Approval of a Preferred Developer in Connection with the Redevelopment of Egyptian Halls, 84–100 Union Street, Glasgow and Continuation of CPO Powers.

Executive Summary – USP and USI Ltd Response

8th June 2026

Updated from Oct 2025 version and prior emails

APPROVAL OF A PREFERRED DEVELOPER IN CONNECTION WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EGYPTIAN HALLS, 84 –100 UNION STREET, GLASGOW AND CONTINUATION OF CPO POWERS.

Executive Summary – USP and USI Ltd Response (8th June 2026)

Refusal of Deputation and Fundamental Concerns on Process, Legality, and Transparency

USP and USI, as legal owners with over 28 years of direct involvement and multi-million-pound investment, were refused the opportunity to present a Deputation on the basis this had been an Open, Fair and Transparent process. This decision, alongside the evaluation outcome, raises serious concerns regarding due process, transparency, and adherence to democratic principles.

Despite extensive experience across USP/USI and their professional team, this was assessed as inferior to Ediston—an entity with no historic involvement, no LBRN experience, and no financial investment in the site. This outcome is neither credible nor consistent with the factual record.

Statutory Obligations Ignored (LBRN)

The 1991 Listed Building Repair Notice (LBRN) remains extant and legally non-variable, requiring stabilisation of all structural elements.

- GCC has not confirmed that the LBRN has been rescinded or replaced.
- The District Valuer (July 2025) confirms it remains outstanding.
- GCC has withheld detailed LBRN specifications and cost data (as recent as February 2025).

Despite this, GCC appears to have proceeded on the basis that the LBRN will not be enforced—contradicting its own long-standing position and statutory obligations.

Contradictions in the CPO Review Process

GCC has previously confirmed (2005 and 2009) that an LBRN is a prerequisite to a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO). And that an LBRN once issued is legally non variable

This raises fundamental unresolved questions:

- How can a second CPO proceed without enforcing the LBRN?
- Is the 1991 LBRN still being relied upon, and if so, why is it being disregarded?
- If rescinded, on what legal basis?
- And if still in place how can it be in effect ignored or discounted
- No legal clarification has been provided at any stage.

Unequal and Potentially Discriminatory Treatment

USP has been consistently required to comply with the LBRN, reinforced through the 2005, 2009 and the 2008 Conservation Burden and subsequent GCC correspondence. However:

- GCC indicated from 2019 that it would not require a preferred bidder to implement the LBRN.
- USP was only informed of this position in July 2025 and given minimal time to respond.
- No waiver or clarification was provided.
- This created a materially unequal and procedurally unfair position.

Flawed Evaluation and Misleading Assumptions

The evaluation relies on District Valuer reports (2019, 2024, 2025) that are materially flawed due to non-compliance with professional standards.

These flawed assessments underpin:

- inaccurate valuation and compensation assumptions
- Upper Floors significantly undervalued
- unrealistic repair and LBRN discharge costs, and
- an unjustified scoring outcome (USP: 39.3/100).

Deliverability of Preferred Bidder Proposal

Ediston's proposal has been described as "compelling" despite

- no reference to the legally binding LBRN,
- no demonstrated understanding of the actual structural condition or stability risks, and
- no credible cost basis for required LRBN or equivalent Repair works.

Given known structural issues spanning over 35 years, any claim of deliverability without full, specialist technical reassessment is fundamentally unreliable.

Funding Transparency and Ethical Concerns

GCC has not disclosed Ediston's full funding structure. The proposal includes **40% non-commercial funding that remains unconfirmed**.

- The project has required grant funding since 1996, increasing significantly by 2010.
- USP was repeatedly denied funding (2000, 2005, 2013), with confirmation in 2015 that no grant funding would be provided by GCC-HES/Scot Govt "for the foreseeable future."
- GCC now supports a grant-dependent proposal based on unverified claims of "grant expertise."

This raises critical questions:

- Has GCC withheld information on funding availability?
- Have GCC and Ediston engaged in undisclosed funding discussions?
- Why has a long-standing "no funding" position been reversed without transparency?

Process Integrity and Potential Bias

Evidence indicates:

- prior and ongoing engagement between GCC and Ediston,
- Ediston's withdrawal on viability grounds (2023) followed by re-emergence as preferred bidder (2026),
- inconsistent restrictions applied to USP but not to Ediston.

This suggests unequal treatment and raises serious concerns regarding fairness, governance, and potential bias.

Disregard of Historical Evidence and Public Safety

GCC has failed to properly consider:

- its own historic assessments e.g. Feb 2002 confirming significant public safety risks,
- its own historic stability/structural assessments 1995-2016
- independent structural reports (2000- 2024 at least 25 reports),
- evidence of LBRN discharge progress (2000, 2005, 2013), and
- four previously approved planning applications that failed due to structural, funding, or GCC-related issues.

The LBRN and Conservation Burden were established to address these risks. Ignoring them undermines both legal compliance and public safety.

CPO Appeal Legal Risk Ignored

The process fails to account for the high probability of legal challenge:

- appeal to a Scottish Government Reporter, and
- escalation to the Court of Session.
- Delays and associated costs

This introduces significant risk, delay, and uncertainty not reflected in the evaluation.

Conclusion

GCC's position is internally inconsistent, legally unclear, and procedurally flawed:

- endorsing a proposal that does not comply with an extant statutory obligation,
- relying on unverified funding assumptions, and
- failing to ensure transparency or equal treatment.

USP/USI required to operate under binding obligations others appear to have been allowed to disregard.

This calls into question:

- the validity of the CPO Review,
- the integrity of the evaluation process, and
- the fairness of the outcome.

Absent clear legal justification, statutory obligations such as the LBRN and Conservation Burden cannot be retrospectively ignored. The legitimacy of the current process is therefore fundamentally in doubt.

Can Minimal Structural Alteration be achieved? If not then approved approach requires Review

We have on record from GCC Stability, Structural, foundational issues. The cast iron frame is now not strong enough? The Roof and Rear Wall were approved for replacement 2012. The compressive strength of the floors has decreased from 100% in Year 2000 to circa 33% in 2019. Physical load tests are to be commissioned as part of the Pre-App submission with GCC. And also the expert, specialist tests are to be updated also. And if the floors individually and combined can't provide 5 Kilo Newtons of load capacity then will have to be replaced. For sure this is certainly not then "minimal structural alteration". Then there will require to be a fundamental re-think. Given GCC's plan to tie back the never, ever connected Parapet to the internal structure becomes structurally challenging to say the least. Given if GCC is intending remove the Scaffolding claiming there are no Public Safety issues.

Fundamental Questions on Ediston's Prior Involvement and Selection

Serious concerns arise regarding the transparency, independence, and integrity of Ediston's involvement and ultimate selection as preferred bidder.

Despite withdrawing from a joint feasibility study in April–May 2023 on the grounds of non-viability, Ediston re-emerged within months and was appointed preferred bidder in February 2026—now relying on significant public/grant funding (30–40%) previously denied to USP over a 15-year period.

Key Concerns

Lack of Transparency and Process Clarity

- There is no clear explanation of when or how Ediston re-engaged with GCC following its withdrawal Spring 2023 from the potential joint feasibility study citing "non viability".
- No disclosure has been made regarding the duration, nature, or extent of discussions between GCC and Ediston.
- The identity of the "interested party" referenced in the February 2025 CPO Review remains unclear.

Potential Prior Engagement and Unequal Access

- Evidence suggests Ediston may have had access to development concepts, feasibility inputs, and strategic direction originally advanced by USP and USI.
- USP and USI have never met or engaged with Ediston, nor received any formal offers for their respective ownership interests.
- Claims of an "informal offer" have not been substantiated despite repeated requests for evidence.

Questions Around Independence of Valuation

- The so-called "independent valuation" referenced in the CPO Review has not been shared with USP and USI.
- It appears unlikely that this valuation was prepared independently given GCC's direct or partial involvement in its commission
- If shared with Ediston but not with the legal owners, this represents a clear imbalance in access to material information.

Inconsistencies in Funding Position

- The project was previously deemed non-viable and ineligible for grant funding (confirmed as recently as 2015).
- It is now presented as a hybrid commercial/public funding model without explanation of this policy reversal.
- If grant funding has been explored or facilitated with Ediston, this was not made available to USP and USI.

Role of GCC and Potential Conflict

- It remains unclear whether GCC:
    - initiated contact with Ediston,
    - facilitated its re-engagement, or
    - contributed to the development of its proposal.
- If GCC had any role in shaping or supporting a commercial proposal while excluding the legal owners, this raises serious governance and ethical concerns.

Disregard for Legal Ownership Structure

- USP and USI hold separate legal interests in the property, yet no direct engagement was made by Ediston with either party.
- Development proposals appear to have been advanced without effective due diligence of title structure, legal constraints, or existing obligations (including LBRN and Conservation Burden).

Credibility of the Preferred Bid

- Ediston's proposal is described as "compelling" despite:
    - no direct engagement with the legal owners,
    - no demonstrated understanding of legal or structural constraints, and
    - reliance on assumptions inconsistent with known obligations and costs.
- The speed of proposal development (mid-2023 to early 2025) further raises questions regarding the extent of prior knowledge or support.

Conclusion

The sequence of events—withdrawal on alleged non viability grounds (2023), undisclosed re-engagement, and subsequent selection as preferred bidder (2026)—raises significant concerns regarding:

- transparency of the process,
- equality of access to information and opportunity,
- independence of evaluation, and
- potential bias or preferential treatment.

Absent full disclosure, these issues call into question whether the process has been conducted in a fair, lawful, and ethically robust manner.

APPROVAL OF A PREFERRED DEVELOPER IN CONNECTION WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT OF EGYPTIAN HALLS, 84 –100 UNION STREET, GLASGOW AND CONTINUATION OF CPO POWERS.

Purpose of Report:

To seek approval of a (1) preferred developer; enter into negotiation of terms for a back-to-back CPO agreement and to continue the of investigation of the use of CPO powers in relation to Egyptian Halls, 84 – _100 Union Street, Glasgow.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Members:

i Consider the contents of the report.

ii Note the outcome of the marketing process and evaluation of submissions.

iii Approve the selection of Ediston as preferred developer; and

iv Authorise officers to enter into negotiations with the preferred developer to agree terms for a back-to-back CPO agreement and to continue investigating the use of CPO powers.

Ediston/GCC's prior "agreement" Spring 2023 for a Joint Feasibility Study with USP and USI ignored

USP and USI have been subject to a biased, flawed and discriminatory Evaluation process? Well there's many a story of a new invention, an innovation and in this case an investment project. That is concepted (started early 1998) then progressed in Year 2000 and worked on assiduously since then notably (2008-2011 and 2017-2020. Then came the Car Free City Centre strategy announcement Autumn 20022 and the scheme became deliverable. So Mackintosh- Thomson Mews ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/opportunity.html*** was created, scoped, presented (with GCC support and endorsement Spring 2023 and was to be a Feasibility Study with support Development Appraisals for a variety of end uses).

However very surprisingly this was then cancelled as was deemed to be non-viable by Ediston. Only for just 18 months later we then have GCC attempting to chisel out the creators/owners now in collaboration with Ediston. So we're to believe these combined entities that had been presented this opportunity just 18 months earlier then decide to and seek to do the project themselves. Now this is certainly commonplace in the private sector; notably Tech/Media/Digital/Finance.

How independent was the DV July 2024 Valuation Report?

Was Ediston given sight of the allegedly independent valuation report by the District Valuer for GCBPT was both funded and facilitated by GCC and also shared with GCC based upon earlier GCC-commissioned reports 2016 and 2019 which contained material, unchecked inaccuracies. If so the definition that it's "independent" requires re-assessment.

Let's be unequivocal the pre- CPO Review selection of Ediston could breach ethical and corporate governance process and protocols if it's uncovered this was cancelled so GCC could then look to mount a 2nd CPO.. Given there is on file that Ediston were to carry out a Feasibility Study for GCC facilitated by then GCC's lead Officer and Savills Alastair Wood circa Spring 2023 (three years ago). Also GCC was to part fund along with USP an independent set of Development Appraisals. This Officer left, GCC put in place a New Officer (who lasted three months), during which GCC conspired with let's allege SCT/GCBPT/GCHT and no doubt HES to begin to develop the case for a 2nd CPO. And then it took till November to get a new Officer in place.

Does Lack of Due Diligence lead to Flawed Assumptions creating untenable decisions?

Core Clarification/ information

- Deed of Conditions Amendments mid 2017

- Mid 2017 post New Rateable Values GCC DRS (Ken Clark/Susan Connolly lobbied for these fixed % for Ground and Upper Floors to be allowed to float to then allow then current Rateable Values to be applied, which would then see the LBRN liability of 68.36% reduce to circa 54%. Therefore, the current 2008 Deed of Conditions was amended and disclosed to GCC and then registered. But as we know late 2017 GCC NDR re- assessed the then NINE separate Upper Floor Rateable Values so as to attempt to reduce Water Rates that were now to be levied to vacant Listed Buildings.

- Rateable Values Amendments – Upper Floors Jan 2018

This assessment was made and Jan 2018 the combined NINE RVs = **31.7%** became ONE RV = **ZERO%.** So, in one fell swoop the aforementioned subjective opinion of "disproportionality" (founded upon decades/centuries of commercial property RV's) became even more pronounced at **100%** Ground Floor and **ZERO%** Upper Floors.

- Does use of Deed of Conditions disproportionally burden specific areas of mutually owned buildings?

The DV does raise that this "*appear to disproportionately burden*" but fails to state that's how a Deed of Conditions works and this underpinned the scoping of the 1991 LBRN and 1996 CPO by GCC. However the LBRN discharge was **£3M**, by 2010 = **£12M**, by 2016 = **£15M**, 2019 = **£20M** and 2026 circa £25M; all caused due to grant funding rescindments and legal issues caused by GDA/HS-HES, GCC and Scottish Government. **So as Deterioration increased so did LBRN obligations caused by the public sector**. And this is very relevant and accurate

Deed of Conditions Clarification NOW shared with GCC from Ken Gerber/A.Strathern May 2021

There have been any instances of people seeking to challenge a registered deed of conditions or other deed imposing title conditions, or to have its terms varied by the Lands Tribunal – invariably a challenge would be by an existing or new owner of part of the larger entity that is affected by the deed of conditions. Given the only parties burdened by the two deeds in question in your case are USP & USI it is difficult to see any problem on this front.

Impact upon District Valuer Reports

2016 DV Report

3.3 Tenure Owner's heritable interest subject to vacant possession.

I understand that the ground and basement floors are owned by Union Street Properties Ltd (USP) while the upper floors are owned by Union Street Investments Ltd (USI). These are legally separate companies although they share the same directors and shareholders. The building is covered by a historic Deed of Condition under which repair obligations are shared between the two ownerships. Under this arrangement, the ground floor and basement units are liable for 68.3% of any repair liability despite the fact these units account for only c.32% of the total floor area. Again this was the case 2008-2016

Post 2016 DV Report

Deed of Conditions Clarification shared with GCC 21st Oct 2025 – Ken Gerber/Mitchells Roberton
If one were to download the title sheets for the constituent parts of the building, they would see that these do not make any reference to the 2008 Deed of Conditions, but they do contain the current and valid 2017 Deed of Conditions. My clients tell me they have been informed via GCC DRS that the District Valuer believes he can make certain assumptions; however, the use of Rateable Values is founded upon the use of current Rateable Values (2017 onwards), and my clients have pointed out that such is actually not an assumption but is the accepted manner of proceeding as decided and as recorded on file via the Scottish Assessors website based on Rateable Values assessed and calculated by your Council or your Council's appointed Valuation Board

GCC DRS having been advised of the changes have informed USP and USI that the District Valuer believes he can make certain assumptions? How were these arrived at only GCC and the DV can confirm? However the use of Rateable Values is founded upon STANDARD RICS PRACTICE. And it has been pointed out and reinforced to GCC several times this is not an assumption but is the accepted manner of proceeding. As decided and as recorded on file via the Scottish Assessors website based on Rateable Values assessed and calculated by your Council or your Council's appointed Valuation Board. And of course this a complex situation but pre USP's involvement there were upwards of 13 separate ownership and causal Standard Security interests.

USP via pragmatic site assembly, assiduous project Mgt reinforced by significant capital investment pared this back to single title. Which GCC was aware of Jan 2018 onwards but remarkably or not given the clear bias underpinning this approach decided to not take any cognisance. And instead created an Evaluation approach , which attempts to start this project at circa 2021-2023 onwards ignoring GCC's less than stellar track record, matched by HES and successive Scottish Govts. But when you control the levers, the use of statutory powers you can easily overlook and discount accountability, transparency, fairness. It's the SNP Glasgow way apparently as relevant mis briefed, misinformed Councillors opine on issues and aspects they have very limited comprehension of.

2019 x 2 DV Reports Inaccuracies

I understand that the ground and basement floors are owned by Union Street Properties Ltd (USP) while the upper floors are owned by Union Street Investments Ltd (USI). These are legally separate companies although they share the same directors and shareholders. The building is covered by a historic Deed of Condition under which repair obligations are shared between the two ownerships. Under this arrangement, the ground floor and basement units are liable for 68.3% of any repair liability despite the fact these units account for only c.32% of the total floor area.

Again as per earlier this was the case 2008-2016 . But again was amended in 2017 (details on Page 1) and it transformed to 100% and ZERO % respectively – see NDR Rateable Roll. And of course this a complex situation but pre USP's involvement there were upwards of 13 separate ownership and causal Standard Security interests. USP via pragmatic site assembly, assiduous project Mgt reinforced by significant capital investment pared this back to single title, which GCC was made aware of Jan 2018 onwards.

2024 DV Report (likely) Inaccuracies

I understand that the ground and basement floors are owned by Union Street Properties Ltd (USP) while the upper floors are owned by Union Street Investments Ltd (USI). These are legally separate companies although they share the same directors and shareholders. The building is covered by a historic Deed of Condition under which repair obligations are shared between the two ownerships. Under this arrangement, the ground floor and basement units are liable for 68.3% of any repair liability despite the fact these units account for only c.32% of the total floor area.

99.99 likely to be same as 2019 x 2 Reports

2025 DV Report Inaccuracies

I understand that the ground and basement floors are owned by Union Street Properties Ltd (USP) while the upper floors are owned by Union Street Investments Ltd (USI). These are legally separate companies although they share the same directors and shareholders. The building is covered by a historic Deed of Condition under which repair obligations are shared between the two ownerships. Under this arrangement, the ground floor and basement units are liable for 68.3% of any repair liability despite the fact these units account for only c.32% of the total floor area.

100% same as 2019 x 2 Reports

Again as per earlier this was the case 2008-2016 . But again was amended in 2017 (details on Page 1) and it transformed to 100% and ZERO % respectively – see NDR Rateable Roll. (App C) And of course this a complex situation **but pre USP's involvement there were upwards of 13 separate ownership and causal Standard Security interests. USP via pragmatic site assembly, assiduous project Mgt reinforced by significant capital investment pared this back to single title, which GCC was made aware of Jan 2018 onwards. Again discounted and/or ignored by GCC**

Current Situation – April 2026 Rateable Revaluation

As above If one were to download the title sheets for the constituent parts of the building, they would see current and valid 2017 Deed of Conditions and reference to the 1991 LBRN and causal 2008 Conservation Burden within. As well as how to apportion Repairs via Rateable Value apportionment.

