



Chief Executive's Office
Fifth Floor, Laurence House
London Borough of Lewisham
1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU
tel: 020 8314 6447

30 December 2016

Steve Kavanagh
Chief Executive
Millwall FC
The Den
Zampa Road
London SE16 3LN

Dear Steve

Further to my e-mail of 23 December, thank you again for your prompt response to my e-mail of 16 December. We have now had the opportunity to review your two e-mails of 23 December.

You will recall my e-mail of 16 December asked two quite simple and specific factual questions, the purpose of which was to enable the Council to satisfy itself that, if the CPO and the Renewal scheme proceed, MFC's Youth Academy's Category 2 status can be maintained. Those questions were:

- 1) what it is about the current arrangements you have in place with Millwall Community Scheme that enabled the Club to secure Academy 2 status?
- 2) what it is about the proposed arrangements with them that you consider threatens that status?

I also asked that your response should cross-reference the current arrangements to the applicable criteria for Category 2 status, and that it should be supported with copies of relevant documents, including for example the Club's application for Category 2 status and the audit committee report on that application.

You have so far helpfully provided a copy of the EFL Youth Academy Rules, and have highlighted Rule 308. This sets out the requirements regarding access to indoor pitches and requires that where the facility is not owned by the football Club in question, it "must have a legally enforceable agreement with the owner of the facility for its use by the Club ... which shall be for the exclusive use of the Academy at all times". You have not, however, explained nor provided any documents to show what is it about the current arrangements with MCS that enabled the Club to satisfy the Rule 308 criteria. I note you are trying to locate the EFL 'audit tool', but surely the Club has a copy of the application it submitted and in any event has the details, including the relevant documents, regarding the current access arrangements?

You suggest that this point is irrelevant, but I do not agree. We are considering whether there is any reason why the current legal arrangements that enabled the Club to secure Academy 2 status cannot be maintained once MCS is relocated. For these purposes, we clearly need to understand what the current arrangements are, hence the specific question raised in my e-mail of 16 December and repeated above.

I should mention that Pete Walsh had previously indicated that there was a Service Level Agreement between MCS and the Club which included a priority right of access for the Academy, but has since advised that that was incorrect and that "priority right of access is held in a separate agreement with the funding body". Can this be provided please?

You have also suggested that the new premises would not be satisfactory and that this could threaten the Academy's Category 2 status. I therefore asked you to explain why you consider that to be the case, but again, your response does not address this issue. Can I therefore invite you to set out your specific concerns in this regard and to explain whether, and if so why, you consider the current arrangements with MCS could not be replicated at the new facility?

As you know, the matter is currently programmed for consideration at the Mayor and Cabinet meeting on 11 January and your early response would therefore be very much appreciated.

Finally, I note that in your first email of 23 December you have mentioned a large number of other points most of which have been raised before, and also claim that your opinions and objections are brushed aside. I know that you are still coming up to speed with the history of this process and may not yet be familiar with the extensive correspondence between officers and their advisers and the Club's advisers over a long period, as well as the meetings that have taken place. Representations made by the Club have also been reported on in the various Reports to Members throughout the CPO process, and correspondence received from the Club and its advisers has been placed before Members at meetings and the issues raised discussed. It really is not correct to suggest the Club's opinion and objections have been brushed aside. On the contrary, the views and the needs of the Club are taken very seriously by the Council. I would however urge you on this occasion please to focus on and answer directly the very clear and straightforward questions I asked you in my email of 16 December, so that we can properly understand the Club's concerns and ensure that the new facilities that are to be provided for MCS as part of the regeneration scheme do not threaten the Youth Academy's Category 2 status.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards



Barry Quirk CBE BSc PhD FRGS FRSA CIPFA (Hon)
Chief Executive

From: Townsend, Charmaine on behalf of Quirk, Barry
Sent: 16 December 2016 17:13
To: 'Steve Kavanagh'
Subject: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Steve Kavanagh
Chief Executive
Millwall Football Club

Dear Steve

As you are aware, last night the Cabinet agreed to defer reconsideration of its decision made on 7 September 2016 to make a compulsory purchase order (CPO) in respect of the New Bermondsey site to its next meeting on 11 January 2017. This was to enable further consideration to be given to the issue you have raised concerning the Category 2 status of the Millwall Football Club Youth Academy.

