EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

31st May 2011

DISPOSAL OF SITE OF FORMER PARK HOUSE (150 EVESHAM STREET)

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Cllr Braley, Portfolio Holder for Corporate Management
Relevant Head of Service	Teresa Kristunas, Head of Finance & Resources
Non-Key Decision	

1. <u>SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS</u>

Members are requested to declare the site of the former Park House (150 Evesham Street) surplus to requirements and to make it available for disposal.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Executive Committee is asked to RECOMMEND that

the site of the former Park House (150 Evesham Street) be declared surplus to requirements and available for disposal.

3. BACKGROUND

Although Park House itself was demolished several years ago the site was never declared surplus and available for disposal. As such the site has not been included in the Asset Disposal Programme.

4. KEY ISSUES

- 4.1 The site is on the corner of Evesham Street and Ludlow Road as indicated on the plan attached at Appendix A. The total site is approximately 1,030 sq. meters (0.25 acres) and slopes steeply down from the Evesham Street frontage. Vehicular access is possible from Ludlow Road.
- 4.2. Since Park House was demolished the site has remained vacant and no alternative use for the site has been identified.
- 4.3. The Council's Development Group has considered the site and Planning officers would in principal support a residential development.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Disposal of the site would general a capital receipt that could be used to support the Council's Capital Programme.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

31st May 2011

6. <u>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</u>

There are no legal implications.

7. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

No policy implications.

8. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

This site if declared surplus would be included in the Council's Asset Disposal Programme.

9. RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUDING HEALTH & SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

There are no significant risks associated with the disposal of this site.

10. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct customer implications.

11. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

There are no equality and diversity implications.

12. <u>VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS, PROCUREMENT AND ASSET MANAGEMENT</u>

It is good Asset Management practice to identify asset surplus to requirements and arrange for their disposal. The capital receipt generated by the disposal can use to meet other Council objectives/priorities.

13. CLIMATE CHANGE, CARBON IMPLICATIONS AND BIODIVERSITY

There are no climate change, carbon or biodiversity implications.

14. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

There are no relevant HR implications.

15. GOVERNANCE/PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no governance/performance management implications.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

31st May 2011

16. <u>COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS INCLUDING SECTION 17 OF</u> <u>CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998</u>

There are no relevant community safety implications.

17. HEALTH INEQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

There are no relevant health inequalities implications.

18. <u>LESSONS LEARNT</u>

None.

19. COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

None at this stage.

20. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	Yes	
Chief Executive	Yes	
Executive Director (S151 Officer)	Yes	
Deputy Chief Executive/Executive Director –	Yes	
Leisure, Environment and Community Services		
Executive Director – Planning & Regeneration,	Yes	
Regulatory and Housing Services		
Director of Policy, Performance and	Yes	
Partnerships		
Head of Service	Yes	
Head of Finance & Resources	Author	
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic	Yes	
Services		
Corporate Procurement Team	n/a	

21. WARDS AFFECTED

Central Ward.

22. APPENDICES

Appendix A - Plan of site.

23. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Files held by Property Services.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

31st May 2011

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Teresa Kristunas

E Mail: <u>teresa.kristunas@redditchbc.gov.uk</u>

Tel: (01527) 64252 ext 3295