

Appendix 1 Online Consultation Responses

<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the draft Policy?</b>	<b>Please tell us the reasons for your answer</b>	<b>If you have any other feedback about the draft Policy, please provide it here</b>	<b>Which of the following statements best describes you?</b>
Neither agree nor disagree			A member of the public living in Buckinghamshire
Strongly agree	It covers quite clearly the allowances and rights of those wishing to apply for a gambling permit or those wishing to object to same		an officer of a responsible authority (Thames Valley Police)
Agree	Vulnerable people need to be protected from gambling, there's a very strong culture of gambling in this country and it has to be regulated properly.	This is probably hard to monitor from a county perspective, but I see a lot of gambling happening online in local groups on Facebook for example. This doesn't appear to be regulated a lot, there are many private persons selling raffles where the money goes into the organiser's pockets with part payment for raffle prizes, but no money going to charity. Often these are people involved with MLMs who have excess stock that they purchased to be able to take part in the hidden pyramid behind the MLM company. I often have to remind these people and ask them if they have a Gambling Licence, to	A member of the public living in Buckinghamshire and Parish Councillor in Buckinghamshire

		<p>which they usually reply 'No, I didn't know I needed one.'</p> <p>More education and information about this would be useful, especially in the run up to Christmas and shortly after Christmas when these practices seem to increase.</p>	
Disagree	<p>5 Interested parties. 'Trade unions, charities, community groups, faith groups, medical practices' should be removed as Interested Parties. These groups do not have a direct interest in these matters and should be given no platform to campaign other than supporting their members who may wish to make representations. Town and Parish Councils who are elected to represent their communities should be added as Interested Parties.</p> <p>15 Risk Assessment. This should go no further than the national standard for such matters and not the additional language included here</p> <p>33 Club Gaming this section proscribes a number of thresholds which are overly complex and prescriptive and it is questionable how they would be enforced. Please consider a simply across the board limit of Stakes per week of GBP10,000</p>		A councillor or MP in Buckinghamshire
Agree	<p>Protection of vulnerable should be highest, because it includes prevention of crime. Antisocial behaviour in betting shops, whilst laudable to have, is not common in betting shops.</p>		A member of the public living in Buckinghamshire
Agree			A councillor or MP in Buckinghamshire
Neither agree nor disagree	<p>Very similar to gambling commission policies</p>	<p>Please do not demonize all gambling, and make out problems that are not there!</p>	A member of the public living in Buckinghamshire

<p>Neither agree nor disagree</p>	<p>The policy as drafted for revision makes no mention of consultation with Town or Parish councils, yet goes on to outline the need for Local Area Profiles and says 'raising awareness of local risks'. Whilst the legislation may not require the council to consult T&amp;PC's, if the council want 'local knowledge' why not include the T&amp;PC's in the list of those to be consulted</p> <p>Residents expect their T&amp;P Cllrs to know what is happening in their community - so if there were an application under the Act it makes sense they should at least be made aware of it</p> <p>The general criteria for considering applications and risks appears to be comprehensive ad it is just the lack of consultation with local communities that concerns me as a local Cllr.</p>	<p>I have been asked by several people why parish councils are not consulted</p>	<p>A councillor or MP in Buckinghamshire</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--	--