

# COMMUNITIES AND PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Monday, 30 January 2017 at 1.30 pm in the Bridges Room - Civic Centre

---

From the Acting Chief Executive, Mike Barker

---

Item	Business
1	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>
2	<b>Minutes of the last meeting</b> (Pages 3 - 6)
3	<b>OSC Review - Impact of Gambling on the Borough - Evidence Gathering</b> (Pages 7 - 12)  Report of Strategic Director Communities and Environment and Trevor David from Gamcare London, will attend provide an update to Committee.
4	<b>Review of Annual Programme</b> (Pages 13 - 16)  Report of the Acting Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

**GATESHEAD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**COMMUNITIES AND PLACE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING**

**Monday, 5 December 2016**

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Dillon (Chair)

Councillor(s): T Graham, B Clelland, S Dickie, K Dodds,  
D Duggan, H Hughes, J McClurey, C McHugh, J Turnbull  
and A Wheeler

**APOLOGIES:** Councillor(s): L Caffrey, P Craig, D Davidson, J Graham,  
M Hood and J Simpson

**CPL16 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2016 were approved as a correct record.

**CPL17 OSC REVIEW - IMPACT OF GAMBLING ON THE BOROUGH - EVIDENCE GATHERING**

The Committee undertook its third evidence gathering session on the review into the impact of gambling on the Borough. This session focussed on what is known about the scale of harm caused by problem gambling in Gateshead and the impact of this on local people.

The Committee were informed that the term 'problem gambling' is one that is difficult to define. It is, to a degree, something that compromises, disrupts or damages family, personal or recreational pursuits. Problem gamblers are more likely than other people to experience harms that can include:-

- Financial harms: overdue utility bills, borrowing from family friends and loan shark; eviction or repossession
- Family harms: preoccupied with gambling so normal family life becomes difficult
- Health harms: low self-esteem; stress related disorders; poor sleep and appetite
- School/college/work harms: poor performance; increased absenteeism; expulsion or dismissal

It was highlighted that 'at risk' gamblers are people who have experienced some difficulty with their gambling behaviour but who are not classified as 'problem gamblers'.

It is found that low and moderate risk gambling is higher among men than women and higher among younger age groups. Factors associated with at-risk gambling are:

- Age (with younger people being more likely to be at-risk)
- Religion
- Cigarette smoking
- Increased levels of alcohol consumption

The Committee noted that mechanisms to effectively record and measure problems caused by gambling in the local community do not exist. From those approached as part of the this evidence gathering session (Community Safety Team, Safeguarding Adults Team, Public Health, Citizen's Advice Bureau and Gamcare), none were able to provide local statistics about specific problems, nor the numbers of individuals or families affected.

Rob Burkitt, the lead for Shared Regulation at the Gambling Commission attending the meeting and provided an overview of the Commission's priorities for 2016/17 that include:

- Increase its focus on putting consumers at the heart of regulation
- Through strengthening the licence conditions and codes of practice on crime, advising on anti-money laundering requirements and reviewing the work of the Sports Betting Intelligence Unit, they will work to give consumers further confidence that betting is crime-free and markets are not rigged
- Review the Commission's enforcement policies and practices to promote credible deterrence

The Committee were informed that the Commission not only issue operators licenses for the larger operators such as William Hill and Coral but following a change in the law, they now provide licenses those who are remote operators (to cover online, telephone etc gambling).

The Committee were provided with research findings, undertaken by Manchester City Council, that highlighted those people who (by theme) may be vulnerable to gambling-related harm.

The Committee commented that the information presented covered a wide cross section of communities, and a wide cross section of people within them. However, they acknowledged that this information could become more comprehensive once organisations are more sophisticated in how this type of data is captured.

The Committee were informed that there is now an expectation for operators to have an understanding of the locality in which their premises are situated and any impact their premises may have on persons in the area who may be more vulnerable to gambling related harm.

