

Enquiries to: Information Team
Our Ref: Various as below



**Liverpool
City Council**

Email addresses as per requests detailed below.

Dear Mr Lee,

Freedom of Information requests received 15 September 2017 onwards

Thank you for the series of 21 substantial interlinked requests, which you have submitted since 15 September 2017 to date. In summary, these all relate to interlinked matters on regeneration and comprised a combination of both Information Request and comment. Our apologies for the delay, which has on this occasion been necessitated in view of the scale and extent of the questions raised.

Response:

We would at this stage draw your attention to Section 14 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 which allows a Local Authority to refuse what is deemed to be a vexatious request.

The volume and extent of requests received from yourself during a short period on what are related matters are such as to be considered a manifestly unjustified, inappropriate or improper use of a formal procedure and designed to cause disruption to the relevant Officers and Service Areas identified by generated additional administrative and bureaucratic work.

Whilst noting the breadth and extent of your recent requests we are on this occasion providing responses as appropriate. However, any subsequent requests received from you on these and related matters, in terms of subject, extent and volume, will be considered in the context of the potential application of Section 14.

We would also advised that whilst dealing with these requests has necessitated substantially in excess of 18 hours in which circumstances we would ordinarily apply a Section 12 Exemption under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However, we have on this occasion undertaken the relevant searches of records to respond to you.

Turning now to the extent of requests to which this letter addresses, these are summarised below as follows –

Date	Ref.	Pages	Subject
15.09.17	555326	2-4	40-50 Percy St 53 - 57 Upper Parliament St
17.09.17	557190	4-5	Relationship Between Liverpool City Council North Point Global Hong Kong
17.09.17	557199	5-6	Former Welsh Presbyterian Chapel on Princess Avenue Mr Bill Maynard
17.09.17	557204	6-8	Promotional developments overseas by City Council representatives
17.09.17	557209	8	NPG LTD Chinatown Ltd National Crime Agency London Cllr Ann O'Byrne
17.09.17	557212	8-9	Liverpool Echo payments from the LCC past 5 years.

18.09.17	557215	9	How much has Liverpool City Council paid to Trinity Mirror
20.09.17	557224	10-11	Mr Nigel Russell relationship with LCC
22.09.17	557233	11-15	Elliot Group
27.09.17	557235 & 557239	15-18	50 Rodney Street Liverpool L1 9AA
27.09.17	557241	18-20	Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Limited
30.09.17	557377	20-28	The Elliot Group Website Councillor Ann O'Byrne
01.10.17	557382	27-28	Paramount - London Road
09.10.17	558345	29-30	Part one Refurbishment of The Irish Centre Liverpool 8m
09.10.17	558352	30-32	Part 2 When did the two Universities team up with (MBPT) Irish £8m project
10.10.17	558497	31-33	Chinese Investors meeting with Councillor Gary Millar
10.10.17	558514	33-34	Councillor Gary Millar's meetings in Hong Kong
11.10.17	558701	34-35	The Welsh Presbyterian Church in Princes Ave Liverpool. Bill Maynard
12.10.17	558703	35-37	Liverpool FC Car Park Anfield
12.10.17	558914	37-38	The Beautiful Ideas Company
17.10.17	559296	38-41	The Former Welsh Presbyterian Chapel - Baltic Creative CIC

Dealing with each of your requests in sequence, our responses are as follows –

555326 –
40-50 Percy St & 53-57 Upper Parliament St

1. It states on the site notice that Elliot Lawless is the applicant - When was the Tendering process carried out in relation to these properties and who carried out the Tendering process?
2. Have the Council sold these houses in their entirety or have they just sold the Leasehold or the Freehold?
3. If the Council has sold the houses - how much did they sell them for?
4. If the Council sold the Leaseholds - how much did LCC sell them for?
5. If they sold the Freeholds - how much did they sell them for?
6. Please indicate the date and name of the Council committee when this development/refurbishment was discussed
7. Please supply the date when this application went to Planning for permission
8. In the last 6 years which LCC properties/leaseholds/ freeholds have been sold to

Responses –

Liverpool City Council confirms that it holds information relevant to the terms of your request, our responses being as follows –

1. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all the properties back to their original town houses to improve the offer in the locality, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, The Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council with a revised scheme, and more importantly a substantially increased financial offer, which is significantly higher than any other offer received for a town house conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders – 13.5 (ix)) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders.

The transaction has yet to be concluded with a number of final points remaining to be resolved.

2. The properties have not yet been sold. Please refer to our response at (1) above. The buildings are owned Freehold by the City Council. It is proposed to grant a 250-year lease of the properties with the lessees under an obligation to carry out development of the block.
3. The properties have not yet been sold. Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.
4. The properties have not yet been sold. Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.
5. The properties have not yet been sold. Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.
6. All disposals are approved by the Director of Regeneration & Employment Services under the approved Scheme of Delegation and in accordance with Contract Standing Orders (13.5 (ix)). All approved delegated sales are reported to the Regeneration Select Committee.
7. The planning application was registered with the City Council's Planning Department on 31 August 2017.
8. The following properties –

- 50 Rodney Street
- Norfolk Street phase 2
- Norfolk Street phase 3
- Toxteth Community College
- Land at Park Lane–EMR Park Lane Limited
- 80 Rodney Street
- 242 Upper Parliament Street

557190 –

Relationship Between Liverpool City Council North Point Global Hong Kong

1. Can the Liverpool City Council please supply all information that would either confirm or prove otherwise that both Cllr Gary Millar and Ellen Culter (Invest Liverpool) were on a business trip representing the council in Hong Kong on the 31/10/2015.
2. Can the Council also supply all information that would explain why Cllr Gary Millar and Ellen Cutler are present in photographs that are evidently promoting North Point Global, well before Chinatown had gone to the Planning committee?

These photographs show Cllr Gary Millar holding hands with the following people:

* Mr Samson Law Hong Kong Homes, Agent for NPG Ltd

* Mr Peter A McInnes Chairman [and then] Promoter of NPG Ltd

3. Could you please supply all information that would explain why, the then, Lord Mayor, Gary Millar was in another photo with Mr Peter McInnes standing behind a huge scale model of the Liverpool project known as (North point) Pall Mall a £90 million unfunded disaster.
4. According to an investor who has been interviewed by ITV News, she would not have invested in the Baltic development if she had not been encouraged by Cllr Gary Millar She was also told by North Point Global that the development was backed by Liverpool City Council and the Government [the Liverpool City Council Logo was on North Point Global's website and promotional posters.]....please explain
5. Who gave permission to NPG to use the Liverpool City Council logo on their website and promotional backdrops [Photographs indicate that LCC's logo on NPG's backdrops would have been clearly evident to Cllr Millar at the time.]

Response

1. Councillor Millar and Ellen Cutler were in China and Hong Kong on behalf of the City Council and Invest Liverpool/Liverpool Vision respectively. This visit did not however extend to representing or promoting individual developments, only to promoting the city of Liverpool itself.
2. Councillor Millar and Ellen Cutler were in China and Hong Kong on behalf of the City Council and Invest Liverpool/Liverpool Vision respectively. This visit did not however extend to representing or promoting individual developments, only to promoting the city of Liverpool itself. For North Point Global as the developer to promote the scheme in the overseas investment market prior to securing planning consent would not be uncommon for a scheme that was to be funded through 'fractional sales'. It is

common practice for developers to soft market schemes and warm up the investment market to the investment opportunity prior to securing planning consent. Clearly the marketing costs will be incurred at the developers risk.

3. The photos to which you refer are not City Council images and, as such, we would advise that you contact the third party organisation displaying these images.
4. We do not consider this question a valid Freedom of Information question. This is a statement of an opinion held by an individual and does not relate to any information held by the City Council. Additionally, for clarification, neither Liverpool City Council or its representatives are involved in the direct selling of any development schemes.
5. The use of the logo by the developer was not sanctioned and once the City Council became aware of its use, the developer was instructed to remove the City Council logo from all marketing and promotional material and websites.

557199 –

Former Welsh Presbyterian Chapel on Princess Ave Mr Bill Maynard

1. The council sold the site to Merseyside Building and Preservation Trust (MBPT) for £1 in 2014 - is this statement true? Mr Bill Maynard is part of (MBPT) as Chair and was seeking funding as high as £8million pounds.
2. Could the Liverpool City Council please indicate if Mr Bill Maynard had worked for the Council in the past, been given any other building to work on or been a part time adviser or been paid for his services by the Council?
3. Erica Rushton was also a part of this as was Mark Lawler. Can the Council indicate if Erica Rushton was given a job at the Liverpool City Council and what role was she given within the Council?
4. Mark Lawler, Erica Rushton and Bill Maynard had plans for the Welsh Presbyterian Church what were these plans please?
5. Did the Council support MBPT in their bid for Heritage Lottery Funding for up to £4m to fund the development, while Baltic Creative was working on an application for £2m from the European Regional Development Fund?
6. What Due Diligence process was used when Mr Bill Maynard, Erika Rushton, were chosen to buy the church for £1.00 and who owns the land?

Response

1. Any information and documentation associated with the registration and titles of properties acquired or disposed of by the City Council are already available in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search)
2. No. Mr Bill Maynard is not a current or former employee of the City Council, either as a direct employee or advisor. In addition, no services or building works have been procured from Mr Maynard.

