

## **CASINO ADVISORY PANEL**

### **AMENDED MINUTES OF MEETING**

Monday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2005 from 10:45am  
Room L20 DCMS, 2-4 Cockspur Street, London SW1Y 5DH

Present:

(Chair) Stephen Crow (SC)

Chris Collison (CC)

James Froomberg (JF)

Neil Mundy (NM)

Deep Sagar (DS)

(Secretary) Jane Bransby

#### **1. Minutes of last meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed by the Panel. It was agreed that they should be given legal clearance prior to publication.

#### **2. Round up on Domestic matters by Panel Secretary**

##### **Legal**

The Secretary confirmed that it had been agreed by DCMS that the Panel could use Treasury Solicitors (T-Sol) for our legal advice. The Panel would now be allocated a specific T-Sol contact who would be briefed on our work by the Secretary.

##### **Website**

The website was now fully functional and had specific links from the DCMS website. It also now came up as the first 'hit' on a Google search.

The Secretary agreed to explore the possibility of having website links to the Gambling Commission (and vice versa) as there was likely to be common interest for users.

##### **Tax**

The Secretary was pleased to inform the Panel that she had been assured that the tax issue on travel and subsistence claims had been sorted out and would not have to be dealt with separately by individuals.

##### **Next Meetings**

The Secretary confirmed that the Panel meetings would take place in Paddington until further notice.

##### **Scoping letters**

The Secretary updated the Panel on the returns she had received from the mail-out to Local Authorities and Regional Planning bodies. It was agreed that the list of respondents should be placed on the Panel website in due course.

#### **3. Budget**

The Secretary confirmed that decisions on the budget for the next financial year were not likely to be made until next year. It was agreed that because the Panel felt a significant increase was likely a detailed budget plan should be submitted to DCMS.

The Panel agreed unanimously that given all members of the Panel, and the Panel Secretary, were part-time, there would be a need for additional personnel in one form or another to deal with the sheer volume of work.

It was also agreed that the Panel should be able to use Specialist Consultants or Advisers if and when necessary to supplement the knowledge and experience of the Panel and/or when necessitated by volume of work. It was agreed that a case should be made for monies to be set aside as a contingency for calling in outside professional advice if necessary. The Secretary agreed to include this in the detailed budget request. It was also agreed that this should only take place to cover areas of work which would best not be undertaken by the panel, that any recruitment of such should follow the usual civil service rules of procurement and should offer good value for money.

JF agreed to draft a call for the appointment of consultants. The Panel Secretary agreed to check DCMS procurement procedures.

The Panel also agreed that it would be necessary to look into obtaining additional assistance to deal with the initial acknowledgement and sorting of proposals. It may also be necessary for this assistance to be able to put together an initial précis report for the Panel to aid their initial sifting process. It was noted however that the Panel cannot and would not want to delegate responsibility for the evaluation process.

#### **4. Panel Members' Activities**

JF shared with the Panel useful maps compiled from public sources covering areas of regeneration.

SC

Had attended a reception chaired by Tessa Jowell where he had met with representatives from the British Casino Association and the Gambling Commission. He had made clear the remit of the Panel.

Queries had been raised about the Panel's inclusion of Regional Spatial Strategies. This wasn't seen as being a problem for the Panel as long as we consulted fully with the Regional Planning Bodies.

A query had also been raised about the need for Strategic Environmental Assessment. It was agreed that this could not be undertaken by the Panel but would be part of the planning procedure. The Secretary agreed to ask DCMS how to proceed.

SC had attended a meeting by the Regional Studies Association on Sport & Regeneration.

CC

Had visited a small shipboard casino recently. Panel members shared details of world casinos which were on a similar scale to the proposed regional casino and recognised

that it was important to be aware of analogous sites which could be replicated in GB. The Chair thought it desirable to visit a large casino development abroad to help get a feel for the scale of the project. The Panel agreed that the Chair should make appropriate visits if budgets permitted.

## **5. Criteria**

### Language

The Panel agreed that they were reluctant to use term 'application' and that future references should use term 'proposal'. The detailed 'call for proposals' should include an outline of Panel Process and specific details of requirements for submission of proposals.

### Impartiality of Panel members

It was agreed that Panel members should make it known if they, or any close family member, had home or business connections to any areas who had submitted a proposal.

### Process

The Panel discussed and agreed a programme outline (now published on the website: <http://www.culture.gov.uk/cap/documents/Project-Outline30-01-06.pdf> )

They agreed that the sifting and evaluation process needed very careful consideration and could be developed further over the weeks following the call for proposals. This may involve a process similar to the 'Examinations in Public' which Local Authorities would be aware through the planning process. SC would put together a paper on how such examinations could be conducted for discussion at the next meeting.

CC agreed to look into scoring systems

### Call for proposals

The Panel discussed the mechanics of the process and the call for proposals. The Panel agreed that as proposals would need to be carefully studied and appraised against the given criteria, careful detailing of the call for proposals was necessary to ensure that the Panel would be able to judge clearly those which best met the criteria.

The Panel discussed at length the overall criteria and detailed questions which should be included in the draft 'call for proposals' (now published in full on the website: <http://www.culture.gov.uk/cap/documents/Callforproposals30-01-06.pdf> ). The Panel agreed the draft document should be cleared by T-Sol and then there should be a further brief consultation with external stakeholders such as the Regional Planning Bodies prior to publication at the end of January.

It was also agreed that the Chair and Secretary should consult separately with Scottish representatives because of the different set-up to ensure that they were not disadvantaged. The Secretary agreed to set up a meeting.

## **6. Any other business**

The Chair wished the rest of the Panel a Merry Christmas.