It was noted that since April 2016, licence holders must undertake local risk assessments in cases where:

- applying for a new premises licence
- applying for a variation to a premises licence
- changes in the local environment or your own premises warrant a risk assessment to be conducted again.

Licensing authorities can request a copy of a risk assessment to ensure that an operator has a full understanding and awareness of the local surroundings.

The Committee were also informed that since April 2016, licensing operators in the arcade, betting, bingo and casino sectors are required to participate in a multi-operator self-exclusion scheme. This scheme would allow a customer to make a single request to be excluded from multiple operators within that sector and it is suggested that data for self-exclusion should be shared within a specified geographical area. There is an expectation that operators should make it as easy as possible for people to self-exclude and this should include being able to do so without having to enter a gambling premise(s).

The Committee raised concerns around online gambling and how accessible gambling sites are, including those outside of the UK. The Committee were informed that whilst it is not ideal that gambling is easily accessible online, if a person is accessing it in this way, more details about this person exist than they would if walking into a betting shop, adult gaming centre or casino where they are able to gamble anonymously.

Concerns were raised by the Committee in relation to problem gambling that can be associated with the sale of national lottery scratch cards. The Committee were informed whilst the regulation of this type of gambling was outside the remit of responsibility of the local authority, statistics/data could be obtained and circulated and that the concerns would be taken back to the Gambling Commission..

The Committee were reminded that whilst the aim of the Gambling Act is to permit gambling (so far as the applicant(s) are compliant with the Act), Council policies to regulate gambling within the borough could include the Council's expectations of gambling operators. The Committee were reminded that, unlike the supplementary planning document for hot food takeaways and over concentration of such premises, a similar approach cannot be taken in respect of betting shops etc, as the Gambling Act does not permit this.

The Committee commented on the accessibility of on-line gambling through use of apps and how their use can become 'normalised' behaviour. They queried if more could be done through way of advertising to help people to recognise that they may have or may be at risk of a gambling addiction.

The Committee were advised that operators have been contacted by the Commission regarding the need to accelerate the pace at which they are putting consumers at the heart of business decisions. The effects of gambling will be picked up as part of Public Health campaigns in the future as it is recognised that this is a feature of a wider issue. A multi-agency approach is needed to keep people appropriately informed, useful information provided and to ensure staff in gambling premises can identify those persons who may have a problem. Gamcare is keen to work closely with local authorities to offer its services.

The Committee recognised the importance of the working relationship between the Commission and the Council and hoped that this would continue.

RESOLVED – That the comments of the committee be noted

**CPL18 THE COUNCIL PLAN - SIX MONTHLY ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE AND DELIVERY 2016-17**

The Committee considered a report that provided a six month assessment of performance delivery for the period April to September 2016 in relation to the Council Plan 2015 – 2020.

The achievements, key actions and areas for improvement were set out in the report.

The Committee commented on the level of recycling and whilst there have been improvements, the recycling rates have now levelled. The Committee were informed that the introduction of payment for green waste collection had had an impact on this figure. We are not aware of any schemes that have yet achieved their 50% recycling target without the collection of food waste.

However, the service are providing regular information to residents around recycling and the Council believe in the education of recycling rather than progressing the enforcement route.

- RESOLVED -
- i) That the Committee was satisfied with the activities undertaken during April – September 2016 in relation to the Council Plan 2015 – 2020.
  - ii) That the report be endorsed for submission to Cabinet at its meeting on 24 January 2017.

**Chair.....**

**TITLE OF REPORT: OSC Review: The impact of Gambling on the Borough  
Evidence Gathering – Developing research evidence on  
gambling related harm**

**REPORT OF: Strategic Director, Communities and Environment**

---

## SUMMARY

The Communities and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee have agreed that it will carry out a review of the impact of gambling in Gateshead as part of the 2016/17 programme.

