

From: [Graham Linecar](#)
To: [Casino](#)
Subject: Objection by SCAPPS to applications for large casino licenses
Date: 25 July 2014 22:56:38

Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS) objects to applications for a large casino license for premises within the proposed Royal Pier development made by
Aspers Universal Ltd
Genting Casinos UK Ltd
Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd
Grosvenor Casinos Ltd
Kymeira Casinos Ltd

SCAPPS submits that the society should be recognised as representing 'interested parties'. There is no planning permission for the 'premises' specified by the above applicants for large casino licenses at Royal Pier. The premises do not exist. To create the premises would require a planning permission destroying Mayflower Park, a heavily used & much appreciated public open space, the only green space close to the city centre giving public access to the waterfront. It is heavily used by families with small children. There is no provision within the Gaming Act for such persons, clearly affected by the applications, to make valid representations. SCAPPS asks the Licensing Committee to recognize SCAPPS as validly representing the interests of users of Mayflower Park who will, without doubt, be directly affected by the grant of a large casino license for 'premises' which the applicants are presuming will be granted planning permission.

The Gaming Act restricts grounds on which an objection can be made. There is no layout & design for a comprehensive development at Royal Pier but from information available to the public it is understood that the development would include a replacement waterfront park intended to serve the same purpose & be used in a similar way as the existing park. That means it will be heavily used by a wide range of people, & especially by families & young children. SCAPPS objects to a large casino license being granted for premises within the undefined Royal Pier development on the grounds that in the absence of a layout & design there is a considerable & justifiable concern that the applicants cannot provide the necessary & sufficient guarantees that the proximity of gaming premises to a recreation area for children will not expose children using the park (& other users) to risk of harm & exploitation.

SCAPPS biggest objection is however one that the Gaming Act does not recognise. The Royal Pier Waterfront development is a waterfront site, probably the most prestigious & prominent waterfront site in the City. It does not seem to SCAPPS that a large gaming premises is an appropriate use for such a special location. Uses & activities in the Royal Pier development should be ones that take advantage of the waterfront location, of the spectacular views out to the Test & down Southampton Water. Gaming premises are essentially enclosed & 'inward looking', they do not need to occupy & certainly do not benefit from such a spectacular location as the site proposed in these 5 applications. Furthermore, the inclusion of a large gaming premises & associated car parking may preclude & deter other more appropriate uses which would have taken full advantage of the water views.

SCAPPS submits that applications for a large casino license at Royal Pier should be refused, & should certainly be refused until such time as a layout & design has been subject to public consultation establishing whether a casino could be incorporated into the development without prejudice to the overall scheme & without resulting in exclusion or deterrence of other more appropriate uses taking full advantage of this prestigious waterfront site & its extensive views.

Graham Linecar
Secretary, Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society
3 Highfield Road
Southampton SO17 1NX

From: [MARIAN HUBBLE](#)
To: [Casino](#)
Subject: Proposed Royal Pier Development
Date: 28 July 2014 20:31:53

From The City of Southampton Society

Re. Casinos on the Royal Pier.
Aspers Universal
Genting Casinos
Global Gaming Ventures
Grosvenor Casinos
Kymeira Casinos.

The Planning and Environmental of the City of Southampton Society has considered the response made by SCAPPS and fully concurs with the contents of the letter written by Graham Linacre. We have nothing further to add.

Marian Hubble CoSS

Friends of Town Quay Park

Representation to Licensing Team (Large Casino), Southampton City Council

28th July 2014

This representation comes from the Friends of Town Quay Park (FTQP), a membership organisation representing the community of people who use Town Quay Park, SO14 2AT and the adjoining Cuckoo Lane Park.

The Park is immediately opposite Town Quay, overlooking the Royal Pier and Mayflower Park. As such we are an interested party with a) the Park being so close to the potential development of a Casino in the area, and, b) we represent people living in the local community who would be affected by the Casino development.

We trust that the Licensing Committee will consider the following matters of concern to FTQP in considering the granting of a Large Casino Premises Licence.

We appreciate that there are limited grounds for comment at the competition phase for granting Large Casino Licence however we are concerned that the issues we list should be fully considered both by the Advisory Panel and the Councillors who make the decision about the “winner” of the competition.

FTQP has been actively involved in the discussions about the City Centre Action Plan (CCAP). There are some specific points in the CCAP which we believe are relevant to the potential development of a Large Casino in the city centre.

“4.69 The Gambling Act 2005 provides the Council with the opportunity to grant a Large Casino Premises Licence. Applicants will be able to apply for this license and the Licensing Committee will consider each application and determine which one, if granted, would bring the greatest benefit to the area.

