

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Graham Linecar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 September 2019 13:09  
**To:** Casino  
**Cc:** Forrest, Andrew; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Application by Aspers to extend Provisional Statement for Large Casino at Royal Pier/Mayflower Park

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

I'm dismayed, to put it mildly, by your request. Please look at Licensing's file. You'll find record of contact & meetings with Richard Ivory, Jamie Hollis & Martin Grout in early 2013 & in 2014. It was accepted that SCAPPS could submit representations. I attended & spoke at the Licensing Committee September 2014 when it considered stage 1 competing bids for the Large Casino Licence because some of the bids, including Aspers', affected a park, & SCAPPS purpose is to protect parks. The correspondence on file & records of that meeting record my address, 3 Highfield Road Southampton SO17 1NX. I cannot give you list of addresses of SCAPPS members — breach of Data Protection.

Graham Linecar  
Secretary, SCAPPS

Sent from my iPhone

On 20 Sep 2019, at 12:17 pm, Casino <[Casino@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:Casino@southampton.gov.uk)> wrote:

Dear Mr. Linecar,  
*Aspers Universal Ltd.*  
*Aspers Casino Royal Pier Development Mayflower Park Southampton SO14 2AQ*  
I refer to your recent correspondence to make representation to the above provisional statement extension under the Gambling Act 2005.  
In order for us to accept the representation please provide your home address so that we can demonstrate that you live "sufficiently close" to the proposed premises as required by the Act. Please note in order for the representation to be on behalf of a body representing others (SCAPPS) you will need to provide a list of names/addresses of those whom you represent.  
Yours sincerely,  
Hayley Montague  
Licensing Enforcement Officer  
Southampton and Eastleigh Licensing Partnership  
**Southampton City Council**  
Tele: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Web: [www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing](http://www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing)  
Post: Licensing - Southampton City Council  
PO Box 1767, Southampton. SO18 9LA

---

**From:** Graham Linecar [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** 13 September 2019 14:08  
**To:** Licensing <[Licensing@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:Licensing@southampton.gov.uk)>; Forrest, Andrew <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Ros Cassy <[REDACTED]>; Irene MacWilliam <[REDACTED]>; Andy Gravell <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Application by Aspers to extend Provisional Statement for Large Casino at Royal Pier/Mayflower Park

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

Following correspondence with Andrew Forrest, I submit, on behalf of Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS) a representation on the current application by Aspers for extension of the Provisional Statement granted to them in 2016. SCAPPS is responding as representing the interests of those who use & enjoy the public park, Mayflower Park.

SCAPPS made representations at successive stages in the process for inviting & considering competing bids for a Large Casino Licence. SCAPPS' principle concern is the unsuitability of a site next to a public park & children's play area for a gaming establishment. This was acknowledged by the Licensing Committee & applicants & conditions imposed which would reduce visibility of the casino from the Park, but SCAPPS continues to express concern that a gaming establishment is not appropriate next to a public park.

SCAPPS expresses considerable concern about the uncertainty surrounding if, when & how any development proposal will come forward which would result in a building on the site defined on plans specified in the Provisional Statement. The plan is one from the planning application made by RPW Developments. The planning application remains undetermined -- in other words, no planning permission exists for the 'premises' named in the Statement. The City Council has announced its withdrawal from its agreement with RPW Developments. It is reasonable to conclude there is now no chance of the RPW development project proceeding. The Aspers site lies off-shore with no immediate prospect of there being the reclamation & development which would provide the 'premises' specified in the Provisional Statement.

Aspers refer to the hope, & at this time it can be no more than a 'hope', that an alternative developer may come forward. That is of major concern to SCAPPS. The alternative development scheme may be for a smaller area -- it seems the site specified by Aspers may at present be the area of water covered by the derelict Royal Pier. The City Council has suggested it might be interested in entering into an agreement again threatening destruction of the present Mayflower Park. In both cases, SCAPPS would oppose extension of the Provisional Statement because of uncertainty as to impact on the Park. If the period in which Aspers may work up its proposal is extended it is inevitable that they will request variation in the siting & possibly extent of the casino to 'fit' with any proposals an alternative developer is working-up. SCAPPS cannot foresee any conditions which can be imposed which would protect the Park from destruction or safeguard against unsuitable juxtaposition of a major gaming establishment with a recreation area used by children & young persons.

Graham Linecar  
Secretary SCAPPS

This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, Environmental Information Regulations 2004 or data protection legislation. If you are not the person or organisation it was meant for, apologies, please ignore it, delete it, and notify us. SCC does not make legally binding agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. E-mails may be monitored. This email (and its attachments) is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and/or confidential. If it has come to you in error, you must take no action based on it, nor must you copy or show it to anyone.