Having heard what you have said about the issue, it is clear that it is an important one for the Club. However, despite years of contact between the parties, the first time the issue was raised was the day of the Business Panel meeting on 13 December 2016. I should be grateful if you would explain why, since the matter is of such importance to the Club, it was raised by the Club so late in the day and in that manner.

The Council believes that sufficient protections are in place already, but wants to be confident that if the CPO and the scheme proceed the Academy's Category 2 status can be maintained. I should therefore be grateful if you would explain in detail what it is about the current arrangements you have in place with Millwall Community Scheme that enabled you to secure that status, cross-referencing the relevant elements of those arrangements against the applicable criteria relating to the achievement of Category 2 status, and what it is about the proposed arrangements with them that you consider threatens that status. Please could you also support your explanation with copies of relevant documents, including for example the Club's application for Category 2 status and the audit committee report on that application.

As stated above, the reconsideration of the CPO decision has been deferred until 11 January 2017. Accordingly I would ask you to provide the necessary information and supporting evidence to me by 23 December 2016.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Barry

Barry Quirk CBE BSc PhD FRGS FRSA CIPFA (Hon)
chief executive

Tel: 020 8314 6447

Nb. A hard copy has also been sent to you in the post.

From: Steve Kavanagh <stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com>
Sent: 23 December 2016 12:00
To: Quirk, Barry
Subject: RE: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Dear Barry

Further to your email below and the various questions you raise, I have not been able to respond earlier because I needed to engage comprehensively with The English Football League (EFL) to obtain most of the necessary information. Additionally, you may have noticed that Millwall had its biggest home derby of the season against Charlton Athletic on Wednesday which inevitably has taken up most of my time. Jim Briden from The EFL came back to me yesterday with some of the information, but he has been on holiday and was only back for one day before Christmas. He will step in again to help when he returns to work in January. For now, it is a holding email. I will separately forward it to you with its attachments and my commentary on the key elements.

Turning to your email:

Why is this raised now?

As you know I only joined Millwall on 31 October 2016 as CEO. I have come into this as a fresh pair of eyes and have been trying to understand all aspects, as well as assess the whole business and ensure it is run in an efficient and effective manner.

I am encouraged to hear that our local Council is firmly committed to the continued operation of the Club and the Millwall Community Trust and that we are part of the core regeneration strategy for the area and must be at the heart of any redevelopment.

What I don't understand, if these sentiments are to be truly believed, is why the Club and Community Trust are battling so hard to remain at the heart of the plans and why our opinions and objections are brushed aside while the interests and wishes of a local private property developer take priority. Why have MFC and MCT been put in a position where, to protect their interests in the future, they have to be in a fight against Mayor and Cabinet? The Club and Community Trust have raised many questions long before I became involved, and yet these seem to simply be ignored. Indeed our lawyers wrote to the Council as recently as 5 September with a number of important points and genuine concerns and they have never even received the courtesy of a reply.

It is clear to me that the Club supports the redevelopment, but it also wants to be properly involved. Not unreasonably, not only does it wish to remain engaged, but it also wishes to have an appropriate opportunity to benefit and future-proof its continuing existence here in Lewisham. Instead, it has been marginalised and is threatened with having its land seized by the very Council that helped move the Club to its current site and leased the land in the first place. If your CPO plans proceed, our stadium will become land locked and we will be surrounded by new freeholders who may or may not have an interest in, and support for, MFC. I make that point in the context of the Council confirming that there is nothing to prevent Renewal from selling on the Millwall land once it owns the freeholds.