3. Ms Erika Rushton formerly worked for the City Council's then Neighbourhood Management Team prior to 2010.
4. The City Council was and remains supportive of any proposals which will bring heritage assets of community value back into active and sustainable use. With regard to the proposals which you refer to, the City Council was advised of and made aware of these organisations and plans. With regard to the specific details of their proposals, we would advise that you contact the organisations directly.
5. The City Council was and remains supportive of any proposals which will bring heritage assets of community value back into active and sustainable use. As such when organisations are seeking to make bids for lottery or grant funding, the City Council will naturally seek to engage with and as far as practicable support organisations in making bids insofar as any proposals clearly align with the City Council's strategic priorities. With regard to the specific organisations concerned, we would advise that you direct your questions to the relevant organisations and the Heritage Lottery Fund. Additional information as regards how the City Council seeks to support the restoration of heritage assets may be seen in the Cabinet decision of 15 October 2015, which may be accessed via the following weblink – <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1201&MId=14964>
6. Appropriate checks were undertaken. Any information and documentation associated with the registration and titles of properties acquired or disposed of by the City Council are already available in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search)

557204 –

Promotional developments overseas by City Council representatives

1. Which individual, in Liverpool City Council instructed Cllr Gary Millar and Ellen Cutler to go to Hong Kong for the 31/10/2015 and to meet Samson Law and Peter McInnes to, evidently, promote NPG Ltd?
2. Has Cllr Ann O'Byrne ever communicated with any member of the Hong Kong Homes sales team, or indeed Samson Law, the Director of this company.....if so, please supply copies of all communications
3. NPG Ltd stated that they were to bring 1000 jobs to the city, 30 million in taxes and over £300 million in investment. Instead, they, [PHD1 Construction, BILT Group, NPG and Chinatown Development Company] have created havoc in the city; developments left as bombsites, sub-contractors unpaid and investors not knowing if their investments will be built or their money recouped.
4. Having contacted the relevant Government office and obtained the relevant regulations on Due Diligence, please supply all information that would indicate why companies with no available accounts, in two cases, companies that had only just been incorporated and with no history of ever successfully being involved in a development of such significance and importance....would be permitted to become a 'preferred developer'. This would indicate a complete lack of adherence to Due Diligence.

5. Was any of the Chinatown land sold as freehold to NPG Ltd or its sister company or to Mr A Garcia, Peter McInnes. Did her office [Cllr Ann O'Byrne] and or (Invest Liverpool) help or give any form of grants loans to the above names and companies with regards to the land or start up fees in Pall Mall and Chinatown?
6. In terms of individuals involved in developments in Liverpool and lack of Due Diligence:
 - a). Nigel Russell had a police record when he dealt with the Council and is now going to be prosecuted for alleged fraud
 - b). Tony Freeman has a previous police record and has recently been arrested [Pinnacle] [c] Samuel Beilin [spokesperson for NPG] has a previous police record and will soon be up before the courts.
 - c). Lee James Spencer [dubious business history] [director of NPG] will soon be up before the courts
 - d). Peter Anthony McInnes - ex business associates that are in prison for drugs and gun crime [please see statements made by Judge at Proceeds of Crime court cases and statements made by DC Watson
7. Please indicate why Cllr Ann O'Byrne ignored Due Diligence in respect of so many developments

Response

1. Councillor Millar and Ellen Cutler were in China and Hong Kong on behalf of the City Council and Invest Liverpool/Liverpool Vision respectively. This did not however extend to representing or promoting individual developments, only to promoting the city of Liverpool itself.
2. No, Councillor Ann O'Byrne has not had nor is she aware of any communications with any member of the Hong Kong Homes sales team or Samson Law.
3. This is a statement of opinion and not a question as such we do not consider this comment to be a valid Freedom of Information request.
4. The City Council undertook due diligence into Chinatown Development Company Limited, which was the SPV that the Council was contracting with in relation to the Great George Street sites. The actual starting point for the due diligence was driven by the commercial deal between the leaseholder of the Phase 3 site to the eastern end of the site and Chinatown Development Company Limited.
5. There has been no disposal of the Council's freehold interests in any of the three parcels of land that make up the New Chinatown site. Chinatown Development Company Limited acquire the residual interest in a 150 year Lease from the leasehold of the Phase 3 site (the most easterly part of the site). The Council grant a 250 year Lease interest in the Phase 1 parcel of land adjoining the Hardy St. The middle parcel of land (Phase 2) remains in the Council's ownership.

There have been no grants of any form provided by the City Council, Invest Liverpool

or Liverpool Vision to either North Point Global or Chinatown Development Company Limited in relation to the Pall Mall or New Chinatown developments.

6. This would appear to be a statement and as such this is not a valid Freedom of Information request.
7. With regards to all projects or developments requiring the formal agreement of the City Council, the City Council undertakes relevant and appropriate due diligence in accordance with both the requirements of the City Council Constitution and all relevant legislation.

557209 –

NPG LTD Chinatown Ltd National Crime Agency London Cllr Ann O'Byrne

1. Cllr Ann O'Byrne in a statement and on TV has said she was in talks with the NCA. Has Cllr Ann O'Byrne followed up on this and has she now met them?
2. Has she handed over a full report on this matter and what steps is she taking to protect investors money in terms of Chinatown, Baltic House, Berry House and North Point?
3. Has Cllr Ann O'Byrne handed over the Minutes of ALL her meetings in relation to these disastrous developments to the NCA, including who got the land deals and why?
4. Will Ann O'Byrne also be informing the NCA that many months previous to the collapse of NPG, she had been sent comprehensive information on individuals involved in these developments and also information that strongly indicated that NPG was never going to complete these developments. Cllr O'Byrne decided, along with her colleagues, to ignore these warnings.

Response

Questions 1 to 4 will be dealt with in the round as follows –

Councillor Ann O'Byrne did not say she was in talks with the NCA. Councillor O'Byrne said that the City Council had reported its concerns to the NCA. With regard to the remaining elements of this request, these are addressed below.

Due to the way the NCA operates and the current court case between Liverpool City Council and New Chinatown Development, it is not appropriate to say more, other than to point out the subject matter of the referral was not any process that involved Liverpool City Council, in particular any land acquisition and that the council will always co-operate fully with any law enforcement agency and respond to their requests.

This concludes our response and comments on this matter.

557212 –

Liverpool Echo payments from the LCC past 5 years.

1. Can the Liverpool City Council please supply all information on the dealing with the

Liverpool Echo regarding all payments to this newspaper in a form of adverts and taking out print paid space, over the last 5 years please.

2. What did the Council spent per year on all adverts and notices to the Liverpool echo

Response

1. Payments relating to the Liverpool Echo are made to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales Ltd. Information on such payments is already included in published information available on the City Council's website and is therefore reasonably accessible to you at – <http://liverpool.gov.uk/council/budgets-and-finance/transparency-in-local-government/> and <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13493&path=0>
2. Payments relating to the Liverpool Echo are made to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales Ltd. Information on such payments is already included in published information available on the City Council's website and is therefore reasonably accessible to you at – <http://liverpool.gov.uk/council/budgets-and-finance/transparency-in-local-government/> and <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13493&path=0>

557215 –

How much has Liverpool City Council paid to Trinity Mirror

1. How much has Liverpool City Council paid to Trinity Mirror, specifically for its publication the Liverpool Echo but not exclusively, for print space, advertising and all other media and any services whatsoever over the last seven years.
2. What is Liverpool City Council's annual budget in regard to all print space, advertising and all other media purchases to all media outlets, in particular Trinity Mirror Group of Newspapers.
3. Is the above budget in any regard whatsoever, recovered from council tax payments.

Response

1. Payments relating to the Liverpool Echo are made to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales Ltd. Payments relating to the Liverpool Echo are made to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales Ltd. Information on such payments is already included in published information available on the City Council's website and is therefore reasonably accessible to you at – <http://liverpool.gov.uk/council/budgets-and-finance/transparency-in-local-government/> and <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13493&path=0>
2. Liverpool City Council does not hold a specific budget in relation to print space, advertising and all other media purchases or budgets that are identifiable to a specific supplier. Payments to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales can relate to a number of services and would therefore come from a number of budget lines depending on the nature of the purchase e.g. Publications, Advertising, Events, Printing etc. Payments to Trinity Mirror North West and North Wales can relate to a number of services and would therefore come from a number of budget lines

depending on the nature of the purchase e.g. Publications, Advertising, Events.

3. There is no direct link between these expenditure budgets and Council Tax payments. Council Tax is one of the income budgets that funds the net cost of all Council services.

557224 –

Mr Nigel Russell relationship with LCC

1. Did Mr Ged Fitzgerald give or offer any professional advice or guidance, or counsel or procure any help whatsoever in regard to buying land or obtaining any leases for either Mr Nigel Russell or Mr Peter McInnes from Liverpool City Council for the time period 2010 to date.
2. Was any professional advice or guidance sought from Mr Tony Freeman at Pinnacle Alliance in regard to Liverpool City Council projects from Mr Ged Fitzgerald.
3. Did Mr Tony Freeman seek to counsel or procure any information or advice on Liverpool City Council projects for the period 2010 to date, from Mr Ged Fitzgerald.
4. Was Mr Ged Fitzgerald known to Mr Nigel Russell in any professional capacity whatsoever
5. Was Mr Ged Fitzgerald known to Mr Nigel Russell in any personal capacity whatsoever.
6. Did Mr Ged Fitzgerald or his office or agents offer help or advice in any way or matter, whatsoever in regard to the following city centre developments
 - a) Alexander Terrace Hatton Garden Liverpool.
 - b) 12 Gradwell Street Liverpool.
 - c) The Paper Mill Henry Street Liverpool.
 - d) St Joseph's student accommodation Woolton Road Childwall Liverpool.
 - e) The Richmond Hotel Hatton Garden Liverpool
 - f) 9 Rodney Street Liverpool.
7. Did Liverpool City Council employees or agents offer any professional help or advice or counsel or procure Mr Nigel Russell obtain or seek to obtain the above developments in any way or form whatsoever.
8. Did Mr Ged Fitzgerald or any employee or agent of Liverpool City Council seek to allow Mr Nigel Russell to obtain for £1, the property, 9 Rodney Street Liverpool.
9. Do Liverpool City Council have a full and proper audit trail and deed and title transfer of the above property to Mr Russell
10. Will Liverpool City Council supply for public inspection the deed and title transfer of 9

Rodney Street Liverpool to Mr Nigel Russell.

