

Public Inquiry into Garden Festival Site

Held at the Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, 5th - 16th November 2007.

The Inquiry into the proposed plans for the development of the former Garden Festival Site got under way, after much preparation and discussion.

Battle lines were clearly drawn, with the objectors, organised by the "Save the Garden Festival" campaign group parading outside the hotel with banners and filling the rear of the Inquiry room with literature and banners.

RRA was represented by Chairwoman Andrea Spyropoulos, Sandra MacMillan, Ken Moore and Reg Cox.

The first days business was largely given to planning the time table of when the various parties would make their presentations. The original time table was changed, at the suggestion of Mr C S Turner and "members of the public" including Spyropoulos, MacMillan and Cox from RRA would speak on Thursday 8th November.

The text of the documents delivered to the Inquiry are printed elsewhere in this edition. Mary Matheson also spoke in support of the plans on the 8th November.

Listening to the "evidence" given by the various parties

was interesting for some of the time, but rather tedious, in it's repetitiveness, for much of the time. One young woman in the opposition, recited a long poem.

The SGF group were not able to complete their presentation, as they had not brought documents that they wished to give as evidence.

The Chairman, Mr Turner, was a man of great patience and fairness. He stopped several people, when he thought that they were repeating statements that had already been made, but for most of the time he sat quietly taking notes and asking the odd question.

Councillor John Coyne was classed as opposing the proposal, at the suggestion of the Chairman, as this would allow him greater freedom to question the plans. Though Councillor Coyne classed himself as a "critical supporter".

As the SGF group and supporters were unable to complete their statements, the Chairman, Mr Turner, temporarily closed the Inquiry, until 7th January, when it will reconvene at Blackburne House, Hope Street, Liverpool.

Statement to the Public Inquiry by RRA Chairwoman Andrea Spyropoulos:

1.1

Riverside Residents Association – formerly Riverside Action Group (appendix 1) was formed in 1992 to represent the views of the residents who live on the other side of Riverside Drive opposite the Former Garden Festival site. Any development proposal will affect them in a direct and personal nature affecting their everyday lives.

Riverside Residents Association is a fully constituted residents association with a vibrant membership in excess of 716 members we are a membership lead organisation, we have no political agenda and we are self funding via our subscription paid by members. All of our committee members and Chair are elected by the membership and work on behalf of the community on a voluntary basis and receive no payment or incentives.

When we talk about local residents we are referring to our paid up members, individuals who live directly adjacent to this development they are of course residents of Liverpool as well but any decision made regarding this site will have a direct impact on their daily lives.

1.2

We have enclosed a copy of our constitution and map of eligibility for your information. Appendix (2) and a sample agenda (appendix 3) and a news letter (.appendix 4)

1.3

This issue of the development of the site is not new to us and we have worked tirelessly to find an appropriate solution. We have on numerous occasions been ardently opposed to developments suggested for the site when we felt it was not an appropriate development. See appendix (5). There have been as many plans as sunsets for this site and we have been involved in all of them see appendix (6) for a sample

1.4

Today we are presenting the collective view of the membership which has been reached after undertaking extensive consultation with our members. The development of the former Garden Festival site has been on the agenda of every meeting since our inception.

Our AGM is open to all residents regardless of membership status and we have built on the work we began by researching what our membership thought would be an appropriate development for this site (appendix 7). In addition we conducted our own membership survey when the council distributed 9000 24 page documents to Liverpool residents in 1999 asking what they thought was appropriate for this site (see appendix (8) for the results of the research.)We also undertook further research of our own at that time using a similar data set which we then

fed into the council research appendix (9). We have constantly reacted to the views of our membership and have kept members informed every step of the way through this lengthy ongoing process. Our last meeting was an AGM in September 2007

1.5

With such a large membership it would be unusual if there was not variation in opinion however on this matter we are confident that we are representing an honest and accurate view of the vast majority of the membership. That confidence is based on the work of our committee which has spanned a 15 year period and the engagement of our members in events organised by our group and the newsletters which are distributed on a regular basis to members and periodically to all residents. We take regular soundings of members and we have an excellent representative structure. Regarding this matter we have encouraged members to write to you expressing their views and we have submitted a signed petition in support of the application.

1.6

Regarding the latest proposal we have had one written letter of opposition from Mr David Jones of Beech Avenue. Mr Jones has written to you and kindly sent me a copy of his submission. He is appearing before this enquiry as part of the save the garden festival campaign as he is not a member of RRA. We have advised him to bring his views to your attention and will make no further comment other than to say they are different to the majority view of our membership. Mr Jones has been an invited guest at our representatives meeting when he declined to join the membership because the consensus view was at variance with his own views. He also attended our AGM in September as a local resident despite not being a paid member we welcomed his views and he had ample opportunity to express them to the members present.