USP via pragmatic site assembly, assiduous project Mgt reinforced by significant capital investment pared this back to single ownership (GCC on record praising this) then split the Upper Floors away so they could be a SPV to facilitate the approved hotel scheme 2012-2013. The reduction to ZERO from 31.7% is a direct consequence of the massively delayed 12 year timescale it took to secure the Upper Floors titles (2 x 50% pro indiviso) from the former owners due to GCC's unilaterally imposed CPO Amendment Feb 1998 then predicted to delay the then approved scheme by a "few months

The mystifying removal of Point 4.1 from the July 2025 GCC-DV Report

Note within the GCC-DV July 2025 report, the to date unexplained removal of Clause 4.1, which was in the 2016, 2019 x 2 and 2024 (99%) Reports and comments on a likely/potential separate Upper Floors Valuation was underpinned by GCC believing inaccurately they/ the DV had been using the correct Deed of Conditions, which is the 2017 version that is legally registered against all the relevant title Deeds. However as per these reports state at Point 3.3 the "historic Deed of Conditions" was used.

District Valuer Valuation Report July 2016 and 2019 (x2) (disclosed 9 and 6 years later)

4.1 *It should be specifically noted that our appraisal does not allow for any effects of value potentially associated with the Upper Floors being in separate ownership to the ground and basement floors or any effects associated with the repairs liabilities under the Deed of Conditions that appear to disproportionally burden the ground and basement floors (68.36% compared to 32% of floor area)*

District Valuer Valuation Report 2 July 2025

Point 4.1 DV 2016 and DV 2019 1st Report Spoiler Alert THIS WAS DELETED for the July 2025 Report- WHY? One would assume 100% this would be included. But it's not! WHY? Was it by error or by design? And if the latter on whose instruction was this deleted? And if deliberate would this breach ethical and corporate governance procedures for GCC. And also, similarly for the District Valuer given a consistent approach has been deleted summarily without any comment.

The separate value of the Upper Floors and its potential for uplift is a core component of the Upper Floors valuation. The announcement in June 2025 of the city centre Tall Buildings Initiative and e.g. the approval of a 14-storey extension development of similar scale building just 300M away in Queen Street is of relevance. And would be factored into both Development Appraisals and Valuation claims going forward, whichever is required.

Therefore the deletion of Point 4.1has to be clarified given the stated opinion for NINE YEARS the Upper Floors had a separate value. And the secondary causal issue that the Deed of Conditions causes "alleged" disproportionality but to whom? Not to the core investors who control the Standard Securities but certainly to any potential purchaser of the Egyptian Halls who has been read the GCC-DV 2025 Valuation Report.

Scottish Government Funded Asset Stripping is this to be approved?

But surely this cannot be allowed not in SNP's Scotland (or indeed Labour's Scotland or indeed the Green Party's Scotland), certainly not within SNP Scotland's flagship Council GCC. Well the truth is it's happening with the Egyptian Halls Union Street Glasgow as GCC in league with we assume HES/Scot Govt aided by SCT/GCBPT/GCHT. Have somehow persuaded Ediston to become the preferred bidder; yes the same Ediston who Spring 2023 resiled from an agreed Feasibility Study citing non viability. And instead of Ediston approaching the co-owners somehow GCC believed a 2nd CPO would be the correct approach; at this juncture this is bordering on significant maladministration

GCC has since stated March 2025 the following *At the end of March the Council served a defective buildings notice in terms of the Building (S) Act 2003 on the owners of Egyptian Halls. This sets out work which the Council considers is necessary to rectify defects in the building and bring it into a reasonable state of repair. This would also result in the removal of the scaffolding which has been located in front of the building since 2010. These repairs are necessary to prevent a further deterioration, but they are not the comprehensive and long term solution which is required to secure the future of the building.* So the latter sentence should be taken cognisance of and defined as a requirement given the believed counterproductive component which would see much of this work requiring re-done hence a Contingent Liability should be estimated.

GCC's unstinting praise of USP 199-2018- Non disclosed- Renders asset Stripping untenable

- From GCC's "Partners" Dec 1999 to (sic) Outcasts Jan 2025; the inexorable decline caused by GCC/GDA/HES-Scot Govt. Yet GCC attempting to wipe out the core investors investment.

- This is a prime example of Apples and Pears comparisons leading to the decision to award to Ediston preferred bidder status. And it's recommended this is reassessed.

- Proven, systemic LONG TERM Non-Viability has been ignored Sept 2000: Buildings at Risk Register states *Scottish Enterprise has withdrawn its offer of grant aid and Historic Scotland has reduced its; the project is unlikely to proceed*.

- Proven Delays caused by GCC April 2003, *"The CPO process adopted in this case involves compensation being determined before the Council can gain a satisfactory title for onward disposal. There is potential for a significant delay in being available for Union Street. I can understand the frustration expressed by Mr Souter. The resolution is not straightforward."*

- NB these are Public sector caused- surely Public Sector takes on the consequences. Why then is USP and USI being blamed, discriminated against, denied access to Councillors

- Jan 2010 GCC acknowledges USP has reconciled the 12 year title transfer impasse, which GCC predicted Feb 1998 would take only a "few months"

- GCC has advised the DV the legally binding 1991LBRN does not require to be assessed, it's not referenced within the Evaluation particulars so Ediston have not considered this.

- The Evaluation Process has not considered fully the massive cost, elongated timescales and causal public safety consequences of discharging the extant 1991 LBRN.

- The Evaluation process has ignored GCC's, HES's and a raft of independent Valuation commentary that discharging the 1991 LBRN is non-viable. GCC has all this on record.

- GCC NRS in an email to MSP Robison stated USP and USI had submitted a detailed and robust proposal but that gets hammered by Ediston who have no project knowledge e.g. unaware of the legal requirement and costs to discharge the extant 1991 LBRN.

- USP and USI have been penalised for taking full cognisance legally binding statutory obligations and then explain because of this there requires to be a holistic architectural review based on expert assessment and which will influence significantly end uses and timescales and costs. Anything else is pure guesswork!

- **GCC NRS have not considered the on record prima facie proof of GCC'S unstinting, non-facilitated praise of USP e.g** ***the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and on completing development appraisals for potential end uses.***

- GCC has discounted the building has two separate valuations. And the 2016, 2019 and 2024 Reports had raised the probability of a significant, separate Upper Floors valuation. So it was deleted for the 2025 DV Report as it would negatively impact the CPO Review given any back to back buyer would have to guarantee funding this. Ediston's submission does not reference this. There is unequivocal proof the scheme has been delayed since Year 2000 due to causal legal, grant funding and non-viability issues, which combined to prevent any scheme being delivered.

1 Introduction

This report seeks the approval of a preferred developer for the repair, repurposing and future active re-use of Egyptian Halls, 84-100 Union Street, Glasgow. This process forms part of the investigation into the use of CPO powers in respect of the property. As the recommended preferred bidder does not own the property, these investigations will now progress to the next stage.

And this is a prime example of premeditated propaganda when one (GCC) seeks to blame others (USP and USI) for what it and GDA/HES/Scot Govt created but are obviously unwilling to reconcile the consequence of. And for an independent opinion log to the acerbic musings of the late, great Professor Gavin Stamp; Greek Thomson's greatest champion ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/The-EgyptianHalls-HeritageLobbying.pdf***

For confirmation GCC have been in receipt of Development appraisals since 2008 from a raft of leading, highly respected Chartered Surveyors who also all used legally registered Deed of Conditions and the current Rateable Values. It knows the Upper Floors has a significant and even greater potential valuation uplift. It also know USP will claim to the Scottish Govt that GCC should compensate USP's significant expenditure (see further on) that did not deliver due to public sector actions all on record.

2 Background

2.1 On 6th February 2025, a detailed (13 page brief summary does not include significant and material information) **report was brought to this committee, which approved the investigation of the use of CPO powers in respect of the property at 84-100 Union Street (Egyptian Halls).** Please assess at f/cover, Page 2 and the Executive Summary Pages 3-14 ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/3001-2026CPOReviewResponseDoc.pdf***

This included approval to seek proposals for the repair, repurposing and future active re-use of the property, and the development of an open, fair and transparent process, aligned with statutory tests, with which to assess proposals.

It's certainly not a fair and transparent process and GCC are ignoring legally binding agreement and the extant 1991 LBRN . GCC were also provided with a detailed Response document March 2025, which was updated July and Dec 2025, Jan 2026 and now May 2026 as more and more discrepancies, non-disclosures, misrepresentations were uncovered. GCC have been asked to confirm its position, which we expect will lead to an immediate complaint to the SPSO, Scottish Government and potential request for a Judicial Review. For the record to repeat this was therefore not the open, fair and transparent process as claimed by GCC Committee Chair when denying hearing a deputation 3rd Feb 2026

2.2 Following approval of that report, the Council began a marketing process via Ryden which invited proposals from the open market for the repair, repurposing and re-use of the property.

An approach, which fails to reference there is an extant, legally non variable 1991 LBRN to discharge, which was then reinforced even enshrined by the GCC 2008 created, legally binding Conservation Burden. This is a deliberate omission by GCC. Given the scope and scale of the LBRN requires circa £20-£22M to be spent. With the Ground Floor properties due 100% and the Upper Floor properties due ZERO%. An astounding situation to repeat caused by GCC, GDA, HS-HES, then GCC/Scottish Govt all detailed in ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/3001-2026CPOReviewResponseDoc.pdf***

And if so the Evaluation Process has issues to consider as this extant, legal requirement has massive cost and public safety consequences. GCC also fails to reference this in the Feb 2025 CPO Review Report. And GCC has also stated since the approval of the Feb CPO Review that the legally binding 2008 Conservation Burden will be rescinded once the CPO is approved.

Therefore it's still legally binding LBRN but apparently being ignored by GCC and not detailed in either the CPO Review Report or Evaluation Report; another material omission. On what basis does GCC believe it can ignore its own LBRN and also own Conservation Burden.

Further none of the following was taken cognisance of

2nd CPO Appeal Complexities

- GCC approve a 2nd CPO - Appeal Process begins
- GCC-Scot Govt have to prove USP 1998-2026 and in parallel USI 2010-2026 have allowed the Egyptian Halls to intentionally deteriorate

a) Scot Govt Reporter assesses and 2nd CPO request is refused- GCC then has to accept USP and USI have not been responsible for circa 46 years of deterioration

b) GCCs request approved; Court of Session appeal 99% certain

c) Timescale 3 years+,

d) Funding' USP and USI and GCC and Scot Govt allocate scarce resources very ineffectively

Downside Summary

- Significant Delays
- Costs increase 40%+,
- Deterioration increases exponentially
- Demolition founded upon known for 25 years Public Safety issues becomes a live option
- Scaffolding cannot be removed until Public Safety is guaranteed

Statutory Notice Primacy/Deed of Conditions

- LBRN served on building 1991; circa 13 ownership interests
- Now reduced to single ownership then co-ownership co-ordinated by common investors
- Neither USP nor GCC can't vary the legally non-variable 1991 LBRN (on record from GCC)
- USP is 100% liable when Deed of Conditions is applied for Statutory Repairs
- USI has Zero liability when Deed of Conditions is applied for Statutory Repairs

2008 Conservation Burden

- GCC created the 2008 Deed of Conservation Burden, which both GCC and USP signed
- GCC is on record stating this was enshrined into the Deed of Conditions April 2014
- GCC can't amend the 2008 Deed of Conservation Burden; it has no locus to do this
- USP can amend the 2008 Deed of Conservation Burden by application to the Lands Tribunal
- Deed of Conservation Burden specifies TMP as the architect to discharge the 1991 LBRN
- GCC wishes to ignore the Burden as the TMP/WRD provided expert advice, GCC refuses to accept.
- Conjecture: GCC is ignoring what was designed to preserve a Grade A architectural masterpiece because GCC cannot accept conservation structural/architectural advice from it specified experts.

1996 CPO Failure; caused by Public Sector 1M%

- Failed when GDA and H. Scot derailed the brilliant Year 2000 100% Conservation scheme
- Failed again due to a GCC unilaterally imposed believed to be vvv minor CPO Amendment Feb 1998 predicted to cause a ***"few months delay"***
- USP reconciled what then became a 12-year legal impasse; GCC failed to disclose why this was!
- GCC on record praising USP for this and its causal development activities/investment

The Egyptian Halls has had FOUR approved but failed Planning Applications – Can there be a FIFTH?

There is unequivocal proof the scheme has been delayed since Year 2000 due to causal legal, grant funding and non-viability issues, which combined to prevent any scheme being delivered

- 1997 - approved (without expert conservation structural advice) and would remove cast iron frame, causing collapse. A CPO Appeal was then made, prompting a CPO Amendment.
- 2000 - brilliant 100% Conservation scheme, CPO appeal reconciled. What could go wrong? GDA/HS rescinded grants, derailing the scheme and payoff for former owners.
- 2005 – Reapproval of Year 2000 scheme, held up before and for next 7 years by CPO Amendment's non-predicted consequences
- 2013 - CPO Title issues reconciled by USP, 100% (P 20-21) Conservation scheme approved, which was agreed to be funded pre-application. GCC/HES then failed to fund (on record)
- 2014/2015 – GCC endorse HLF grant application (P 29-30). GCC/HES meet HLF to state no grant funding would be on offer therefore torpedoing a £5M HLF grant application
- 1997-2025 GCC's CPO failure see a scheme increase in cost from £3M to £25M (Page 33)
- Jan 2026 USP and USI are being punished for TELLING THE TRUTH! And have had their Evaluation marked down.

Pre- App lodged

UPDATE In an attempt after 45 YEARS to facilitate a deliverable solution! A Pre-App has been submitted and validated 13th Jan 2026 **GCC Application Ref: 26/00052/PRE**

SITE: Egyptian Halls 92 Union Street Glasgow

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of Egyptian Halls behind a retained and restored façade to deliver mixed-use development comprising a range of office, residential, hotel, retail, leisure uses

Material Omissions from CPO Review Process/ Recommended Preferred Bidder process by GCC
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/2003-2026 Material Omissions from CPO Review Process.pdf

Firstly Is Public Safety being ignored! based on GCC's own correspondence it looks 99% likely

Feb 2002 GCC advise *"You may be aware that there was* ***a potentially fatal building collapse*** *in the City Centre in October 2001 "The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern. This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter* FYI the legally non variable LBRN states ***"stabilise all elements of the supporting* (whole) *structure"***

GCC March 2008 - *I recall that the original investigation found this material to be very weak to the extent that some of the attempted cores could not be obtained because they fell through when they started to core the concrete.* ***The addition of any loading onto the existing foundations would have to be very carefully considered*** *and independent foundations for new elements may be a less risky option.*

GCC DRS - Dec 09: *In terms of the "floors" i.e. the concrete infill, in my opinion, that has never been entirely safe to walk on anyway. If you recall when they tested the material, some years ago (circa 2000), some of it was unable to be cored and fell through onto the floor below. It is clear from the original construction that it was never intended for that purpose anyway;* ***however, its continuing security/stability is indeed an issue.***

TMP - Aug 09: "*You have seen our last report/animation. The building's stability is dependent on the inter-relationship of so many elements. Increasing distress in one element compounds the risk for the rest, and all move towards failure. Not until well into their decay will these elements show any outward signs of distress. The reality is, however, that the decay is well embedded, and it cannot be reversed. This building is very close to the point – if it isn't already there, recovery is then not an option*."

GCC April 2014 states to the Herald ***The conditions of the Listed Building Repair Notice were enshrined in the Deed of Conditions ;*** this would be via the 2008 Conservation Burden, which has the objective of is to discharge the incumbent, extant LBRN.

Addison Conservation Nov 2014: "***Standing on the scaffolding with only an hour of background reading and then handing out suggestions is unprofessional and incompetent***. *Regarding the overall frame, we might sympathise with a Building Control statement based on the old adage that if it looks stable, it is stable. But this is a dangerous assumption set against a potentially wobbly matrix of 1000001 chemically interacting components, including lime concrete, wood, nails, iron, steel, rivets and iron lathes.* ***We have used radar, boreholes, probes and stone analysis to help us understand!"***

GCC Feb 2016 ***https://www.glasgowtimes.co.uk/news/14285327.warning-over-calls-for-egyptian-halls-facade-to-come-down/*** ***The proposed works on the Egyptian Halls will both preserve this building and promote public safety – always our greatest priority*** *- by making the building weather tight and arresting the rate of its deterioration. "These works are considered urgent for the building's preservation, and entirely unrelated to future work on Union Street*

WRD - Dec 2019: *The building is now in an unsafe condition, structurally unpredictable, primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure, with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences, with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings. Key decisions now need to be made. While these decisions may be a difficult compromise for some parties, it is no longer possible to leave the building in its current condition.*

Without doubt these are all consequences that had led to major Structural Report 2008 (on file ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/Egyptian-HallsStructuralSurveyGlossaryYear2000-2023.pdf*** **(**apparently nobody at GCC has any idea of the existence of this chronology of studies). **Scaffolding has been and still is the only cost effective method to protect public safety until the extant 1991 LBRN is discharged or New Build is approved and implemented? Yes/No?**

And can it be reinforced GCC created the 2008 Conservation Burden to enshrine this requirement, confirmed this in 2010 and also 2014 yet appears 2019 onwards to have ignored/forgot as its advised all its external professionals it won't be implemented or another LBRN won't be served despite GCC stating an LBRN is needed for a CPO. And of course GCC has provided no confirmation that it's rescinded the 1991 LBRN or is attempting to rescind. Is this a material error. And why was USP and USI not advised similarly to the District Valuer (5 Reports), Narro Associates (2 Studies 2018 and 2025), Ryden (2025 Marketing), Ediston (approved preferred bidder 2023-2026

GCC VOLTE FACE 2019-2025 given the LBRN is legally non variable, is needed for a 2nd CPO and has to be discharged fully to protect public safety against a *"potential fatal building collapse"* And GCC *enshrined it into the Deed of Conditions* via the GCC created Conservation Burde

- **2005** GCC's on record advice states an LBRN is a pre-cursor to the submission of and potential approval of a Listed Building CPO. And that it's non variable once served

- **2009** GCC's on record advice to USP re-states an LBRN is a pre-cursor to the submission of and potential approval of a Listed Building CPO. And that it's non variable once served.

- **2010 GCC state *that we acknowledge and accept that Union Street Properties("USP")*** *acquired title on a voluntary basis to the whole subjects of the CO by direct negotiation with and payment of agreed price to the owners of said subjects**, and have granted a deed of conservation burdens in our favour***

- **DV March 2019 1 Report -Point 3.3 Tenure** *For the purposes of this valuation, **I am to assume that GCC will not act upon the existing LBRN and is unlikely to serve an LBRN in the future.***

- **DV March 2019 2 Report -Point 3.3 Tenure** *For the purposes of this valuation**, I am to assume that GCC will not act upon the existing LBRN and is unlikely to serve an LBRN in the future.***

- **DV 2024-** we assumes this is the same, casts massive doubt on independent valuation that an offer in excess of was refused by USP and USI

- **DV July 2025 Report- Point 3.3 Tenure** *For the purposes of this valuation, **I am instructed to assume that GCC will not enforce the Listed Building Repair Notice.***

Potential Ramifications based on significant LEGAL Inconsistencies

1. If what GCC stated 2002 -2014 is legally binding and COMPETENT. Then what it stated 2019-2025 is NOT COMPETENT.

2. GCC has not as we are led to believe legally rescinded or attempted to rescind the extant, legally non variable 1991 LBRN. And for either has not informed USP or USI.

