohibiting certain ancillary activities, and prefers to leave any relevant rules on what may or may not be acceptable to Gambling Commission Codes of Practice and Guidance. However, there are a number of specific instances where government believes that conditions are necessary to prevent customers being distracted or gambling taking place that is unfair.

Under paragraph 1 of Schedule 4 of the 1963 Betting Gaming and Lotteries Act betting shops are in general not permitted to be used for anything other than the acceptance of bets. The Government believes that this is an important principle, as it helps to prevent people not intending to gamble being attract into attracted into gambling premises. It is therefore proposed that this principle is maintained in regulations. The Government believes that a sensible approach is to base these restrictions on the existing provisions of Schedule 4 to the 1963 Act, which have worked well.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Information to be displayed

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Sufficient player protection and adherence to precautionary principle; protection of children			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Casinos, Bingo, AGCs, Betting Offices and Tracks</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations? What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>No</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>None</i>
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The actual costs and benefits • Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes? 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement with the industry, communities and local</i>

	<i>authorities.</i>
--	---------------------

Evidence Base

The display of this information is considered to be fundamental to the licensing objectives of the Act. This will include the display of information relating to:

- *evidence that a premises has the relevant permissions to provide gambling facilities under the Gambling Act;*
- *rules on children and young people's access to the premises;*
- *the fair and open conduct of gambling eg rules, charges etc as appropriate.*

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY SHEET

Policy Option: Other conditions for tracks premises

Benefits	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
Transitional Benefits				
Annual Benefits	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary benefits	Player protection. Bookmakers benefit from 'five times rule' (not quantified).			

Annual costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
Current (no action)	0	0	0	0
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Annual Costs	0	0	0	0
Non-monetary costs				

Annual Regulatory Benefit (in brackets if negative) 0

Transitional costs	Citizens	Public Sector	Private & Voluntary	Total
New Administrative	0	0	0	0
New Policy	0	0	0	0
New Transitional Costs	0	0	0	0

Which business sectors / organisations are impacted?	<i>Tracks</i>
What's the average pa cost for organisations?	<i>Not available</i>
What's the average pa cost for a typical small organisation?	
Will this prevent, restrict or distort competition?	<i>No</i>
Will there be any disproportionate impacts? On whom?	<i>No</i>
Who will enforce this?	<i>Gambling Commission</i>
What's the average pa cost for enforcement?	<i>£</i>
To what extent does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	<i>/High</i>
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	<i>N/A</i>
Is a sunset clause included? If so, when?	<i>The 'five times rule' protection for bookmakers will expire five years after the regulations are laid</i>
What is the average pa value of the proposed offsetting measure?	<i>none</i>
When will you review the policy to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The actual costs and benefits 	<i>There will be post implementation stakeholder engagement</i>

- | | |
|---|--|
| • Whether it has achieved the desired outcomes? | |
|---|--|

Evidence Base

A number of conditions are proposed relating specifically to tracks, which are consistent with current practice, and with the licensing objectives of the Act:

- In order to ensure that the public are not exposed to unlicensed betting operators while on a track, it is proposed that track operators take responsibility for ensuring that only appropriately licensed betting operators are accepting bets on their premises.*
- In our 2003 Policy Position Paper on Licensed Betting Premises the Government stated that while it accepted that Gambling Review's recommendation that the 'five times rule' relating to admission charges payable by bookmakers to enter a track should be abolished, we did not believe it was appropriate to immediately move to a fully commercially based admission charge for bookmakers on horserace courses.*
- A totalisator on a licensed dog track can currently be operated only while the public are admitted to the track for the purpose of attending dog races and no other sporting events are taking place on the track; and for effecting betting transactions on dog races run on that track. This will be replicated through mandatory conditions (either on the operating or the premises licence).*