We have also received a verbal comment in opposition from Karen Fletcher who supports the notion of a park but nothing else in the proposal. Karen Fletcher is a local resident but again is not a member of Riverside Residents Association she was a member of Riverside Action Group the predecessor to Riverside Residents Group (see appendix 10) when we were opposing one of the developments proposed by the Wiggins Group..

We have 2 other comments in opposition from local residents which arose during our door to door visits by representatives. Those individuals' are not members of the Riverside Residents Association and they did not supply their names.

1.7

We have represented Riverside Residents Association at council meeting, meetings with our MP Louise Ellman and with local council members. (Appendix 11)

Continued on p2.

We have also engaged with a variety of groups and local committees and Liverpool City Council and developers in order to ensure we have a voice in this process. On this particular development we have had some difficulty because one of our councillors is here as an "objector" or "critical supporter" of the development and has been advising the Friends of the garden festival on procedural advice and provided any information he could obtain (see appendix 12) following this declaration we felt that there was a conflict of interest and we felt unable to trust our councillor with any information from our group regarding this development.. The other 2 councillors were on the planning committee so could not discuss the plans.

1.8

Over the past eighteen months we have had many consultative meetings with Langtree MacClean, local councillors and various representatives of Liverpool City Council. We are confident that these consultations have brought about a number of changes to the initial proposals that now make up the development application for approval. The s106 planning gain of the creation of a new park with restoration works to parts of the original festival gardens is to be particularly commended being funded purely through the new residential development with ratepayers and Council bearing none of the costs or risks.

Quite naturally our residents have had many concerns and reservations about the initial proposals particularly on four key aspects, they are:-

- Infrastructure
- Decontamination
- Over Development
- Construction Management

We offer our comments about these reserved matters.

1.9

Infrastructure

During our meeting with the Traffic Impact Survey (TIS) Consultants we were shown how the proposed modification to Riverside Drive, by way of improvements to roundabouts, left and right turn filter lanes and new pedestrian crossings, brought about a quicker flow and reduced waiting time to traffic after them having made allowances for the increased volume of vehicles generated by the proposed development. Whilst the merits of the alterations were impressive we felt that the volume of traffic was under estimated both in the number of vehicles generated by the new development and also that no consideration had been given to increased levels of traffic exacerbated by several other developments on and around Sefton Street and Riverside Drive. There was also a reliance on the City Highway Engineers carrying out improvements to the Jericho Lane/Aigburth Road junction. It was noted that TIS reviews would be carried out during different phases of the development, the first being 2011. It was further noted that the initial infrastructure works would have priority to be completed early within the construction programme.

We understand that developers often have to contribute to works in order to secure approval but we would like to point out that whilst we have been debating this particular development over 15 years there have been hundreds of planning approvals which all contribute to the increased traffic flows along Riverside Drive, the majority being through traffic. For example Greens Gym, the Chinese Restaurant, Spa, Travel Lodge, Casino, Motor Mile, Johnson's the cleaners, Speke retail development, and the Redrow housing development on Aigburth Road, John Lennon Airport expansion and the commercial Estuary Park as well as the large developments of office blocks and facilities. The redevelopment of the Dock area providing an arena with a maximum capacity of 10,126 seated and a convention centre holding 1,350 There is also a large hotel developments will all contribute to traffic flows independent of the development of this site.

There have been housing developments on the Riverside which of course generate their own traffic increase such as the Tay homes and the Herculaneum development, with Columbus Quay under construction, as well as the Quarter a combined Retail and apartment's development which are under construction.

We do not believe that this is an issue which should restrict the potential for this site. We feel this is a much bigger picture issue which the City of Liverpool has to take a strategic lead and to ensure there is a joined up approach to planning across the city.

They could start by restricting heavy goods vehicles now using the drive as a main route access into the city and HGV that park up in the lay-bys and viewing platforms. As well as the coaches who now use the drive as a parking place throughout the day.

We are not traffic experts and can offer no expert opinion but River-

side Drive has a capacity problem mainly at peak times only, the majority of the time the traffic volume is within an acceptable range.

We believe that the provision of retail may actually decrease some traffic flows as local residents will have an accessible shopping opportunity within walking distance which they do not have at present.

We feel that the enquiry should reach an informed opinion on traffic based on expert evidence not fiction and we await the results, we do not pretend to have expert knowledge on traffic flows and therefore rely on the council officers in their assessment to protect our community's interest.

