

Individual comments regarding reasons why proposing authorities did not make the shortlist:

## **Regionals**

### **Coventry**

The Panel recognised the commitment of your authority to the proposal, and the pressing need for economic regeneration in the City, not least in the light of the recent and unfortunate news of industrial closure which you brought to our attention. Nevertheless, difficult though circumstances are at the present time, the Panel concluded that other proposals appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in respect of their remitted criteria.

### **Chesterfield**

While the Panel recognised the detailed consideration of social issues and the need for regeneration in the Chesterfield area they concluded that other proposals in the regional and large categories have more to offer in respect of the remitted criteria.

### **Havering**

While the Panel recognised the social problems and regeneration needs in Havering, they formed the view that other areas matched up more strongly in terms of stakeholder support.

### **Ipswich**

While the Panel recognised the social problems and regeneration needs in Ipswich, they formed the view that other areas had more urgent needs that matched up to the remitted criteria.

### **Midlothian**

While the Panel recognised the detailed consideration of social impact and the need for regeneration they concluded that other proposals in the regional and large categories have more to offer in respect of the remitted criteria.

### **Newport**

The Panel recognised the pressing need for economic regeneration in the City, not least in the light of the almost complete closure of the steelworks at Newport over the past few years. Nevertheless, difficult though circumstances are at the present time, the Panel concluded that other proposals appeared to them to have more to offer in respect of their remitted criteria.

### **Saint Helens**

The Panel recognised the pressing need for regeneration in all its aspects in St Helens but they concluded that other proposals appeared to them to have more to offer in respect of their remitted criteria.

### **Southend**

The Panel recognised the strong commitment of your authority to their proposal and detailed consideration of social impact and the need for regeneration in Southend. However the Panel concluded that other proposals for of the one regional casino had more to offer in respect of the remitted criteria.

### **Sunderland**

The Panel recognised the pressing need for regeneration in all its aspects in Sunderland but they concluded that other proposals in the regional and large categories have more to offer in respect of the remitted criteria.

### **Wakefield**

The Panel not only recognised the experience of social impact, in light of seven existing casinos in the catchment, and regeneration needs in Wakefield and its environs, but also the commendable partnership approach in your proposal but they could not avoid the view that the more urgent needs of other areas met the criteria more fully.

### **West Dunbartonshire**

The Panel recognised the commitment of your authority to the proposal, and also the pressing need for economic regeneration in the area. Nevertheless the Panel concluded that other proposals appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in respect of their remitted criteria.

### **Regional Fallback**

#### **Dartford**

While the Panel recognised the detailed consideration of social impact and the need for regeneration they concluded that other proposals in the regional category had more to offer in respect of the remitted criteria, but were nevertheless pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

#### **Dudley**

The Panel recognised both the commitment of the authority to their proposal and also the need for regeneration in your area. And while the panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of large and small casinos.

#### **Great Yarmouth**

The Panel recognised not only the economic problems in your area and the need for regeneration in all its aspects that is shared by many coastal towns in Britain. And while the Panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a combination of large and small casinos.

#### **Kingston upon Hull**

While the Panel recognised your commendable attention to social issues and the high levels of deprivation and while the Panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

#### **Leeds**

The Panel recognised not only the social problems in your area and the need for regeneration in all its aspects, but also the support offered in the draft revision of Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber that is now before the Secretary of State. But while the Panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

#### **Middlesbrough**

The Panel recognised not only the economic problems in your area and the need for regeneration in all its aspects. And while the Panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

### **Solihull**

The Panel recognised not only the commitment of the authority to their proposal but also your approach to social impact and partnership in your area. While the Panel did not consider your authority's case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

### **Southampton**

The Panel recognised that your city shares many of the problems facing seaports at the present time and while the Panel did not consider the local case strong enough to weigh against the very strong competition for the one regional casino, they are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casinos.

### **Thurrock**

Situated in the Thames Gateway, and with the support of the Development Corporation, your proposal did not compete sufficiently well with others for a regional casino, but the Panel are pleased to consider your proposal further in the context of a large casino.

### **Large, small and mixed**

#### **Bradford**

Although the Panel recognised the pressing need for all aspects of regeneration in Bradford, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of their remitted criteria.

#### **Cannock Chase**

While your proposal was not without merit, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of the remitted criteria.

#### **Carlisle**

Although the Panel recognised some merit in the statement of regeneration needs, other areas appeared to the Panel to offer more in terms of their remitted criteria

#### **Chester**

While the Panel recognised the partnership approach and strategic intent of your authority in Chester, they formed the view that the more urgent needs of other areas met the criteria more fully, in particular to do with the need for regeneration.

#### **Derby**

Although the Panel recognised the regeneration needs of Derby, other areas with greater problems appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in all of their remitted criteria.

#### **Dover**

Although the Panel recognised the international visitor potential of your proposal, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of the remitted criteria.

#### **Falkirk**

Although the Panel recognised the pressing need for all aspects of regeneration in Falkirk, other areas with equal problems appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in terms of their remitted criteria

**Harrogate**

Although the Panel recognised the potential to build on the strong conference and exhibition base, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of their remitted criteria.

**Maidstone**

While your proposal was not without merit, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of all of their remitted criteria.

**Renfrewshire**

While the Panel had no difficulty in recognising the social problems and regeneration needs in Renfrewshire, they could not avoid the view that the more urgent needs of other areas met the criteria more fully.

**Salford**

Although the Panel recognised the pressing need for all aspects of regeneration in Salford, other areas with equal problems appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in terms of their remitted criteria.

**Sevenoaks**

While your proposal was not without merit, other areas appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in terms of all of their remitted criteria.

**Shepway**

While your proposal was not without merit, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of all the remitted criteria.

**Swindon**

While your proposal was not without merit, other areas appeared to the Panel to have much more to offer in terms of the remitted criteria.

**Surrey Heath**

While your proposal introduced an inland location in the South East of England into the competition, other areas appeared to the Panel to have more to offer in all of their remitted criteria.

**Taunton Deane**

Although the Panel recognised the pressing need for all aspects of regeneration in Taunton Deane, other areas with greater problems appeared to the Panel to offer more in all of their remitted criteria.

**Westminster**

Although the Panel recognised the merits of your proposal other areas appeared to offer much more in terms of their remitted criteria.