

Appendix 2 - Consultation Responses to the Gambling Policy

In regard to the "No Casino" policy, I'd be interested in looking at this again. We don't know how much is currently being spent by local residents on on-line gambling web sites - revenue of no benefit to H&F. We should try and understand usage of these sites in any future consultation to help ascertain a local demand.

The "don't want to favour one of our three town centres over the other" argument doesn't wash with me either. Did concerns about the future of shopping in Hammersmith and Fulham stop us from opening Westfield in Shepherds' Bush? Let market forces determine the best location.

Councillor Donald Johnson

I am in support of the previous decision for there to be no casino in the borough. Is it possible to identify "vulnerable persons" as taking into account the capacity for some people to become addicted to gambling? This is not a moral issue, but one of fact. Addiction to anything is an identifiable illness, especially if it can impact the health of the addicted, or those with whom they have close contact. It is quite possible for people not to be aware that gambling is addictive, or necessarily to be aware that they may be prone to such an addiction.

Anonymous