1.10

Decontamination

We are all aware to some extent of the pollution that exists on the ex-landfill areas of the site. Apart from 15 years dumping of household waste the site is badly contaminated with oil, tyres by the thousand, motor vehicles and builder's rubble allegedly containing many tons of asbestos and other contaminants. We have seen no robust evidence to support the existence of asbestos on the site. For a number of years prior to the current ownership policing and management of the site was virtually non-existent. Past successful prosecutions of Builders, Waste disposal tipplers etc leave incontrovertible evidence as to the scale of previous abuse of the site.

Langtree MacCleans proposals suggest they will carry out some decontamination to the site. We are not experts but would expect planning approval to be given only if the council officers responsible for assessment of the proposals are satisfied that what is being proposed is viable and safe. Their leaving behind "long term monitoring" and "maintenance programmes" suggests a programme of working around rather than removing the contamination which may be the most appropriate solution and indeed the safest option but again we want the experts to demonstrate safety is paramount.

When the Herculaneum development was in the planning stage we had numerous people including the Liverpool Permaculture group who were the fore runners to the save the garden festival campaign presenting information regarding anthrax on the site. At that meeting Chaired by Richard Hunter members of that group were adamant that there were real health issues associated with the site development. We saw no evidence then or subsequently to support such a claim. We would not wish any individual to be put at risk and consider safety as paramount. We prefer to deal with fact as opposed to rumour and conjecture and we rely on expert evidence and examination by the appropriate authorities to ensure safety.

1.11

Over Development

A large number of local residents are commenting that the concentration of proposed dwellings-1374-represents over development for the areas involved. We appreciate the financial link between the profit attained on the residential development being also funding for the decontamination costs, the redevelopment of the park areas and infrastructure improvements. We question however whether the high density of the development as proposed is justified in order to fund the planning gains that the application encompasses. No viable alternatives have been put forward for the site that offer such prolific planning gains to the City Council

That said the view of our membership is that the development will offer a first class residential opportunity whilst delivering considerable gains to the general public in the development of the park. We are lead to believe that the number of dwellings gives the balance for the viability of the development and the long term sustainability of the park. We understand the compromise and therefore fully support the proposals.

1.12

Parking Provision

We understand the requirement as part of planning to have in place a green travel plan and we have no objections to travel schemes. However we strongly support the provision of adequate parking on site for visitors and retail shop users. The development proposal currently has one space per dwelling within the plan. We would urge that the residents have adequate car parking bays for the number of occupants with a minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling and if possible 2 per dwelling. No development thus far on the river front has sold dwellings without such provision and we believe any restrictions on this would impact on saleability. Our biggest concern is that if adequate parking is not provided there will be an overspill on to the adjacent roads and this will again affect our residents. We do not want to go down the route of resident only parking in an area that has visitors to the promenade. We are also hopeful that as technology moves forward the emissions from cars will be removed

Continued on p3.

by the development of clean fuel, the amount of research and development in this area is beginning to produce results. Regardless of that we endorse the approach taken by the developer and do not support the proposals put forward by one of our councillors.

We fully support and endorse the proposals put forward by the developer as a realistic plan for the site.

1.13

Priory Wood

This area is included in the proposal because of a request by the council to have some work completed as part of the planning conditions. Priory Wood is a direct access route to the train service. It should be vibrant and utilised extensively. The wood offers a challenge because currently very few residents will use it as an access route because the trees provide hiding points. It is an area that some women will not walk through unaccompanied. A number of residents who use the train use the park and ride facility at the next available stop Brunswick. Residents who currently use the train complain about the lack of seats on the train as opposed to any access.

There is mixed views regarding this site ranging from "it should be cleared to provide a park and ride with good visibility from the station" to "leave it to the birds." The truth is the developer has been placed in an impossible situation and will not resolve this because of the diversity of views, the proposed plan at least starts the process of management of this area. Again we do not see this as a reason to prevent the proposed development.

We warmly welcome any form of improvement to the area and feel strongly that what is proposed by the developers is an acceptable compromise on an issue that has no consensus of opinion we fully support the approach outlined in the development plan.

1.14

Wildlife

We understand the views put forward regarding wild life and green spaces and we think that the concerns are heartfelt and honest but tend to be exaggerated. 70% of the land will continue as green space providing habitat for the wild life. This is a man made area not a natural green space 25 years ago it was a rubbish dump. We have within yards, an abundance of trees in residents gardens, the wood in Jericho Lane, Priory Wood, Fulwood Park and Sefton Park are all within a short walking distance.

We believe that a 70% provision for birds and 30% for people provides due consideration to the wildlife on the site. The preservation of the current habitat has only been possible because of the vigilance of local residents; they have reported numerous fires which have been started by vandals over the years. It is only the prompt action of residents that has saved the trees from being completely destroyed by fire. We believe occupancy of the site will increase security and would alert emergency services if forest fire arose.