None of this reflects any sense that we are at the heart of the proposed redevelopment. If we are, then surely we all need a reasonable period to review all of these issues and ensure that the words and sentiments of the Council match its actions.

My entry into this process is perhaps the ideal time to stop and reflect and for people to get round the table and talk through all aspects. I understand that the Club's owners provided considerable help at their own expense in the early stages to agree the original s106 agreement and to secure outline planning permission. It is ridiculous for the Council to suggest that MFC is intent on stopping the regeneration and shameful of the Council to tell its local community that it is merely seeking CPOs over the final 10% of the development site. As you heard, it was reluctantly admitted by Officers last week that the CPO land around our stadium represents more than 40% of the total site.

My understanding is that Council Officers have a duty to be impartial and fully consider all information and not simply look for ways round problematic information and make statements such as “We do not believe this to be the case” without having made any serious attempt to establish the facts and assess the impact and implications. Such statements only serve to heighten the belief that the Council doesn’t see the Club as being at the heart of matters. Neither is it helpful or constructive to find the Council making statements about this latest situation that seem remarkably similar to statements made by Renewal to the press a little earlier. That doesn’t convey impartiality and it feels to me as if we are persistently up against a partnership between local authority and property developer. There have been many points, comments and objections by the Club and MCT that have been ignored and gone unanswered by the Council. Nevertheless, I am pleased that the threat to our Academy is being taken seriously and very much hope that, in parallel, the Council will take the trouble to gain a better understanding of the MCT, its close ties to the Club, the nature of the vital work it does in the community and the cavalier manner in which the Council and Renewal have chosen to ignore its objections to the proposed plans. I understand that my colleague, Steve Bradshaw, explicitly told Cabinet members that the future of the MCT was under threat when they visited the Lions Centre in April. Yet no further questions were asked, no investigations undertaken and, in early September, those same Cabinet members voted in favour of CPOs while all expressing how important the MCT is to the community.

I have come into this process only very recently and, in addition to running the business, have had to get my head around these issues that are quite clearly restraining the Club as it is a huge distraction to the Board and Management.

I have nearly 15 years of experience in senior management of Football Clubs. About five years ago The English Premier League (EPL) introduced a significant change to the structuring and funding of Football Academies. They introduced a four-tier structure and there were then two years of preparation by Clubs to set out what Category they should be, followed by an audit process.

At the start of this period of change I was at Charlton Athletic and involved in their Cat 2 application. There was an issue at Charlton over the use of their outdoor astro turf facility. The facility was in a poor state and there was concern that it would not pass the external audit. Please note the rules clearly state an indoor and an outdoor astro facility are required and the indoor facility was separate to this issue.

There was another outdoor astro facility on Charlton’s land, owned and managed by its Community Trust. The facility had been built in the previous year, grant funded. As a result of the grant funding there were specific needs and hours that had to be met or the £1m of funding would have been put in jeopardy. We tried to construct ways in which the Club could obtain exclusive use, as required under the rules, and it was not possible because of the funding used to build the facility. The funding was not unusual or complicated. As far as I remember, the significant part came from Barclays and Sport England – a similar funding structure to the new Bermondsey facility as I understand.

When I joined Southend United I reviewed the Academy category, they went for a Cat 3. Unlike the previous CEO, I got involved in the audit process. Please understand that it is very unusual for the CEO to be involved. But for me, it’s substantial funding and required my detailed understanding, certainly as I was new at Southend at that time it seemed vital, similar to my introduction into Millwall.

Southend’s audit was very complicated, as they all are, and the preparation and time taken is substantial. Millwall’s next audit commences on 1 February 2017 and we are very much in the preparation and planning stage. The timing of this issue now, if I am honest, is very bad and unhelpful given the importance of the forthcoming audit to us.