3. GCC has not as we are led to believe legally rescinded or attempted to rescind the extant, legally binding Conservation Burden into which it enshrined the LBRN. And for either option has not informed USP or USI prior to the CPO Review process

4. Given USP or USI were then not briefed as per the DV, Ediston, Narro is this bias, discrimination against the legal owners and in parallel preferential treatment being awarded to Ediston

LBRN Discharge Cost not considered by GCC or Ediston

This is either disingenuous or just a failure to update the clutch of DV Reports, which have not post 2018 checked the relevant title deeds. And we'd like to believe it's the latter but it's still means all assessments post Jan 2018 have used an out of date Deed of Conditions coupled with inaccurate RV's

Also GCC have been given LBRN discharge costs since 2010 all the way up to Feb 2025 as briefed and detailed by GCC's Conservation Burden architect, which has as at its core as described by GCC "Listed Building Repairs Condition have been enshrined into the Deed of Conditions.

And of course further on you'll get more reinforcement of the fact that GVV the District Valuer, Narro Associates, Ryden's are using wrong, inaccurate, out of date information, which have not been founded upon RICS Standard Practice. And therefore is the essence using wrong documents and wrong inputs leads to massively untenable assumptions

The LBRN that GCC "enshrined" in the Deed of Conditions via the Conservation Burden is now costed at circa £20M-£22M. However this is when the costs are apportioned due 100% by the Ground Floor properties, with a valuation of circa £2M-deficit of leads to a deficit of circa £18M-£20M. This was not factored into the various DV Reports 2019-2025. So it was not briefed by Ryden either. This also casts material doubt on the provenance of the Feb CPO Review Report.

USP LBRN Discharge Confirmation Proof 2000, 2005 and 2013

GCC somehow state "no proposals have been submitted for the past five years". And ignore their own on record assessments of non-viability and failure to collaborate openly and honestly. And are attempting to ignore FOUR previous approved Planning Applications, which failed for structural reasons (1997), funding and legal reasons (2000 and 2005) and 100% grant funding (20130 see as follows

DV Report 2016 *3.8 "The Council have confirmed that implementation of the planning permission granted would satisfy the LBRN mentioned above"*

So proof this was to be discharged and would have been but for the GCC failure to fund what it promised pre-application. Or the approval of extra storeys; from 2 to 4 or even 2 to 3 storeys would have seen this project delivered 13 years ago. Note the primary reason the extra storeys were not approved was due to both GCC and HES stating they would affect the visual perspective of the Lighthouse; now let that sink in the conservation of and return to commercial sustainability of the Egyptian Halls and the wider regeneration of Union Street was sacrificed so as to not impinge on the view of the Lighthouse Viewing Tower. As fundamental an example of dysfunctional management structures and zero joined up Govt.

Grant Funding Open bias, discrimination, ethical challenges

GCC and HES and Scot Govt also knew the project had always needed grant funding since 1996 **(£1.335M** was awarded) by 2010 had all stated it was non-viable but did nothing. Apart from May 2015 hand in hand met with the HLF to state no grant funding would be available for the foreseeable future. Yet today based on the GCC-GCBPT DV Report/ briefing **grant funding of up to 40% of project costs is maybe/ likely/definitely to be secured; blatant attempts at asset stripping led by GCC** assisted unwaveringly by HES/GCBPT/SCT – tacitly by Scot Govt but will move to "strongly supporting" no doubt post coming election.

LBRN Discharge Cost not considered by Ediston – is its proposal therefore materially flawed?

Whether it's the current LBRN (that GCC "enshrined in in the current Deed of Conditions via the Conservation Burden) or a replacement LBRN or an amended DBN the works required have to be scoped, planned, delivered and funded. The LBRN that GCC "enshrined in the Deed of Conditions via the Conservation Burden is now costed at circa **£20M-£22M** with a valuation of circa **£2M**-deficit of **£18M-£20M+.** The Upper Floors are worth circa **£3M+ .**

Ediston appear to have founded upon the DV 2024 and 2025 Reports . That said Ediston failed to assess and reference the registered Title Deeds, which detail the 2017 Deed of Conditions and the existence of the LBRN and Conservation Burden and how Repairs are apportioned by application of current Rateable Values. All of which when combined would have seen a more accurate development proposal, which take account of the actual structural condition and the requirement for a holistic architectural/structural review including assessing all elements of the supporting structure supported by specialist and physical load testing to confirm what scope and level of works is required. And then that would be costed and from that end uses can be evaluated and valued leading to a clutch of Development Appraisal options.

The LBRN that GCC "enshrined is now costed at circa **£20M-£22M** as per specification by GCC's Conservation Burden architect with an estimated valuation of circa **£2M**, which creates a deficit of **£18M-£20M.**

Flawed Comprehension of actual Structural/ Architectural position means project costs are massively underestimated

The Addison/TMP and WRD surveys reinforce potential/probable/actual Public Safety issues

- The floors are circa 33% of the required commercial strength and cannot be used/walked upon safely.
- The massive dead weight Parapet is balanced atop the structurally weak façade and is not tied to the floors or structure.
- Therefore, Nov 2019 a protective Crash Deck was designed and constructed as a safety feature should the parapet move forward onto the scaffold.
- The Roof requires to be replaced
- The Rear Wall requires to be replaced
- For a visual reinforcement of this, use this link ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page17.html***

Given the inexorable increase on construction costs, will increase significantly once the actual architectural/ structural position is known e.g Ediston is unaware of the following as GCC have not disclosed this. Further if one skims the following and then factors in the deleterious state of the Upper Floors; 46 years of increasing and accelerating deterioration; the fact the floors are too dangerous to walk on ***https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/26005126.14-storey-office-block-glasgow-turned-259-student-flats/?ref=glasgowbell.co.uk***

*Planners at Glasgow City Council have approved an application which will include the partial demolition of a building on Cadogan Street. Over 250 student beds will be made available across the 14-storey block. Plans stated the owners believe the existing seven-storey building "underutilises an important city centre site". The application added that the building, constructed in 1989, would need "**considerable investment to improve the energy performance of both the external envelope and mechanical-electrical plant in line with modern occupier sustainability requirements".** It stated the "**cost of such upgrades are not balanced by prevailing market conditions and rental values in Glasgow". A 14-storey development, retaining the "substructure and perimeter walls" of the existing building, was proposed.***

DBN implementation – Counterproductive Reversal costs not factored in

GCC has since stated March 2025 the following *At the end of March the Council served a defective buildings notice in terms of the Building (S) Act 2003 on the owners of Egyptian Halls. This sets out work which the Council considers is necessary to rectify defects in the building and bring it into a reasonable state of repair. This would also result in the removal of the scaffolding which has been located in front of the building since 2010. These repairs are necessary to prevent a further deterioration, but they are not the comprehensive and long term solution which is required to secure the future of the building.*

So the latter sentence should be taken cognisance of and defined as a requirement given the believed counterproductive component which would see much of this work requiring re-done hence a Contingent Liability should be estimated e.g.

GCC July 2025 DV Report states *In 2016, GCC estimated the cost of the Defective Building Notice works - essentially safety compliance works relating to the facade - to be in the region of £150,000. The BCIS All-in Tender Price Index shows an increase in build costs of c.46% between 1Q2016 and 2Q2025 This would inflate the £150,000 figure to c.£220,000 however I would adopt a figure of £250,000 to allow for additional costs since that time (equivalent to an added contingency allowance of c.13.5%* **so let's go for £300k as of today- maybe £500k, maybe £1M**

DBN states For the front elevation to Union Street various works lets guess **£500k**

8. Stabilise the distorted parapet wall and associated stone cornice below – sure that's been costed separately but we're advised as submitted to GCC numerous times; this is almost impossible to achieve but GCC believes it can be done based on no conservation, accredited expert assessment apart from Building Control's well regarded general Structural Engineering capabilities= **cost £ several £M at least**

Hardies Feb 2021 Costs

Union Street façade works item 1,650,000.00 1,650,000.00 – March 2021 now guesstimated to be **£2.8M based on Feb 2025 estimate**(specified by TMP-scheme architect also GCC's specified Conservation Burden architect)

WRD (Draft)1&2 Combined Study July 2024 Section 12 Temporary Works NOTE 6 "***Any intrusive fixing for temporary tied methods must be acceptable and agreed with HES. No long lasting/further damage to the façade will be acceptable***". We do not surmise HES are aware fully that the DBN Repairs will not be Gold Standard Conservation quality

Now if GCC's budget is circa **£1Mk** for the whole DBN then compare that to circa **£2.8M** just for the façade repair and Windows for the LBRN or equivalent specification

And if the DBN ends up costing **£1M+,** then that's counterproductive and therefore requires additional costs further down the line. Then that affects the USP/USI proposals as well as the Ediston funding proposal; who knows maybe their project needs much more than 40% NON-COMMERCIAL funding, which USP has stated is needed for now 16 years (**FYI USI has a development surplus and has never needed grant funding, therefore has never applied for it)**

And it would be even more counterproductive if after all its "proven" the Scaffolding cannot be removed founded upon historic GCC detailed Public Safety issues after this DBN has been implemented.
For expert assessment of this read the following from GCC's specified 2008 Conservation Burden architect. Described as follows by GCC Feb 2016 *The Council acknowledges that George Morrison and John Addison have considerable experience, expertise and knowledge of this building.*

TMP persona non grata at GCC because TMP won't change advice to what GCC wants it changed to; ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/TMP-ExpertStatementAppendices-GCCMarch2025DefectiveNotice.pdf***

So given Ediston have provided no budget figures, given if they had they would not include the aforementioned. Its challenging in the extreme to view the Ediston proposal as anything other than highly conditional, significantly under specified, therefore massively underestimated in terms of cost and timescale; the claim that there is a deliverable proposal requires objective, expert assessment, which GCC NRS does not have in house.

Given GCC have confirmed the conditions of the Listed Building Repair Notice were enshrined in the Deed of Conditions via the Conservation Burden

To repeat GCC can't ignore the legally binding position to suit its own purposes e.g. CPO Review/Preferred Bidder Report whilst in parallel holding USP and USI to these obligations. Hence we reinforce the Pre-App is to discharge the LBRN via whatever structural/architectural options would emerge and so back to this objective for TMP/WRD- Savills

To reach the position where the unique cast iron frame is to be replaced the following has had to have been implemented as recommended by WRD/TMP (GCC 2008 Conservation Burden specified architects) Alongside the works to restore the building's structural integrity a full holistic architectural feasibility study should be commissioned to develop a concept design for the building conservation project.

There are now key decisions that will need to be taken as a result of the structural investigations. Whilst these decisions may be a difficult compromise for some parties, it is no longer possible to leave the building in its current condition" It is anticipated that a further piece of work, "Volume 3" of Will Rudd reporting will be required. "Volume 3 will capture any physical load testing works on the structural fabric, with the proposals recorded and their results presented and interpreted. This testing will ultimately determine the viability of a development option where conservation is championed above all else.

This has to be developed within the parameters of the 1991 extant LBRN, which is legally non variable as well as the known for 30 years grant funding support requirements due to proven non viability.

Valuation Errors by GCC and/or District Valuer- Material Flaws; have to be reconciled

And Ediston appear to have founded upon the DV 2024 and 2025 Reports, which (as well as 2019 x 2 Reports) ignore the legal position, statutory Notice position, Cons Burden position and RICS Standard Practice and how Repairs are apportioned by application of current Rateable Values. All of which when combined would have seen a more accurate development proposal, which actually attempts to take account of the actual structural condition and the requirement for a holistic architectural/structural review including assessing all elements of the supporting structure supported by specialist and physical load testing to confirm what scope and level of works is required. And then that would be costed and from that end uses can be evaluated and valued leading to a clutch of Development Appraisal options. If we ever meet Ediston we'll make these points and it's over to them and their partners ; GCC/GCBPT/SCT/GCHT and HES/Scot Govt to adhere to the implementation of legally non variable statutory Notices and Title Burdens. **And given it's been non-viable to discharge the LBRN since 1996; how can it be viable in 2026; thirty years later. Aha it needs grant funding!!! Aha GCC-HES/Scot Govt stated 2010-2015 this was not an option for a) the foreseeable future b) a commercial project**.

Have all Public Safety Issues been considered by Ediston?

Further we assume (95%-99.99%) the Ediston proposal has taken no cognisance of known Public Safety issues to USP/USI via studies/reports dating back to 2000 up to July 2024, which have also been assessed for competence and veracity by GCC's Conservation Burden specified architect but GCC has discounted this expert advice and instead attempt to re-shape the narrative to suit their purposes. However we have uncovered GCC's own assessments 1995-2015, which have a) been lost b) misfiled c) ignored as none of this is reflected in either the 2018 or 2025 Narro Associates Conditions Surveys. GCC require to explain this and why they have failed to take full cognisance of known Public Safety issues. Again a question for how effective were the internal management structures 2011-2025!?

3 Site Survey and District Valuer 3.1 As part of the process, an updated structural fabric condition survey was undertaken, and an associated digital survey laser scanning of the property was carried out with reports being provided to the Council in May and June 2025. The full survey information was made available to all interested parties. The survey enabled the Council to note defects in the property.

All accomplished in under TWO HOURS! And in parallel GCC has decided to ignore the substantive chronology of studies co-ordinated by the GCC specified Conservation Burden architect – The Morrison Partnership e.g. the 2015 Joint Structural Survey

http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian Halls Structural Survey Glossary Year 2000-2023.pdf

GCC LBRN Volte Face- Is it Legal to ignore an extant Statutory Notice without replacing it?

This is a very strange, perplexing approach given the following

- **GCC has reinforced an LBRN is needed for a 2nd CPO; confirmed by correspondence 2005 and 2009.**
- **GCC has reinforced the LBRN Legal Non-Variability; confirmed by correspondence 2005 and 2009**
- **GCC has reinforced it created in 2008 a Conservation Burden and persuaded USP to accept this and it was integrated into the Deed of Conditions; confirmed by correspondence 2010**
- **GCC reinforced the importance of this Conservation Burden by stating it had *enshrined* the LBRN into the Deed of Conditions via this; confirmed by correspondence 2014**
- **GCC in 2012 correspondence and also via DV 2016 correspondence confirm the LBRN would be satisfied by the delivery of the approved planning application.**
- **Previously the approved 2000 and 2005 schemes would also have discharged the LBRN.**
- **GCC 2019-2026 are apparently unaware of all this as have advised 2019-2015 *For the purposes of this valuation, I am to assume that GCC will not act upon the existing LBRN and is unlikely to serve an LBRN in the future.*** (Four DV Reports, Two Narro Reports and Ryden Data Room all have materially flawed components)**.**

Further, these **burdens** are referenced in the title deeds for N0 84, 88,96, 100 and Upper Floors via No 92 but for an as yet non disclosed reasons were never reviewed accurately by the DV or Narro or Ryden.

And as confirmed to lawyers GCC has never advised USP or USI of any changes as if they had then the Deed of Conditions- Conservation Burden would have had to be reviewed and revised accordingly.

So, have GCC been implementing a legally flawed strategy based on assumption? Whilst both USP and USI in parallel have been attempting to follow their inalienable legal obligations? If so? It does as stated many times now render the CPO Review process as being "under review" also.

There is frequent use of Cut and Paste between the various DV Reports 2019 (twice), 2024 and 2025 as it would appear that different Officers were involved for each report and knowledge gaps then developed and were never corrected; LBRN related, Deed of Conditions related, failure to adhere to RICS standard practice.

So given the aforementioned why has GCC stated since 2019 that the incumbent LBRN will not be implemented or the FACT however it's defined massively fundamental structural- stability, façade, parapet, floors, walls, stairs, windows remediation or replacement is required. The idea that "minimal structural alteration" can be achieved is now impossible. It was possible 26 years ago via the approved Year 2000 scheme but GDA/HS-Scot Govt and GCC combined to derail that possibility.
And given Leader Aitken stated last week re CPO's "***But they are legally challenging and they are expensive as well, so there is a lot that is beyond the reach of the council.***"

And to repeat here's a few specific examples of GCC's on record correspondence, which GCC 2023-2025 are apparently unaware of? But incontrovertible proof GCC had expressed there were identified public safety concerns from let's be clear 24 years ago. "*You may be aware that there was a potentially fatal building collapse in the City Centre in October 2001. "The general condition of the building overall is much deteriorated and an immediate cause of concern. This situation will only worsen if the full repairs package as per the terms of the extant Listed Building Repairs Notice, are not effected before the onset of the next winter.*

And of which the 1991 LBRN has a key requirement as follows *repair or otherwise stabilise all elements of the supporting structure, where necessary, leave in a wind and watertight condition; all works urgently required for the preservation of a listed building and to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning"*

WRD - Dec 2019: *The building is now in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable, which has primarily caused by deterioration of roof and upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure, with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences, with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings. Key decisions now need to be made. While these decisions may be a difficult compromise for some parties, it is no longer possible to leave the building in its current condition.*

SAVILLS - Sept 2021: "*Once the Council has had the opportunity to consider this second-stage Building Condition Report, all parties will need to engage in a grown-up discussion and agree on practical steps and timescales to secure a long-term future for the building. It is envisaged there will be a requirement for third party review and verification of all matters given the serious state of the building and the depth of funding support and timescales that will be involved to recoup any public monies that might be deployed in the short term to help provide a long term future for the building largely vacant for so many years".*

WRD 1 & 2 Combined (Draft) - July 2024: *Designed by world-famous, Alexander 'Greek' Thomson in 1871, one of his most celebrated remaining completed works which has unfortunately deteriorated significantly due to a lack of intervention over the previous 40 years and has now reached the point where appropriate measures need to be taken to save the building from being lost forever through material deterioration that is beyond feasible recovery.. Elements of the structural fabric are now considered to be in an unsafe condition and structurally unpredictable which has primarily been caused by the deterioration of the roof and the upper floors from continued water ingress over a prolonged period of time, and the fundamental lack of robustness in the structure with the potential for a trigger event to cause a structural failure which could have serious consequences with the risk to public safety and damage to surrounding buildings.*

July 2024 - TMP details why combined Conservation/Construction/Costs (and Public Safety) have to be taken full cognisance of; therefore ruling out Temporary Works as being counter–productive (note TMP are the GCC 2008 Conservation Burden specified architect and have been for 17 years).

3.2 An updated valuation was also carried out by the District Valuer; this was also made available to all interested parties. As detailed earlier please log to *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/2701-2026-UPDATED%20Response%20E-Halls%20DV%20Valuation%20Report-9th%20July%202025.pdf*

For the record all DV Reports fail to reference the LBRN is legally non variable, or that GCC "enshrined" the LBRN into the 2008 Conservation Burden. And GCC have stated on record an LBRN is a pre-cursor to a CPO; which begs the question how can GCC secure a 2nd CPO if they're a) not enforcing the incumbent LBRN b) not seeking a new LBRN

District Valuer Valuation Reports July 2016, 2019 (x2), 2024 (disclosed 9 years later)

4.1 *It should be specifically noted that our appraisal does not allow for any effects of value potentially associated with the Upper Floors being in separate ownership to the ground and basement floors or any effects associated with the repairs liabilities under the Deed of Conditions that appear to disproportionally burden the ground and basement floors (68.36% compared to 32% of current floor area* **inaccurate 2018 onwards when It became 100% and ZERO%.**

GCC- DV should clarify the mystifying removal of Point 4.1 from the July 2025 Report

	LBRN Cost	G. Floor	Upper Floors
2016 LBRN Apportionment	**£15M**	**£10.25M**	**£4.75M**
2019 LBRN Apportionment	**£18M**	**£18M**	**£ ZERO**
2025 LBRN Apportionment	**£22M**	**£22M**	**£ ZERO**

Since Jan 2018 £6M+ of LBRN costs were transferred from the USI Upper Floors to the USP Ground Floor properties. Based upon the application of settled Deed of Conditions practice.
To repeat GCC of course references the use of the Deed of Conditions but uses the wrong version and Rateable Values. GCC has had these FACT for SIX MONTHS but has refused to engage or discuss.