1.15

Improved Access & Security

We support the improved access to the promenade provided by the development opportunity and we believe that occupancy will make the promenade a much safer and secure area to visit, providing a natural policing element by the community. The improved access for the disabled from the promenade is considered essential as many people have mobility problems and making a site disabled accessible improves access for all. We understand that to achieve this there will have to be a removal of some of the trees but as there are more trees than people on the prom we would welcome a shift in balance. As far as we are aware there are no protected species of bird or plant on this site and there are no conservation orders in place. We therefore do not see any reason to deny access by the disabled in order to retain a few trees.

We fully endorse the proposals for the long term maintenance of the park and we are encouraged by the fact that at last there is now long term planning for management of the area.

1.16

Shopping Facilities

Riverside Drive residents lack shopping facilities of any description and for such large volumes of dwellings that currently exist there is a need for some low key retail we believe this scheme fulfils that need.

We fully support the proposal put forward

Summary

We are not a NIMBY group and we do not resort to "rent a mob" tactics nor trying to infiltrate organisation with opposing views. We have not lied to our members in order to get them to sign petitions and we have not used scare mongering tactics such as the closure of the prom to the public. I hope that we have demonstrated that our committee members have been in this for the long haul they have been dedicated and hard working representing with honesty and integrity the views of the majority of residents in our organisation. We know only too well the cost of having this derelict site as our neighbour with risk of being bitten by dogs left to roam freely on the site (See appendix 12 for recent evidence) and to contend with frequent visits from travellers who leave behind an enormous amount of rubbish (see appendix 13). Evidence of a history of dumping is provided in appendix 14 not just on the site but on its periphery despite there being a rubbish site within half a mile.

The local people have put their money where their mouth is. The Garden Festival site was created to pump prime regeneration. Our residents represent the reality of investment in Liverpool and its slow recovery from an economic wilderness. The people we represent had a choice 17 years ago to leave Liverpool as many did at that time. Instead they made the biggest investment that any of us make buy purchasing their home in a redevelopment zone. They are hardworking individuals who contribute to the community and want nothing more than a development in keeping with the now residential nature of the Riverside area.

We realise that we are not the only voice here and that many people because of the history of the site feel they have a stake in the sites use. The development of the Park makes it an issue for the wider population of the city but the development of the park does not appear to be a contentious issue. The main difference of opinion arises in how funding such a development can be secured. Over the 15 years we have been dealing with this we have had lots of suggestions but no money, no business plan and no deliverable options to support the suggestions of which there have been many... This is the first realistic proposal that we have seen that has a robust funding structure to deliver. There is no plan B as far as we can see this is the only game in town.

When the decision for the future of this site is taken the vast majority of you in this room will not have to live adjacent to the site. We do not have the luxury of making a decision and then retreating to the comfort of our own homes because our homes are on the old garden festival site. We have raised almost identical issues to the friends of the festival garden site campaign the key difference is we are prepared to find a solution for this site which involves compromise but never the less a workable solution. We therefore ask you subject to the conditions discussed (on safety, density and traffic) to approve this development and this will allow our members to have some certainty on the future of this site.

We believe the proposed development delivers for the local community, the wider community and the city of Liverpool creating a park that will be an asset in a prime location on the riverfront. There are 447,500 people living in Liverpool presumably they are either supportive or unequivocal about this development or they would be here today protesting they are the silent majority. Whilst we respect the opinion of the minuscule number of objectors we would be disappointed if they were able to dictate the outcome of this inquiry

To their credit the development of the site has the approval of the Council and is fully supported by the 716 members of Riverside Residents Association We could have filled this room with residents and raised banners during the site visit but we listened very carefully to the advice given on the first day and we have purposively had a very controlled number of our residents attending. We are not paid to attend and for us to have attended for the whole time would have been very costly for example my involvement for four days has cost my company in excess of £4000. We hope that we will not be disadvantaged in any way because we have chosen to be represented by a small group representative of the membership.

There is a stark choice on offer here between a derelict site and a vibrant community contributing to the city with a Riverside park located in a spot to die for. We fully support this development and hope with all our hearts that approval is granted.

Only those who will not listen or look at the facts

Continued on p4.

objectively would be stupid enough not to see the advantages of this opportunity.

That completes our case.

Andrea Spyropoulos. Chair of Riverside Residents Association.

Elected Representatives

Julie Bonner, Reg Cox, Ina Cox, Eric Cohen, Wendy Cohen, Kevin Crone, Roy Fletcher, Linda Kattou, Rosemary Kay, Peter Gerhard, Sandra MacMillan, Ken Moore, John Thompson, Peter Scott.

Sandra MacMillan

Statement of fact.