The Southend audit showed that we theoretically scored sufficient points to be a Cat 2 Academy. However, Southend failed Cat 2 because they were unable to deliver the mandatory requirement of an indoor facility. Before joining Millwall, I spent three years looking at ways this could possibly be achieved to get Cat 2 in this fast approaching audit round. We explored hiring third party facilities but every time I went back to The EFL, who oversee the rules for EFL Clubs on behalf of the EPL, they could not be satisfied that we truly had exclusive use of the facilities. This was very frustrating and a complex issue and requires detailed EFL involvement. The rules in this area are clear and clubs have lost Cat 2 status on this point alone as I personally experienced. I should also note that new facilities are judged more harshly than existing facilities. The EFL’s objective is not to take away Academy status but if you are doing something new or changing things, then the requirement for rigorous compliance becomes greater. Change is not always a good thing!

The answer to your question about why this has come up now is that I have recently arrived and I happen to have become an expert in this area and have an experience that is unusual in football clubs as most have their own facility under their control, so they never go into the complexities that are at stake here

The problems were therefore unseen, as they are unusual. I have come in as a fresh pair of eyes and as I gained my knowledge of what was happening I started to ask about the way the proposed new facility would be delivered and operated. That led me to understand that there were serious risks to our Cat 2 status.

I obtained the requested EFL letter that I received last Thursday within 48 hours to ensure that my conclusion was supported by relevant third party corroboration. The EFL audit process, a 3 yearly process, is now in full flow and their time is very limited. I have been trying to get hold of them since your email of last Friday to obtain more information for you but only received a holding email yesterday.

What information is required?

A key consideration in this is not the history you are asking for, it is the proposed operation going forward. For our audit starting in February, there is no requirement regarding the Indoor facility to upload documents. The historical files that may contain the detail you want are not readily to hand since our usage requirements have been accepted and audited. The key aspect that we are collectively addressing is that, as a result of the threatened CPO process, a substantial change will occur to the existence and use of our indoor facility – a facility which has been reviewed and signed off by the auditors.

Given this, it does make me wonder how Cllr Smith could state that you don't believe this is as an issue and sufficient controls are in place. Therefore, please can you provide me with the information that you are drawing upon to substantiate your position. Perhaps I am missing something in the way the facility will be provided? However, with all due respect to Renewal and the Council, it is the EFL's opinion that matters to Millwall Football Club and the community in which it operates. Please therefore can you set this out for me including, but not limited to, the following issues so I can seek the views of the EFL as soon as they are back after the Christmas break:

- Will the new facility be built using any grant funding, for example from Sport England?
- Will the Trust and the Club run the facility and fully manage it?
- Who is responsible for maintaining the surface to the requisite level required under our rules?
- Will there be any access requirements or required hours for other users? I understand that the Council has in the past published a document that sets out hours of usage and the plans for operating the new sports centre. Please can I see them?
- Will the new sports centre be exclusively for the Club and Trust?
- Will the facility be built on the existing site?
- What are the proposed commercial terms regarding, notably, rent, rates and service charges bearing in mind the current premises costs enjoyed by the MCT?

I am trying to get the EFL to set out any further understanding they would need to confirm the new facility is acceptable and they have confirmed they need the above information to do so.

You already have their letter of 15 December and will shortly have their latest email. If you can respond to my questions above, then hopefully we can progress this rapidly. This is a vital issue and it is essential it is fully understood by all, and indeed signed off by the EFL, before we can move forward.

But I have to ask why none of the other issues that we and the Millwall Community Trust have raised are being given the same level of review?

Sadly, it does appear that the Cabinet and Council Officers have made up their minds. They seem determined to apply CPOs and are trying to find ways to do so rather than looking with open minds at the issues and asking why Millwall FC and the Millwall Community Trust, as articulated by Peter Walsh their Chairman on 13 December, are not comfortable with the process and don't feel they are remotely at the heart of the proposed redevelopment. Surely this has shown that matters have not been properly explored by everyone and that a fresh approach is required. Sometimes stopping and reviewing matters gets things done more quickly, but to do this it has to be a genuine attempt, not just platitudes.