11. Was Mr Ged Fitzgerald or any employee or agent of Liverpool City Council, have any knowledge whatsoever, in regard to Ms Julie McInnes being employed by Liverpool City Council or its agents.
12. Did Mr Ged Fitzgerald or any employee or agent of Liverpool City Council ever conduct or hold meetings with Ms Julie McInnes in her capacity as the managing director or director of PHD1.

Response

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.
4. No. Liverpool City Council does not hold any information as regards any knowledge Mr Nigel Russell may have.
5. No. Liverpool City Council does not hold any information relevant to this question.
6. No.
7. No.
8. No. Neither the Chief Executive or any Officer of the City Council has sought or undertaken any such actions.
9. Yes.
10. All information and documentation associated with the registration and titles of such properties are already available in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search)
11. No. The City Council is not aware of any knowledge by Mr Fitzgerald in respect of Ms Julie McInnes.
12. No. The City Council is not aware of any employee conducting or holding formal meetings on this matter with Ms McInnes.

This concludes our response and comments on this matter.

**557233 –
Elliot Group – The Caribbean Centre, 40-50 Percy Street & 53-57 Upper Parliament
Street**

1. When did Liverpool City Council Sell the Land known as Kingsley Place, Upper Parliament Street Previously known formally as The Caribbean Centre.

2. Who is holds the title deeds to the above said property.
3. Who is responsible for Council Tax on the above said property,
4. Are Liverpool City Council aware that the above said property is being advertised for sale by the Elliott Group.
5. Are Liverpool City Council aware that The Elliott Group are offering for sale the said property, to potential investors through their website www.elliott.co,
6. Have Liverpool City Council entered into any negotiations whatsoever with the Elliott Group for the sale of the said property.
7. As of 22 September 2017, if the above property is still owned by Liverpool City Council, why is the City Council allowing the Elliot Group to portray that it is the legal owner of the said property, to the general public.
8. Has Liverpool City Council received any offer for the said property from The Elliott Group.
9. Has Liverpool City Council received any offer for the said property from any other interested parties whatsoever.
10. In regard to the property 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 and 53 -57 Upper Parliament Street Liverpool 8 when was the lawful tendering process undertaken in relation to the said properties.
11. In regard to the said properties at 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 and 53-57 Upper Parliament Street Liverpool 8 who carried out the lawful tendering process.
12. In regard to the said properties at 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 and 53-57 Upper Parliament Street Liverpool 8 has Liverpool City Council sold the properties leasehold or freehold.
13. In regard to the said properties at 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 and 53-57 Upper Parliament Street Liverpool 8 what sale price did Liverpool City Council achieve on completion of the sale.
14. In regard to the said properties at 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 and 53-57 Upper parliament Street Liverpool 8 what sale price did Liverpool City Council achieve for the sale of the leasehold.
15. For the period 2010 to 2017, how many properties either freehold or leasehold or any properties whatsoever have been sold by Liverpool City Council to The Elliott Group or associated companies or agents whatsoever.
16. Did councillor Ms Ann O'Byrne, her office or agents offer advise or help in any way whatsoever, The Elliott Group obtain the said properties.
17. How did Liverpool City Council determine that The Elliott Group should be the preferred contractor/purchaser for the said properties.
18. How did Liverpool City Council determine that the The Elliott Group were fit and

proper contractors to purchase the said properties.

19. Why did Councillor Ms Ann O'Byrne refuse to make any comment when she was informed that the properties at 40-50 Percy Street Liverpool 8 would only be sold to investors in China and not to local people in Liverpool.
20. Did Liverpool City Council employees or agents offer any professional help or advice or counsel or procure The Elliott Group to obtain or seek to obtain any properties whatsoever from Liverpool City Council.
21. Do Liverpool City Council have a full and proper audit trail for any properties sold or leased to The Elliott Group.
22. Will Liverpool City Council supply for public inspection all title deed of transfer and any relevant documents whatsoever in regard to any properties sold or leased to The Elliott Group.
23. Will Liverpool City Council provide for public inspection all relevant minutes of meetings dates of meetings and any other contact between Liverpool City Council and The Elliott Group in regard to the sale or lease of any properties to The Elliott Group.
24. In regard to question 22 and 23 above will Liverpool City Council provide copies of all relevant documents requested in the above questions.

Response

1. The City Council has not sold the Caribbean Centre.
2. This information is publicly available and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry website ([www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property Search](http://www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search))
3. There is no Council tax payable in respect of the property as this is a commercial property, for which Business Rates are instead liable. Given the property remains in the ownership of the City Council any liability for Business Rates payable – less any deductions arising from the premises being vacant – is with the City Council.
4. The City Council is not aware of any such advertisements. Appropriate checks will be undertaken with regard to information such as that provided within your request and if necessary the third party will be advised of the continued ownership of the premises by the City Council.
5. The City Council is not aware of any such advertisements. Appropriate checks will be undertaken with regard to information such as that provided within your request and if necessary the third party will be advised of the continued ownership of the premises by the City Council.
6. The Council is working with the African Heritage Caribbean Centre and the Elliot Group to see if it is possible to provide new housing and more importantly a new Caribbean Centre.
7. The City Council currently retains ownership of the property and is unaware of any third parties otherwise claiming to own or have an interest in the property. The City

Council has not sold this property.

8. Yes. The City Council is working with the African Heritage Caribbean Centre and the Elliot Group to see if it is possible to provide new housing and more importantly a new Caribbean Centre. If this proposal is progressed this will result in a formal agreement and associated planning application in due course.
9. No. The City Council is working with the African Heritage Caribbean Centre and the Elliot Group to see if it is possible to provide new housing and more importantly a new Caribbean Centre. If this proposal is progressed this will result in a formal agreement and associated planning application in due course.
10. The Council marketed the properties (40-50 Percy Street and 53-57 Upper Parliament Street), seeking expressions of interest, in 2015.
11. The City Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all of the properties back to their original townhouse layout to improve the housing offer in the local area, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations. The assessment of any formal tender offers received was made by Council Officers from Regeneration, Finance and Legal in accordance with the requirements of the City Council Constitution and all relevant legislation and forms part of the assessment and due diligence process.
12. Negotiations are ongoing with a view to the sale of the properties on a Leasehold basis with an option to purchase the Freehold reversion on completion of works.
13. The transaction has not yet been concluded. Once the sale process is complete details of any prices paid will be available Land Registry Land Registry Search Facility, via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search
14. The transaction has not yet been concluded. Once the sale process is complete details of any prices paid will be available Land Registry Land Registry Search Facility, via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search
15. Details as follows –
 - 50 Rodney Street
 - Norfolk Street phase 2
 - Norfolk Street phase 3
 - Toxteth Community College
 - Land at Park Lane
 - 80 Rodney Street
 - 242 Upper Parliament Street
16. The City Council will respond to requests from interested parties in respect of property or sites marketed or due to be marketed for disposal and regeneration. Any requests or queries relating to individual sites are dealt with by Officers and not Elected Members. All inquiries are dealt with in a consistent manner irrespective of the requestor and is given in accordance with Council procedures and policies.
17. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given

the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all of the properties back to their original townhouse layout to improve the housing offer in the local area, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, the Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council; with a revised scheme and, more importantly, a substantially increased financial offer which was significantly higher than any other offer received for a townhouse conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders".

In this instance it was determined that the revised proposals best matched the City Council's aspirations to improve the housing offer in the local area.

18. Appropriate checks were undertaken
19. This information is not held by the City Council.
20. No.
21. Yes.
22. All information and documentation associated with the registration and titles of such properties are already available in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search
23. The types of meetings to which you refer to are not required to be formally recorded through the production of Minutes or Action Notes and as such this information is not held.
24. Please refer to our responses above.

557235 & 557239 –
50 Rodney Street Liverpool L1 9AA

1. Did Liverpool City Council own the property 50 Rodney Street Liverpool 1? (The Property)
2. When Did Liverpool City Council own the said Property?
3. Who did Liverpool City Council purchase the said property from?
4. What purchase price did Liverpool City Council pay for the said property?
5. Did Liverpool City Council purchase the property Freehold or Leasehold?

6. If the property was purchased Leasehold did Liverpool City Council subsequently purchase the freehold?
7. When did Liverpool City Council Purchase the Freehold?
8. Why did Liverpool City Council purchase the said property?
9. When did Liverpool City Council sell the said property?
10. Why did Liverpool City Council sell the said property?
11. Who did Liverpool City Council sell the said property too?
12. Was the property sold leasehold or Freehold?
13. What was the length of time (days) Liverpool City Council owned the said property?
14. What length of time (days) did Liverpool City Council owned the Freehold of the said property?
15. At the point of sale by Liverpool City Council where there any conditions or covenants in place in regard to the said property?
16. Was the said property advertised for sale?
17. How was the said property advertised for sale?
18. Was a tendering process used for the sale of the said property?
19. What tendering process was used for the said property?
20. When was the said property advertised for sale and or the tendering process take place? (Date)
21. How did Liverpool City Council determine that Elliot Lawless should be the preferred purchaser of the said property?
22. Did Liverpool City Council employees, agents offer any professional help or advice whatsoever, or counsel or procure Elliott Lawless purchase the said property?
23. Do Liverpool City Council have a full and proper audit for the purchase and sale of the said property?
24. Will Liverpool City Council provide for public inspection all the deeds of transfer and all relevant documents whatsoever appertaining to the sale of the said property?
25. Will Liverpool City Council provide for public inspection or provide full unedited documents of all meetings and minuets of meetings or any documentary evidence or contact whatsoever between Liverpool City Council or agents, and Elliot Lawless in regard to and appertaining to the said property?
26. Did Liverpool City Council instruct its own solicitors to deal with the purchase and

subsequent sale of the said property?