Sir I am a local resident and want to make a comment on the level of consultation regarding proposals for this site. I am amazed that any individual in this city is unaware of the proposed development. There has been unprecedented and extensive exposure to the proposed development. Both in the Liverpool Echo and Daily Post and Echo. There has also been a vast number of occasions when there has been reports on local tv and radio with numerous phone in opportunities.

There has been far ranging and exhaustive discussions at neighbourhood meeting. Every councillor has been contacted regarding the proposals and everyone has an opinion on it. There has been correspondence with local residence over a long period of time as well as meeting with the developers

There are numerous websites reporting the progress of the development proposals such as the Indymedia site at www.indymedia.org.uk reported by Ritchie Hunter as well as protestors having web sites such as www.violetmazedventures.blogspot.com

There is a fly through of the development and the full proposals available at riversidegardens.org.uk.

We know the council undertook extensive research in the area sending out 9000 documents covering over 24 pages..

As a member of the local residents association I can say with impunity that we have consulted widely with our members and our AGM is well attended.

The current developers have held over 100 information sessions and we were able to access the full planning documents which have been available to all via the planning department

We just wish to point out that any individual who wished to avail them selves of information regarding this development has had ample opportunity and scope.

We therefore have no difficulty in understanding the proposal and we fully support this planning proposal.

Sandra MacMillan.

Statement to the Inquiry on the Proposed plans of Langtree/McLean for the Liverpool Garden Festival Site, by Reg Cox.

I am Hon. Sec. of Riverside Residents Association "RRA", formerly Riverside Action Group "RAG". Riverside Residents Association represents the nearly 700 houses which border the Garden Festival Site, on the western side of Riverside Drive.

Born and raised in Wavertree, I retired in 1989 as Lecturer in Photography in the Faculty of Art & Design, John Moore's University.

In 1994, my wife and I made the biggest investment of our lives, when we bought a property in what is known as St Michael's Wood.

In the mid 50's, when I left the Royal Air Force, my wife and I settled in Liverpool 8, firstly in Percy Street and then Canning Street, where we eventually bought one of the large terrace houses, now known as the "Georgian Quarter". After retirement the house was too large for us and the gas bills were also far too high, so we looked around for somewhere more economical.

After much searching we found the "Redrow" house that is now our home. Our solicitor warned us that there may be problems with "Pleasure Island", as it had a reputation for noise and rowdy behaviour. We had a look and a listen at different times of the day and decided that, though there was a problem there, it was sufficiently far away and would not be too much of a problem. Though this was not the case for residents of properties bordering Promenade Gardens. Virtually every night, they were terrorised by mobs of drunken youths who vandalised the whole area, the glass in the bus shelters was smashed and the noise pollution was very high.

My wife and I became members of Riverside Action Group "RAG" a year, or so after we moved into St Michael's Wood and became committee members not long after that. Since December 2000 I have edited and produced the Association's newsletter "RAG Pickings".

In 2001 Wiggins, later Planestation consulted with RAG regarding plans for developing the Garden Festival Site and in September of that year Wiggins produced a plan which met with RAG's approval. One of the benefits for local residents, was that it re-routed Riverside Drive along the promenade, as it is north of the Britannia Inn, meeting up with Jericho Lane at the roundabout. This would have been much safer, particularly for the residents on Promenade Gardens, which include a group of houses for senior citizens, and for whom crossing the road to catch a bus is a case of the quick and the dead.

This proposal met with a great deal of opposition from the conservationists. or the "dicky bird lovers and dog emptiers" as they are known locally. Wiggins eventually modified their plans, but by all accounts they did not have the funds to convince Liverpool City Council that they could carry the scheme through and Wiggins sold the lease to Langtree/McLean.

At a meeting of Liverpool City Council's Regeneration Select Committee in April 2005, which was open to the public, Langtree/McLean put their scheme to the committee and, at the end of their presentation, the Chairman asked if there were any questions from the public. I put forward the concerns of the local residents and the Chairman of the Select Committee suggested that Langtree/McLean people pass their business cards to me. From then on Langtree/McLean have consulted RAG on many occasions, taking our suggestions into account and modifying their plans. They also consulted a large number of other groups.

Whilst the proposals do not meet with Riverside Residents Association's complete approval, they are an acceptable, viable plan that would restore the current eyesore to the glory of the International Garden Festival of 1984. Plus, and a big plus for local residents, there are community facilities as part of the scheme, retail and Primary Care. At present, it is a good thirty minutes walk for me to buy a newspaper. And, in fine weather, when the motor cycle riders arrive at the Garden Festival Site, it is bedlam, the noise being a constant intrusion to the peace of a normally quiet residential area.