---

### Background

The Committee agreed that the review will draw upon local and national evidence and will focus on:

- **Gambling in Gateshead** – the distribution, types and number of premises licensed for gambling and how this has changed over time; the types of gambling taking place in the borough
- **The legal framework for regulation of gambling and the role of the regulators** - the Gambling Act 2005 and the respective roles of the Gambling Commission and Gateshead Licensing Authority; the impact of other regulatory regimes on gambling activity
- **Local and national concerns about gambling** - evidence and observations from local and national regulators, operators, trade bodies, treatment providers, charities and public agencies
- **Developing research evidence on gambling related harm** - a review of recent developments and best practice and how it can be used in Gateshead to minimise gambling related harm.

The third evidence gathering session took place on 5 December 2016 and the Committee focussed on what is known about the scale of harm caused by problem gambling in Gateshead, and the impact of this on local people.

A representative from the Gambling Commission also attended the meeting to inform members of the work of the Commission and it's future plans, and to answer members' questions.

### Purpose of this Session

This fourth evidence gathering session will focus on recent research into the way that local authorities can protect vulnerable people from gambling related harm by improving the understanding of local area risk. It will focus on some work commissioned by Westminster and Manchester City Councils which was published in 2016.

### Background to the Study

The Gambling Act 2005 gave local authorities responsibility for issuing premises licences for gambling venues. The advice contained within the Act was that licensing authorities should “aim to permit” premises licences so long as applications are reasonably consistent with the following objectives:

- (a) preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime,
- (b) ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way, and
- (c) protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

More recently, there have been some changes in the recommended approach to gambling licensing and regulation, as expressed in various documents published by the Gambling Commission. These changes can be summarised into three broad themes:

- increased focus on risk and risk regulation;
- greater attention to local area risk, and
- encouragement of partnership and collaboration between stakeholders to mitigate risk.

In addition, a further change is the devolvement of public health to local authorities and their new responsibility to protect the health and wellbeing of people in their local communities.

To date, there has been little investigation about who may be vulnerable or why. Information about the characteristics of who is more or less vulnerable to gambling-related harm has only been considered in very general terms using evidence from large-scale national surveys, such as the British Gambling Prevalence Survey (BGPS). How vulnerability and harm may vary at a local level has not been explored.

In 2015 Westminster and Manchester City Councils commissioned a study to:

- to explore and document the range of characteristics that suggest someone is vulnerable to harm from gambling,
- to investigate how these characteristics can be measured at a local level, using a range of different data, and
- to develop a local risk index model showing areas where those who may be more vulnerable to harm are located with the aim of mapping results visually, so that areas of potential risk are highlighted with the intention that these results become a tool for both local authorities and industry when making decisions about the location of gambling venues, helping them to think through the specific needs of local communities and enabling them to work together to develop plans to protect vulnerable people



## **Policy context**

In the years since the Gambling Act 2005 was implemented, there have been some noticeable shifts in how gambling premises are distributed. A major change is that many gambling premises have moved from back street to high street locations and there has been rising concern about how some premises are 'clustering' in certain areas.

The Gambling Commission has made it a requirement that gambling industry operators should, from April 2016 conduct local risk assessments for premises to demonstrate that they understand local issues and to show what measures they propose to introduce to mitigate against this risk.

The introduction of local risk assessments reflects a broader policy movement which encourages local authorities, the regulator and the industry to work in partnership to address local issues and concerns. The assessments are required for all premises and operators need to demonstrate that they understand local issues and show what measures they propose to introduce or currently have to mitigate.

The Gambling Commission has also recommended that local authorities consider producing local area profiles to support their licensing statements and principles. The intention is that these local area profiles draw on information from a wide range of local bodies to further understand the nature of potential risks in each local authority and to develop more locally focused gambling policy.

A final important policy change is the devolvement of public health to local authorities. The Health and Social Care Act, 2012 gave responsibility for health improvement to local authorities. This gave each local authority a new duty to take appropriate steps to improve the health of people in its area. The intention was for local authorities to have freedom in how they chose to improve their population's health and it was hoped that this would create a new focus on improving health and reducing inequalities. The Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB), the body responsible for providing advice to the Gambling Commission and Government about gambling, advocates that gambling is considered within a public health framework.