Whilst the Council’s preferred site is Royal Pier, applicants will be able to submit proposals for other sites in the city which will be determined against set criteria. The most important criterion set is the **regenerative benefit** of the proposal. This is a separate process to the planning process. The inclusion of reference to a possible casino at Royal Pier does **not pre-empt the licensing process.**”

Key points of concern from FTQP:

1. Peace of TQP – a protected Open Space

We refer to definitions of Section 106 – Recreation and Open Spaces and specifically this extract from Annex of PPG17:

- ii. urban quality: helping to support regeneration and improving quality of life for communities by providing visually attractive green spaces close to where people live;
- iii. promoting health and well-being:

This is what the Friends of Town Quay Park strive to do in protecting and developing the amenities of the park as a quiet public space where people, particularly residents in an increasingly populous area, can relax away from the city bustle. **We are part of the regeneration of the area and the provision of essential public space. We are very concerned about how the parks will be affected, particularly late at night, as they borders the QE2 mile – the main north south spine to the city centre and Town Quay which are likely to be widely use by those going to and coming from the waterfront and any casino located within the development.**

2. Safety – crime, noise, disruption on dispersal and the impact on local policing and health services

The Council states on record that it “will deal with risk of increased crime and anti-social behaviour in the vicinity of the building (*the casino*) through the existing procedures of design out crimes, securely designated car parks and linkage to the Council CCTV systems. The casino operator would also have to invest heavily in its own private security measures within and in the vicinity of the building”. **FTQP have a real concern about drift into the Park as people leave premises in the early hours of the morning and how managing public safety will be achieved in a climate of public service austerity and reducing services.**

3. Attitude of any operator granted a license to social responsibility versus commercial gain

FTQP urges the Licensing Committee to consider careful use of gaming machines which are causing so much distress due to high stakes – and to consider that Southampton require the ratio to be well below the 1:5 limit set by the Gambling Commission.

We also urgethe Licensing Committee to seek clear demonstration from applicants that they treat social responsibility on a par with responsibility to their shareholders (as advocated in a speech by Philip Graf, Chairman, Gambling Commission 4.2.14)

Applicants should also be asked to demonstrate (through minutes perhaps) “that owners, boards, audit committees and remuneration committees consider player protection on a par with commercial development or is it relegated to the compliance department or the regulatory affairs director” (Philip Graf, *ibid*)

In the same speech this theme is continued “We (the gambling regulator) are concentrating more and more on how the boards of operators themselves get assurance that their businesses, for example, have effective anti-money laundering and player protection systems in place. How do they know their policies and procedures are actually working? That commercial pressure is not trumping other concerns? How do their social responsibility principles translate into the culture and behaviour of their business? How can they in turn give us, the regulator, the assurance we need that they are ensuring whole-hearted compliance with the licensing objectives?” **Will the Licensing Committee ensure that a successful candidate operates to the highest standards expected by the regulator and will they be diligent in**

monitoring the ongoing operation? We seek specific and detailed assurances on how this will be achieved.

FTQP also urge the Licensing Committee to consider and publicly state how the standards and guidelines reproduced below from the City Centre Action Plan will be fully met in granting any licence for a large casino.

From the CCAP Night Time Economy background paper

To provide further details on policy CLT 14, a briefing paper 'Night Time Economy Guidelines for opening hours relating to Policies CLT 14 & CLT 15' was produced. This sets out guidance to development control officers on recommended opening hours for food and drink uses (A3-A5), other leisure uses (D2) and nightclubs as follows to ensure a consistent approach to decisions:

Licensing decisions are based on four objectives as set out in the Licensing Act; the prevention of crime and disorder; public safety; prevention of public nuisance; and the protection of children from harm.

Large casino:

5.4.1 The Gambling Act provides the opportunity for the City Council to grant a licence for a large casino in Southampton, one of eight large casino licences available throughout the country. A large casino has a combined gaming floor area of between 1,500 sq m and 3,500 sq m (with table gaming covering at least 1,000 sq m). Further criteria are placed on gaming machines, other betting facilities and non-gambling areas.

5.4.2 There is reference to a large casino in two parts of the CCAP. The supporting text to policy 8 (The Night Time Economy) details the license process which precedes the granting of planning permission and considers which application (if there are more than one) brings greatest benefit to the area. As the council's preferred site is Royal Pier, policy AP 24 (Mayflower Park and Royal Pier) includes reference to a large casino as a possible appropriate use within the development site. The policy will be reconsidered as necessary to reflect the progress on the license process. An indicative timescale has been published and a license is expected to be awarded in June 2014.