I cannot understand why the objectors do so. They say they want a park and woodland, exactly what the scheme will provide. Admittedly at the cost of some houses and apartments, but they will fund the scheme, which will not be a charge to the Liverpool Council Tax payers. There have been objections to the traffic, but there are traffic calming measures in the scheme and, whilst many years have gone by in producing this acceptable plan, umpteen properties have been started and completed along Riverside Drive and Sefton Street. Did anyone object to that possible traffic increase problem? If they did, I didn't hear about it.

The Garden Festival Site has been a constant topic of discussion at the committee meetings and Annual General Meetings of RAG/RRA for many years and it has always been voted for in these discussions, usually by a large majority, if not unanimously. There have been a few objectors. Mr Jones of Beech Avenue is a resident in the RRA area. I had not met the gentleman until I came here last week, though I have probably pushed RRA newsletter through his door.

When Liverpool City Council approved the Langtree / McLean plans, we (RRA) settled back, thinking all was done and dusted. Then the objectors got going and in answer to the objectors petition signing activities of people walking along the promenade and visiting the Britannia Inn, the RRA committee members went round knocking on doors in the evening, asking residents of our area if they approved of the plans for the Garden Festival Site. I personally visited some sixty houses and met with only one objector to the plans. We collected 285 signatures of RRA residents, by knocking on doors when people were home from work. There were also 127 other people, non residents, who supported the scheme and, I believe RRA Chairwoman Andrea Spyropoulos has many more from non residents, that she has not submitted.

RRA is a non political organisation, nor is it allied to any political parties. Our activities are funded by members subscriptions and we cannot match the blanket leafleting that is carried out by the objectors. Who funds that production line would be interesting to know!

Continued on p5.

Some of their statements have been pure emotive fiction, e.g. "Any decisions made about this site will have a huge impact on the Prom - it could become a no-go area with construction and all sorts of toxic dust blowing around for the next 15 years!" Quote from the undated letter to Deborah Tobin, circulated by the Save the Garden Festival group.

It has been stated that RRA area residents are concerned with the Garden Festival Site because it depresses the value of our property and, to some extent, that is true, but the major concern of most of the people with whom I have discussed the Site is to get rid of the eyesore, that was once a beautiful garden and restore it in all its wonder and pleasantness to the citizens of Liverpool.

Reg Cox.

Hon. Sec. Riverside Residents Association.

TREASURERS REPORT

Your year off "holidaying" from membership fees – and my year off recording them – is rapidly coming to an end. The next news letter, Feb/Mar '08 will contain a tear off slip requesting your fees for 2008, still great value and retained at £3.00 per household.

As you are aware, our fiscal year is April – April, same as the Tax Year – so please do not make any payments till March of next year.

In the next news letter I will indicate a budget for expenditure 2008 and hopefully some ideas for distributing any excess funds back into the community.

In the meantime on behalf of your representatives have a great Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Kevin Crone

Distribution of the RRA Newsletter "RAG Pickings".

Recent editions of the newsletter have been delivered to all houses in the RRA area, some nearly 700 copies. This has been done to keep our members/residents up to date, as much as possible, keeping them informed of developments, particularly those concerning the planned development of the former Garden Festival Site.

Whilst the Association can afford the printing costs from existing funds, delivering them to all the houses in our area is a considerable undertaking, involving many hours of walking round pushing newsletters through letterboxes. This is done, voluntarily, by committee members, during their spare time.

To save time and shoe leather, it is proposed to "deliver" as many copies of future newsletters as possible electronically, using pdf editions via Adobe Reader.

Adobe Reader is available FREE at www.adobe.com/products/acrobat and allows you to read and create files in this format. Well worth having, if you do not have it already.

PDF (Portable Document Format) is a file format created by Adobe Systems Inc to enhance document exchange. Documents in PDF are independent from device and display resolution and can be read on any operating system (Windows, Macintosh, Linux). These files are a combination of vector graphics, text, and raster graphics. They support links (internal and external), forms, javascript and 3D objects. PDF documents may have different levels of encryption (view, print, select...) and even DRM.

Since the 90's, Adobe's PDF has become the standard file format for document exchange.

If you wish to receive future newsletter by email, please send a message to The Association's Hon. Sec. Reg Cox at: [<regcox@mac.com>](mailto:regcox@mac.com) and your name will be added to the list.

Beware of new car-jacking scheme.

You walk across the car park, unlock your car and get inside. Then you lock all your doors, start the engine and shift or put into reverse. You look into the rear-view mirror to back out of your parking space and You notice a piece of paper stuck to the middle of the rear window.