Repeated Inaccurate opinion based upon Visual Inspection/ Desktop analysis - no Specialist Testing

Given the continuing misinterpretation and inaccuracies stated and repeated by influential stakeholders who are unable or unwilling to accept the actual reality caused by 45 years of accelerating and unchecked deterioration e.g Scottish Civic Trust still state this from Feb 2020 *"An independent structural assessment has been carried out by a conservation-accredited structural engineer who has found the building's structural integrity to remain intact, and whilst remedial works are required, the building's structure provides no major barrier to the future use of the building".*

https://www.saveegyptianhalls.com/condition

The challenge being this is dangerously misformed and was not actually stated in the report it references. And ignores the advice and recommendations from the canon of studies commissioned by GCC's 2008 Conservation Bond. specified architect The Morrison Partnership (TMP) via Addison Conservation and now Will Rudd Davidson (WRD). ***That the Narro May 2025 Report uncovered Defects*** (of course it did NOT they've been apparent and developing since 1980-yes for 46 years; check the Buildings at Risk Register. And here's a direct quote ***From our last full structural survey conducted between March and July in 2018, and our further site visits in February 2020, November 2023 and now May 2025, the building does not appear to have deteriorated significantly.***

This is incredibly germane as given WRD, TMP and now Narro Associates disagree with GCC currently re a) rate of deterioration b) when it occurred ergo certainly not the last FIVE- SIX YEARS! And c) GCC on record 1995 onwards regarding this and again it's all on these links

Evidence of Continuing Deterioration starting 1980 - yes 46 years ago not less than a year ago!

Deterioration Timeline 1980-2022
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/Deterioration%20Timeline%201980-Oct%202022.pdf

LBRN Discharge Visual Aide Memoire
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/E-Halls LBRN Repairs Aide Memoire-June2023.pdf

Public Safety is Paramount - Is GCC track record denial and diversion from assessment?

GCC now has to take full cognisance of its own Feb 2002 assessment confirmed that there were significant Public Safety issues that a full LBRN discharge was required this is 24 years ago. GCC never actioned this. And by the time the title delay (12 years) was reconciled. And a major structural survey was the carried the scaffolding used for this was agreed to be kept in place until a scoped and funded scheme could be delivered. This never happened and the Scaffolding has been protecting public safety ever since. GCC of course had denied this 2015 onwards but had obviously overlooked it's Feb 2002 assessment.

So to repeat to claim visible Defects have been uncovered Dec 2024 to May 2025 is disingenuous; just skim the following and again why has GCC decided to ignore the advice on Conservation/Construction/Cost and Public Safety of its Conservation Burden specified architect

http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/TMP-ExpertStatementAppendices-GCCMarch2025DefectiveNotice.pdf

3.2 An updated valuation was also carried out by the District Valuer; this was also made available to all interested parties

For the record material flaws detailed to GCC 10th -12th July 2025 After assessment the significant errors / omissions contained within that study were noted in detail to GCC July 2025 but SIX MONTHS later GCC continue to found upon what is clearly not an accurate Valuation Report; wrong Deed of Conditions, out of date RV's used and no clear clarification the LBRN- Conservation are legally binding currently. GCC's belief it can rescind both is not relevant to the current process and therefore should be discounted fully. Or indeed GCC should have stated this to allow USP and USI the same brief as Ediston and other interested parties. Further GCC's own correspondence states the LBRN is legally non variable and was enshrined into the Deed of Conditions via the 2008 Conservation Burden.

Deed of Conditions Clarification shared with GCC 21st Oct 2025 – Ken Gerber/Mitchells Roberton
If one were to download the title sheets for the constituent parts of the building, they would see that these do not make any reference to the 2008 Deed of Conditions, but they do contain the current and valid 2017 Deed of Conditions. My clients tell me they have been informed via GCC DRS that the District Valuer believes he can make certain assumptions; however, the use of Rateable Values is founded upon the use of current Rateable Values (2017 onwards), and my clients have pointed out that such is actually not an assumption but is the accepted manner of proceeding as decided and as recorded on file via the Scottish Assessors website based on Rateable Values assessed and calculated by your Council or your Council's appointed Valuation Board

Deed of Conditions Clarification NOW shared with GCC from Ken Gerber/A.Strathern May 2021

There have been any instances of people seeking to challenge a registered deed of conditions or other deed imposing title conditions, or to have its terms varied by the Lands Tribunal – invariably a challenge would be by an existing or new owner of part of the larger entity that is affected by the deed of conditions. Given the only parties burdened by the two deeds in question in your case are USP & USI it is difficult to see any problem on this front.

And at the Lands Tribunal GCC must then succeed in re-writing accepted Commercial Property processes because it accepts there is a Deed of Conditions for the Egyptian Halls but has used the wrong Deed of Conditions for the 2019 (x 2), 2024 and 2025 Reports. In a nutshell this is an error because one assumes "cut and paste" 2016- to 2019, and then 2019-2024 and then 2024-2025. But now we've been informed of this "error". We've decided to just ignore that and stick with the now inaccurate split as it poses potentially fundamental issues the CPO Review including the Evaluation Report

As an update further omissions regarding the previous GCC 2016, 2019, 2024 studies were detailed 27th January 2026, including misrepresentation of the potential Upper Floors Valuation.
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/2701-2026-UPDATED%20Response%20E-Halls%20DV%20Valuation%20Report-9th%20July%202025.pdf

4 Marketing of the Opportunity

4.1 Following a procurement process, the Council selected Ryden to act as agent to facilitate the marketing of the opportunity on the open market; the marketing commenced on 24.7.25 with a closing date set for 17.10.25.

4.2 Over the marketing period, Ryden received over 20 notes of interest asking for access to the data room where relevant information, including a development brief, was made available.

4.3 Additionally, interested parties were provided with the Evaluation Framework to be used by the Council to assess and select a preferred proposal and developer.

Spoiler Alert And very surprisingly NOT! Ediston who resiled from an agreed Feasibility Study Spring 2023 citing Non Viability now return as preferred bidder. And also act for GCC's Pension Fund what a coincidence indeed; surely all ethical and corporate governance protocols were adhered too.

Also fails to include a weighting for GCC's on record unstinting praise of USP

June 2004 GCC Econ Dev Report

• USD re-secured the grant funding from Historic Scotland, which had reduced the offer of grant for the scheme from £990,000 to £250,000.

• Union Street Properties negotiated the grant offered back up to £930,000 for the scheme.

• USD also brought about the withdrawal of the objection to the promulgation of the CPO by the upper-floor proprietor of the building."

July 2010 has GCC's on record in correspondence to the Culture Minister ***the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and completing both option and development appraisals for a variety of potential end uses***

2011-2013 Heads of Terms in place for both an operator and 4 star franchise- Accor Hotel 13 years ago. Ediston have ZERO!!! And will need to pay market/development value for their proposed Upper Floors hotel with 2 or 4 or more storeys extension

May 2013 *Dear Mr Souter, Thank you for your kind invitation to visit the Egyptian Halls. I have been kept fully informed of your progress* ***and am delighted that your team has now secured Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent as the next milestone in your plans to redevelop the building.*** *Officers from the Council have visited this building on many occasions, as have those from Historic Scotland****, and I have been briefed by them on the work you have done. Unfortunately, I'm unable to attend a tour at this point but I look forward to your team bringing the building back into a viable new use, which I'm sure, will complement Union Street and the surrounding area***. Councillor Gordon Matheson Leader of the Council, 22/05/2013

Fundamental Q? So on what basis is GCC evaluating USP and USI's track record of achievement that of course GCC itself is on record praising Yet an interested party with a) 1% track record, no proper cognisance of the actual structural condition, has access only to materially flawed Valuation Reports yet gets 77.5/100 compared to USP and USI 39.5/100

May 2015, Bailie Cameron in a letter to Shadow Culture Minister Baker ***"As the property recession took hold the project became unviable."*** **So GCC is highlighting this impact and is NOT blaming the Egyptian Halls owners.** Unlike now, a decade later, it's now alleging, based on discounting all evidence it's been provided, that it apparently does not the depth of files USP has to hand.

- Fails to disclose April 2015 when GCC and HES informed the HLF that there would be no grant funding provided therefore torpedoing a £5M grant application (P 29-30).

- Fails to include a weighting for GCC's acknowledgement of unrivalled expert knowledge of TMP.

- Fails to reference the extant legally binding non variable 1991 LBRN, estimated to cost circa £20M as of Feb 2005.

- Fails to reference this £20M cost is 100% apportioned to the Ground Floors

- Fails to reference the correct, legally registered Deed of Condition

- Fails to reference USP /USI Track Record and experience of FOUR approved applications

And USP/USI got 39.3/100 given none of this was taken cognisance of; as astonishing as its perplexing.

ANOTHER FUNDAMENTAL FLAW

Q? Why was USI not marked separately given it has the separate ownership of the Upper Floors, has a significant surplus, does not need grant funding, has been prevented from developing it's project since 2010; primarily due to GCC and HES causing massive non viability.

Why did GCC assume it would be a combined title?

Why did GCC and Ryden not interview USP and USI as it appears to have afforded Ediston this access? And did Ediston meet any Councillors as part of this process directly or indirectly via GCC ciphers ; GCBPT/SCT/GCHT?

Ediston Track Record – Project Comprehension of inherent Complexities; remains unclear.

Ediston have no clear idea of the existence of the legally non variable 1991 LBRN and the Repairs Apportionment as per the Deed of Conditions and of what needs actually done structurally, never been in the building, relying on a desktop survey but seek to replicate the 2013 approval and just projected a deliverable timescale, unaware of the legal obligation that there's an extant LBRN to be discharged circa £20M by the Ground Floor properties.

Coupled with the fact the DV 2019 (x2), 2024 and July 2025 Report are wrong so envisaged Valuation scenarios are untenable but somehow got 79.5/100; from GCC the primary entity that caused this farrago. This is comparable to week this is to knowing the house is on fire and the solution is to ask the people who lit the fire to extinguish it. Note GCC are fact blaming the owner of the house for being in effect far too trusting.

Again if a CPO Appeal is needed then the *"deliverable timescale*" is of course what it is; highly conditional, very problematic and dependent on GCC somehow not being blamed for the failure of the 1996 CPO; how this proposal was approved is open to significant conjecture. GCC NRS, Building Control, Legal and Councillors must all just believe each other with no objective assessment to return to Councillor Bell back to the comfort of "marking your own homework"

Costing/Scheduling Knowledge Gaps

Given the objective of both preserving the Listed Building and returning it to commercial sustainability then one assumes the scheme works are undertaken in phases. The works can be split in three sections as follows: -

A. Works required to comply with Planning and Listed Building Consent and LBRN or equivalent
B. Additional works required by Building Control and the Fire Safety Department.
C. Works required to return the building to an acceptable commercial standard.

Given the inexorable increase on construction costs, will increase significantly once the actual architectural/ structural position is known e.g Ediston is unaware of the following as GCC have not disclosed this. Further if one skims the following and then factors in the deleterious state of the Upper Floors; 46 years of increasing and accelerating deterioration; the fact the floors are too dangerous to walk on ***https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/26005126.14-storey-office-block-glasgow-turned-259-student-flats/?ref=glasgowbell.co.uk***

*Planners at Glasgow City Council have approved an application which will include the partial demolition of a building on Cadogan Street. Over 250 student beds will be made available across the 14-storey block. Plans stated the owners believe the existing seven-storey building "underutilises an important city centre site". The application added that the building, constructed in 1989, would need "**considerable investment to improve the energy performance of both the external envelope and mechanical-electrical plant in line with modern occupier sustainability requirements".** It stated the "**cost of such upgrades are not balanced by prevailing market conditions and rental values in Glasgow". A 14-storey development, retaining the "substructure and perimeter walls" of the existing building, was proposed.***

So no significant project Knowledge, no funding in place, no idea of the actual Deed of Conditions, no idea of the LBRN obligations but got 77.5/100 truly remarkable and those that scored are now in line to be Eurovision Song Contest judges

Potential Scottish Government Intervention Mediation/Collaboration

Recent correspondence Oct 2025 from Scottish Ministers via Mr Harry Bickel – PARD *As we have stated in our previous correspondence, we would recommend that all efforts are focused on looking to future and securing a positive future for the site. We are not concerned with apportioning blame for the delays of previous development efforts and we are unable to conduct reviews of legacy issues*. With regard to Glasgow City Council's current work around the new CPO for the site and the possibility of a role for the Scottish Government as mediator or arbiter between USP/USI and the council, where land is to be compulsorily acquired under the Planning Act, Ministers have a statutory role in deciding whether the Compulsory Purchase Order should be confirmed.*

(* Of course, any appeal of any 2nd CPO would see the FM's Office have to disclose what GCC briefed it on May 2004 and given we have the evidence ; 100% GCC did not disclose the existence of the 1998 CPO Amendment and that this caused GCC to breach the Dec 1999 CPO Contract with USP causing a then 12-year delay; now 27 years. Skim to f/cover in a nutshell is it acceptable to not tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth to not only Scotland's then First Minister and also GCC's own Councillors; ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/3001-2026CPOReviewResponseDoc.pdf*** All on record GCC have a massive task developing a stateable case to explain this whilst also blaming USP! And of course we have 5000+ email and letters on file

And given the SNP is on Glasgow's side- Time to Slice the Gordian Knot and save the Egyptian Halls via P&C Mediation/Collaboration - then no need for a 2nd CPO- No Delays the following has been submitted to both the Union Street Corner Recovery Initiative and the core political parties; SNP, Labour, Greens as of 1st May 2026

http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/The Egyptian Halls-How Mediation-Collaboration reconciles a 46 YEAR IMPASSE.pdf

4.4 The Evaluation Framework consisted of five categories, with each category carrying an agreed weighting. The five categories were as follows:

Strategic case - Clear proposal for adaptive re-use of the building that addresses the objectives

An LBRN is required for a CPO according to GCC correspondence 2005 and 2009. And if still the case then this Evaluation Framework requires a complete reassessment whether it's the incumbent LBRN or a replacement. Either or has to consider the actual structural condition.

Further the fact Ediston have been led to believe only "minimal structural alteration is required" is manifestly inaccurate given the Narro 2018 and 2025 Conditions Survey are founded upon desktop assessments/visual surveys with no specialist testing. And are not remotely comparable to the Addison/TMP/WRD studies/surveys Year 2000 -2024, which a) GCC are on record praising b) include detailed specialist testing

e.g ***We have used radar, boreholes, probes and stone analysis to help us understand!"*** WRD' Dec 2019 Study both updated and expanded the specialist testing and were to test the floors to see if they can still be retained and at circa 33% compressive strength; very challenging.

Further USP has been refused grant funding since 2010, see below and on record for 16 years.

USI does not need any grant funding and never has; so why is it being conjoined with USP?

It's USP that has 100% of all Repairs; LBRN, DBN, DBN + extras or a new LBRN.

GCC definitely does not comprehend the actual realities hence from the outset the Strategic case is materially flawed. And further if it's disclosed that GCC has been working with or indirectly with Ediston or its agents then that is bordering on serious discrimination? And may even be a breach of corporate governance processes.

Weighting 50% - Case assessed against 5 sub-criteria each scored out of 10 producing a total score out of 50. **Can we be provided with what the sub criteria area?**

Commercial case - Clear commercial case for the proposal including a Development Appraisal and viability assessment.

Further the fact Ediston have been led to believe only "minimal structural alteration is required" is manifestly inaccurate. The actual structural condition has to take full cognisance of and factored into cost estimates. The fact GCC have on file LBRN costings briefed and assessed by GCC's specified 2008 Conservation Burden architect but have a) ignored b) discounted is as astounding as its perplexing. The LBRN discharge or equivalent will costs £20M-£25M.

And until a holistic architectural/ structural review is implemented no one knows if the cast iron frame can be retained given the floors are circa 33% of the compressive strength required and also the Rear Wall requires to be replaced as does the Roof. Therefore no competent Development Appraisal could be developed as the costs are not known, **see earlier Costing/Scheduling Knowledge Gaps**.

Further the GCC-DV July 2025 Valuation Report because it did a cut and paste from previous DV Reports undervalues significantly the Upper Floors due to using the out of date Deed of Conditions , which had changed in 2017. Therefore the development value of the Upper Floors is underestimated. Further the DV Reports 2016, 2019 (potentially 2024) also had references to a separate Upper Floors value. This clause was removed from the 2025 Report. And when one assesses that clause 4.1 now and applies the actual Deed of Conditions

USP is to make a significant claim for compensation based on a) being GCC's Partners b) being duped by these partners but also c) praised for a significant investment by these same Partners d) praised in correspondence to the Scottish Govt and e) praised by GCC's then Leader mid 2013. So given all this how can four approved schemes failing due to funding and legal issues be blamed wholly on USP and also confusingly also USI?

Weighting 20% Case assessed against 5 sub-criteria each scored out of 4 producing a total score out of 20. **Can we be provided with what the sub criteria area?**

Economic case - Clear plan for ensuring the economic viability and impact of the proposal.

USP has stated until the actual structural condition is confirmed, no scheme can be developed for costing and in parallel end use. USI's plans have been for an Hotel since 2008 and still are today similar plans. And USI has a development surplus, which between them GCC and the DV due to error have failed to comprehend 9thJuly 2025 onwards; the day after the DV Report was issued. GCC despite this massively significant error have decided to ignore RICS Standard practice by failing to rectify an error dating back to October 2017.

Ediston have somehow accepted all that was provided and apparently without effective due diligence regarding Valuation, Ownership Repair Obligations, assumed the legally non variable LBRN does not have to be discharged, ignored the actual structural condition in preference to a "wishful thinking" assessment that "minimal structural alteration can be achieved in tandem with ignoring the estimated LBRN discharge costs; in a nutshell have not done the following

Deed of Conditions Clarification shared with GCC 21st Oct 2025 – Ken Gerber/Mitchells Roberton

If one were to download the title sheets for the constituent parts of the building, they would see that these do not make any reference to the 2008 Deed of Conditions, but they do contain the current and valid 2017 Deed of Conditions. My clients tell me they have been informed via GCC DRS that the District Valuer believes he can make certain assumptions; however, the use of Rateable Values is founded upon the use of current Rateable Values (2017 onwards), and my clients have pointed out that such is actually not an assumption but is the accepted manner of proceeding as decided and as recorded on file via the Scottish Assessors website based on Rateable Values assessed and calculated by your Council or your Council's appointed Valuation Board

Weighting 10% - Case assessed against 4 sub-criteria each scored out of 2.5 producing a total score out of 10. **Can we be provided with what the sub criteria area?**

Financial case - Clear financial case for the viability of the proposal. **Again double standards have been applied given USP has been told this since 2010**

Proven Non Viability caused by grant funding and legal errors

- Jun 2010: The GCC Econ Dev Report states, "*There is therefore no prospect of the project proceeding without external funding support.*"

- Aug 2010: HS Head of Grants Martin Fairley - "*However, I have made my position clear: the project as it stands is not viable*."