5.4.3 Table 3 set out latest opening hours in zones and hubs. This applies to all night time uses with the exception of large casinos which are open 24 hours. The opening hours for the Hub at the southern end of Royal Pier includes a specific reference to any large casino licensed at Royal Pier which would be open 24 hours. **Policy AP 8 The Night Time Economy (CCAP)**

The Council will use its planning and licensing functions to promote a night time economy with a range of activities that contribute to a vibrant city centre whilst **minimising potential disturbance to nearby residential areas**. New uses with extended opening hours (beyond 23.00 hours) will therefore be directed to designated evening zones and late night hubs as shown on the Policies Map.

Proposals for new development and extended opening hours will be subject to restricted opening times as set out in table 3. In evening zones and late night hubs, extended opening hours for food and drink uses (Use Classes A3, A4 and A5) will be supported subject to meeting other policies, particularly those

to protect residential amenity and retail areas. Applications for extended opening hours in the Cultural Quarter will be judged on their own merits.

Elsewhere in the city centre proposals for extended opening hours outside the designated late night hubs and evening zones will only be permitted where **they would not cause late night noise and disturbance to residents.**

Contributions to community safety facilities will be sought from proposals for entertainment venues, including A3, A4, A5, nightclubs or D2 uses which relate to the night-time economy, leisure and tourism facilities.

4.67 There are however challenges in managing people using night clubs, bars and pubs at night in order to reduce the noise and disruption to people living in and close to the city centre (to address potentially negative impacts on health and increased crime raised in the Sustainability Appraisal SA/SEA).

The planning system has an important role in directing such uses to areas of the city centre which are easily accessible, attractive to the entertainment industry and which create minimum noise and nuisance to residents

4.68 The approach in this plan is to direct uses with extended opening hours to designated late night hubs and evening zones. Late night hubs are located away from residential areas and are appropriate for late night uses with opening hours up to 3am including new nightclubs, casinos and other entertainment (D2) uses. Also appropriate in these hubs are food and drink uses (use Classes A3, A4 and A5) with extended opening hours. The late night hubs may also include other uses as part of mixed use schemes, including residential. New residential development in late night hubs should incorporate measures to reduce noise and carefully consider the location of residential units in relation to the late night uses. Where residential development has already taken place, proposals for nightclubs should not be detrimental to those living nearby, for example by causing undue noise and disturbance.

FTQP is very concerned about the impact on the quality of life of local residents and visitors of the 24 hour operation of a large casino and seeks reassurance that the “policing” of the impact will be rigorously undertaken.

We Trust that the Licensing Committee will uphold the standards in the CCAP and consider the interests of Town Quay Park members and local residents in considering the granting of any licence for a large casino.

Ros Cassy, Chair of the Friends of Town Quay Park, www.friendsoftownquaypark.org.uk



Hampshire Constabulary
Chief Constable Andy Marsh

Police Licensing Unit
Southampton Central Police Station
Southern Road
Southampton
Hampshire
SO15 1AN

Southampton City Council
Licensing Department
Civic Centre
Southampton
SO14 7LY

Telephone: 0845 045 45 45

Direct dial: 02380 533 368

Fax No: 0845660037

Deaf/speech impaired minicom: 01962 875000

Email: western.licensing@hampshire.pnn.police.uk

28th July 2014

Dear Licensing Department

Representation by Hampshire Constabulary in respect of applications to Southampton City Council Under the Gambling Act 2005 for the Provisional Statements in Respect of a Large Casino Licence.

This representation is made under section 161 of the Gambling Act 2005 in respect of the following applications,

- 1 - Kymeira Casino Ltd of Eversheds House, 70 Great Bridgewater Street, Manchester M1 5ES in respect of a Large Casino Licence to be situated at the proposed Royal Pier development on a site bounded by Town Quay road, Town Quay pier, Mayflower Park and the river Test, accessed from Town Quay Southampton.
- 2 - Global Gaming Ventures (Southampton) Ltd, of 11 John Princes Street, London W1G 0JR in respect of a Large Casino Licence to be situated at the Watermark West Quay scheme, to be located on a development to the south of the West Quay Shopping Centre bordered by Western Esplanade and Harbour Parade Southampton.
- 3 - Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd, of 11 John Princes Street London W1G 0JR, in respect of a Large Casino Licence to be located on existing and reclaimed land situated to the south of Town Quay and east of Mayflower Park known as the Royal Pier Waterfront Southampton SO14 2AQ.
- 4 - Genting Casinos UK Ltd, of Genting Club Star City, Watson Road, Birmingham B7 5SA in respect of a Large Casino Licence to be constructed on a plot of land to be reclaimed from the River Test (and expected to be situated at building identified as RP2), Royal Pier Waterfront, Mayflower Park, Southampton, SO14 2AQ.