Kind regards

Steve

From: Townsend, Charmaine [mailto:Charmaine.Townsend@lewisham.gov.uk] **On Behalf Of** Quirk, Barry
Sent: 16 December 2016 17:13
To: Steve Kavanagh <stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com>
Subject: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Steve Kavanagh
Chief Executive
Millwall Football Club

Dear Steve

As you are aware, last night the Cabinet agreed to defer reconsideration of its decision made on 7 September 2016 to make a compulsory purchase order (CPO) in respect of the New Bermondsey site to its next meeting on 11 January 2017. This was to enable further consideration to be given to the issue you have raised concerning the Category 2 status of the Millwall Football Club Youth Academy.

Having heard what you have said about the issue, it is clear that it is an important one for the Club. However, despite years of contact between the parties, the first time the issue was raised was the day of the Business Panel meeting on 13 December 2016. I should be grateful if you would explain why, since the matter is of such importance to the Club, it was raised by the Club so late in the day and in that manner.

The Council believes that sufficient protections are in place already, but wants to be confident that if the CPO and the scheme proceed the Academy's Category 2 status can be maintained. I should therefore be grateful if you would explain in detail what it is about the current arrangements you have in place with Millwall Community Scheme that enabled you to secure that status, cross-referencing the relevant elements of those arrangements against the applicable criteria relating to the achievement of Category 2 status, and what it is about the proposed arrangements with them that you consider threatens that status. Please could you also support your explanation with copies of relevant documents, including for example the Club's application for Category 2 status and the audit committee report on that application.

As stated above, the reconsideration of the CPO decision has been deferred until 11 January 2017. Accordingly I would ask you to provide the necessary information and supporting evidence to me by 23 December 2016.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Barry

Barry Quirk CBE BSc PhD FRGS FRSA CIPFA (Hon)
chief executive

Tel: 020 8314 6447

Nb. A hard copy has also been sent to you in the post.

From: Steve Kavanagh <stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com>
Sent: 23 December 2016 12:27
To: Quirk, Barry
Subject: FW: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order
Attachments: Youth_Development rules.pdf

Dear Barry

As referred to in my earlier email please see below an email I received from the EFL, underneath it you will see the information I have requested to assist in answering your questions.

The current Youth Academy rules are attached and must be read in their total quantum to ensure no misunderstandings exist, the rule of primary concern here though is rule 308 which was set out in the letter from The EFL which I sent to the Cabinet prior to last weeks adjourned meeting.

To assist you in reviewing the rules I would also bring the following to your attention:

- In the general note at the introduction of the Rules, it is stated that the binding rules are shaded in light blue. All of the rules referred to in this note, and including 308, are so shaded and therefore binding on the Club.
- Rule 3 requires that if a club engages in the training and development for a young player then it must:
 - 3.1 obtain a licence to operate an Academy; and
 - 3.2 operate its Academy in accordance with the ... Rules.
- Rule 4 provides that the maximum term of a licence shall be three years, unless revoked earlier in accordance with the Rules or extended by the PGB. This ties into the Cat 2 Audit reviews that are taking place now. As I referred to in my earlier email this is not focusing on every aspect and the indoor is not being reviewed as it is not being changed. It is as referred to in the note that change brings additional requirements and needs.
- Any breach of the obligation to operate an academy in accordance with the rules shall be dealt with under the provisions of Section 8 of the League's Regulations.
- Rules 300 to 316 governs the facilities to be provided at the various grades of Academy.

We are locating the audit tool and as you can see this is proving difficult as detailed below by the EFL and it is within this tool that the document evidencing the indoor facility arrangement is held. Once I have the document and or the audit tool, along with confirmation I can disclose this then I will forward to you, but I repeat this is in some ways irrelevant, it is the rules attached that are most relevant.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Also can I take this opportunity to wish you a Happy Christmas.