So, you shift the gear stick back into park or neutral, unlock your doors and jump out of your car to remove that paper or whatever it is that is obstructing your view. When you reach the back of your car that is when

the car-jackers appear out of nowhere, jump into your car and take off!! Your engine was running, you would have left your purse in the car and they practically mow you down as they speed off in your car.

Be aware of this new scheme that is now being used in Glasgow and Manchester and is making its way across the country!

Just drive away and remove the paper later! It is stuck to your Window and be thankful that you read this email. I hope you will forward this to friends and family especially to women! A purse contains all identification, and you certainly do not want someone getting your home address. They already have your keys!

I have been sent this warning and asked that it be distributed widely to alert everyone - Just be aware and take care it will probably soon arrive in your area.

Brian Molloy, Detective Constable, Force Intelligence Bureau, Strathclyde Police.

WARNING

Be on the Lookout for a Mail Scam.

Trading Standards have brought the following to the attention of Liverpool Chamber of Commerce

A card is posted through your door from a company called PDS (Parcel Delivery Service) suggesting that they were unable to deliver a parcel and that you need to contact them on 0906 6611911 (a premium rate number). DO NOT call this number, as this is a mail scam originating from Belize.

If you call the number and you start to hear a recorded message you will already have been billed £15 for the phone call.

If you do receive a card with these details, then please contact your local Trading Standards Service or ICSTIS (the premium rate service regulator) at www.icstis.org.uk

mobile phone scam!

If you receive a phone call on your mobile from any person, saying that he or she is a company engineer, or telling that they're checking your mobile line, and you have to press #90 or #09 or any other number, end this call immediately without pressing any numbers.

There is a fraud company using a device that once you press #90 or #09 they can access your 'SIM' card and make calls at your expense.

Forward pass this message to as many colleagues, relatives and friends as you can, to stop it.

Euromillions

Another scam, (That they tried with me. Ed.)

I received a letter, with Spanish stamps containing a document, that congratulated me on winning 615,810.00 Euros and to claim my winnings, I had to complete the enclosed form and fax it to a number in Spain.

I was immediately suspicious, as I hadn't entered any lotteries. I took the form to my bank and they could not help as they had not seen such a letter before. Though they did say it looked very suspicious.

I completed the form, using only the information they already had. i.e. my name and address, but no details of my bank account etc., and faxed off the form.

The next day I had a phone call from a Spanish sounding gentleman who again congratulating me. He went through a great rigmarole of numbers and then said that I would receive a phone call from the Manager of the Banco Santander in Madrid the following day.

The next day, sure enough, I had a phone call from "The Manager of the Banco Santander in Madrid, Spain", or so he said. Again he congratulated me and went through another great rigmarole, assuring me that as it was a lottery win, there was no income tax payable. However, to comply with International Law, I had to pay International Value Added Tax of £1,355.00, plus a handling fee of £75.00, before the cheque could be released to me.

I said I did not have that kind of money, I am a pensioner, with modest means. He asked me how much money I had, so I said "twenty quid". He then reduced his price, offering for the bank to pay half the £1,440 and could I send him £700.00. I said, "no way José". And after much flanneling, we ended the conversation.

I have not heard from them since. But, beware, if they come on to you. My father taught me that "You don't get owt for nowt" and he was right!

I did however enjoy playing them along and mounting up their phone bill. Reg Cox.

Subject: latest credit/debit card scam

This one is pretty slick since they provide YOU with all the information, except the one piece they want. Note, the callers do not ask for your card number; they already have it. This information is worth reading. By understanding how the VISA & MasterCard Telephone Credit Card Scam works, you'll be better prepared to protect yourself.

The scam works like this: Person calling says, "This is (name), and I'm calling from the Security and Fraud Department at VISA. My badge number is 12460. Your card has been flagged for an unusual purchase pattern, and I'm calling to verify. This would be on your VISA card which was issued by (name of bank) did you purchase an Anti-Telemarketing Device for £497.99 from a Marketing company based in London?" When you say "No", the caller continues with, "Then we will be issuing a credit to your account. This is a company we have been watching and the charges range from £297 to £497, just under the £500 purchase pattern that flags most cards. Before your next statement, the credit will be sent to (gives you your address), is that correct?"

You say "yes". The caller continues - "I will be starting a fraud investigation. If you have any questions, you should call the 0800 number listed on the back of your card (0800-VISA) and ask for Security.

You will need to refer to this Control Number. The caller then gives you a 6 digit number. "Do you need me to read it again?"