I have examined these applications in full and understand that the Council are currently at stage 1 in this application process. I also understand that this stage requires the applicants to demonstrate to the Licensing Committee that they are "fit and proper" persons to potentially be awarded the licence. With this in mind I have the following observations to make regarding these applications.



Hampshire Constabulary

Chief Constable Andy Marsh

Firstly, the following applicants do not appear to be holders of an operating licence issued by the Gambling Commission. I see this as a fundamental requirement as it demonstrates acceptance by a regulatory body and demonstrates a degree of responsibility. The applicants that are affected by this are Kymeira Casino Ltd, Global Gaming Ventures (Southampton) Ltd and Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd.

I do note that the application published on your website is rather basic and perhaps some of the required information is not directly asked for. However, point 19 on the application does ask for any further information that may be relevant to the application and it is here that I would have expected to see reference to the applicants Codes of Practise, Operating Procedures or a Responsible Gambling Policy which cover the statutory gambling objectives and specifically to "protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling".

This brings me to my second observation in that all four of the above applicants have failed to provide any evidence that might convince the Licensing Committee that they are in fact fit and proper to hold such a licence. They make no reference to any age verification schemes such as Challenge 25 and no mention of what forms of identification will be accepted. There is no evidence as to how the applicants will protect children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

I find that this omission is rather surprising considering the nature and expense of what the applications are for and the fact that they are trying to demonstrate that they are suitable to hold the licence. However, as a responsible authority, it is an area that I look to see being covered and in these applications it isn't. Therefore I ask the Licensing Committee to reject these applications for a provisional statement.

If the applicants were to submit a robust and acceptable policy or policies detailing how they propose to comply with this specific gambling objective, Hampshire Constabulary would be prepared to withdraw its representation.

Yours Faithfully



PS 2117 Wood
Alcohol Harm Reduction and Licensing Team

LEGAL & DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

RICHARD IVORY, Solicitor,
Head of Legal and Democratic Services
Southampton and Eastleigh Licensing Partnership

Southampton City Council
 Licensing Services
 Civic Centre
 Southampton SO14 7LY

Please address all correspondence to:
Licensing – Southampton City Council,
PO Box 1767, Southampton, SO18 9LA



Direct dial: 023 8083 3523
 Our ref: PB/2014/02561/70SLCP
 Your ref:

E-mail: phil.bates@southampton.gov.uk
 Please ask for: Mr. Bates

The Licensing Team
 Southampton and Eastleigh Licensing Partnership
 Civic Centre
 Southampton SO14 7LY

21 July 2014

Dear Sir,

**GAMBLING ACT 2005 – GLOBAL GAMING VENTURES (RP) LTD, ROYAL PIER
 REPRESENTATION IN RESPECT OF APPLICATION FOR A LARGE CASINO PROVISIONAL
 STATEMENT –**

This is a representation under section 161 of the Gambling Act 2005 by Southampton City Council, as a responsible authority under section 157(a) of the Act, in respect of an application by Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd., of 11 John Princes Street, London W1G 0JR for a Provisional Statement in respect of a Large Casino Licence to be located on existing and reclaimed land situated to the south of Town Quay and to the east of Mayflower Park and known as the Royal Pier Waterfront, Southampton SO14 2AQ.

I have examined this application in detail, which is at stage 1 of the process. This requires an applicant to demonstrate to the Licensing Authority that they are a “fit and proper” person to potentially be awarded the licence.

I understand that the applicant, Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd. does not hold an operating licence issued by the Gambling Commission; however the application published on the City Council’s website is very basic and, when referring in general to the statutory gambling objectives, and specifically to:

- *Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling*

the applicant has failed to provide any evidence which might satisfy the Licensing Committee that they are fit and proper to hold such a licence. There is no reference to a “Challenge 21” or similar policy, and no mention as to what forms of identity might be acceptable as proof of age. There is no evidence as to how the applicant will protect children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

The applicant has also failed to produce their responsible gambling policy, assuming that one exists.

On behalf of Southampton City Council as Responsible Authority, I would therefore ask the Licensing Committee to reject this application for a provisional statement.

If the applicant were to submit a robust and acceptable policy or policies detailing how they propose to comply with this specific gambling objective, Southampton City Council would be prepared to withdraw its representation.

Yours faithfully,


 Licensing Manager
 for Head of Legal and Democratic Services

