

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 2749
Our ref:
Your ref:

E-mail: martin.grout@southampton.gov.uk
Please ask for: Martin Grout

Global Gaming Ventures (RP) Ltd
11 John Princes Street
London
W1G 0TR

15th April 2015

Dear Sirs,

Casino Competition (the "Competition"): Licensing Committee Meeting 9th April 2015

Thank you for your letter dated 10th April 2015.

We note your concerns, which we understand to be:

- That the Licensing Committee decided to extend the closure of Stage 2 of the Competition by three months.
- This results in precisely the same delay as was requested by certain Competition applicants last year and which was considered and rejected by the Licensing Committee at a hearing on 16th December 2014.
- The agenda for the meeting of 9th April 2015 did not include extending the closure of Stage 2.
- Although delay was discussed at the meeting, parties were not able to consider the matter properly.
- GGV would be seriously prejudiced by a three month delay, including because several applicants will now have three months to prepare the applications which they were unable or unwilling to prepare and submit next week in accordance with the published timetable.

At the outset of the hearing, the Committee considered whether to discuss Kymeira's argument, which had been notified in advance, that the location of the casino could move vertically within the same footprint. You opposed discussion on that matter too, but the Committee decided that it was better that the debate be had and the matter clarified, to enable the preparation of Stage 2 bids.

The upshot was that there were now three sites in play on the Royal Pier: the original Casino Location Zone, a vertical variant thereof and Plots WQ2, 3 and 4. It would only be following the Committee's decision about whether the latter two could be the subject of Stage 2 bids, whether as a matter of right or discretion, that parties would be in a position to prepare their Stage 2 bids. That created a difficulty since the deadline was one week away.

Accordingly, parties were asked to address the issue of how long would be needed to submit Stage 2 bids, on the basis that the further plots were and were not in play. Nobody, including you, suggested that this matter should not be addressed or that more time was needed for preparation of arguments. Indeed, with four of the five applicants before the Committee together

If you require this letter or future correspondence from us in a different format (e.g. tape, Braille or disc) please do not hesitate to let us know.

with the main residential objectors, it was an obvious piece of case management to consider the matter at that hearing.

Accordingly, argument was heard from all parties, which continued into the late afternoon. Following such argument, the parties were specifically asked whether there was anything more they wished to say. There wasn't. The Committee therefore retired and came to a balanced decision. The arguments for and against delaying closure of Stage 2 were fully set out and considered, including the arguments to which you have referred above.

We are therefore in some difficulty understanding the nature of your complaint, other than that, on this matter, the Committee came to a decision with which you do not agree. We are satisfied that no unfairness has occurred.

In your letter, you appear to suggest that because the Committee held a hearing in December to consider the extension of Stage 2, it must therefore adopt precisely the same procedure if it wishes to consider a further extension. There is no statutory or jurisprudential basis for that assertion. In December, the Committee decided to convene a hearing to consider the arguments. In April, it was convenient to consider the matter at what was effectively a case management hearing.

However, if you persist in your view that the manner in which the determination was reached has occasioned unfairness, and in particular if there are arguments which were not put on 9th April, we would respectfully suggest that the proper course is to write a letter setting out your position, which will be placed before the Committee for a decision as to whether it is necessary to re-open this element of the debate.

Yours faithfully,



Locum Licensing Officer
for Head of Legal and Democratic Services

If you require this letter or future correspondence from us in a different format (e.g. tape, Braille or disc) please do not hesitate to let us know.