GCC/HES torpedo £5M Grant Application

- May 2015 *We have discussed the project with both Glasgow City Council and Historic Scotland. Our conclusion is that there is no realistic prospect of you receiving funding from either of those bodies, or from the Scottish Government, in the foreseeable future. The proposal submitted to us is therefore not viable.*

So what were Ediston briefed by GCC? Given Ediston have a proposal approved which states 40% Non-Commercial Funding can be sourced? Now if any is from GCC-HES/ Scot Govt directly or indirectly then that's a case of unequivocal bias and discrimination

Weighting 10% - Case assessed against 7 sub-criteria each scored out of 1.4 producing a total score out of 10. **Can we be provided with what the sub criteria area?**

Management case Clear project management plan for the delivery of the project.

Ediston have very limited scheme implementation knowledge 10% max!
Gibert Associates- minimal knowledge based on visual tours and desktop assessment
David Narro- more than minimal but massively below the comprehensive knowledge WRD/TMP have
Others ???

USP and USI's core team experience

Firstly USP and USI have in place for 28 years CC's specified 2008 Conservation Burden architect, And February 2016 GCC stated :"The Council acknowledges that George Morrison and
John Addison have considerable experience, expertise and knowledge of this building
Project to be co-ordinated by Savills using skillset of WRD (four reports in seven years) with the added integration of Page & Park. Cost Cons

To repeat USP and USI's Track Record- GCC's praise of USP apparently just discounted?

June 2004 GCC Econ Dev Report

• **USD re-secured the grant funding from Historic Scotland,** which had reduced the offer of grant for the scheme from **£990,000 to £250,000.**

• **Union Street Properties negotiated the grant offered back up to £930,000 for the scheme.**

• **USD also brought about the withdrawal of the objection to the promulgation of the CPO by the upper-floor proprietor of the building."**

Jan 2010 GCC acknowledges USP has reconciled **the 12 year title transfer impasse,** which GCC predicted Feb 1998 would only **" *delay the scheme for a few months".***

July 2010 GCC wrote to Culture Minister Hyslop as follows: "*As you may know, the Council has been working with USP Properties, the owners of the magnificent grade A listed Egyptian Halls building in Union Street, Glasgow, for many years in order to help them bring the building into a single ownership and, having achieved this, to bring forward suitable proposals for the refurbishment of the building for an appropriate productive use* ***and the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and on completing both option and development appraisals for a variety of potential end uses.*** *We have now reached a very critical stage in these discussions whereby there is a clear, but very time-limited, opportunity to secure the development. The challenges to do so remain formidable.*

The Council is now extremely concerned that this development may not proceed for a number of reasons, including the likelihood that the failure to fill the current funding gap will almost certainly mean the prospect of securing the development in the foreseeable future would be lost."

May 2013, *Dear Mr Souter, Thank you for your kind invitation to visit the Egyptian Halls. I have been kept fully informed of your progress* ***and am delighted that your team has now secured Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent as the next milestone in your plans to redevelop the building.***

*Officers from the Council have visited this building on many occasions, as have those from Historic Scotland**, and I have been briefed by them on the work you have done. Unfortunately, I'm unable to attend a tour at this point but I look forward to your team bringing the building back into a viable new use, which I'm sure, will complement Union Street and the surrounding area***. Councillor Gordon Matheson Leader of the Council, 22/05/2013

Ediston's Proposal

When actually assessed there appears to have been minimal Due Diligence YES/NO?

a) LBRN is legally non variable and the works required cannot be overlooked whether LBRN, DBN or replacement LBRN
b) Unaware of the massive stability/structural-public safety interconnected issues to be reconciled
c) Unaware of the Deed of Conditions obligations
d) Unaware of the Repairs Apportionment by Rateable Value changed Oct 2017
e) Unaware of the actual separate legal ownership between Ground Floor and Upper Floors
f) Unaware the Upper Floors has a significant stand-alone Valuation
g) Unaware Ground Floor will lodge a massive claim for compensation citing GCC- Scot Govt errors, mistakes, misrepresentation

Again any management plan is clearly predicated on "minimal structural alteration" being able to be achieved, which is impossible. Therefore all costs are massively underestimated. As are any projected timescales. Further this ignores the 99.99% certain the following

- GCC approve a 2nd CPO - Appeal Process begins
- GCC-Scot Govt have to prove USP 1998-2026 and in parallel USI 2010-2026 have allowed the Egyptian Halls to intentionally deteriorate

a) Scot Govt Reporter assesses and 2nd CPO request is refused- GCC then has to accept USP and USI have not been responsible for circa 46 years of deterioration

b) GCCs request approved; Court of Session appeal 99% certain

c) Timescale 3 years+,

d) Funding' USP and USI and GCC and Scot Govt allocate scarce resources very ineffectively

Downside Summary

- Significant Delays
- Costs increase 40%+,
- Deterioration increases exponentially
- Demolition founded upon known for 25 years Public Safety issues becomes a live option
- Scaffolding cannot be removed until Public Safety is guaranteed

Weighting 10% Case assessed against 8 sub-criteria each scored out of 1.25 producing a total **Can we be provided with what the sub criteria area?**

4.5 Each submission would therefore achieve a total score out of 100 by aggregating the combined score achieved for each category.

4.6 During the process, the closing date was pushed back by ten days to 27.10.25 to allow all parties more time to submit their proposals. No time was allowed for USP to secure clarification that the LBRN they were advised by and reinforced by GCC for 27 year was legally non variable, had been "enshrined by GCC into the Deed of Conditions and was now according to GCC somehow now NOT LEGALLY NON VARIABLE AND NO LONGER ENSHRINED INTO THE DEED OF CONDITIONS. But of course GCC did not brief USP and USI regarding this despite briefing this since mid 2019 to the District Valuer, GCC Councillors, Heritage Groups and of course Ediston

Given Ediston apparently have been granted a relaxation that is not legally confirmed; some would say a very unfair one. As they did not have to take account of the specified Repairs obligations and the costs of implementing these specified Repairs obligations either via the LBRN or the equivalent. No matter what it transfers to the essence of the LBRN "stabalise all elements of the supporting structure where necessary" has to be delivered to protect public safety

5 Evaluating submitted proposals.

5.1 At the closing date submissions were received from

LPT/Lola Ltd

USP/USI (the current owners) and

Ediston.

For the record GCC claim in CPO Review USP and USI refused Edison offers but never received any, have never met. GCC refuses to amend the record to confirm this.

5.2 Each submission was assessed against the Evaluation Framework.

Ediston **ZERO Track Record, see earlier**

USP and USI

5.3 The evaluations were carried out by officers from NRS teams including Planning and Heritage, Economic Development and Property Asset Management.

This is as surprising as it's perplexing given the on record 28 years of errors, non-disclosure (F/c CPO Response), misrepresentation, fundamental knowledge gaps, lack of understanding of the actual building, it's ownership structure, the failure to have applied accurate Rateable Values, the failure to apply the actual registered Deed of Condition. All of which if applied properly renders the July 2025 GCC-DV report as

a) requiring revision

b) untenable and requiring revision.

So one of the primary entities that caused this farrago is assessing how to reconcile but without assessing it's pivotal contribution and instead blames the co-owners and attempts to asset strip building's latent value and wipe out their proven SEVEN figure investment over 28 years.
Scottish democracy needs to have a look at itself here! We aim to lobby the new Scot Govt to instruct an objective Review. **And not GCC continuing to be allowed to mark its own homework.**

Also what is the individual and combined track record of those "evaluating"? What experience do they have of the following, which GCC is on record praising USP and USI

- **Site Development**
- **Site Acquisition**
- **Securing Commercial Funding for the significant expenditure**
- **Re-securing rescinded grant funding (bizarre rescinded by HES)**
- **Developing and submitting Structural/Architectural Studies**
- **Developing and submitting Development Appraisals**
- **Developing and submitting Planning Applications**
- **Sourcing and securing end use for Upper Floors 4 star hotel 2010-2015**

And if no definable, legitimate experience how can they individually and combined evaluate the proposals received?

5.4 Following the independent evaluations, each party's aggregated score was _ calculated by adding the score received by the party for each category. This resulted in one party having scored substantially higher than the other two.
Again based upon subjective assessment coupled with an unwillingness to accept what the actual structural condition, Valuation issues and therefore the causal combined consequences have not been taken proper cognisance of.

6 Scoring and Recommendations

6.1 The combined average scores for each submission were as follows:

6.2 Officers used the Evaluation Framework to assess and score submissions against the weightings of each category. They carried out their assessment and scoring independently. At the end of the comparison exercise, the average score was taken forward.

And to repeat what was the experience/track record. What previous projects had they done this for? And do they have the structural/architectural/valuation/legal combined knowledge to do this effectively?

6.3 The submission from Ediston proposes the redevelopment of the building for mixed uses including leisure and hotel use. In fact a virtual copy of the approved 2013 scheme. And then ask why was this scheme not delivered? USI had its funds in place, Heads of Terms for a 4 star hotel and was combining to achieve a single title but GCC failed to deliver

The proposal retains the listed building and would include minimal alteration to the structure.

Apparently GCC does **NOT** "concur with" the **FACTUAL** and **ACTUAL** structural condition developed over 28 years Proven Deterioration – Structural Engineering Chronology, agreed as accurate by the GCC specified Conservation Burden architect; is GCC ignoring what it does not want to hear or read about.
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian Halls Structural Survey Glossary Year 2000-2023.pdf

Evolving Structural Changes from 100% Conservation to Façade Retention; Cultural Chaos

- **1997: GCC/HS approved the removal of the cast iron frame, would have caused Demolition. minimal structural alteration DEFINTELY NOT achieved".**

- **2000: brilliant TMP/Add Cons 100% Conservation scheme retains cast iron frame; "minimal structural alteration achieved".**

- **2013: Another brilliant TMP/Add Cons scheme, but now the cast iron frame is structurally too weak, so structural cellularisation is developed by passing the cast iron frame. "minimal structural alteration achieved".**

- **2026-2027- TMP to work on the only realistic option: Façade Retention, which then means the unique cast iron frame is lost. And of course "minimal structural alteration NOT achieved".**

Historic Environment Scotland Independent Current Commentary ***We are aware of the structural condition of Egyptian Halls, as described in the engineering reports by Will Rudd Davidson. We recognise that significant investment is required for structural and fabric repairs and conversion to a new use."*** HES 17th Feb 2025 **And for "significant investment" one could add by deduction "much more than "*minimal alteration*"**

GCC commissioned Narro Conditions Survey May 2025 "***Any refurbishment programme would likely involve strengthening and repairs of the main structure, a new roof, complete replacement of internal finishes to the upper floors and a comprehensive restoration programme of the main façade. Additionally, the structural integrity of the rear elevation has been questioned.***

It should be noted that "minimal structural alteration" would have been achieved for the approved Year 2000 scheme but 26 years on it's now structurally impossible to repeat

Structural Conclusions from GCC specified Conservation Burden architect – ignored by GCC

- **The floors are 33% of the required commercial strength cannot be used/walked upon safely.**
- **The massive dead weight Parapet is balanced atop the structurally weak façade and is not tied to the floors or structure.**
- **Nov 2019 a protective Crash Deck was designed and constructed as a safety feature should the parapet move forward onto the scaffold.**
- **The Roof requires to be replace as does the Rear Wall requires to be replaced**
- **Watch this and decide if "minimal structural alteration" can be achieved based on discharging the extant 1991 LBRN *http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/E-Halls LBRN Repairs Aide Memoire-June2023.pdf***
- **Which of course would be clarified/confirmed by the recommended holistic architectural Review recommended by WRD since July 2023 and endorsed by of course still currently GCC's 2008 Conservation Burden architect.**
- **And I do believe we'd benefit from GCC Legal clarifying if indeed the extant 1991 LBRN is still legally non variable**
- **And given the legally binding 2008 Conservation Burden is still legally binding as GCC continues to ignore this, which is perplexing as it was GCC that created this and insisted this was signed!**

This highlights and reinforces further why no competent planning application can scoped past a Pre-App until it can be certain LBC can be approved based upon GCC also agreeing with the actual structural condition not the version many fervently believe it is. Hence why the recommended "*holistic architectural review"* with support, expert physical load testing and specialist testing updates is crucial! This was submitted for assessment July 2023, July 2024 and Sept 2024

Further USP and USI are working on Physical Load test brief for June onwards which is a requirement for the Pre-App Façade Retention submission. And given the historic GCC assessment dating back to 2008-2009 regarding floors stability and whether they could take full commercial structural loads (5 Kilo Newton+) this will be fundamental to whether the advice of ADD CONS/TMP/WRD is accurate compared to the GCC belief "*minimal structural alteration*" can be achieved. As for sure if the floors, rear wall, roof all have to be replaced then that's not minimal structural alteration

The submission also has a clear project management and team structure so are GCC intimating that USP and USI and the core investors don't have this? So let's list what they've achieved

e) invested significant SEVEN FIGURE SUM
f) b) GCC has praised for the range of issues it had reconciled CPO impasses, grant funding restoration,
g) commissioned development appraisals, raft of expert architectural and structural studies
h) we've detailed in place massively experienced core professional team co-ordinated by Savills, TMP, WRD, Hardies, Shepherds who would be delivering this. And by contrast Ediston have done not a lot!

Also given Ediston have no locus over or ownership interest for the Egyptian Halls GCC should not have discussed any development options. And GCC should have referred Ediston to USP and USI; given GCC have told USP and USI it cannot discuss the integration of the NCP Car Park to create Mackintosh-Thomson Mews because yep they have no locus or ownership interests. Can't have one rule for Ediston and not allow USP and USI same. But of course we now allege GCC and Ediston have been hand in glove since May 2023; appalling ethical, biased and discriminatory conduct

And how can GCC opine on what a clear Mgt Structure is given it's chequered track record as follows GCC and HES-Scot Govt between them they have presided over FOUR failed Planning Applications and watched as LBRN costs have increased from £2.5M to circa £20M due to 46 years of unchecked deterioration. But it's all the fault of the private sector owners; so let's take their building from them for a fraction of their proven investment despite GCC's on record praise.

and includes a defined timeline for development, which includes various assumptions.

Let's test these assumptions by disclosing them for assessment. Given USP and USI have been advised

1) Ignores completely that both USP and USI will appeal separately and both have incredibly strong claims USI- valuation led and USP- GCC on record praise of USP's "significant investment.
2) Structural – see July 2024 quote above re required detailed architectural/structural review
3) LBRN has to be discharged as its legally non variable But Ediston have been granted a non-disclosed exemption apparently? And if so why was USP and USI not granted similar?
4) And if so could have submitted a draft timescale that had no realistic chance of ever being delivered. Which then impacts upon causal City Centre Development initiatives; Golden Z, City Avenues Project. We've been honest, open and transparent and penalised for this.
5) Proven Non Viability stated both GCC and HES who have refused all grant funding requests

- Jun 2010: The GCC Econ Dev Report states, "*There is therefore no prospect of the project proceeding without external funding support.*"
- Aug 2010: HS Head of Grants Martin Fairley - "*However, I have made my position clear: the project as it stands is not viable.*"
- Aug 2010 Culture Minister refuses GCC's request for "extraordinary funding".
- April 2015 when GCC and HES informed the HLF that there would be no grant funding provided therefore torpedoing a £5M grant application (P 29-30).
- May 2015, Bailie Cameron in a letter to Shadow Culture Minister Baker *"As the property recession took hold the project became unviable."* **"GCC is highlighting this impact and NOT blaming the Egyptian Halls owners.**
- **Unlike now 11 years later, based on discounting all evidence it's been provided, apparently it does not the depth of files USP has to hand.**

6.4 Additionally, the proposal contains an in-principle commitment from proposed new occupiers for both the leisure aspect at ground and first floor, and an international hotel operator on the upper floors. Again no cognisance that GCC informed

USP/USI that because it did not control the NCP site it could not include that in a Pre-App. Yet Ediston with no locus or ownership interests can with GCC's support and approval "hawk" USP's and USI separate assets to whomever it wants.

6.5 Ediston's submission states that their proposed redevelopment would be funded by a mixture of commercial and public funding. See Point 2 above and CPO Response in a nutshell Ediston based on the information GCC provided to Ryden do not have a substantive basis to state this or rely on this. There are massive knowledge gaps here that proper due diligence would uncover.

To repeat a leading question how can "in principle planning be "approved" Feb 2025 CPO Review but this won't discharge the *1991 LBRN to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning*?

They have identified commercial funding which will cover a substantial portion of the development costs. So what is the development cost if it's not the discharge of the 1991 LBRN then it's materially flawed, see indicative Hardies costs based on discharging the 1991 LBRN And is the source of this actually commercial funding? Or is it just replicating/copying the 25-30 year funding model recommended by USP and USI for the once scheduled March 2023 Ediston Feasibility Study, which was cancelled summarily. Did "the clear GCC Mgt Team" decide to just "cut" USP and USI out of this project. And instead decided to seek a 2nd CPO? Of course GCC 2023 onwards had no idea or wish to accept that its Feb 1998 CPO Amendment precipitated a never predicted 12 year delay- 500% cost increase aided by GDA/HS's grant rescindments 1998-2000 to cause systemic non viability, which caused the 1st CPO to fail. And of course GCC were submitted a Feasibility Study proposal Sept 2024, which it failed to respond to. One does wonder of the parallel timeline for Ediston's renewed interest in this project? Surely GCC would not be favouring one commercial entity that does not own the property over the actual co-owners? If so, if so then that's probably blatant discrimination! TBCF

So again how can "in principle planning be "approved" Feb 2025 CPO Review but this won't discharge the *1991 LBRN to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning*?

Yet the Preferred Bidder according to GCC have submitted a "*well thought out and compelling proposal*", which is dependent on

- **40% non-commercial funding; from where?**
- **Has never been costed based on what is actually required for the LBRN, then shell status based on modern commercial needs**
- **Whether it's the current LBRN, the now DBN or a new LBRN will cost £20M+ and Ediston have been led to believe "minimal alteration is only required" which is impossible to deliver**
- **All Valuation, Repairs Apportionment. back to back buyer scenarios are founded upon the old Deed of Conditions not the one GCC "leveraged" to be created mid to late 2017**
- **Once the actual legally binding Deed of Conditions is applied then there is a paradigm shift in valuations upwards for the Upper Floors.**
- **And of course USP separately will sue for a commensurate return on the "significant investment" as it's been defined by GCC in correspondence to the Scottish Govt.**

For sure GCC NRS will look to cite "commercial confidentiality" but GCC Councillors who have voted for this need now get confirmed that this funding is guaranteed/ring fenced. And it won't be plain and simply due to the significant complexities, which are influenced by "unknowns"; principally the actual structural condition hence costs and very likely massive Contingencies

And as HES stated Feb 2020 "*There are some complex issues around Egyptian Halls. Solving those issues will need some creative solutions. It needs creative approaches to design and engineering, but also creative approaches to funding. It also needs a commitment from all involved to continue to discuss and test a wide range of options.* Yet GCC appear to believe have solved this via an apparently simple Evaluation Matrix assessment process; one which discounts statutory, legally binding obligations

Also the core professional team cannot with any confidence sign their PI cover against the current condition until the recommended since Dec 2019 and most recently October 2025 the "holistic architectural review including updating physical load testing and specialist reports accordingly and endorsed by let's not forget GCC's specified Conservation Burden architect.