27. If Liverpool City did not instruct its own solicitors to deal with the purchase and sale of the said property which firm of solicitors dealt with the same?
28. What department within Liverpool City Council dealt with the purchase and sale of the said property?
29. Which Liverpool City Council officers dealt with the purchase and sale of the said property?
30. Where any Liverpool City Councillors involved in any way whatsoever in the purchase and or sale of the said property.

Response

1. Yes.
2. From early 20th Century to 27 October 2016
3. Records not available
4. Records not available
5. Freehold
6. Not applicable
7. Early 20th Century
8. This information is no longer retained on file nor is this required to be for operational purposes.
9. 27 October 2016
10. The Leaseholder approached the City Council with a view to purchasing the freehold reversion.
11. The Leaseholder
12. Freehold
13. The Council owned the property for many years (see above)
14. See previous answer.
15. No.
16. No. The Council did not advertise the property for sale. It was sold to the leaseholder. This is in accordance with the requirements of the City Council's Scheme of Delegation and Contract Standing Orders – CSO 13.5 (ix).
17. Not applicable

18. No. The property was sold to the leaseholder. Information as regards the current ownership of the property is available from the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search
19. Not applicable.
20. Not applicable
21. Mr Lawless was the leaseholder.
22. No.
23. Yes.
24. All information and documentation associated with the registration and titles of such properties are already available in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the Land Registry Search Facility, which may be accessed via the following weblink – www.eservices.landregistry.gov.uk/wps/portal/Property_Search
25. The types of meetings to which you refer to are not required to be formally recorded through the production of Minutes or Action Notes and as such this information is not held.
26. The Council's solicitors dealt with the sale of the property. The purchase occurred in Early 20th Century and records are not available.
27. Not applicable.
28. Property and Asset Management Services dealt with the sale of the property. The purchase occurred in the early 20th Century and specific records are therefore not available.
29. The following City Council Officers – Regeneration Officers, Head of Property & Asset Management Services, Assistant Director – Physical Assets, Director – Regeneration & Employment Services.
30. Councillor Malcolm Kennedy was consulted in accordance with Constitutional requirements in his then the capacity of Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Transport & Climate Change.

557241 – Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Limited

1. I would like a response and information on Mr Lindsey Ashworth, Peel Development Director, as to why has he been using (Antonio Garcia BLOK Architecture) in a number of writeups in the Liverpool Echo?
2. Is the Liverpool city council working in partnership with Peel land and or Mr Ashworth on the Liverpool water front using Mr Antonio Garcia of BLOK Architecture?

3. Has Mr Antonio Walker and Blok Architecture been selected as the preferred lead architect company for both the Liverpool city council and peel land with regards to the Liverpool water front project?
4. Can the council and Cllr Ann O'Byrne please state if this person "Mr , Antonio Garcia BLOK Architecture is the same person who held talks with both Ann O'Byrne Mark kitts in regards to the Chinatown project or PHD1, North point global, North Point (Pall Mall) Mr Garcia said: "From the beginning we have had a vision for an essentially Chinese development that will breathe new life and vibrancy into an historic but recently declining area. North Point Global was backed in the venture by its Chinese investment partners and the UKTI's Regeneration Investment Organisation - although it was not selected as the preferred developer for the site back in June 2015 by Liverpool City council and former site owners Urban Splash because PHD1 Contractors where yet its SPV China Town Developments Company gained the leases somehow.
5. Mr Garcia is linked to the below persons and companies and yet Peel Land and Mr Ashworth are still using his company BLOK why has the council not said nothing?

Lee James Spence, Samuel Beilin, David Choules,

MISS KATE ELIZABETH PARRY

CLLR PETER MITCHELL

MR PETER ANTHONY MCINNES

MR PAUL JAGOTA

MR CRAIG MALCOLM WILLIAM BLACKWELL

LITL PROPERTIES LTD (07345747)

Lisa HAMPTON

PUMPFIELDS REGENERATION COMPANY LIMITED, This is Mr A Garcia's new company linked to: Acentus real estate which is selling the Metal works apartments in Leeds St liverpool.

Mr Lee Spence is a part of this as is Simon Clarke and Peter McInnes office address is in St Helens but works from the Albert Dock in NPG office.

BALTIC HOUSE DEVELOPMENTS LTD

CHINA TOWN DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LTD

PHEASANT (ST HELENS) LIMITED

ST GABRIELS (LIVERPOOL) LIMITED

6. Additionally could you tell us the relationship between Liverpool City Council and the Bramley Dock site. Do you own the land or lease it from Liverpool City Council?
7. How are Everton Football Club going to buy the land for the proposed Stadium via

Peel Holdings or Liverpool City Council?

Response

1. It is a matter for Peel Holdings as owners of the land to determine what third parties it chooses to contract with. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council and as such we do not hold any information - please therefore direct your question to Peel Holdings.
2. Liverpool City Council is working with Peel Holdings in order to progress their wider regeneration proposals including the Liverpool Waters scheme. However, with regard to the selection and appointment of any consultants, planners or architects used by Peel Holdings, this is a matter directly for Peel Holdings as the developer and owners of the land to determine who it chooses to contract with. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council and as such we do not hold any information - please therefore direct your question to Peel Holdings.
3. Liverpool City Council is working with Peel Holdings in order to progress their wider regeneration proposals including the Liverpool Waters scheme. However, with regard to the selection and appointment of any consultants, planners or architects used by Peel Holdings, this is a matter directly for Peel Holdings as the developer and owners of the land to determine who it chooses to contract with. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council and as such we do not hold any information - please therefore direct your question to Peel Holdings.
4. The City Council and its representatives meet and engage with representatives from various external agencies in the course of considering proposals for regeneration and investment projects across the city.
5. Peel Group is a PLC and will make their own assessments as regards their consultants. This is not therefore a matter for Liverpool City Council and as such we do not hold any information - please therefore direct your question to Peel Holdings.
6. This question is directed to Peel Holdings. In terms of Liverpool City Council we would refer you to the meeting of Cabinet of 31 March 2017, report reference RTC/45 for further information –
<http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1201&MId=15591>
7. We would refer you to the decision of Cabinet on 31 March 2017 entitled 'Everton FC New Stadium - Deal Terms (RTC/45)'. This may be accessed via the following weblink –
<http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1201&MId=15591>

557377 –

The Elliot Group Website Councillor Ann O'Byrne – re property at Percy Street/Parliament Street

1. What are the council's expectations for the property?
2. How many people expressed an interest in the properties?
3. How many people actually tendered for the properties?

4. What was the highest bid?
5. Who made the highest bid?
6. What were the individual bids?
7. How much was the substantial offer from The Elliot Group.
8. How did The Elliot Group match the Council's expectations for the property?
9. Secondly, what are the "Contract Standing Orders"?
10. Under what circumstances do they apply to the tendering process?
11. Which section or part or paragraph of the Contract Orders was applied to the decision to allow The Elliot Group to be the sole contractors?
12. Who was the relevant director who made the decision?
13. Who was the relevant cabinet member who made the decision?
14. Will the council provide copies of all evidence used in forming the decision?
15. Will the council provide copies of all evidence used in promulgating the decision?
16. Why would the offer from The Elliot Group be prejudiced, in inviting further tenders?
17. Will the council provide full written reasons for the decision to award The Elliot Group the contract?

Response

1. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all the properties back to their original town houses to improve the offer in the locality, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, The Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council with a revised scheme, and more importantly a substantially increased financial offer, which is significantly higher than any other offer received for a town house conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders.

The transaction has yet to be concluded with a number of final points remaining to be resolved.

2. 173

3. 21

4. The highest bid was submitted by the Elliot Group. Until the transaction has concluded, details as regards the values of the highest bid remains the subject of negotiation with the bidder. In view of this fact, the City Council has therefore considered whether any Exemptions as set out within the Freedom of Information Act be applied, in this instance specifically the exemption in respect of commercial confidentiality (Section 43 (2)) Our considerations and assessment are set out below.

Section 43 (2) – Prejudice to Commercial Interests

Turning firstly to matters of potential prejudice to commercial interests of the City Council. The disclosure of the requested information would be prejudicial to the City Council's commercial interests insofar as seeking to secure the best possible price is secured for the commercial transaction and for similar transactions. .

Section 43 (2) – Public Interest Test

In considering the public interest test and its application in the context of the information retrieved, as is standard practice when dealing with all such issues, the City Council has carefully considered the factors both for and against disclosure of the information held.

The City Council does not consider that generic public interest arguments are relevant in the majority of cases as indeed this one – rather, the specific circumstances and nature of the information enable this to be focused and therefore more refined.

Factors in favour of disclosing the information –

- (i) transparency of the process with which the City Council negotiates with third parties; and
- (ii) the level of public interest in disclosure.

Factors against disclosure of the information –

- (i) the requested information relates to a commercial contractual transaction which if disclosed would compromise the ability of the City Council to secure the best possible financial and commercial terms for asset disposal transactions given that any bidders would be aware that any bids would be disclosed whether successful or not. The disclosure of information of this type relating to either party would subsequently compromise the City Council's ability to effectively conduct negotiations on future transactions and could give rise to an actionable breach of confidence as well as inhibiting the effectiveness of the City Council's negotiations on future commercial projects; and
- (ii) the level of public interest – limited.