Here's the IMPORTANT part on how the scam works the caller then says, "I need to verify you are in possession of your card." He'll ask you to "turn your card over and look for some numbers." There are 7 numbers; the first 4 are part of your card number, the next 3 are the security numbers that verify you are the possessor of the card. These are the numbers you sometimes use to make Internet purchases to prove you have the card. The caller will ask you to read the 3 numbers to him. After you tell the caller the 3 numbers, he'll say, "That is correct, I just needed to verify that the card has not been lost or stolen, and that you still have your card. Do you have any other questions?" After you say, "No," the caller then thanks you and states, "Don't hesitate to call back if you do", and hangs up.

You actually say very little, and they never ask for or tell you the Card number. But after we were called on Wednesday, we called back within 20 minutes to ask a question. Are we glad we did! The REAL VISA Security Department told us it was a scam and in the last 15 minutes a new purchase of £497.99 was charged to our card.

Long story - short - we made a real fraud report and closed the VISA account. VISA is reissuing us a new number. What the scammers want is the 3-digit PIN number on the back of the card. Don't give it to them. Instead, tell them you'll call VISA or MasterCard directly for verification of

their conversation. The real VISA told us that they will never ask for anything on the card as they already know the information since they issued the card! If you give the scammers your 3 Digit PIN Number, you think you're receiving a credit. However, by the time you get your statement you'll see charges for purchases you didn't make, and by then it's almost too late and/or more difficult to actually file a fraud report.

Please pass this on to all your family and friends. By informing each other, we protect each other.

*Wishing all
Riverside Residents
a very merry
Christmas
and a prosperous
New Year
from: Chairwoman,
Andrea Spyropoulos
and all the
Committee of RRA.*

Riverside Residents Association (RRA)

RRA is run by volunteers, people just like yourself, who wish to improve the community in which we live. We aim to have a "representative" in each road who will attend the Representatives Meetings, which are held about four times a year and pass on information to their neighbours. There is also an Annual Open Meeting, when all members, and sometimes others, are welcome. This newsletter is published three times a year and it is hoped to set up a website soon.

The annual subscription is £3.00.

If you have any information concerning the area, which stretches from Jericho Lane to the CQ6 site on the river side of the MerseyRail line, please contact your nearest rep. Or one of the elected officers.

Chairwoman:-

Andrea Spyropoulos,
8 The Bulrushes, Liverpool L17 7EX.
tel: 07739 436 038

Deputy Chairman:-

Peter Gerhard, 14 Floral Wood,

Hon. Secretary:-

Reg Cox, 14 Penhale Close, Liverpool
L17 5BT. tel: 0151 727 2177
email: regcox@mac.com

Hon. Treasurer

Kevin Crone, 60 Promenade
Gardens. tel: 0151 726 0631

List of Representatives:-

The Bulrushes,
8, Andrea Spyropoulos,
4, Julie Bonner.

Camellia Court,
26, John Thompson.

Cottonwood,
34, Linda Kattou,
14, Bob Muirhead.

Floral Wood,
14, Peter Gerhard.

Gardenia Grove,
E & W Cohen, 45 Floral Wood.

Kerris Close,
10, Robert Hughes.

Moel Famau View,
7, Peter Scott.

Orchid Grove,
4, Rosemary Kay.

Penhale Close,
14, Reg Cox.

Promenade Gardens,
60, Kevin Crone.

Thistledown Close,
5, Ken Moore
7, Sandra MacMillan.

New Representatives wanted

There are several "roads" within the RRA area that do not have a "Rep".

Rep's attend committee meetings about four times a year and disseminate information to the

residents of their area and collect subscriptions.

If you live in the RRA area, are interested in your community and would like to take part in the Riverside Resident Association's activities, please contact the Hon. Sec. Reg Cox, tel: 0151 727 2177, email <regcox@mac.com>, or any of the other Rep's.

The contact details of your political representatives are as follows:

M.P. Louise Ellman, Labour Party (Riverside),
Freeport , WW2909A, Liverpool L3 4ZZ. Telephone: 0151 236 2969
Louise Ellman MP, House of Commons, LONDON NW1 1AA.

Concillors: St Michaels Ward.
Councillor Elaine Allen, Lib Dem.
2 Rosemont Road, Liverpool, L17 6BZ
elaine.allen@liverpool.gov.uk
Councillor Peter Allen, 2 Rosemont Road,
Liverpool, L17 6BZ. tel: 0151 225 2354
peter.r.allen@liverpool.gov.uk
Councillor John Coyne, Green Party.
86 Belgrave Road, Liverpool, L17 7AH
tel: 0151 727 7779
john.coyne@liverpool.gov.uk

This newsletter is Published by Riverside Residents Association, Chairwoman; Andrea Spyropoulos, tel: 07855 661 395, e-mail: a.spyropoulos@btinternet.com Edited and designed by Reg Cox, tel: 0151 727 2177. email: regcox@mac.com Articles or information concerning the RRA area should be sent to either of the above.