And is this for a single title building given it's a currently co-owned building with very different end uses and valuations? And whether GCC can compensate USP for the issues GCC has caused (as well GDA/HES etc) especially if the new Scottish Govt intervenes. and agree what the significant valuation is for the Upper Floors is very complex and complicated.

If so it's close to 99% conditional and does not include anything close to an accurate set of costs based upon the requirements to discharge the extant 1991 LBRN, which GCC have been provided with since 2010. And the latest set of costs by Hardies Cost Consultants was provided to GCC DRS mid 2025.

Ediston's team includes members with substantial experience in fundraising for historic assets. Again surely this is defined by the evidence from competent Development Appraisals. So one is genuinely interested by this given Ediston also resiled from the Spring 2023 Egyptian Halls/Mackintosh- Thomson Mews Feasibility Study citing non viability could not be reconciled.

And by Feb 2025 GCC CPO's Review states USP and USI refused offers from Ediston despite never, ever having any contact with them. And GCC NRS at same time offered £5-£10k towards a new set of Development Appraisals and USI was to match this funding. All on record but apparently GCC NRS cannot admit this occurred. Surely this previous activity has to be assessed for accuracy.

Their proposal includes a description of the anticipated sources of public grant funding. It should be noted that this funding has not been applied for or approved at this stage. Further work will also be required to identify additional sources of funding (which are likely to be public) and to assess prospects of securing both these and the other funding. The table below provides a breakdown of indicative funding sources. Again see above this now raises questions on how public funds are applied for and the decision making process. On the face of it GCC 2023-2026 has just decided to write of the much praised by GCC 2000-2013 efforts of USP over 28 years to develop a funding solution for a financial chasm caused by the PUBLIC Sector as follows:

Proven, systemic LONG TERM Non-Viability

- **Sept 2000: Buildings at Risk Register states *Scottish Enterprise has withdrawn its offer of grant aid and Historic Scotland has reduced its; the project is unlikely to proceed***

- **April 2003: E.Times article briefed by GCC DRS: "*The CPO process adopted by the Council in this case involves compensation being determined before the Council can gain a satisfactory title for onwards disposal. There is potential for significant delay in being available for Union Street. I can understand the frustration expressed by Mr Souter The resolution is not straightforward.*** Jings unerringly accurate took from 1998-2010 and GCC failed; USP who reconciled this; again, on record.

- **Non disclosed On record prima facie proof of GCC'S unstinting, non-facilitated praise of USP GCC July 2010 GCC NRS have not considered the on record prima facie proof of GCC'S unstinting, non-facilitated praise of USP e.g *the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and on completing development appraisals for potential end uses.***

- **Jun 2010: The GCC Econ Dev Report states, "*There is therefore no prospect of the project proceeding without external funding support.*" Again, proof on file that GCC and also HES never engaged on any serious discussions centring on deficit reduction. Just the usual narrative of blaming the private sector owners. My personal opinion is GCC dislikes private sector investors who don't toe the GCC line.**
- **Aug 2010: HS Head of Grants Martin Fairley - "*However, I have made my position clear: the project as it stands is not viable*." Again, proof on file that GCC and also HES never engaged on any serious discussions centring on deficit reduction. Just the usual narrative of blaming the private sector owners. My personal opinion is that the GCC dislikes private sector investors who don't toe the GCC line.**
- **May 2015, Bailie Cameron in a letter to Shadow Culture Minister Baker *"As the property recession took hold the project became unviable."* So GCC is highlighting this impact and is NOT blaming the Egyptian Halls owners. Unlike now, a decade later, it's now alleging, based on discounting all evidence it's been provided, that it apparently does not the depth of files USP has to hand.**

So again what part did USP have in creating this? Note GCC on record praising USP for getting the HS grant restored. GCC despite its scale, contacts, heft, did not achieve this or indeed the same for GDA grant. And has never ever taken GDA and HS to task to explain why they derailed this massively important Conservation- Regeneration project from 1996 onwards (which GCC appears to believe can be airbrushed away). GCC failing despite of course having a clear Management structure!

6.6 The submission from LPT/Lola Ltd consisted of a cash sum offer but did not provide any detailed proposals or viability assessment. Again we ask is this the List Magazine and if so incontrovertible proof GCC leveraged well beyond commercial reality the provenance of a NEVER OFFER MADE, which was detailed by March 2025 in 1st version of CPO Review Response. **And if not what happened to the List Magazine aka "the interested party" whose above independent valuation offer was not progressed by the owners; UTTER BALDERDASH bordering on Falsehood unless as predicted they were a Stalking Horse for GCBPT/SCT-Ediston/ GCC**

6.7 The submission from USP/USI was assessed against the Councils advertised _evaluation framework however it achieved a lower score because the content did not adequately address the requirements set out against each of the categories listed. In particular it did not contain a clear deliverable proposal or viability assessment. Again perplexing and GCC NRS are being very economical here; given May 2015 Heritage Lottery Fund state *We have discussed the project with both Glasgow City Council and Historic Scotland. Our conclusion is that **there is no realistic prospect of you receiving funding from either of those bodies, or from the Scottish Government, in the foreseeable future**. The proposal submitted to us is therefore not viable.*

Also no scheme can be scoped until a) the actual structural condition is assessed and agreed as submitted for this assessment and July 2023, 2024, and Sept 2024. But GCC refuse to accept what it is and when recommendations were provided GCC then cut of the income stream that would have funded this work and also refused any grant funding support (how damming is the claim 30% grant funding could be delivered see Page 22 for just one of a plethora of Scot Govt, HES, GCC, GCBPT, SCT, GCHT grant refusals or creating impossible obstacles.

Proposed Funding Streams	% of Development Costs Covered
Ediston Commercial Funding	60%
Public Grant Funding	30%
Additional Funding (still to be sourced)	10%

Funding Streams Lack of Clarification.

So let's be unequivocal what is above are THREE separate non related % figures but what is the quantum of each and when combined? What has been costed? And for sure it's not the discharge of the legally non variable 1991 LBRN or the equivalent. So let's ask GCC a simple question if Hardies Feb 2025 Project Costs had been assessed and they're £20M-£22M for the LBRN discharge to be funded by Ground Floor properties as due 100% as per Deed of Conditions. And on completion the Ground Floor is worth £2M. Are Ediston funding 60% or £12M to achieve a £2M Valuation. And then have to source another £10M from as yet unidentified grant sources.
Surely not the Scottish Investment Bank? And for the record the Grant requirement was £2.5M in Year 2000 and £5M in 2013 or £2M and an extra two storeys to create a near 200 bed 4 star hotel; yet another opportunity allowed to atrophy). The assumption 60% will be commercial funding predicates on a combined title.

Therefore, proof the Upper Floors contribution to the end value is indeed very valuable given the Ground Floor on completion circa £2M. This actually now strengthens significantly the Upper Floors owner's Negotiating position, which further reinforces why the deletion after a decade of and presence in four consecutive reports of Clause 4.1 from the latest DV Report becomes even more perplexing? But surely GCC and the DV will be able to explain this during negotiations to come

6 Scoring and Recommendations

*LPT/Lola Ltd: 1.9 / 100
USP/USI: 39.3 / 100
Ediston: 77.5 / 100

* Clarification asked again is the List Magazine part of the Ediston bid? If so then USP's commercial assessment of their non offer is reinforced by GCC's assessment. So Clause 5 CPO Review was a complete fabrication and as stated in Response Document the List was always a stalking horse to buy time for GCC to work with the heritage acolytes to get Ediston on board no matter **how.**

6.8 It is therefore the conclusion of the evaluation team that Ediston's submission represents the strongest proposal to achieve the proper planning of the area, contribute to the regeneration of the surrounding area and secure the future of this A-listed building. **Materially flawed, biased and ignores the actual structural condition , the current legally binding LBRN obligations, the historic requirement for Grant funding, the fact USP the Proven Long Term Non Viability acknowledged by GCC and HES since 1997 and the FACT GCC, HES- Scot Govt decided no grant funding would be awarded to USP 2010 onwards (when 92% of funding was in place or accessible as per GCC correspondence July 2010) and re-confirmed May 2015. . It ignored the fact this proposal is based upon the wrong use of RICS Standard Valuation practice (NOT AN ASSUMPTION BUT FACT). Due to not accessing the correct title Deeds GCC, the District Valuer, have been using inaccurate Repairs Apportionment splits. Whether Ryden and Ediston**

GCC DRS has been submitted all of this information yet now acts as if it's unaware of what it's been submitted; sizeable and frequent evidence of systemic knowledge gaps have been admitted. Oh and to date GCC NRS have still not responded to the Sept Feasibility Study scoped and submitted by Savills, which included the holistic architectural review and an assessment of all potential end uses, which are included in the Pre-App.

6.9 Ediston do not own the property, and if a voluntary purchase cannot be agreed with the current compulsory acquisition may still be required. **Given the fact GCC refused to adhere to standard Commercial Property processes it's used previously the current July 2025 DV Report is materially flawed (as are DV 2019 x 2 and 2024 Reports) And any negotiations will falter until that's applied and the certainty of an appeal lodged at the Court of Session, which then stops GCC's plan to appropriate the building by wiping out a significant SEVEN figure investment that GCC itself has praised USP for making? There is something very out of kilter here.**

6.10 Before making a CPO, the Council needs to satisfy itself on a range of factors, these include being satisfied that the proposed scheme can be delivered within a reasonable timescale. **Currently impossible to put a timescale on given the 99.99% certainty for an appeal to the Scottish Govt and then potentially a C of S action based upon 28 years of errors, mistakes, misrepresentation and a causal absence of any joined up govt.**
And then we have now the material non-disclosure of the actual structural and legal obligations, which impact upon cost and valuation scenarios as well as ignoring RICS standard valuation processes. My gut feel if GCC would operate in a fair and transparent manner, account for its and the Scottish Govt errors then within 6-9 months. There could be an agreement to purchase both USP and USI's property assets over an agreed phased period or indeed a JC. If none of this then 3- 4 years minimum.

Note GCC has failed consistently to state it understands/comprehends that Ground Floor properties are due the combined 100% of the LBRN Costs. And the Upper Floors are due ZERO %. Also we now surmise in the absence of no clarification as asked SIX months ago that GCC instructed the DB to delete Clause 4.1 from the 2025 DV Report due to it raising the very real potential for a significant Upper Floors valuation. And again one surmises are Ediston unaware? And also what of GCC's own Councillors>

There will there need to be two very distinct and separate CPO Approaches

1) The Ground Floors have 100% LBRN liability and cannot commercially fund the costs since 2010. Nor has any grant funding being provided ever. So GCC surely needs to compensate USP for what it has praised it for because it was GCC- Scot Govt who caused the scheme delays – on record!

To repeat proof of GCC'S unstinting, non-facilitated praise of USP- not factored in- why not?

June 2004 GCC Econ Dev Report

- **USD re-secured the grant funding from Historic Scotland, which had reduced the offer of grant for the scheme from £990,000 to £250,000.**
- **Union Street Properties negotiated the grant offered back up to £930,000 for the scheme.**
- **USD also brought about the withdrawal of the objection to the promulgation of the CPO by the upper-floor proprietor of the building."**

July 2010 GCC wrote to Culture Minister Hyslop as follows: "*As you may know, the Council has been working with USP Properties, the owners of the magnificent grade A listed Egyptian Halls building in Union Street, Glasgow, for many years in order to help them bring the building into a single ownership and, having achieved this, to bring forward suitable proposals for the refurbishment of the building for an appropriate productive use. A considerable amount of correspondence and many meetings, over a prolonged period of time, have already taken place between the developer and his agents, the City Council, and Historic Scotland, and the developer has committed very significant expenditure on bringing the building into a single ownership, on preparing a range of technical and conservation studies, and on completing both option and development appraisals for a variety of potential end uses.*

We have now reached a very critical stage in these discussions whereby there is a clear, but very time-limited, opportunity to secure the development. The challenges to do so remain formidable. The Council is now extremely concerned that this development may not proceed for a number of reasons, including the likelihood that the failure to fill the current funding gap will almost certainly mean the prospect of securing the development in the foreseeable future would be lost." **And whose fault was that? In chronological order, it is a) GDA, Historic Scotland and GCC (see Page 22) as GCC seek to blatantly rip of the investors using statutory powers and MSP's, Scottish Govt and media are SILENT!!!**

May 2013 ***Dear Mr Souter, Thank you for your kind invitation to visit the Egyptian Halls. I have been kept fully informed of your progress so far and I am delighted that your team has now secured Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent as the next milestone in your plans to redevelop the building. Officers from the Council have visited this building on many occasions, as have those from Historic Scotland, and I have been briefed by them on the work you have done. I look forward to your team bringing the building back into a viable new use, which I'm sure, will complement Union Street and the surrounding area.*** **Councillor Gordon Matheson Leader of the Council, 22/05/2013 but GCC derailed this.**

2) The USI owned Upper Floors is a very different situation; it's always had a development surplus (GCC has this on file), has ZERO LBRN obligations since Jan 2018, has been prevented from delivering the approved hotel scheme since 2013 and probably Year 2000 onwards. Also USI requires no Grant funding. So what is GCC's case for a CPO of the Upper Floors? What has USI not done that GCC thinks or believes it should have done? It looks very like overreach and unwillingness to accept both USP and USI are separate legal entities; again evidence of knowledge gaps within GCC.

Aha back to the Clause 4.1, which was in the 2016, 2019 and 2024 DV Reports but deleted from the DV 2025 report GCC knows, the DV knows Ryden we believe knows and does Ediston that the Upper Floors has a significant valuation

This will involve an assessment of the likelihood of planning permission and listed building consent being granted and the likelihood of funding being available to cover both the costs of the CPO (including compensation costs **read/use the actual Deed of Conditions, apply accurate RV's and one can determine the Upper Floors has a very significant valuation as per the Dev Apps GCC have been submitted 2010-2028**)

And the development costs. Massively underestimated currently! See 1991 LBRN appended and Hardies 2025 estimated costs which for the record GCC have been submitted but obviously decided to not include in this exercise. So USP and USI are working to an entirely different legal obligation which has massively different cost consequences; Ediston are not so it's a prescient example of Apples and Pears. And given USP which has the 100% LBRN obligation cannot scope and cost a scheme until the actual structural condition is known given New Build has been refused 2011 and ruled out of any discussion 2016, 2019 and latterly October 2025.

6.11 As mentioned at 6.5 above Ediston's submissions identifies public grant funding is required, with the potential source of a proportion of that funding still to be identified. It should also be noted that no grant funding has been applied for or secured, which is to be expected at this early stage. As stated earlier should either GCC or HES or the Scottish Govt directly or indirectly award grant funding then legal action will be taken. Also should any collaborate to submit e.g. an HLF grant then similar (P29-30)

If Ediston is approved as preferred developer, officers will work with them to investigate and address these issues, There has never been any offers to collaborate with USP and USI the actual, legal owners that rejected the original GCC approved scheme as it would have caused the building to collapse due to removal of the cast iron frame ***ENDORSEMENT OF THE SUPERIOR SCHEME BY GREEK THOMSON'S GREATEST CHAMPION***

"The Council did the right thing and started compulsory purchase proceedings against the delinquent owners of the upper floors. "After legal wrangles majority ownership has been acquired by Dundee Developer Derek Souter, who has commissioned an admirable conservation report from good architects and structural engineers. "The resulting proposals for a conservative restoration of the whole structure, including the remarkable iron framed interior, has won backing from Historic Scotland." Private Eye, Piloti (Prof Gavin Stamp) Jan 2000

and this will form part of any future report to committee seeking authority to conclude a back-to-back agreement and to make a CPO. For the record this would be a 2nd CPO And surely GCC will have to explain why there should be a 2nd CPO given it and Scot Govt (GDA-HES) caused the 1st one to fail.

7 Next Steps

7.1 Both the Council's CPO Framework and report to the committee 6.2.25 Both envisage one report to committee seeking approval of the recommended proposal and authority to (1) enter into a back to back agreement with the preferred developer and (2) proceed to promote the CPO. In order to allow the preferred developer to further develop their proposals, and to work towards securing the necessary funding, authority is being sought now to select Ediston as the preferred developer. The legal owners disagree unequivocally that there has been an open, fair and transparent process; significant misformed assumptions have been made relating to LBRN discharge, structural condition, costs, public safety and valuation for both Ground and Upper Floors. As well as the signal failure to admit public sector errors, mistakes, misrepresentation ,

7.2 Following approval of Ediston as the preferred developer, the Council will continue to investigate the justification for a CPO and will enter into negotiations with Ediston to agree terms for a back to back agreement for any CPO. Once terms are agreed between the parties and a sufficiently robust justification for a CPO is in place, the approval of this committee will be sought in order to enter into a legally binding back to back agreement and proceed with the promotion of a CPO. GCC have been advised since Feb 2025 this will be appealed and it's believed on balance to date the new Scottish Govt may well seek to refer this to Mediation/Arbitration given the FM's Office will be reluctant to disclose GCC did not in fact tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; see F/Cover CPO Review

7.3 The Property and Contracts Committee Paper dated 6.2.2025 provides further details of the next steps: Authority To Investigate The Use Of Compulsory Purchase Powers (CPO) And To Seek A Development Proposal For Egyptian Halls

List of Appendices

- **CPO Review How can there be a 2nd CPO without asking how the 1st CPO failed Page 44**
- **1991 extant, legally binding Listed Building Repairs Notice – Pages 45-46**
- **Feb 1998 CPO Amendment predicted to cause a few months delay- non disclosed for 16 years- Page 47**
- **Jan 2010- GCC acknowledges USP reconciled CPO impasse 12 years on from few months delay" P 48**
- **June 2010 – Scot Govt refuses to increase grant funding caused by GDA/HS/GCC – Page 49**
- **2013 Upper Floors Hotel Approval, Ground Floor Bars/Restaurants approval – Page 50**
- **2013 Independent Opinion reinforcing GCC had agreed to provide gap funding – Page 51-52**
- **2014-2015- USP/USI call for a CPO Review – Pages 53-54**
- **2014-2015 – GCC endorses HLF Grant Application then GCC/HES torpedo a £5M HLF grant surreptitiously – Page 55-56**
- **2018 GCC Legal disclose inadvertently an internally known Contract Breach, which was not disclosed externally to Scotland 's First Minister, GCC Councillors and USP – Page 57**
- **CPO Review Key Evidence for Mediation/Arbitration - Downloads – Page 58**
- **Hardies Cost Consultants LBRN Discharge Cost Estimate Feb 2025 – Page 59-60**
- **GCC Preferred Bidder Contracts and Property Committee Report Pages – 61- 69 (to be added)**

Use the link to find out

HOW DEFEAT WAS SNATCHED FROM THE JAWS OF VICTORY 25 YEARS AGO
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page13.html

The Egyptian Halls CPO Review Report

30th JANUARY 2026

How can there be a 2nd CPO without clarifying why the 1996 1st CPO failed?

"You will see from the letter that Mr Souter is concerned at the Council's handling of the transfer of ownership of the remainder of the building to his company. He feels that the Council's actions may be putting the project to repair and restore the building in jeopardy."

"I would be grateful if you could reply direct to Mr Souter outlining the Council's position. Can you also let me have a copy of the response for our records."