The above factors were, in the opinion of the City Council, finely balanced. However, a key factor in the application of the Exemption was that of the ability of an organisation such as Liverpool City Council to undertake and ultimately complete commercial negotiations on matters relating to transactions of this type. Were information of this

nature to be routinely disclosed, the ability of the City Council to achieve the best possible commercial and financial outcomes for the use of public funds as well as supporting regeneration and wider activities under its general powers of competence, and to be able to continue and conclude such negotiations would be significantly prejudiced.

Having carefully considered the above factors, and in view of the ongoing nature of negotiations on this matter, the City Council considers that, at this stage, the application of a Commercial Confidentiality Exemption under the provisions of Section 43(2) FOIA is justified and therefore withholds the requested information.

Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.

5. The highest bid was submitted by the Elliot Group. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all the properties back to their original town houses to improve the offer in the locality, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, The Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council with a revised scheme, and more importantly a substantially increased financial offer, which is significantly higher than any other offer received for a town house conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders.

The transaction has yet to be concluded with a number of final points remaining to be resolved.

6. With regard to this element of your request, details of individuals bids reflect the commercial considerations and methodology of individual bidders. In view of this fact, the City Council has therefore considered whether any Exemptions as set out within the Freedom of Information Act be applied, in this instance specifically the exemption in respect of commercial confidentiality (Section 43 (2)) Our considerations and assessment are set out below.

Section 43 (2) – Prejudice to Commercial Interests

Turning firstly to matters of potential prejudice to commercial interests of the City Council. The disclosure of the requested information would be prejudicial to the City Council's commercial interests insofar as seeking to secure the best possible price is secured for the commercial transaction and for similar transactions. .

Section 43 (2) – Public Interest Test

In considering the public interest test and its application in the context of the information retrieved, as is standard practice when dealing with all such issues, the

City Council has carefully considered the factors both for and against disclosure of the information held.

The City Council does not consider that generic public interest arguments are relevant in the majority of cases as indeed this one – rather, the specific circumstances and nature of the information enable this to be focused and therefore more refined.

Factors in favour of disclosing the information –

- (iii) transparency of the process with which the City Council negotiates with third parties; and
- (iv) the level of public interest in disclosure.

Factors against disclosure of the information –

- (iii) the requested information relates to a commercial contractual transaction which if disclosed would compromise the ability of the City Council to secure the best possible financial and commercial terms for asset disposal transactions given that any bidders would be aware that any bids would be disclosed whether successful or not. The disclosure of information of this type relating to either party would subsequently compromise the City Council's ability to effectively conduct negotiations on future transactions and could give rise to an actionable breach of confidence as well as inhibiting the effectiveness of the City Council's negotiations on future commercial projects; and
- (iv) the level of public interest – limited.

The above factors were, in the opinion of the City Council, finely balanced. However, a key factor in the application of the Exemption was that of the ability of an organisation such as Liverpool City Council to undertake and ultimately complete commercial negotiations on matters relating to transactions of this type. Were information of this nature to be routinely disclosed, the ability of the City Council to achieve the best possible commercial and financial outcomes for the use of public funds as well as supporting regeneration and wider activities under its general powers of competence, and to be able to continue and conclude such negotiations would be significantly prejudiced.

Having carefully considered the above factors, and in view of the ongoing nature of negotiations on this matter, the City Council considers that, at this stage, the application of a Commercial Confidentiality Exemption under the provisions of Section 43(2) FOIA is justified and therefore withholds the requested information.

Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.

7. With regard to this element of your request, the transaction has not yet concluded and subject to active dialogue. In view of this fact, the City Council has therefore considered whether any Exemptions as set out within the Freedom of Information Act be applied, in this instance specifically the exemption in respect of commercial confidentiality (Section 43 (2)) Our considerations and assessment are set out below.

Section 43 (2) – Prejudice to Commercial Interests

Turning firstly to matters of potential prejudice to commercial interests of the City Council. The disclosure of the requested information would be prejudicial to the City Council's commercial interests insofar as seeking to secure the best possible price is secured for the commercial transaction.

Section 43 (2) – Public Interest Test

In considering the public interest test and its application in the context of the information retrieved, as is standard practice when dealing with all such issues, the City Council has carefully considered the factors both for and against disclosure of the information held.

The City Council does not consider that generic public interest arguments are relevant in the majority of cases as indeed this one – rather, the specific circumstances and nature of the information enable this to be focused and therefore more refined.

Factors in favour of disclosing the information –

- (i) transparency of the process with which the City Council negotiates with third parties; and
- (ii) the level of public interest in disclosure.

Factors against disclosure of the information –

- (i) the requested information relates to a commercial contractual transaction which if disclosed would compromise the ability of the City Council to secure the best possible financial and commercial terms for asset disposal transactions. The disclosure of information of this type relating to either party would subsequently compromise the City Council's ability to effectively conduct negotiations on future transactions and could give rise to an actionable breach of confidence as well as inhibiting the effectiveness of the City Council's negotiations on future commercial projects; and
- (ii) the level of public interest – limited.

The above factors were, in the opinion of the City Council, finely balanced. However, a key factor in the application of the Exemption was that of the ability of an organisation such as Liverpool City Council to undertake and ultimately complete commercial negotiations on matters relating to transactions of this type. Were information of this nature to be routinely disclosed during ongoing negotiations, the ability of the City Council to achieve the best possible commercial and financial outcomes for the use of public funds as well as supporting regeneration and wider activities under its general powers of competence, and to be able to continue and conclude such negotiations would be significantly prejudiced.

Having carefully considered the above factors, and in view of the ongoing nature of negotiations on this matter, the City Council considers that, at this stage, the application of a Commercial Confidentiality Exemption under the provisions of Section 43(2) FOIA is justified and therefore withholds information on this matter (for the avoidance of doubt, the application of this Exemption extends to all correspondence extant between the City Council and the third party on the basis that this includes

details which, if disclosed could have a harmful impact on the commercial and financial interests of both parties and give rise to an actionable breach.

Should the sale complete the purchase price will be publicly accessible at the Lands Registry.

8. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all the properties back to their original town houses to improve the offer in the locality, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, The Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council with a revised scheme, and more importantly a substantially increased financial offer, which is significantly higher than any other offer received for a town house conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders. The relevant Contract Standing Order is 13.5 (ix).

The transaction has yet to be concluded with a number of final points remaining to be resolved.

9. The Contract Standing Orders form part of the City Council's Constitution and are the basis under which the Council may undertake various commercial transactions. These are already in the public domain and reasonably accessible to you via the following weblink –

<http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=SD6837&ID=6837&RPID=11484721>)

10. Contract Standing Orders and Financial Regulations apply to the entire process and given the conduct of transactions.

11. Contract Standing Order 13.5 (ix), which states –

"Disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources could be prejudiced by inviting tenders"

12. Decisions made under Contract Standing Order 13.5 (ix) may be taken by the Director Regeneration & Employment Services in accordance with the provisions of the Scheme of Delegation.
13. In the event of a decision being required, the Cabinet Member would be a consultee and does not make the decision. The relevant Cabinet Member was that for Regeneration, Transport & Climate Change.
14. Once a decision has been made then this will be published within records of Delegated Decisions which are in the public domain and accessible via the following weblink –

<http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecCatDisplayClassic.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13560&path=536> . However, at this stage no decision has been made and the proposals remain under consideration subject to active dialogue.

15. Once a decision has been made then this will be published within records of Delegated Decisions which are in the public domain and accessible via the following weblink – <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/ecCatDisplayClassic.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13560&path=536> . However, at this stage no decision has been made and the proposals remain under consideration subject to active dialogue.
16. As indicated above the process is ongoing and no final decision has yet been made. As is practice across all public and private authorities when dealing with commercial transactions, it is appropriate to have a clear approach to how such negotiations are conducted. Once a preferred bidder is identified it is entirely appropriate to enter into negotiations on that basis until such time as a final agreement is reached. If a final agreement were unable to be reached then alternative offers would be invited and considered. The potential prejudice would be for a preferred bidder to incur expenditure whilst such negotiations continued.
17. The Council marketed the properties, seeking expressions of interest, in 2015. Given the large number of apartments already in the area and a desire to try and convert part/all the properties back to their original town houses to improve the offer in the locality, none of the offers received met the Council's aspirations or financial expectations.

One of the interested parties, The Elliot Group, subsequently approached the Council with a revised scheme, and more importantly a substantially increased financial offer, which is significantly higher than any other offer received for a town house conversion scheme.

In view of the increased offer, it was agreed to proceed with the revised offer rather than go back to the market on the grounds (as permitted under Contract Standing Orders) that the "disposals of property to developers who are proposing schemes which will have a regenerating effect on the City and investment which in the view of the relevant Director in consultation with the Cabinet Member could be prejudiced by inviting tenders.

The transaction has not yet concluded and subject to active dialogue.

557382 –
Paramount - London Road

1. Could the council please tell me if they have looked into the safety of the 120 students living in this unfinished building "The Paramount" in London road and have the council held talks with the MFRS with regards to this matter and tested the cladding?

Response

1. Liverpool City Council Building Control have carried out site inspections to determine the compliance with building regulations, this has included several meetings both on site and at the Fire Service HQ with Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service. Both Merseyside Fire and Rescue Service and Liverpool City Council Building Control are satisfied that the requirements of the Building Regulations and the Regulatory Reform

(Fire Safety) Order 2005 have been met, and are satisfied that the building can remain partially occupied in accordance with the conditions of the final certificate issued by the approved inspector.

The cladding is considered to comply with the requirements of the building regulations and has not been tested in accordance with post Grenfell DCLG guidelines because the material used is a cementitious board that is non-combustible and therefore fit for purpose.