Kind regards

Steve

From: Jim Briden [mailto:JBriden@efl.com]
Sent: 22 December 2016 11:59
To: Steve Kavanagh <stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com>
Subject: RE: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Hi Steve,

Sorry for not coming back to you sooner, but I have been on holiday since last Thursday and today is the only day I am working before January 4th.

With regard to the audit tool the Club submitted prior to the previous audit, the EFL do not have a copy, it was sent directly to the ISO (Doublepass), but I will request an electronic copy from them, although I am not sure that they will release this, due to their concerns over Intellectual Property Rights. The Academy staff may have a copy of what was submitted, maybe check with Scott.

Moving forwards, I think the issues covered in the 4 points you listed, would provide us with the information we would need to determine if the access and usage arrangements for the indoor area, would be sufficient for category 2 status.

There are examples where Clubs with category 2 status have utilised facilities (both indoor and outdoor artificial pitches) that are owned by a third party, but their access to these facilities meets the requirements as detailed in the EFL YD rules, which basically are that they are available to the club at all times, that Academy players are training. I have attached an electronic copy of the rules as requested.

Obviously grant aid funding provides an excellent opportunity to assist clubs with building the facilities required under EPPP, although the stipulations attached to this funding (often around community use) can cause problems in terms of meeting the EPPP requirements.

I trust this is helpful for now, but as you may be aware I am due at the Academy on January 10th, as part of our preparation for their forthcoming audit and would obviously be available to discuss further then.

Best regards
Jim

From: Steve Kavanagh [mailto:stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com]
Sent: 20 December 2016 09:21
To: Jim Briden <JBriden@efl.com>
Subject: FW: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Dear Jim

Further to our discussions last week and the letter you provided for me regarding our Academy Indoor facility which is housed in The Lions Centre at The Den, I have been trying to call but I appreciate with the audits taking place and also Christmas you are busy so I thought it best to write.

I forwarded the letter you sent to us onto the Mayor and Cabinet of Lewisham Council who were meeting last Thursday to discuss the compulsory purchase of the Millwall Community Trust land, and other areas, which is home to the Lions Centre and the Indoor facility.

The meeting was deferred due to the issue we have raised over the facility and the impact its loss would potentially have on our Academy.

As you can see from the email below from the CEO of Lewisham Council they are asking for more information.

Can you provide me with an electronic copy of the audit tool that was submitted at the last audit and also a copy electronically of the current Academy rules. As you will see they are also asking for any audit response, this will have been over 3 years ago now but I assume the EFL would have this? Is there any other information you can provide that will assist me in responding?

I am drafting a response to the Council in the interim and I have asked for the following on how they envisage the new facility would operate in order that we can sit down with you and discuss how best we ensure within those parameters that our Cat 2 status is maintained as this has to be a priority to us and as you can see from the email it is a clear priority for the Council. Is there any other information you would require to provide clearance on such an arrangement in the future?

- 1) Will the Trust and the Club run the facility and fully manage it?
- 2) Will there be any access requirements or required hours from any other user?
- 3) Will there be other third party users or will it be exclusively for the Club and Trust?
- 4) Will the facility be built on the existing site or will it move?

I also think it would be useful if you could explain your experiences of third party run facilities and whether these are used to achieve Cat 2 status and if so how does it operate to ensure the indoor facility complies with the regulations. Specifically in addition to this can you comment on whether you have experience of facilities where Grant funding is used to build such facilities and again whether such grant funding provides any operational difficulties in achieving the required usage. I can't remember if you visited Charlton when I was there and the discussions that took place around trying to use the new Community Astro facility that was built as I remember in conjunction with Sport England and Barclays Spaces for Sport. The facility had high community usage which barred using it as the academy facility because they were unable to satisfy the exclusive priority access requirements. You will be aware of my experiences at Southend United and where we ended up purchasing the old Beckham Academy to provide the indoor facility, one for the Community and one for the Academy, ironically the facility is going to be built on land that the Southend Council will CPO for the Club!!