First Minster McConnell's Private Secretary 1st May 2004 to GCC's Lord Provost

1) **Was the First Minister told the truth? Unequivocally NO!**
2) **Given GCC failed to disclose a then known contract breach**
3) **That was only disclosed by massive error by GCC 14 years later!**
4) **Surely the Scottish Government is interested some 22 years later?**
5) **Given it's potentially to be asked to approve a 2nd CPO?**
6) **Or will this be a case of GCC - Scot Govt marking each other's homework?**

This Grade A "architectural masterpiece" is under threat. Unless transparency, honesty and accountability are factored in; nearly 30 years since the 1996 1st CPO.

Log to the independent view of Greek Thomsons's Greatest Champion for clarity!
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/The-EgyptianHalls-HeritageLobbying.pdf

1991 LBRN- note specification on Page 2

G/1066

City of Glasgow

Town Clerk's Office,
City Chambers,
Glasgow G2 1DU
Central Switchboard 041-221 9600

STEVEN F. HAMILTON, J.P., B.L., D.P.A., D.M.S.
Town Clerk and Chief Executive
CHARLES P. HORSBURGH, J.P., B.L.
Solicitor to the Council

Fax 041-227 5666 Telex 777762 GDCHQ G Rutland Exchange GW 269

Your Ref .....

Our Ref. R65/MH2/CF/CPLGEN257
Mrs Hughes

To telephone direct dial 041-227 4266

BY SHERIFF OFFICER

Important - This communication affects your property

Dear Sir/Madam

Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1972 as amended
Listed Building Repairs Notice
Section 104 and 105
84-100 Union Street, 'Egyptian Halls', Glasgow

WHEREAS you are the owner of subjects known as and forming 84-100 Union Street, 'Egyptian Halls', Glasgow.

AND WHEREAS the said subject is a building of special architectural or historic interest and has been listed by the Secretary of State under section 52 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1972 as amended.

AND WHEREAS it appears that reasonable steps are not being taken for properly preserving the said subjects, namely:-

Failure to maintain roof; failure to maintain floor; failure to maintain gutters, downpipes and flashings where necessary; failure to eliminate any dry rot, wet rot or dampness; failure to maintain plasterwork; failure to maintain stonework; failure to maintain premises wind and watertight; failure to maintain elements of supporting structure.

NOW THEREFORE the City of Glasgow District Council, as planning authority, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sections 104 and 105 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1972 DO HEREBY REQUIRE YOU within THREE MONTHS from the date of this notice to carry out the following works:-

Renew/...

Scottish Metropolitan
Royal Exchange House
100 Queen Street
GLASGOW
G1 3DL

If corresponding in connection with this matter please quote the reference given above and address to the Town Clerk

Renew defective or missing roof and floor timbers; re-slate roof; replace gutters, downpipes and flashings where necessary; eliminate any dry rot, wet rot or dampness in the building; reinstate plasterwork; repair and replace all stonework where necessary; make all windows or other openings wind and watertight; repair or otherwise stabilise all elements of supporting structure where necessary; leave in a wind and watertight condition; all works urgently necessary for the preservation of a listed building and to be carried out to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

Unless the above specified repairs are executed to the sight and satisfaction of the City of Glasgow District Council as local authority within the stated period, the Secretary of State will be requested to authorise the local authority to acquire compulsorily the subjects and any land comprising or contiguous or adjacent thereto which appear to be required for preserving the subjects or the amenities thereof under the above Act.

Sections 104 to 107 of the above Act are enclosed to explain the foregoing and for further guidance.

At Glasgow the Twenty fourth day of January Nineteen hundred and ninety one.

Yours faithfully

Chief Solicitor

Encl

Feb 1998 CPO Amendment- non disclosed for 16 years

The 1 page GCC CPO Amendment letter, which has caused a projected 25-26 year delay, close to being unbelievable but wholly accurate, very, very, very unfortunately!

Director
Ian G Cumming LLB

Legal Services
Glasgow City Council
City Chambers
George Square
Glasgow G2 1DU

DX GW145

Telephone: 0141 287 4529
Fax No: 0141 287 5662
If phoning please ask for Ms Farrell

Date: 11 February 1998
Our Ref: CPD3333/KF/SMK
Your Ref: WCF/22263.1/LAW MS

FAX NO. 0141 204 1902
Messrs Bird Semple
Solicitors
DX GW 10
GLASGOW

Dear Sirs

EGYPTIAN HALLS LIMITED
PORTFOLIO HOLDINGS PLC
EGYPTIAN HALLS, 84-100 UNION STREET, GLASGOW

I refer to the above and write to advise you that we have received further correspondence from the Solicitors for Paratus (No. 403) Limited, Messrs Murray Beith Murray. The Solicitors have indicated that they are likely to submit an Appeal against the Compulsory Purchase Order. As you are aware, the last date to lodge this Appeal is 20 February 1998. We will inform you as soon as we are advised that the Appeal has been lodged.

If an Appeal is lodged, it will mean a delay of several months to the commencement of your clients' development, assuming the Appeal is unsuccessful. Can you advise us if this delay will mean that your clients will not wish to proceed with the CPO, in view of the fact that you expressed that a delay of a few weeks would have severe implications on your clients' Plans. This was the reason the Notice to Treat and Notice of Entry procedures were implemented rather than taking entry by General Vesting Declaration.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

CPO Officer

1KF543.DOC

Jan 2010- GCC acknowledges USP has reconciled the CPO impasse 12 years on

Ian Drummond LLB
Executive Director

Corporate Services
Glasgow City Council
City Chambers
George Square
Glasgow G2 1DU
DX GW145
Legal Post: Corporate & Property Law: LP-4, Glasgow 10

Hand Deliveries to:
Room 35, Ground Floor, 235 George Street

Anderson Strathern LLP
Solicitors
24 Blythswood Square
Glasgow
G2 4BG

Our Ref CPD3790/RMM/KH Your Ref KG/KG/UN10010.4/AZL
11 January 2010

Dear Sirs

THE EGYPTIAN HALLS

We Glasgow City Council, as successor to The City of Glasgow District Council, refer to The Egyptian Halls, Union Street Compulsory Purchase Order 1996 made by The City of Glasgow District Council on 29 March 1996, which was confirmed by the Secretary of State for Scotland on 23 May 1996, relating to The Egyptian Halls, 84 to 100 Union Street, Glasgow ("the CPO").

We hereby confirm:-

(1) that we have not completed title to the property that was the subject of the CPO
(2) that we acknowledge and accept that Union Street Properties("USP") acquired title on a voluntary basis to the whole subjects of the CPO by direct negotiation with and payment of agreed price to the owners of said subjects, and have granted a deed of conservation burdens in our favour registered against the title of the said subjects, and that USP completed title to said subjects, and has onward conveyed the said subjects to Union Street Investments Ltd.
(3) that we will not take any steps to complete title or to otherwise exercise any powers or rights that we may have under the CPO.

Yours faithfully

Robert M Murray
Senior Solicitor
For and on behalf of Glasgow City Council

Please address correspondence to Robert M Murray, Corporate and Property Law Section
Direct phone 0141 287 5822
Fax No: 0141 287 5662
E-mail : robert.murray@ced.glasgow.gov.uk
www.glasgow.gov.uk

3RMM557

Glasgow City Council is an equal opportunities employer

June 2010 – SNP Scot Govt refuses to increase grant funding increase of caused by GDA/HS/GCC claims Abbotsford House is more deserving!

Minister for Culture and External Affairs
Ministear airson Cultair agus Chùisean Taoibh A-muigh
Fiona Hyslop MSP/BPA

T/F: 0845 774 1741
E: scottish.ministers@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

The Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

Pauline McNeill MSP
Glasgow Kelvin Constituency Office
1274 Argyle Street
Glasgow
G3 8AA

Your ref/Ur faidhle: PM/MD

23 JUN 2010

Our ref/Ar faidhle: 2010/0014091

21st June 2010

Dear Pauline

Thank you for your letter received on 1 June 2010, regarding the Egyptian Halls project in Glasgow. I ought to say at the outset that, whilst they appear similar, Abbotsford House and the Egyptian Halls are two very different projects. The Abbotsford House project is a non commercial project, being delivered by the Abbotsford Trust, a registered charity, which is committed to delivering a long term sustainable future for the house and its collections as a visitor attraction. The Egyptian Halls project, though, is a commercial project and whilst it will undoubtedly have significant public value, it is decidedly different in its nature from Abbotsford.

I can confirm that the Scottish Government through Historic Scotland has already provisionally indicated its support for the Egyptian Halls project. Furthermore, in recognition of the buildings historical and architectural importance and the commercial positives that may be delivered for Glasgow, the Agency has taken an exceptional approach to their provision of funding, in agreeing to exceed their normal maximum grant level, through a phased funding programme totalling £1.5m.

We understand, however, that the project is facing a major shortfall and that the owners are seeking higher levels of funding. Unfortunately it is beyond the capacity of Historic Scotland or the Scottish Government to contribute more to the project financially than has already been committed. I know that Historic Scotland have continued to discuss Egyptian halls with the owner and the local authority and will continue to search for a solution for this building.

Kind regards

Fiona

FIONA HYSLOP

St Andrew's House, Regent Road, Edinburgh EH1 3DG
Taigh Naomh Anndrais, Rathad Regent, Dùn Èideann EH1 3DG
www.scotland.gov.uk

2013 Upper Floors Hotel Approval, Ground Floor Bars/Restaurants approval

Laura Boyd is to take part in the Moonwalk

Laura streets ahead in bid to aid charity

SCOTTISH television presenter Laura Boyd will take part in a charity walk.

The showbiz correspondent at STV, who has battled leukemia, is doing The Scottish Moonwalk in Edinburgh as a thank-you to the charity which funded Maggie's Centre at Gartnavel, Glasgow, where she found support.

The walk on June 8, organised by Walk the Walk, raises money and awareness to improve the lives of cancer patients in Scotland.

It funded the centre at Gartnavel, which offers support to cancer patients, and the centre's running costs for the first three years.

Laura will wear a specially designed bra by Glasgow designer Cassandra Belanger, founder of The Stitchery, for the walk which sees thousands of people take part on the night-time walk wearing brightly decorated bras.

For more information about The MoonWalk Scotland, which offers four distances, from 6.6miles, visit www.walkthewalk.org

Boost for historic Halls as £20M hotel a step nearer

EXCLUSIVE
By CATRIONA STEWART

PLANS to convert one of Glasgow's historic listed buildings into a £20million hotel have taken a step forward.

The owners of the A-listed Egyptian Halls in Union Street have been granted Listed Building Consent by the Scottish Government agency Historic Scotland.

And Accor Hotels has revised its proposals to create a four-star venue for the city centre, rather than the three-star originally planned.

Derek Souter, of owner USP & USI Ltd's Egyptian Halls Project, said: "This reappraisal, which we had always pushed for, vindicates our long-held belief that Union Street has significant development potential.

"According to Glasgow City Marketing Bureau, there is a need for an extra 17,000 hotel, guest house and bed-and-breakfast bedrooms in the city and surrounding area.

"So once the ground floor is funded, we can also begin to confirm other interested leisure developers whose plans are on hold while we look for extra funding."

The Evening Times reported last August on the plans to convert the Alexander 'Greek' Thomson building into a 114-room three-star hotel.

The building has lain empty for 33 years, coming under threat of demolition in 2011.

> **We can see the development becoming a very desirable location**

However, a public campaign, backed by thousands of people, helped save the Halls.

Franchise Accor Hotels, managed by hotel operator Longrose Buccleuch, had initially planned to convert the building to a mid-range IBIS or Mercure hotel. But now it wants to transform it into one of its upmarket M Hotels, making it one of only 45 worldwide.

Steve Wright, of Accor Hotels, said: "As planning has now been approved we can see the development becoming a very desirable location within Glasgow.

"Accor thinks the Egyptian Halls would make a perfect M Gallery."

Planning permission was granted last December.

Funding for the hotel is secure but a further £10m is needed to refurbish the ground floor level of the Halls.

The owner said the lower level upgrade would rely on "substantial public subsidy", but Glasgow City Council said no funding was currently available.

However, it said the only remaining obstacle to beginning the refurbishment is agreeing public and private sector funding.

Mr Souter said talks were under way and should be concluded in the next two months.

Richard Heggie, planning consultant of TPS Planning, which is also involved in the scheme, said: "This is evidence Glasgow City Council's new and embryonic city centre strategy is beginning to work effectively."

catriona.stewart@eveningtimes.co.uk

Derek Souter is delighted by consent approval

CRAFT BEER EVENT
Come and raise a glass to some of Scotland's finest craft beers.
CITATION, GLASGOW SUNDAY, MARCH 24, 2013 AT 12.30PM
Ticket price includes arrival drink, lunch and tasting
Reserve tickets on 0141 302 7407 or 0141 302 7319
TICKETS: £30 PER PERSON
The Herald sundayherald

NHS gavel gift has historic links with Africa

THE bicentenary of David Livingstone's birth was marked when his great-great grandson presented health bosses with a historic gavel.

It was carved from the wood of the tree where the heart of the medical missionary and explorer was buried after he died in Zambia in 1873.

Livingstone's descendant, Neil Wilson, presented it to the chairman of NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Andrew Robertson.

Mr Wilson, of Bearsden, is paediatric orthopaedic surgeon at the Royal Hospital for Sick Children at Yorkhill.

The gavel has a long connection with the health service in Glasgow. It was used by the NHS Executive Council for the City of Glasgow from the creation of the NHS in 1948 until 1974. It was then held in archives.

Mr Wilson said: "To have such a tangible link is a great reminder that the events of the past live on."

Mr Robertson said: "Following David Livingstone's death Florence Nightingale described him as 'the greatest man of the age' and it is indeed an honour to receive this gavel which will be put on display for our visitors to see.

"Given Livingstone's strong links to medicine in Glasgow, it is fitting for us to be responsible for the safekeeping of this most extraordinary of artefacts."

David Livingstone

2013 Independent Opinion reinforcing GCC had agreed to provide gap funding

From: Richard Heggie <richardh@tpsplanning.co.uk>
Date: Thursday, 9 May 2013 13:09
To: Derek Souter <derek@djscm.com>, Fiona Donaldson <f.donaldson@themorrisonpartnership.com>
Cc: Susan Connelly <Susan.Connelly@glasgow.gov.uk>, Kevin McCormack <kevin.mccormack@drs.glasgow.gov.uk>, Ross Martin <rossm@tpsplanning.co.uk>
Subject: RE: GCC's promises to "Unlock the Sources of Funding"

Derek
There's no doubt whatsoever that putting in place a scheme with planning and listed building consent was seen as a crucial step in opening up funding discussions. All parties agreed on this, as without a shovel ready scheme there could be no firm commitment from the likes of Historic Scotland.

From GCC point of view, they were also unable to firm anything up without these consents - and it was obviously necessary to detach the statutory requirement for the consents from any detailed discussion on funding, to avoid compromising the integrity of the planning decision. GCC were quite clear on that point.

However, the principle of GCC support not only for pursuit of a planning solution, but also for a delivery package involving them as funding partners, was established long ago. Everyone accepts this development will not happen without a positive input from GCC, including assistance with funding.

There would have been no point in submitting planning and listed building applications if we did not have reassurance from the Council that they would play the role they had stated. If they are now unwilling to step up to the plate, then there is only one conclusion to be drawn - with an undeliverable planning permission, the building is exposed to a greatly inflated risk of demolition, since its retention will have been fully tested and will have failed. Historic Scotland and GCC will have no option but to approve demolition. So, it can be said that in this scenario, the grant of planning and listed building consents has brought the Egyptian Halls very much closer to a pile of rubble than it has ever been in the past.

I do not feel that this is a result any of us want or should settle for. It is incumbent upon us all to make this regeneration project and its potential spin-offs a reality. Failure would send out all the wrong signals and be an abdication of GCC's civic and cultural responsibilities. Whilst they are not the only agency with a responsibility here, they are undoubtedly the key public participant in this process. Glasgow has lost enough of its heritage - this project should be seen as an opportunity to create an iconic new focus for Union Street and secure Glasgow's reputation as a center of design and culture.

Finally, I understood that the distinct role of the two separate owners of the building had long been clarified to GCC satisfaction. If we are back to a point where that matter is being held up as an insurmountable issue, then presumably GCC and HS have satisfied themselves that a multi-million pound headache and a hole in the ground is preferable to a partnership approach which minimizes their financial commitment and risk, whilst delivering a high quality project which already has planning approval and prospective tenants in place?

I do hope you are able to achieve progress soon but in the event that you need to revisit the process for demolition of the building then let me know and I'll regretfully advise on the way forward.

Regards
Richard

Subject – The Egyptian Halls

Date – Friday 10th May 2013 11:24:36

From George Morrison

To Derek Souter, cc Richard Heggie-TPS

Over several years you & I met with Glasgow City Council and Historic Scotland to discuss the funding and designs for 'indicative development proposals'. Eventually we were told in unequivocal terms that in going any further it was essential that we secure Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent for specific and acceptable proposals. Only then could both Authorities give specific consideration to the financial challenges.

Those meetings at diferent times involved very senior personnel both at GCC Planning Department and Historic Scotland. At all times those parties were acutely aware of the financial deficit and the need for substantial grant support from the authorities. At our later meetings with the same senior GCC personnel it became the norm that on concluding discussions on design etc that yourself and one or two of the council's most senior representatives stayed behind as separate meetings to discuss specific costs and funding matters while the rest of us left.

It was understood that those separate meetings for design and funding were very deliberate steps to ensure that design topics were unencumbered by discussions about finance, while there was a shared understanding.

At yet later meetings with some senior GCC personnel I noted their "guiding comments" that a development / design proposal acceptable to them would be considered for grant support by GCC. Furthermore, that they would also press the case at Historic Scotland for their grant support. In due course Jim Patrick, Kevin McCormick and Ruth Smith were introduced to those meetings. Soon thereafter those meetings then become stand alone design meetings with myself, Jim Patrick, Kevin McCormack and Ruth Smith but without yourself or the most senior Council personnel. During those meetings I was repeatedly told that the Council was committed to working with us in achieving an approved design solution. Armed with those approvals the Planners committed to taking the case to Historic Scotland for their support. If necessary the Planners were prepared to 'lock horns' with Historic Scotland in making the case for the necessary support.

In the meetings just prior to Jim Patrick retiring we were close to an agreed design proposal. It was during those meetings Mr Patrick stated voluntarily that when we had achieved those two Approvals that funding support would be forthcoming and we might be surprised at the sources of that funding. The natural conclusions from such statements could only be that there had been discussions in other places about this project's need for financial support which in turn gave rise to optimism.

In due course Richard Heggie joined the design team and together we finalised the design proposals in conjunction with the senior planners to the point where the application for Statutory approvals were submitted. Thereafter the application was assigned to another planning officer (Ms Susan Connolly) as the case officer in dealing with the application up to and issuing the approvals. We had ongoing dialogue with the planning officer throughout the decision making process.

Our discussions with the Planning officials both pre and post the formal applications involved design studies which showed extensions of various heights. For each of those design options we made it clear there was a direct impact on the deficit - namely the larger the extension the lower the deficit thereby reducing the required grant assistance. It was clearly understood by all of those officers at all stages in the process that grant assistance would need to come from GCC and historic Scotland. With that knowledge and our illustrations showing what we considered to be imperceptible differences especially between 2 & 3 storey extensions, the Council's final insistence was an extension no higher than 2 storeys if the approvals were to be granted.

