

### Simon Morrow <simonjmorrow@googlemail.com>

# Fw: RE: Further Questions from the Aylesbury

3 messages

Beverley Robinson <champaign2340@yahoo.com>
Mon, Nov 27, 2017 at 11:33 AM
To: Simon Morrow <simonjmorrow@googlemail.com>, "T. ECKERSLEY" <toby.eckersley@btinternet.com>, "A.
Glasspool" <aglasspool@gmail.com>, Jane Rendell <j.rendell@ucl.ac.uk>, KAREN GREGORY/JERRY FLYNN
<gregoryflynn@btinternet.com>, Agnes ASK <agnessak@hotmail.com>

---- Forwarded Message -----

From: Chambers, Simon <Simon.Chambers@southwark.gov.uk>

To: 'Beverley Robinson' <champaign2340@yahoo.com> Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 10:31:19 AM GMT Subject: RE: Further Questions from the Aylesbury

Dear Beverley,

Please see the Council's responses to your questions set out in red below.

Kind Regards,

Simon

Simon Chambers

Regeneration Manager

Regeneration South

Southwark Council

Tel: 0207 5257495

Mob: 07932 807656

From: Beverley Robinson [mailto:champaign2340@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 1:56 PM

To: Chambers, Simon

Subject: Further Questions from the Aylesbury - A response is required by 16th November 2017

Dear Mr Chambers,

I acknowledge receipt of your e-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017 and respond as follows:

### **Commercial Confidentiality**

Please demonstrate why the information that you are withholding is commercially confidential, particularly given that some of the information requested you have already willingly put into the public domain. It is incumbent on you to demonstrate to the objectors and the inspector the economic benefits of your proposed scheme. Please explain how you intend to demonstrate that your proposed scheme provides economic benefit and is not loss making if you will not release the financial information underpinning your decisions.

I have set out the position on commercial confidentiality below. More broadly, the Council has set out it's position to the Inquiry in its Statement of Case. As set out by the Inspector the Council's Proofs of Evidence must be submitted by 12 December, which you will be able to review. This will set out the Council's position in detail.

#### Decision to stop work

You still have not answered the question I raised in my e-mail dated 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2017, namely "information on the date on which that work was instructed to be ceased, who issued such instructions, and for what reasons." The Levitt Bernstein Executive Summary, reporting on Stage E of the South-West Corner refurbishment project, states that on 1 April 2005 the Client instructed them to cease work on that project. Please advise the full reasons for those instructions and who gave them (and who authorised the giving of them, if different).

#### This information is not held.

The 26 September 2005 Southwark Executive decision to demolish instead of refurbish, including comparisons of new build and refurbishment.

Your response references the cabinet report but does not provide the detailed information requested. Please provide the detailed calculations which back up this decision, in particular:

- The detailed calculations used to justify the statements made in paragraph 4.4 of the cabinet report.
- Detail of how HRA revenue implications have been calculated, as noted in paragraph 8.2 of the cabinet report.
- The detailed calculations which have been used to calculate the figures within Appendices A and C of the cabinet report.

### This information is not held.

Please do not refer back to the Levitt Bernstein 2005 Stage E report or the 2005 Frost report again as the figures noted above are not included in these reports.

### Notting Hill Trust viability statement dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015

In your letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017 you stated "The Council does not hold the underlying information that sits behind this statement." You state in your e-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> October 2017 "This information requested will not be released as it is subject to commercial confidentiality." Please explain why your statement has changed and confirm either of the following:

- The council doesn't hold the information: or
- The council does hold the information but is withholding it on the basis of commercial confidentiality.

I also asked for "all cost information or due diligence exercises that the council does have that have been used to validate the figures either within the DPA agreement between Southwark and the Notting Hill Housing Trust or the Notting Hill Housing Trust viability statement dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015." Please provide the cost information requested. If you are not willing to do so, please provide me with copies of the due diligence exercises.

Your initial request related to whether the Council holds information that sits behind the Notting Hill Housing Trust viability statement dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015. Please note that this statement was requested by the GLA and not by the Council. It was not reviewed by the Council as part of the planning

application as the scheme was deemed to be policy compliant, therefore we do not hold the information that sits behind this statement.

Your follow up request related to the validation of figures within the DPA agreement between Southwark and the Notting Hill Housing Trust. Within the DPA Site 1b/1c is not subject to viability assessment. However the DPA does include other financial information, including a detailed financial model. A request for this detailed financial information within the DPA has already been made, which the Council refused on the basis of commercial confidentiality. This request was subsequently referred to the ICO who upheld the Council's decision not to release the information on the basis of commercial confidentiality. In line with the decision from the ICO the Council will not therefore be releasing this information.

#### **Detailed Cost Information**

The information you have provided me is generic, in particular with regard to the decanting and risk items. Please provide the costings related to Items A-C as originally requested.

You have requested cost breakdowns in respect of all costs underpinning the 2005 Southwark Executive decision, the conclusions set out in the Planning Committee Report and the Notting Hill Housing Trust viability statement dated 4<sup>th</sup> March 2015, 2001-05 work on refurbishment, and structural surveys referred to in the Planning Committee Report. The Council has responded with the information that we hold and set out where we do not hold this information. You have subsequently asked for detailed breakdowns of the information that sits behind the information that we have released. As set out previously and in the responses in this email we do not hold information that sits below the documents already provided.

### **Access to Properties**

I will respond with regard to this once you have provided the necessary financial information.

As previously stated, we are prepared to grant access on the basis of our previous response.

### Further Information required

Please provide the following in relation to the First Stage tenders for refurbishment of the South West corner of the estate:

- The detailed back up (Priced Bill of Quantities) to the pre-tender estimate of £31,043,934.00 noted in item 5.1 of the First Stage Tender report (Item 10.1 of Volume 2: Supplement to Stage E report).
- The priced Bill of Quantities submitted by Higgins (or other tenders submitted if this is not available), which has been used by BPTW when pricing their April 2005 estimate for refurbishment of the estate.

## This information is not held.

Can you please also provide details of all Decent Homes or Decent Homes Plus works carried out by London Borough of Southwark in the financial year 2004/2005, as detailed below:

- Name of each estate and number of properties refurbished and whether they were refurbished to Decent Home or Decent Homes Plus.
- Cost of refurbishment as a total for each estate and cost per property for each estate.

I will come back to you on this request for information.

Please provide the information requested above by close of business on Friday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful. Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not