558345 –

Part one Refurbishment of The Irish Centre Liverpool 8m

Two years ago, as part of the ECHO's relaunched Stop the Rot campaign, it stated that the Irish Centre in Mount Pleasant was the focus of an ambitious £8m development plan which aimed to keep "talented graduates in the city." Could you please explain:

1. Just why and how would this very overpriced ambitious £8m project keep talented graduates in the city?

[The two Universities have questioned this remark as misleading and could not understand how the graduates could or would benefit from this at all?]

Echo quote: "But although progress has appeared slow, we can reveal these proposals are still on track – major repair work is finally set to begin, and a funding application made to hopefully ensure the development plans become a reality."

2. Which LCC individual supplied the Liverpool Echo with this information
3. Who will be doing the major repair work?
4. Who will be funding it & how much is it going to cost?
5. Had Cllr Ann O'Byrne within the last 4 weeks had approval from any funding body in relation to the Irish Centre

Response

1. We would advise you direct any comments as regards media articles to the relevant publication as the quote you have supplied was not made by a City Council Officer or Councillor but rather is part of the text of the article. With regard to the remaining elements this question these are a statement and as such are not a valid request under the Freedom of Information Act. However and to offer context and with reference to the article to which you refer, the establishment of a business and innovation hub would assist individuals – including talented graduates – with the establishment of small businesses thereby supporting graduate retention as well as job creation.
2. If you refer to the content of the article, it is clear that Councillor Ann O'Byrne responded to the inquiries of the newspaper. However, whilst a small number of quotes may be directly attributable to Councillor O'Byrne, the remainder of the article was produced by the reporting journalist as a result of their own work and as such we would advise you direct any further comments directly to them.

3. Quadriga has been appointed to undertake urgent works to make the building, wind, weather tight and secure.
4. The urgent building works, which will make the building wind, weather tight and secure are being funded with £10,000 from Historic England, £10,000 from Merseyside Building Preservation Trust and approximately £10,000 from the Council's Planning Revenue budget.
5. Until a development partner is identified, a scheme worked up and planning and listed building consent secured, it is not possible to say what the project cost will be. The City Council is not aware of any funding bid or funding approval in relation to the Wellington Rooms or the Irish Centre in the last 4 weeks.

558352 –

Part 2 When did the two Universities team up with (MBPT) Irish 8m project

1. Please supply all information in relation to the past failed enterprises and the proposed hotel .
2. When did the two Universities team up with (MBPT) and LCC? Please supply a copy of the legal paperwork and indicate who will end up with the freehold land?
3. Did the Council refuse the hotel application because a city councillor wanted it for a dance studio? Was that Councillor - Frank Prendergast?

In March 2016 it was reported that a £30,000 architectural study had been commissioned which would focus on the condition of the building and provide definite options and costings for its refurbishment.

4. Where did this £30,000 come from and to whom did it go ? Person or company please. Then the following month, the project took another step forward when OMI Architects, who are based in Salford and were working on another building on the ECHO's Stop The Rot list – Lister Drive Library in Tuebrook – had been appointed.
5. OMI Architects is Mr Andy James could the Council please explain how this company got the contract and how much has been paid out to-date?
In November 2016 £121,000 of repair work was due to begin on the Irish Centre, however, delays have meant the contract for this work is only expected to be awarded this month.
6. Who is this funding coming from and who is it going to?
Deputy Mayor of Liverpool Cllr Ann O'Byrne told the ECHO: "A survey has found that the structure of the building is generally sound but identified that urgent works were required to prevent further deterioration of the historic fabric. The works comprise: works to the roof, masonry and internal repairs to address issues associated with water getting in.
7. Who did the survey and how much were they paid?

"Historic England has awarded a grant of £60,500 to jointly fund the urgent works with the city council. Specialist conservation contractors have been invited to tender and

the contract is expected to be awarded this month. It is estimated the urgent works will take four months to complete."

8. Please state when these works took place and who was paid the £60,000

"Cllr O'Byrne explained: "A feasibility study highlighted a range of options for the future use of the building. The preferred option was the creation of an 'Innovation Hub'."

9. Please explain in detail what will be the function of this Innovation Hub

The Merseyside Building Preservation Trust was commissioned to carry out a soft market test with developers with a track record in heritage-led regeneration. Their task is to develop the detail of the hub proposal in terms of design, cost, value and funding options with a view to submitting a Stage 1 funding application to the Heritage Lottery Fund by the end of this year.

10. When did this application go in and how much funding was requested?

Declan Doolin, who is on the committee of the St Michael's Irish Centre in Boundary Lane, Everton, would like to see part of a redeveloped Wellington Rooms used as a new Irish Centre.

11. Will a new Irish Centre be part of the plan?

Response

1. With regards to any previous proposals for a hotel within the Wellington Rooms building, extensive searches of the City Council's records have identified that this information is no longer retained by the City Council. With regard to specific details of Planning Applications submitted for the site these are already in the public domain, we would refer you to the City Council's Planning Explorer search facility to access this information – <http://northgate.liverpool.gov.uk/PlanningExplorer17/GeneralSearch.aspx>
2. The two Universities are part of a stakeholder group that includes, the City Council, MBPT, Historic England, Liverpool Science Park and Knowledge Quarter which has been brought together to drive forward the regeneration of the Wellington Rooms.
3. No. Decisions on any Planning Applications are made by the City Council in its capacity as Local Planning Authority and each individual application is considered on its own merit.
4. The £30,000 to fund the building feasibility study and building survey, was funded in equal amounts (£10,000) by Historic England, Liverpool City Council and MBPT. The feasibility survey and study were undertaken by OMI Architects.
5. OMI Architects were appointed following a competitive tendering process. The feasibility study cost £30,000, in line with the funding that had been secured for the project. The relevant project – namely the feasibility study – has been completed and the work invoiced for.
6. The funding to deliver the building urgent works contract is coming from Historic

England and Liverpool City Council. The funding will be paid to the preferred specialist contractor, in accordance with an agreed works schedule and when signed off by an independent project manager or cost consultants.

7. This point has been dealt with in response (5) above.
8. The building works commenced on 12 February 2018. Quadriga are undertaking these works.
9. The Merseyside Building Preservation Trust have being commissioned to undertake out a soft market test with a range of developers with a track-record in heritage-led regeneration. It is not the purpose of the soft market test to develop the detail of the innovation hub proposal in terms of design, cost and value. The purpose of the exercise for MBPT is to test all the options in the feasibility study in the market. The outcome of the test might be that an innovation hub is the most appropriate and viable end-use.

The Council and MBPT would then work with a preferred developer on the most appropriate end-use to look at funding options with a view to submitting a Stage 1 funding application to the Heritage Lottery Fund in late 2018.

10. There has been no application for Stage 1 HLF funding submitted to date.
11. The City Council is aware of the Irish Centre's aspirations for the Wellington Rooms, in terms of the building being, developed for an Irish Centre and cultural venue. Representatives of the City Council have met with Declan Doolin to discuss those aspirations. The Irish Centre have been advised that they would need to work up those proposals, develop a robust, viable and sustainable business plan for consideration. The City Council has instructed MBPT that as part of the soft market test, they should engage with the Irish Centre as an interested party. Clearly the viability of the business case will be key and bringing a development partner to the discussion.



558497 –

Chinese Investors meeting with Councillor Gary Millar

1. Cllr Gary Millar, Was with the Chinese Consul General in Manchester at a party on the 6th October 2017 could Liverpool City Council please tell us was he on business for the council or was he acting alone?
2. Did any other member of Liverpool council attend this party/ Dinner in Manchester?
3. This matter was also talked about on Radio Merseyside by a friend of Cllr Millar.
4. Will Liverpool council please state for the public record if Cllr Millar will be going back to the far east, China, Hong Kong acting in the same role (Assistant Mayor & Mayoral Lead for Business & International Trade)?
5. So many Chinese investors have wanted to talk face to face with Cllr Millar over his bad advice at the dinner in Hong Kong he was with NPG Ltd Staff, Along with Peter A McInnes, and Samson Law who the Manchester police are now looking into, along with other depts will Cllr Millar please talk to the police over this meeting?

6. Chinese investors who have lost out so much money over their investments in Liverpool. Hong Kong is now part of China, So would Cllr, Millar talk to the police in China and Hong Kong as to his dealing with NPG Ltd and Samson Law?
7. New evidence of Cllr Millar endorsing NPG in Hong Kong back in 2015 will now be passed on Chinese Consul General's office in Manchester They should be questioning Cllr Millar over the disaster, not inviting him for dinner.
8. Will Cllr Millar also talk to the UK police and other departments in Manchester and London?
9. The matter also may be passed on to Anti-Money Laundering Suspicious Cases Unit Abu Dhabi - UAE and China others.
10. Cllr Ann O'Byrne had stated she was in talks with the NCA, will she pass on any new details about Cllr Millars Hong Kong meeting and past dealing with the above names to any and all police units?
11. Will Cllr Millar also please tell as what he knows with regards to Peter A McInnes moving from Dubai and moving to the USA ?
12. Has Cllr Millar ever being paid by NPG Ltd and or Peter McInnes/ Samson Law/ or Tony Freeman/ or had gifts or other items?
13. Will Cllr Millar please state if he had held talks Mr (Samuel Beilin) in Liverpool and or Hong Kong in regards to selling £350,000 apartments off plan in both Chinatown and the Baltic House in Norfolk St Liverpool, as a number of investors from Hong Kong and China had meeting in Liverpool with Samuel Beilin who was a part of NPG Ltd and known to Cllr Millar, would Cllr Millar please try to recall this person?
14. Will Cllr Millar please tell us if he held talks with Pinnacle Manchester, who had sold both the Quadrant, Shaw St Liverpool and Paramount, London Rd in which was a scam run by Mr Tony Freeman from Hong Kong and the UK, Mr Freeman may have been at the meeting in Hong Kong when Cllr Millar was there, Has Cllr Millar held any talks with him or his office staff both in Hong Kong and Liverpool?