It is against this policy and regulatory background that the study was commissioned. The aim was to explore what area-based vulnerability to harm might look like and support these policy changes. Westminster and Manchester City Councils were used as case studies to demonstrate what a local area risk profile might look like when those vulnerable to gambling harm are identified, mapped and results displayed visually.

The intention is that the methods and outputs can be used by other local authorities and built into local area profiles, risk assessments and Statements of Licensing Policy.

## **Findings**

The first aim of this study was to consider the types of people who may be at greater

risk of harm from gambling and where they might be located. Based on review of existing research evidence, it was concluded that the following groups are potentially more vulnerable to harm from gambling:

- youths
- people affected by substance abuse / misuse / excessive alcohol consumption
- poor mental health
- people living in deprived areas
- certain ethnic groups
- people with low IQs
- people with personality/cognitive impairments
- people seeking treatment for gambling problems
- people who are unemployed

Having identified these groups, the next stage was to bring this information together to create local risk indices, showing areas with greater concentrations of people who are more likely to be vulnerable to harm.

For each characteristic of vulnerability identified, using Westminster and Manchester as case study areas, the availability of local level data was reviewed. For some characteristics, there were good data available (for example, unemployment rates) but for others there were no data available (such as low IQ).

Therefore, the final characteristics of vulnerability included in the models were those where there was a strong theoretical and empirical basis for inclusion and good local level data available.

Information from all different characteristics was brought together and visually displayed. Data were grouped into two different indices based on whether they related to:

- the characteristics of people who live in a local area (the resident profile) and/or,
- the location of local services which are likely to attract potentially vulnerable people to a specific place.

Data from the two indices were then combined to produce an overall gambling risk index for each area. These results were displayed visually on maps for Westminster and Manchester to highlight the locations which had relatively higher risk profiles.

In Westminster, four broad areas of greater risk were identified. The heightened risk in each area is driven by a range of different factors. For example, in Pimlico risk is higher because of a greater number of homelessness shelters and substance abuse treatment providers in this area. In the North West area, risk is driven by rates of

unemployment, ethnic make-up and large numbers of resident young people.

In Manchester, many different areas of risk were identified which include areas around the city centre and the south of the city; Risk in the city centre is driven primarily by the concentration of pay- day loans shops, education establishments, younger residents and support centres for problem gamblers. Relatively high levels of unemployment as well as ethnic mix are major driving factors in the other locations.

Comparisons of the areas identified by the risk models with data on deprivation shows some overlaps but also some differences. For example, the City of Manchester has a relatively low score according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) but was identified as higher risk of gambling harm in our models. This is because there are a range of services offered within the city that may draw potentially vulnerable people into the city centre. This is not represented in IMD scores which focus only on the profile of people living in an area. Because of this it was concluded that IMD is not a sufficient proxy to represent risk to gambling-related harm at a local level.

### **Caveats**

The models are probabilistic - just because an area is highlighted as being at greater risk, does not mean that all people in those areas will experience harm. The models suggest that there may be greater propensity for harm and therefore greater consideration should be given to attempts to mitigate this.

The models are based on current knowledge and available data - they are limited to areas where more research has been conducted and where good quality local level data are available.

The evidence base used to develop the models shows those vulnerable to gambling problems rather than gambling-related harm. The models may be conservative as gambling-related harm is broader than problem gambling.

### **Recommendations of the Study**

- The Gambling Commission's introduction of Local Area Risk profiles represents a new opportunity for local authorities and industry alike to think more deeply about the protection of vulnerable people from gambling-related harm. This means extending understanding of local area risk beyond mapping deprivation and considering a more nuanced range of factors.
- Local authorities interested in pursuing this approach should start to consider the different types of data they have available and how these can be used in local area profiles.
- Local authorities should also start to consider what data and/or evidence is missing and how they could fill these gaps, working with different departments within the authority to capture relevant information.