At all stages the two key topics have been the scale of the proposed design for the development and the financial deficit. As such there has always been a universal awareness of a financial deficit and its inter relationship with the scale of the development. It was common knowledge that financial assistance from the public purse was the only way to address the deficit and save the building by this project.

George Morrison
THE MORRISON PARTNERSHIP

2014- USP/USI call for a CPO Review; so we welcome one to come from the Scottish Govt late 2026/early 2027

8th September 2014

UNION STREET PROPERTIES LTD
Registered in Scotland No: 186601
26 Foundry Lane
Dundee
DD4 6AY
Tel: (01382) 451702
Fax:(01382) 456778
email:derek@djscm.com

Mr George Black
Chief Executive
Glasgow City Council
City Chambers
George Square
Glasgow
G2 1DU

Dear Mr Black

The Egyptian Halls- A Review of GCC's LBRN and CPO strategies is urgently required!

Further to USP's letter of 15/08/204 and your reply of 28/08/2014. Unfortunately for the future of the Egyptian Halls GCC has failed again to grasp the financial, cultural and regenerational consequences of its pivotal role since 1991. And in relation to the failure of GCC s1999 CPO agreement with USP, "your colleagues" have yet to comment at all or on any level about this clear contractual breach, which is contrary to what you state in your aforementioned letter.

Further if you refer to the letter of 14th April 2014 from the Head Of your Council's Legal Department's letter to USP, it is highlighted that new evidence is required, which has now been provided in USP's letter 15/08/2014. At the very least an admitted GCC "error" should be assessed to determine whether it was in fact potentially inadvertent misrepresentation.

Back to your aforementioned letter, USP does in no way agree "*that the Council has actively supported this through the Planning process*". USP has already made a formal complaint on this issue, which GCC has ignored just as it has ignored the separate correspondence from both USP's architects and Planning Consultants, which is appended.

I also find it as surprising as I find it perplexing that GCC can wish USP well with regard to the applications for additional grant funding when

a) GCC's non-disclosed CPO amendment has in fact caused the bulk of the project deficit

b) GCC also awarded a £1M grant for a 3 storey extension hotel, then awarded permission for a 2 storey extension hotel, which actually then increased the then very challenging project deficit.

c) GCC then post planning threatened that the Egyptian Halls would become another Springburn Baths ergo **DEMOLISHED** and USP has an independent witness to this obtuse attempt at bullying.

d) Further over the past 18 months USP has tabled the following all to no avail as nobody from GCC is able and also willing to discuss how this project can be funded:

March 2013 (14 months)-to discuss the USP Project Deficit Report, a report requested by then Head of Planning Alistair MacDonald and City Property, MD Richard Rae

May 2013 (12 months)-to discuss the combined Project Deficit, requested by then Head of Planning Alistair MacDonald and City Property, MD Richard Rae?

March 2014-to discuss the apparent BPRA Confusion caused by Ryden valuing assets not belonging to USP Ltd. Ryden requested to produce the crucial clarification of its misformed assumption and claims?

April 2014 - to discuss the *Can The Egyptian Halls be part of the City Centre Regeneration* stakeholders Consultation process?

UNION STREET PROPERTIES LTD
Registered in Scotland No: 186601
26 Foundry Lane
Dundee
DD4 6AY
Tel: (01382) 451702
Fax:(01382) 456778
email:derek@djscm.com

And you now also advise USP to get in touch with Mr Brown when USP is in a position to implement the development. **USP were for the record in a very strong position to implement the development back in 1999 - 2000 but could then not implement the project due to GCC being unable to convey the Upper Floors titles to USP as per the then legally binding missives.**

USP then afforded GCC hugely significant understanding due to this contractual breach being defined by GCC as an alleged error, which 16 years later USP discovers was in fact not an error but the result of a deliberate action. And the subsequent 2002 and 2005 CPO missives were therefore founded on GCC's either pre-meditated or inadvertent misrepresentation and let's be clear it's either one or the other. USP believes it was misled and that USP's solicitor was also misled, this has also coalesced horribly into a now 16-year delay. And if the approved scheme is ever completed will be closer to 20 years since GCC's CPO amendment cast the die! And somehow GCC think there is nothing to be discussed in relation to this?

And just to remind all stakeholders here are the Scheme options for a world-renowned architectural masterpiece:

1, GCC and Scot Govt officials could re-start collaborating with the co-owners to discuss how to secure the preservation and return to commercial sustainability of Alexander "Greek" Thomson's Egyptian Halls noted as being one of Europe's finest commercial buildings.

2, Or If the Egyptian Halls has to be eventually demolished due to now proven public sector errors and mistakes, which are still being denied. It is difficult to imagine how it could be done without closing Union Street for perhaps as long as three perhaps four years.

- Given the uniqueness of the stone carving on the façade it may be that the Historic Scotland will want it demolished by hand, stone by stone.
- Also uncontrolled removal of any part of the structure is likely to result in the collapse of the building. So it would be undertaken very, very carefully.

So to summarise extraordinary collaboration and agreement is required to save an extraordinary building! And to borrow from one Albert Einstein, who did know a thing or two!

"We can't solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them"

Yours sincerely

Derek J Souter

Derek J Souter
Director

CC Richard Brown- Exec Director DRS, Forbes Barron Head of Planning and Building Control, Annemarie O'Donnell Head of Legal Services, Local Govt Minister Derek Mackay MSP, Culture Minister Fiona Hyslop MSP, Sandra White MSP, Patrick Harvie MPS and Ward Councillors Bailie Nina Baker, Philip Braat, Gordon Matheson and USP Directors Duncan Souter and Kelvin Kerr

Owner of crumbling landmark in appeal over CPO

shows what could be done at the city council-owned former Royal High School.

INSIDE: The former school has a multitude interior.

THE owners of a crumbling landmark building in central Glasgow have called on the city council to review a "flawed" Compulsory Purchase Order made in the 1990s.

Co-owner Derek Souter, of Union Street Properties, which is based in Dundee, has handed a 222-page dossier to council leaders in an attempt to either restore the 142-year-old Grade A-listed Egyptian Halls in Union Street, or have it knocked down.

Mr Souter said a CPO deal in 1996 was flawed and he is calling for the council to review it, accusing it of "ineffective use of relevant legislation".

The order related to previous owners of the building's top floors and Mr Souter's company agreed to buy the floors if the previous owners dropped a CPO appeal.

Mr Souter, who, together with co-investors bought the final part of the three-storey site more than 10 years ago, wants the council to help them find some of the £20 million needed to transform the building into "one of the best-looking hotels in the UK".

It has stood empty for 10 years and was granted planning permission to become a 154-bedroom hotel in 2012.

A council spokeswoman said: "The council has corresponded with the developer on this particular matter before, and we continue to hold the view we have done everything in our power to support this project and acted appropriately at each stage.

"The council has supported the potential development of the Egyptian Halls for a long time now and look forward to a business plan that could deliver this."

Author's 'dog dirt' jibe

PLANS for the restoration of Donaldson's College and the creation of a new crescent overlooking the historic building in Edinburgh were unveiled in August.

In 2012 the A-Listed structure was added to the Buildings At Risk Register by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland.

The developer of the new St James Quarter has John Lewis as its top department store in the £850 million revamp of the eyesore building.

The focus has been on its centrepiece, described as the "the lost hotel" after author Candia McWilliam said it "resembled dog dirt".

Officer arranged sex with missing girl, 15

A POLICE constable who arranged to have sex with a 15-year-old runaway while investigating her disappearance has been jailed for four years.

Leigh Brighouse, 33, of Hitchin, Hertfordshire, called her to discuss sexual services, arranging for her to travel to his house, after being assigned to the case in August 2014.

The court heard he claimed to have been handed an escort card and told to stop by his colleagues, who thought he was contacting the missing girl. He pleaded guilty to three counts of misconduct in a public office as well as downloading indecent images of a child.

2014- GCC endorses HLF approach, whilst praising itself; how unlike it!

Public Sector Dysfunctionality - Prima Facie evidence that The Left Hand did not know what the Right Hand had done?

2014 Confirmation GCC supports the HLF £5M Grant Application

Executive Director
Richard Brown

Development & Regeneration Services
Glasgow City Council
231 George Street
Glasgow G1 1RX
Phone 0141 287 8555
Fax 0141 287 8444

Our ref LD
Your ref
Ask for Liz Davidson
Phone Direct 0141 287 8831
Fax Direct 0141 287 6030
Email liz.davidson@drs.glasgow.gov.uk
Date 5 February 2014

For the attention of Derek Souter
Union Street Investments Limited/Union Street Properties Limited
26 Foundry Lane
Dundee
DD4 6AY

Dear Sir

THE EGYPTIAN HALLS - HLF ENTERPRISE GRANT APPLICATION

The Egyptian Halls are a nationally important, A Listed building which Glasgow City Council has strived over a number of years to secure the successful re-use of. As you will be aware the Council took the unusual step of consolidating the building's ownership through a Compulsory Purchase Order - with full ownership passing to yourselves in 2009 - as we felt that the previous mixture of disparate private owners meant that it would be impossible to rescue and restore the property until such clarity of ownership, purpose and intent was achieved. Subsequent to that we have continued to work with yourself and your design team as you have presented the Council with proposals for its re-use, most latterly as a hotel with foodcourt at ground floor.

Glasgow City Council wish to confirm its strong commitment to securing a future for this imposing building designed by one of our finest architects – Alexander 'Greek' Thomson and wish you success in your application to the Heritage Enterprise Grant Scheme. We look forward to learning the outcome of this bid in due course.

Yours faithfully

Liz Davidson
Principal: City Design

cc Martin Fairley, Head of Investment, Historic Scotland

2015 – GCC/HES torpedo a £5M HLF grant surreptitiously

2015 Confirmation GCC (and HES) then torpedo the HLF £5M Grant Application

Scotland
38 Thistle Street
Edinburgh EH2 1EN

Telephone
0131 225 9450

Textphone
020 7591 6255

Facsimile
0131 225 9454

Website
www.hlf.org.uk

heritage lottery fund

27 May 2015

Our Ref: HE-14-08261

Derek Souter
Director
Egyptian Halls Building Preservation Trust
26 Foundry Lane
Dundee
DD4 6AY

Dear Mr Souter

HE-14-08261 Egyptian Halls The preservation and return to commercial sustainability of this Grade A Listed architectural masterpiece

We have now completed our assessment of your application and it was presented for a decision by our Board of Trustees on 19 May 2015.

We have decided not to offer a first-round pass and development grant to your project. I know this will come as disappointing news to everyone who has been involved in developing it so far, and I have set out our reasons below.

- We have discussed the project with both Glasgow City Council and Historic Scotland. Our conclusion is that there is no realistic prospect of you receiving funding from either of those bodies, or from the Scottish Government, in the foreseeable future. The proposal submitted to us is therefore not viable.
- There are no partners or end users on board as occupants for the lower level of the building.
- The application provided very little information on what the proposed activities would be as part of the project, or what benefits might accrue to the local community.
- Both our Committee for Scotland and our Board of Trustees voted unanimously to reject the application.

As we expect strong competition for our funds to continue, we recommend that you should not consider reapplying to us for this project unless there are significant changes in the circumstances mentioned above.

Awarding funds from The National Lottery®

2018 GCC Legal disclose inadvertently an internally known Contract Breach, which was not disclosed externally to Scotland 's First Minister, GCC Councillors and USP.

Wednesday, 4 July 2018 15:16:42 British Summer Time

Subject: RE: e mail of the 21st June 2018
Date: Tuesday, 3 July 2018 15:20:39 British Summer Time
From: Fisher, Richard
To: Derek Souter
CC: Miller, Iain

Ken , I rest my case ! Every response results in the same rehashed diatribe going over old ground .

The only point he has was that in December 1999 we entered into missives with Union Street Developments Ltd (not USP Ltd) (renewing the terms of the 1996 missives with the previous consortium). These missives contained the provision that GCC would obtain title using the GVD procedure .

In fact GCC had agreed with the consortium that they would use the Notice of Title / Notice to Treat procedure in order to obtain immediate entry. This procedure had in fact been effected before we entered into the 1999 missives .

Accordingly we were in breach of the missives entered into (subject to a weak argument on error). If USP had expended money or altered their position in some way prior to knowing about this error in 2002 and had taken action then they may have had some sort of case. This is subject to them being able to get over the difficulty that the missives were not with them, which seems to me to be a major initial difficulty .

They would further have to show they relied upon the GVD procedure being utilised and that if they had known the notice to treat procedure was being used they would never have proceeded .

However they were fully aware in 2002 of the change and in fact agreed that it should be used in all missives since 2002 . As far as I am aware no property was acquired by USP between 1999 and 2002 (as they could not get finance arranged). Most of the properties were acquired before they entered into the missives and self-evidently could not have been induced by anything in subsequent missives .

USP then purchased a further property in the block in 2005 when they were fully aware of the agreed utilisation of the Notice to Treat procedure .This is entirely inconsistent with the position now advanced : that if they had known they would have pulled out of the deal.

No complaint let alone legal action was made until c 2013 .

On this basis any right of action has long since prescribed .

We could answer Soutar's questions on the basis of the above but I would strongly advise against doing so . To concede now that we were indeed in breach of the 1999 missives will just renew his conviction he is right and will perpetuate further diatribes .

I think it is strongly advisable to maintain the position that 1) It was agreed that all correspondence on the historic legal issue would be between myself and his solicitor and 2) that our position has been set out clearly and finally .

On the non-legal issues of grants , redevelopment , designs etc obviously these can be addressed if so wished .

I hope this is OK but no matter what we do it will not prevent widely circulated , histrionic e-mails being circulated .

- **CPO Review Key Downloads for Mediation/Arbitration or Court of Session-**

How Defeat was snatched from the Jaws of Victory - STV 2001
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/page13.html

FEB 2024 - GCC's misrepresentation to Provost, Scotland's FM, USP, key stakeholders 1999- 2024
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/CPO Title Transfer Delay-Inadvertent Misrepresentation Document.pdf

AUG 2023 - Egyptian Halls Slicing the Gordian Knot
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/SlicingTheGordianKnot.pdf

JUNE 2023 What caused the Year 2000 Scheme to Founder?
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/What Caused The Brilliant Feasible Year 2000 Scheme To Founder.pdf

MARCH 2023 - How a barrier to regeneration was created inadvertently
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/How A Barrier Was Created Inadvertently.pdf

AUG 2022 - HES Request for Accountability
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/HES-Accountability-Appendices.pdf

SEPT 2019 - Why did the 1996 Egyptian Halls CPO fail? Briefing to SPICE- Scottish Parliament
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/1609-2019-UPDATEDEgyptianHallsCPOBriefingNote.pdf

SEPT 2019 - Why has GCC's CPO Amendment Claim "it will only delay your scheme by a few months" become 312+ months and MANY times the original £3M cost?
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/2409-2019-GCCsFeb1998CPOAmendmentwillcausea300monthdelay-WHY.pdf

NOV 2018 - History of Non-Viability Development caused by GDA, HS, GCC, assisted by Scot Govt.
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/0811-2018-TheEgyptianHallsNonViabilityConfirmation1996-2018.pdf

NOV 2018 - Missed Opportunities caused by GDA, HS, GCC assisted by Scot Govt
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/assets/files/0511-2018-HistoricMarketingandMissedOpportunitiesSummary1996-2018.pdf

JAN 2024 – Detailed evidence of attempted engagement and avoidance of difficult decisions
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/ProductiveProblematicNowHopefullyProductiveDiscussions.pdf

JAN 2024- Correspondence proving attempted engagement and avoidance of difficult decisions
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/EgyptianHallsSpineTimelineofCorrespondence.pdf

JAN 2024- Expert studies by Conservation accredited Structural Engineers/specified architect
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Egyptian Halls Structural Survey Glossary Year 2019-2023.pdf

MARCH 2024 Spine line of key documents detailing errors, mistakes, misrepresentation and
http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/Key Documents-Deed of Conditions Summary.pdf

JAN 2026 GCC DV Valuation Reports update ***http://www.egyptianhalls.co.uk/2701-2026-UPDATED%20Response%20E-Halls%20DV%20Valuation%20Report-9th%20July%202025.pdf***

- **Hardies Cost Consultants LBRN Discharge Cost Estimate Feb 2025**

Egyptian Halls Scheme Repair, Development and New Build Extensions Costs
16 March 2023
Construction Costs_Shell
Excludes Fees & VAT

February 2020 Includes 22% for Preliminaries and contingency, split 15/7

	LBRN/Repair/Replacement	Full Construction Specification	Extension Costs (above existing envelope, above level 04)	Total
Option A	10,700,000.00	0.00	0.00	10,700,000.00
Option B	11,683,000.00	0.00	2,147,000.00	13,830,000.00
Option C	13,083,000.00	0.00	4,297,000.00	17,380,000.00
Option E+A4	10,700,000.00	0.00	7,830,000.00	18,530,000.00

February 2020, add for contingency at 15%

Option A	11,400,000.00	0.00	0.00	11,400,000.00
Option B	12,452,000.00	0.00	2,288,000.00	14,740,000.00
Option C	13,941,000.00	0.00	4,579,000.00	18,520,000.00
Option E+A4	11,407,000.00	0.00	8,343,000.00	19,750,000.00

February 2020, add 15% for professional fees

Option A	13,110,000.00	0.00	0.00	13,110,000.00
Option B	14,319,000.00	0.00	2,631,000.00	16,950,000.00
Option C	16,034,000.00	0.00	5,266,000.00	21,300,000.00
Option E+A4	13,116,000.00	0.00	9,594,000.00	22,710,000.00

February 2020, add £200,000 for preparatory works plus contingency and fees = £265,000, say £300,000

Option A	13,410,000.00	0.00	0.00	13,410,000.00
Option B	14,619,000.00	0.00	2,631,000.00	17,250,000.00
Option C	16,334,000.00	0.00	5,266,000.00	21,600,000.00
Option E+A4	13,416,000.00	0.00	9,594,000.00	23,010,000.00

Projected to February 2023

	LBRN/Repair/Replacement	Full Construction Specification	Extension Costs	Total
Option A	15,290,000.00	0.00	0.00	15,290,000.00
Option B	16,671,000.00	0.00	2,999,000.00	19,670,000.00
Option C	18,617,000.00	0.00	6,003,000.00	24,620,000.00
Option E+A4	15,293,000.00	0.00	10,937,000.00	26,230,000.00

Projected to February 2025

	LBRN/Repair/Replacement	Full Construction Specification	Extension Costs	Total
Option A	16,230,000.00	0.00	0.00	16,230,000.00
Option B	17,686,000.00	0.00	3,184,000.00	20,870,000.00
Option C	19,548,000.00	0.00	6,372,000.00	25,920,000.00
Option E+A4	16,001,000.00	0.00	11,609,000.00	27,610,000.00

Exclusions

The following are not included in these Project Estimates:

- Value Added Tax
- Planning and other Local Authority charges
- Ground investigation surveys and reports
- Land purchase and legal fees
- Contributions to Section 75 works agreements
- Finance Charges
- Sales and Marketing costs
- Any costs caused by 'Third Party Rights'
- Loose furniture and soft furnishings
- Office equipment fit out
- Tenant fit out requirements
- Hotel operator fit out requirements
- Data wiring, CCTV wiring, equipment and fit out (Containment is allowed for)
- Specialist Security
- Corporate and tenant signage
- Works associated with any archaeological studies.
- Site Acquisition/Development Costs