Response

1. Liverpool City Council holds no information about a party. Councillor Millar requested a meeting to meet the new deputy consul and the consul general as part of his ongoing efforts to build relations with China both in the UK and within China. There was a meeting on the 6th October followed by a formal dinner, hosted by the Consul General. The topics of discussion were IBF, future trips to China and a general update.
2. Councillor Millar was accompanied by a member of staff from Liverpool Mutual Homes.
3. This is not a valid question, no response is therefore required.
4. Yes. Cllr Millar visited China in November as part of an academic trip with the Confucius Institute, and represented the city of Liverpool in Xi'an, Shanghai, Qingdao

at the end of the trip.

5. Cllr Millar has not provided investment advice to any potential investor in either LCC or private schemes. All investors are always advised to make their own assessment of the potential investment risk, with appropriate due diligence, which should also be carried out by the investment agency they use.

Liverpool City Council, including its representatives, will always make themselves available to respond to any questions from law enforcement agencies.

6. Liverpool City Council advises anyone who believes their investment has been lost due to illegal activities to report it to the appropriate authorities.

Liverpool City Council, including its representatives, will always make themselves available to respond to any questions from law enforcement agencies.

7. This is not a valid question, no response is therefore required.
8. Liverpool City Council, including its representatives, will always make themselves available to respond to any questions from law enforcement agencies.
9. This element of your request is not valid under the Freedom of Information Act.
10. Councillor Ann O'Byrne did not say she was in talks with the NCA. She said that the Council had reported its concerns to the NCA. Due to the way the NCA operates and the current court case between Liverpool City Council and New Chinatown Development it is not appropriate to say more, other than to point out that the council will always co-operate fully with any law enforcement agency and respond to their requests.
11. Liverpool City Council holds no information on this and Councillor Millar is unaware of any movements of Peter McInnes.
12. No.
13. Councillor Millar is unaware of any of Samuel Beilin's business activities and has never met him in regards to New Chinatown, or any of North Point Global's schemes or developments. Councillor Millar has no business relationship with him.
14. No. Councillor Millar did not.

558514 –
Councillor Gary Millar's meetings in Hong Kong

Could Liverpool council please supply all information, on the trip to Hong Kong with Councillor Gary Millar, Assistant Mayor & Mayoral Lead for Business & International Trade and his photos with Samson Law and Peter A McInnes at the NPG Ltd sales / LCC partnership 31st October as new information has just come to light.

1. Cllr Millar has he ever met a lady called " Chans Chan" in the same hotel (Hong Kong) on that night?

Note: Chans Chan, was working for Peter A McInnes, Tony Freeman and Hong Kong Homes, Mr Samson Law, who was linked to Liverpool@ Landlord from Hell, Mr Nigel Russell.

2. Cllr Millar, has he held talks or met " Amie Tsang" British Senior Lawyer in the same meeting in Hong Kong?

Note: Amie Tsang was working with both the seller and the poor investors in Hong Kong, Liverpool, Baltic House Norfolk St and Chinatown and Manchester.

3. Did Cllr Millar in Liverpool fix or set up a talk in with "Mick Coyle" at Radio City in Jan 2017 in which Salesman for NPG Ltd plugged these apartments in Chinatown and Pall Mall?
4. Cllr Millar may be a friend of Mick Coyle Yes or No?
5. Cllr Millar has he ever used a PR company Known as Bond PR in Liverpool who works with NPG Ltd?
6. It will help if Cllr Millar can recall all these persons in Hong Kong as many are saying he was a part of this?

Response

1. Liverpool City Council holds no information on this, as there was no meeting in Hong Kong with anyone called Chans Chan. Councillor Gary Millar is not aware of meeting anyone called Chans Chan. Councillor Millar has no record or recollection of meeting her.
2. Liverpool City Council holds no information on this, as there was no meeting in Hong Kong with anyone called Amie Tsang. Councillor Gary Millar is not aware of meeting anyone called Amie Tsang. Councillor Millar has no record or recollection of meeting her.
3. No. Councillor Millar did not.
4. Liverpool City Council holds no information on the personal friendships of any of its staff or representatives. However, Councillor Millar confirms that he considers Mick Coyle a friend.
5. Liverpool City Council holds no information on the previous personal business relationships of councillors. However, Cllr Millar confirms he has never used Bond PR.
6. This is not a valid question under Freedom of Information legislation.

558701 –

The Welsh Presbyterian Church in Princes Ave Liverpool. Bill Maynard

1. Can the Liverpool City Council please explain why it has taken so long for this project to start and as to why a vast amount of over prices grants are needed £6m plus others fees?

2. Will Liverpool Council please act and ask MBPT to hand this back to the council as no work or funding is coming from Bill Maynard or MBPT?
3. Please I have asked many times has Mr Bill Maynard worked with the LCC or worked for the LCC in the past 15 years?
4. Also will LLC please tell the public has Erica Rushton worked in the past 15 years for the LCC or has she worked alongside the LCC?
5. Has Erica Rushton worked with the Mayor of Liverpool in the past 8 years?
6. If so please state on what projects in Liverpool has she been on with the Mayor?
7. Will Liverpool council please state on record what links it has to been given grant funding from the "European Regional Development Fund" and do you have a contact names and full address fro (ERDF) Please?

Response

1. This is not a valid question under Freedom of Information legislation.
2. This is not a valid question under Freedom of Information legislation.
3. Mr Maynard is neither a current or former City Council employee. The City Council will engage with will engage with and offer advice to all key stakeholders and interested parties in respect of projects and regeneration initiatives across the city, which includes the Merseyside Building Preservation Trust of which Mr Maynard is a representative. We do not retain nor do we have any operational or legislative requirement to, details of all contacts or communications we have had with the Merseyside Building Preservation Trust or its agents.
4. Ms Erika Rushton formerly worked for the City Council's then Neighbourhood Management Team prior to 2010. In her current capacity as Chair of Baltic Creatives CIC Ms Rushton will from time to time engage with the City Council on matters which the City Council are the relevant body or consultee.
5. The It is routine practice for the Mayor, Councillors and Officers to have contact with key stakeholders on matters of interest when relevant to do so, however regeneration activities within the city are managed by Officers in the Regeneration Directorate in partnership with relevant organisations such as Baltic CIC.
6. Regeneration activities within the city are managed by Officers in the Regeneration Directorate in partnership with relevant organisations such as Baltic CIC. Ms Rushton and the Mayor do not work directly on any projects in the city.
7. With regard to the final element of your request – insofar as this relates to the European Regional Development Fund, relevant information is available from the UK Government via the following weblink – <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/england-2014-to-2020-european-structural-and-investment-funds>

558703 –
Liverpool FC Car park Anfield Cllr Nick Small - £186,000 in taking

1. Could the Liverpool council and or Cllr Nick Small please name all the good causes in the local communities who had funds to benefit from the £186,000 in cash?
Note "Anfield, County and Kirkdale wards are all set to benefit from the profits of the community car park run on football match days at Priory Road".
2. Please name all the companies and or persons who were to benefit from this project?
3. Were Liverpool FC part of this?
4. Who owns the car park and in total what cash over the years has been taken?
Note The Beautiful North Partnership, which was established to improve the local area and has its address as: BEAUTIFUL IDEAS COMPANY (NORTH) CIC 19 Devonshire Road, Princes Park, Liverpool, Company number 09138025
5. Why is the LCC given Erika Ann Rushton the name of " Neighbourhood Director" and what is her role with this car park in Anfield?
6. Is LCC paying any fees or commissions to Erika Rushton for her services in running this car park or is her role free to the public?
Note Assistant mayor Cllr Nick Small, chair of the Beautiful North Partnership community interest company, said: "The community car park has been a tremendous success, improving life for the local community and raising money which we can now reinvest back into the local area.
7. Please can Cllr Nick Small account from the 1st week one as to all cash income and where has it gone?
8. Will LCC please tell the public has Cllr Ann O'Byrne had any role / part in this with Erika Rushton and have these in the past worked together on other LCC projects?
9. Is the car park still in use and if so who runs it and where is the income going to?
10. Can the LCC please tell me the link to a person: Gemma Louise McGowan as also being a part of "Beautiful North Partnership" at the same time running this other company.
11. THE ISLA GLADSTONE OUTSIDE CATERING LTD Company number 07665811
Could the LCC please ask Cllr Ann O'Byrne is she or any other family member and or friends linked to this company "THE ISLA GLADSTONE OUTSIDE CATERING LTD"
12. Will the LCC please supply the information on who owns the land and or the building of the Isla Gladstone and what's the rents or and other income to the LCC in the event LCC do own it?

Response

1. This question should be redirected to the Beautiful Ideas Community Interest Company (CIC) who would hold any relevant information as opposed to the City Council. We would however advise that the car park to which you refer operated by the CIC ceased at the close of the 2015/16 football season.
2. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.

3. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.
4. Liverpool Football Club. With regard to the second element of this question this information is not held by the City Council and we would redirect you to the Beautiful Ideas Community Interest Company (CIC) who would hold any relevant information
5. Liverpool City Council is not aware of Erika Rushton ever having been designated a 'Neighbourhood Director' by Liverpool City Council.
6. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.
7. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.
8. Insofar as this question relates to the activities of the Beautiful Ideas Community This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.
9. The land to which you refer is owned by Liverpool Football Club who acquired the majority of the site from Liverpool City Council during 2014/15 and who ran the car park from 2015. As such we would advise you redirect any questions with regards to the use of the land directly to them.
10. This is not a matter for Liverpool City Council. Please refer to our response (1) above.
11. This is not a valid question under the Freedom of Information Act. As such please direct such questions to the company concerned.
12. Liverpool City Council owns the land and the property. The Isla Gladstone Company manages and operates the building on behalf of the City Council under a licence for a fixed period of five years expiring August 2019. The City Council receives an income of £26,000 from the company.