As you will note the Council have requested I provide all of this by the 23rd and I am therefore under extreme pressure, never mind I have 2 home matches in the next 6 days and a transfer window looming!! But if you can respond as soon as possible I would appreciate it esp given your other commitments.

Kind regards
Steve

From: Townsend, Charmaine [<mailto:Charmaine.Townsend@lewisham.gov.uk>] **On Behalf Of** Quirk, Barry
Sent: 16 December 2016 17:13
To: Steve Kavanagh <stevekavanagh@millwallplc.com>
Subject: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Steve Kavanagh
Chief Executive
Millwall Football Club

Dear Steve

As you are aware, last night the Cabinet agreed to defer reconsideration of its decision made on 7 September 2016 to make a compulsory purchase order (CPO) in respect of the New Bermondsey site to its next meeting on 11 January 2017. This was to enable further consideration to be given to the issue you have raised concerning the Category 2 status of the Millwall Football Club Youth Academy.

Having heard what you have said about the issue, it is clear that it is an important one for the Club. However, despite years of contact between the parties, the first time the issue was raised was the day of the Business Panel meeting on 13 December 2016. I should be grateful if you would explain why, since the matter is of such importance to the Club, it was raised by the Club so late in the day and in that manner.

The Council believes that sufficient protections are in place already, but wants to be confident that if the CPO and the scheme proceed the Academy's Category 2 status can be maintained. I should therefore be

grateful if you would explain in detail what it is about the current arrangements you have in place with Millwall Community Scheme that enabled you to secure that status, cross-referencing the relevant elements of those arrangements against the applicable criteria relating to the achievement of Category 2 status, and what it is about the proposed arrangements with them that you consider threatens that status. Please could you also support your explanation with copies of relevant documents, including for example the Club's application for Category 2 status and the audit committee report on that application.

As stated above, the reconsideration of the CPO decision has been deferred until 11 January 2017. Accordingly I would ask you to provide the necessary information and supporting evidence to me by 23 December 2016.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Barry

Barry Quirk CBE BSc PhD FRGS FRSA CIPFA (Hon)
chief executive

Tel: 020 8314 6447

Nb. A hard copy has also been sent to you in the post.

DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.jewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

From: Townsend, Charmaine on behalf of Quirk, Barry
Sent: 03 January 2017 12:38
To: 'Peter Walsh'
Subject: RE: MCT and the Lions Centre

Pete Walsh
Chair
Millwall Community Scheme

Dear Pete

First, Happy New Year - and I hope you've had a good Christmas break.

Thanks again for your email of 23 December. I note that you'll be meeting with Emma Talbot and Kplom Lotsu from Lewisham shortly to discuss details.

In the meantime it would be most helpful if you would confirm a simple query - is the Trust happy to take on accommodation in Energize in a manner which would enable them to adopt arrangements with the Club to enable it (the Club) to continue to satisfy the Category 2 Academy requirements?

As stated above, the reconsideration of the CPO decision has been deferred until 11 January 2017. I should therefore be extremely grateful if you would come back to me as soon as practicable.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Barry

From: Peter Walsh [mailto:peterrswalsh@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: 23 December 2016 08:54
To: Quirk, Barry
Subject: MCT and the Lions Centre

Dear Barry ,

Apologies for the delay in responding but I needed to consult with colleagues and Steve Bradshaw the Trusts CEO . In terms of the proposed CPO and the protections you referred to via the Section 106 I am pleased to say that Kplom and Emma have sent me all the relevant pages and a link to the full document . We will be meeting with them shortly after Xmas to discuss .

