



17 Ashfield Road
Blackpool
FY2 0DH

**REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE AT EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC FOR
REGIONAL CASINO PROPOSAL IN BRENT**

Dear Professor Crow

Further to your request for representations from those wishing to participate in the planned Examinations in Public for Regional Casino licences, I write on behalf of the national Campaign Against Super Casino Expansion with a request to take part.

CASE (www.thecase.org.uk) is a national campaign with support from across the country and we welcome this opportunity to air arguments concerning both the merits and the risks associated with the Regional Casino development in Brent. We believe strongly that the debate concerning the Regional Casino in Brent has so far been overwhelmingly one sided and that the EiP process represents an important opportunity to raise matters of which some stakeholders may be unaware.

It is noted that, as you make clear in your guidance notes on the subject, national casino policy has been settled through primary legislation. Accordingly, it is not our intention to address to the EiP general arguments against Regional Casinos. Instead, CASE's intention is to outline what we see as the shortcomings of the particular bid put forward by the local authority in Brent.

With that in mind, I have set out in the appended note a brief précis of what we see as the essential flaws in Brent's bid, on which subject we would look to expand in the context of the discussion framework afforded by the EiP process.

With this in mind, we would very much welcome the opportunity to take part in the EiP in Brent, and look forward to hearing from you in due course regarding arrangements.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Steven Bate

On Behalf of the Campaign Against Super Casino Expansion

Briefing note

10 August 2006

Re: Problems arising from LB Brent's bid for a Regional Casino licence

Proximity to Heathrow: The proximity of the Brent site to Heathrow airport – one of the world's busiest international airports – on land owned by Quintain Estates and in a complex already comprising the new Wembley stadium and arena is considered positively in the local authority's submission to the CAP. In fact, to the extent that the casino trade is from foreign visitors, this skews the social and economic impact measurement. However, the reality is that any casino will rely on local trade and that has to be paramount. Equally the massive expenditure on the local area from the recent Wembley stadium development reduces any argument for further need for further regeneration.

Displaced jobs: The authority-commissioned NERA study referenced in their submission makes clear that there will be certain local impacts, notably, 'jobs displaced by existing local employers closing and the leakage of jobs to people outside the borough'. A close reading of the Brent submission suggests this will contribute towards over 750 **fewer** jobs than would normally be the result of such a development. Of course, the displacement effect will apply in most conurbations though perhaps most strongly in those where the proposal is closest to a particular town centre.

Problem gambling: The authority's own submission notes that a ten per cent increase in problem gambling among the local population is expected. This will, the submission notes, put 'additional pressure on local support services.' The social impact study predicts a yet higher figure, though costs are sketchy in this regard, and in others. While Brent's social impact study may be criticised as being insufficiently detailed, the plain fact is that serious social impact is likely to be caused in this location as in all others on the CAP's shortlist.

Lack of adequate consultation: There are four initiatives planned to take place to gauge public support for the local area hosting a Super-Casino - including a 'multi faith forum', a 'Citizens Panel' and a 'Great Casino Debate'. All of these are scheduled for May 2006 or later - i.e. AFTER the local authority had already formally expressed its interest in the first regional licence.