
From: Graham Linecar < >
Sent: 08 June 2022 14:26
To: Montague, Hayley
Subject: Re: Objection from SCAPPS to further extension of period of a provisional statement for a large casino, Royal Pier Waterfront

Oh, sorry -- meant to add address, & forgot! Yes, same as 2019, 3 Highfield Road SO17 1NX.
GL

From: Montague, Hayley
Sent: 08 June 2022 10:09
To: Graham Linecar
Subject: RE: Objection from SCAPPS to further extension of period of a provisional statement for a large casino, Royal Pier Waterfront

Good morning,

Thank you for your representation, is your address for correspondence as per the previous representation in 2019?

Kind regards,

Hayley Montague
Licensing Enforcement Officer
Southampton and Eastleigh Licensing Partnership
Southampton City Council

Web: www.southampton.gov.uk/licensing
Post: Licensing - Southampton City Council
Civic Centre, Southampton, SO14 7LY

Please note:- This email is confidential but may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. SCC does not make legally binding agreements or accept formal notices/proceedings by email. Emails may be monitored. This e-mail (and its attachments) is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain information which 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.

From: Graham Linecar
Sent: 06 June 2022 18:53
To: Licensing
Cc: Montague, Hayley
Subject: Objection from SCAPPS to further extension of period of a provisional statement for a large casino, Royal Pier Waterfront

You don't often get email from [redacted]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Application by Aspers to extend for a further 3 years a provisional statement for a large casino, Royal Pier Waterfront
Objection by Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS)

SCAPPS was an objector at the Licensing Committee hearing in October 2019 when a decision was made to extend for 3 years the period of the provisional statement granted in March 2016.

The Committee was given legal advice at the October 2019 hearing that the site of the large casino may not be moved under this provisional statement from that specified in the 2016 application and decision. The premises cited in the application do not exist. The 2016 application identified the premises by reference to a developer's (RPW Southampton Limited) plan for what was termed the Royal Pier Waterfront Development; the site lies underwater, somewhere off the Royal Pier and the Red Funnel vehicle ferry terminal. RPW Southampton Limited is no longer in business. The land owners involved in the scheme have withdrawn from the development proposal. A planning application was withdrawn without being determined. It is not apparent from Aspers' letter requesting this further extension if the landowner (presumably Crown Estate, as the site is below the LWM) has been notified.

The applicant has submitted no evidence to show any action to promote a replacement development proposal which might result in the reclamation & development necessary to secure the premises identified in the 2016 application. The premises do not exist. There is no planning permission or planning application for the premises. There is no developer with a scheme which might feasibly result in any such planning proposal.

In 2019, the Committee noted there was 'no current evidence of feasibility' of a development scheme which might result in construction of the premises specified in the provisional statement. It however granted the 3-year extension because the large casino might 'help to catalyse' a fresh development proposal. That has not happened. The applicant has provided no evidence of any activity in the two and a half years since October 2019 which might even remotely result in a fresh development scheme being prepared. There is no developer interested, even with a large casino to act as 'anchor' or catalyst. There is no likelihood the premises will ever exist. This application should be refused.

SCAPPS repeats the objection it made to the 2019 application to extend the period of the provisional statement. In the absence of a developer's overall scheme, there must be uncertainty as to extent of the overall scheme (whether it includes, and destroys, Mayflower Park), the uses and activities it would include and the juxtaposition of those activities and uses. SCAPPS concern is protection of Mayflower Park. SCAPPS cannot envisage any condition which would safeguard against the undesirable consequence of a major gaming establishment in close proximity to a significant public recreation area used by children and young persons. SCAPPS has long pressed for improvements to be made to Mayflower Park. Rejecting this application to extend the period of the provisional statement will remove one of the uncertainties which, seemingly, may have contributed to holding back investment in Park improvement.

Graham Linecar
for SCAPPS