



17 Ashfield Road  
Blackpool  
FY2 0DH

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

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](http://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 Greenwich. We believe strongly that the debate concerning the Regional Casino in Greenwich 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 Greenwich.

With that in mind, I have set out in the appended note a brief précis of what we see as the essential flaws in Greenwich'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 Greenwich, 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 Greenwich's bid for a Regional Casino licence**

**Inconsistent with borough regeneration aims:** The borough's draft regeneration strategy prioritises "reducing relative deprivation". This priority is incompatible with Super-Casino development because the displacement of low wage jobs does nothing to reduce relative deprivation.

Greenwich's own consultants (PricewaterhouseCoopers) found that 'in terms of negative impacts...problem gambling is the social risk with the highest potential impact and the highest level of uncertainty. The costs and social impacts of problem gambling can be substantial.' This concern, of course, applies in all locations.

**Lack of adequate consultation:** The council has held three public meetings, in February and March 2006. On March 21, a unanimous vote of full council endorsed the decision to apply for a Super-Casino licence. Given the scale and detail of Greenwich's submission, it is abundantly clear that a substantial amount of preliminary work had therefore been done before the public meetings - supposedly an opportunity for residents and local stakeholders to hear all sides of the debate - had even taken place.

**Local people using the casino:** The submission makes clear that according to the PwC study commissioned by Greenwich, over 80 per cent of the estimated 1.7 million visits will come from within a 45-minute peak drive time of the Dome. Although Borough residents are expected to make just six per cent of the visits (and contribute five per cent of the revenue) other local boroughs whose people will be encouraged to take part in vast numbers include Hackney, Waltham Forest, Tower Hamlets, Southwark, Lambeth, Islington, Camden, Bromley etc.

The business case seems overwhelmingly to rest on the idea that people from some of London's poorest areas will spend most of an estimated £103m per year. It is, however, a truism that with the Super-Casino emphasis resting on the provision of 1250 unlimited stake and prize slot machines, the appeal is likely to be strongest amongst socio-economic classes C, D and E wherever the Super-Casino is located.