558914 –
The Beautiful Ideas Company

1. Can Liverpool city council please tell us if Erika Rushton worked for Liverpool council's first economic development department? If so for how long and did she resign?

Note

The Beautiful Ideas Company began as the Beautiful North, set up to change perceptions of the north of the city. It opened a community-run car park on a former school site for visitors to park their cars on match days. The money generated was matched with the government-baked LaunchPad fund, and now a pot of £600,000 is available to enable 'Beautiful Ideas' – new businesses and community enterprises of benefit to the north of the city

2. Who are the Launch Pad fund and it linked to LCC, how did this £600,000 benefit the north of the city?
3. Can Liverpool council please tell us as to where this cash went and what accounts are there?

Response

1. Erika Rushton formerly worked for the City Council's then Neighbourhood Management Team prior to 2010. With regard to the remaining elements of this question we would advise that Liverpool City Council would advise that it considers the requested information to be exempt from disclosure on the basis that this constitutes personal data and that Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 is engaged.

Specifically, with regard to posts within the City Council and indeed other public sector organisations, advice and guidance issued by the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) indicates that when dealing with requests such as this, consideration be given to the seniority of role and to what degree an individual Officer or former Officer may reasonably expect their information to be disclosed in response to information requests.

In this instance it is the City Council's determination that the individual concerned could not be anticipated to have any reasonable expectation that information on their former employment with the City Council would be disclosed on the basis that the role concerned is not one of sufficient seniority nor one which could reasonably be anticipated to be placed under such level of public disclosure.

2. This question should be redirected to Government insofar as it relates to the Launch Pad Fund to the Beautiful Ideas Community Interest Company (CIC) who would hold any relevant information as opposed to the City Council.
3. This question should be redirected to the Beautiful Ideas Community Interest Company (CIC) who would hold any relevant information as opposed to the City Council.

559296 –

The Former Welsh Presbyterian Chapel - Baltic Creative CIC

Can you please supply details on the Former Welsh Presbyterian Chapel on Princess Ave Liverpool 8. The council sold the site to Merseyside Building and Preservation Trust (MBPT) for £1 in 2014.

1. MBPT trustee Mr Steve Power in a long telephone call with myself, has stated he now owns this building and the freehold land and had put in for a Grant of £4.2 million to the lottery and then wanted to put in for another £2 million with the (ERDF)

Mr Steve Power has also stated he has on the inside a very good contact within the Liverpool city council when it come to getting things done? Can the LCC please tell me the name of this person within the council?

2. Can LCC please explain as to why this building has been left in such a poor state and after 3 years will the council ask what MBPT new plans are as a witness has come forward to say that the funding sent in to the H L F (Lottery) was over priced and to cook the books to get as much as they could.

3. Has the Liverpool city council got any council members linked to these persons, Mr William Maynard MBPT, Mr Mark Lawler, Mr Steve Power MBPT and Erica Rushton?.
4. Will the Liverpool city council please give all details of this other company and were the LCC the "Mayor" Cllr Ann O'Byrne and other members of the Mayor's team even linked or helped set this company up, The Baltic Creative CIC?
5. Has the council ever sold land in the BalticTriangle to this company Baltic Creative CIC?
6. Has the council given any long leases to Baltic Creative CIC? (Besides 61-65 Norfolk St) Note: Cllr Ann O'Byrne has just awarded the four storey red brick warehouse at 61 – 65 Norfolk Street, to Baltic Creative CIC.
7. Did Cllr O'Byrne put this out to any other Liverpool company besides Baltic Creative CIC in which Mr William Maynard and Erica Rushton are linked to and what has the ratepayer got out of this deal, or how much will LCC make on this deal for the city of Liverpool?
8. Has the LCC and or Cllr Ann O'Byrne taken any part in getting loans and free grants for Baltic Creative CIC? Note: The Charity Bank and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) have provided a total funding package of £2.6 million to complete the redevelopment and refurbishment of the property. The Charity Bank have provided a commercial loan, whilst ERDF has proved a grant of £768,512.
9. Mr Bill Maynard is part of (MBPT) could the LCC please supply all other past building MBPT have worked on with the LCC and all grants and payments made to Mr Maynard and MBPT?
10. Could the Liverpool city Council please indicate if Mr Bill Maynard had worked for the Council in the past, been given any other building to work on or been a part time adviser or been paid for his services by the Council?
11. Can the Council indicate if Erica Rushton was given a job at the Liverpool City Council and what role was she given within the Council and why she had to resign?
12. What is the link with the Mayors office and Baltic Creative CIC as a whistleblower within the LCC has said the Mayors office were behind this company? These are the words of a member of the LCC, not mine.

Response

1. The City Council will respond to and engage with individuals or organisations seeking advice with regard to projects which support the regeneration or restoration of buildings across the city with a view to seeing these being brought back to active community use. There is no single designated point of contact for individual developers, rather any requests are dealt with by Officers from within the Regeneration Directorate on a case by case basis.
2. We would advise that you contact the owners of the building directly with regard to any specific queries you may have as regards their proposals for it. The City Council

continues to actively seek to work with partners and stakeholders in respect of all heritage assets across the city with a view to seeing these being brought back to active community use.

3. With regard to this element of your request, we would refer you to the Register of Interests entries for all members of the City Council, which are in the public domain and provide details of all registrable interests – <http://councillors.liverpool.gov.uk/mgFindMember.aspx?XXR=0&AC=USERSEARCH&ST=Enter%20name>
4. With regard to the Baltic Creative Community Interest Company (CIC), this organisation was established in 2009. Details of the history of the organisation – including a timeline chronology may be accessed via the following weblink – <https://www.baltic-creative.com/about/story/>
5. With the exception of 1/63 Norfolk Street, no other sales or disposals have been made of assets from Liverpool City Council to Baltic Creatives CIC.
6. With the exception of 1/63 Norfolk Street, no other sales or disposals have been made of assets from Liverpool City Council to Baltic Creatives CIC. With regard to the remaining element of this question, the City Council would advise that all decisions with regard to the sale or otherwise disposal of assets are made in accordance with the City Council’s Constitution, Scheme of Delegation, Contract Standing Orders and Financial Regulations and are either made by Officers under the Scheme of Delegation following relevant consultation or if required by Cabinet.
7. With regard to the disposal of assets, these are marketed inviting expressions of interest or, in the event of an expression of interest from a third party to a specific site then the City Council will engage with interested parties and review proposals in the context of their regeneration value and the financial benefit this may offer to the City Council. The marketing of properties is not undertaken by Councillors.
8. The City Council will offer practical advice to organisations seeking loans and grant funding from external agencies however it is a matter for the individual organisation to draft and submit their own funding applications. As previously stated, we are aware of the longstanding work of the Baltic Creative CIC in the City and will engage with them and other key local stakeholders and offer advice as appropriate.
9. The following payments are recorded as having previously been made to Merseyside Building Preservation Trust –

Subject	Value	Invoice Date
FENCING WELSH CHURCH	-7,200.00	16/01/2012
FORMER WELSH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH	-4,800.00	03/07/2014
AGREED CONTRIBUTION		
WELLINGTON ROOMS	-10,983.00	14/11/2016
CONTRIBUTIONS WELLINGTON ROOMS	-9,017.00	06/09/2017

** Payment made in respect of urgent building works, which will make the building wind, weather tight and secure will be delivered by a specialist contractor funded by £10,000 from Historic England, £10,000 from Merseyside Building Preservation Trust and approximately £10,000 from the Council's Planning Revenue budget.

10. Mr Maynard is not a former City Council employee or advisor in any capacity, paid or otherwise.
11. Erika Rushton formerly worked for the City Council's then Neighbourhood Management Team. With regard to the remaining elements of this question we would advise that Liverpool City Council would advise that it considers the requested information to be exempt from disclosure on the basis that this constitutes personal data and that Section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 is engaged.

Specifically, with regard to posts within the City Council and indeed other public sector organisations, advice and guidance issued by the Information Commissioners Office (ICO) indicates that when dealing with requests such as this, consideration be given to the seniority of role and to what degree an individual Officer or former Officer may reasonably expect their information to be disclosed in response to information requests.

In this instance it is the City Council's determination that the individual concerned could not be anticipated to have any reasonable expectation that information on their former employment with the City Council would be disclosed on the basis that the role concerned is not one of sufficient seniority nor one which could reasonably be anticipated to be placed under such level of public disclosure.

12. As indicated in our response at (8) above, the City Council is fully aware of the longstanding work of the Baltic Creative CIC in the City and will engage with them and other key local stakeholders and offer advice as appropriate. Baltic Creative CIC is an independent company and is not part of the City Council.

This concludes our responses on these matters. As we have not provided all of the information you have requested we are required to serve you with a Section 17 Notice, please treat the following as such.

If you remain dissatisfied, you may also apply to the Information Commissioner for a decision about whether the request for information has been dealt with in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

The Information Commissioner's website is www.ico.gov.uk and the postal address and telephone numbers are:- Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 5AF. Fax number 01625 524 510, DX 20819, Telephone 01625 545745. Email – mail@ico.gsi.gov.uk (they advise that their email is not secure)

Yours sincerely

M Jones

Mike Jones
Deputy Head of Democratic Services & Information Manager