In terms of the SLA the Trust have with the Club it is not as I had thought . I was under the impression that it did include priority right of access for the Academy but in fact I was incorrect and the priority right of access is held in a separate agreement with the funding body. I am aware that you have written to Steve Kavanagh and he is obtaining the document that was presented as part of their audit and he will provide this to you.

On a separate point the issue of the Councils understanding of the MCT funding is troubling me. I am unsure that they appreciate that match funding is often ring fenced so that it can only be used for that specific project and means limited funding is available for central costs such as rent and overheads .

We will elaborate when we meet with Kplom and Emma but we have been through it in some detail with Renewal and the valuers and feel they never really took what we were saying on board .

Regards
Pete

From: Peter Walsh <peterrswalsh@yahoo.co.uk>
Sent: 23 December 2016 08:54
To: Quirk, Barry
Subject: MCT and the Lions Centre

Dear Barry ,

Apologies for the delay in responding but I needed to consult with colleagues and Steve Bradshaw the Trusts CEO . In terms of the proposed CPO and the protections you referred to via the Section 106 I am pleased to say that Kplom and Emma have sent me all the relevant pages and a link to the full document . We will be meeting with them shortly after Xmas to discuss .

In terms of the SLA the Trust have with the Club it is not as I had thought . I was under the impression that it did include priority right of access for the Academy but in fact I was incorrect and the priority right of access is held in a separate agreement with the funding body. I am aware that you have written to Steve Kavanagh and he is obtaining the document that was presented as part of their audit and he will provide this to you.

On a separate point the issue of the Councils understanding of the MCT funding is troubling me. I am unsure that they appreciate that match funding is often ring fenced so that it can only be used for that specific project and means limited funding is available for central costs such as rent and overheads .

We will elaborate when we meet with Kplom and Emma but we have been through it in some detail with Renewal and the valuers and feel they never really took what we were saying on board .

Regards

Pete

From: Townsend, Charmaine on behalf of Quirk, Barry
Sent: 16 December 2016 17:14
To: 'peterrswalsh@yahoo.co.uk'
Subject: New Bermondsey (formally Surrey Canal Triangle) proposed compulsory purchase order

Pete Walsh
Chair
Millwall Community Scheme

Dear Pete

As you are aware, last night the Cabinet agreed to defer reconsideration of its decision made on 7 September 2016 to make a compulsory purchase order (CPO) in respect of the New Bermondsey site to its next meeting on 11 January 2017. This was to enable further consideration to be given to the issue that the Club have now raised concerning the Category 2 status of the Millwall Football Club Youth Academy. The Council recognises that this issue is an important one to the Club and to the Academy.

The Council has throughout sought to put in place measures to protect the interests of the Club and of the Millwall Community Scheme (MCS), including through the imposition of planning obligations to secure the new facilities that will be provided to MCS if the redevelopment proceeds. The Council believes that sufficient protections are in place already, but wants to be confident that if the CPO and the scheme proceed the Academy's Category 2 status can be maintained. We therefore need to understand the existing arrangements between MCS and the Club so that we can ascertain what future protection would be needed and what, if any, further assurances may be required in this respect.

I understand that you mentioned to Emma Talbot (Head of Planning) that there is a written Service Level Agreement between MCS and the Club which provides for the Academy to have exclusive use of one of the pitches on a season by season basis. It would be extremely helpful if you could let us have a copy of that Agreement, together with any other information that you think is relevant to our understanding of the arrangements you have with the Club regarding the use by the Club of the MCS facilities. It would also be helpful to know whether MCS would be happy to take on accommodation in Energize in a manner which would enable them to adopt arrangements with the Club to enable it (the Club) to continue to satisfy the Category 2 Academy requirements.

As stated above, the reconsideration of the CPO decision has been deferred until 11 January 2017. I should therefore be extremely grateful if you would come back to me by 23 December 2016.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

Barry

Barry Quirk CBE BSc PhD FRGS FRSA CIPFA (Hon)
chief executive

Tel: 020 8314 6447