- The models developed are based on the best information currently available. An acknowledged limitation of gambling research is the paucity of evidence available. The study recommends that the models are periodically reviewed and updated to take into account growing knowledge, better data and changes in local areas.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Committee gives its views on the evidence presented.

**Contact:**  
**Elaine Rudman, Environmental Health, Licensing & Enforcement Manager**  
**Extension 3911**



**COMMUNITIES & PLACE  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE  
30 JANUARY 2017**

**TITLE OF REPORT: Review of Annual Work Programme**

**REPORT OF: Mike Barker, Acting Chief Executive**

---

### **Summary**

The report updates and seeks the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's views on the current position with regard to the annual work programme.

---

### **Background**

1. At its meeting on 18 April 2016, the Communities and Place Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed its work programme based on the Council's policy framework. This work programme was then agreed by the Council as part of the policy planning process.
2. In line with the process agreed by all OSCs this OSC selected its review topic and case studies using a process designed to help make linkages between potential topics and the Council's policy framework.

### **Proposals**

#### **OSC Review Topics for 2017/18**

3. In advance of the OSC agreeing its review topic for 2017-18, members of the OSC were invited to identify any issues which might potentially be appropriate for a detailed review by 14 December 2016. Any issues put forward by members have been added to the list of potential review topics for consideration by the OSC at the start of the municipal year, unless the issue is already being, or would more appropriately be, dealt with through other processes within the Council. Members have been notified if this has been the case and advised as to how their issue is being dealt with.

### **Monitoring of OSC Reviews**

4. All of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee's have received feedback on the outcomes of the specific reviews undertaken by them during 2015-16. This Committee has received a monitoring report on the outcomes generated by its Review of Opportunities to Promote Rural Gateshead on 12 September 2016 and will receive a further monitoring report on 24 April 2017.

## Case Studies

5. Case studies have been included within OSC work programmes to provide an additional means of examining specific issues of concern/carrying out more detailed work on a particular topic/measure the impact of a particular OSC's review recommendations over a specific period of time.
6. The case study for 2016/17 is :-  
**Street Cleanliness – Enforcement, Education and Community Involvement** (31 October 2016 meeting)
7. Each OSC has identified specific issues to be considered through the case study method and it was agreed that in view of the timing of case studies within the 2015-16 work programmes that feedback on their effectiveness be sought during its work programme review in 2016/17.
8. During 2015/16 the OSC considered the following case study :-

### **Estates Management – 14 September 2015 meeting**

The OSC focused on:-

- How services have been reconfigured, public expectations managed and new ways of working developed;
- The scale of the financial reductions for waste services and grounds maintenance;
- The impacts of reduced funding and resources on service provision;
- Plans for the future.

Having examined the issues the OSC :-

- Raised concerns regarding the impact on services in light of budget cuts and the notable visible impact in some areas.
- The OSC queried if the Council was promoting gardening services to target those households who might be interested in buying into services. The OSC received information that although there was the scope to do this there had to be a balance between the cost of service provision and the sustainability of such a service. The Council and the Gateshead Housing Company were looking to create a package of services that could be considered for “ buy in” by developers.
- The OSC also suggested that where there is active tenant involvement / community groups around the borough there may be an opportunity for Grounds Maintenance to pass on skills and have links to events such as Community pride. The OSC was advised that Gateshead Housing Company does have a tenant engagement programme but it could be beneficial to hear from tenant groups which are successful.
- The OSC requested that all councillors be kept informed of any changes in relation to Universal Credit and implications this may have on service delivery.

In light of the above the OSC requested that its comments be noted.

## Recommendations

9. The Committee is asked to

- (i) Note that any issues identified by members of the OSC as potential review topics by 14 December 2016 have been included in the list of review topics to be considered by the OSC at the start of the municipal year unless such issues are being or would more appropriately be dealt with via other Council processes.
- (ii) Give its views on the review monitoring process carried out so far.
- (iii) Give its views on the effectiveness of the case studies carried out in 2015/16.

This page is intentionally left blank