

**Report of:** Head of Oxford City Homes

**To:** Executive Board

**Date:** 5 November 2007 **Item No:**

**Title of Report :** Options for 16 Tyndale Road, St Clements.



### Summary and Recommendations



**Purpose of report:** To give the options for 16 Tyndale Road, a two bedroom traditionally built terrace house which is currently vacant but in a poor state of repair.



**Key decision:** Yes

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Patrick Murray

**Scrutiny Responsibility:** Housing Scrutiny Committee



**Ward(s) affected:** St Clements

**Report Approved by:**



**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Patrick Murray

**Finance:** David Higgins



**Legal:** Jeremy King

**Strategic Director:** Michael Lawrence



**Policy Framework:** To meet Decent Homes Target by 31 December 2010.



**Recommendation(s):** That Option 1 be adopted - to market the property generally and to submit a further report with offers received and the proposed use for the building.



### **Background –**



1. This two storey Victorian, two bedroom, house is a traditional, brick built property, which is currently void. The property is terraced and located close to the Plain in Oxford.

2. The structure of the property is solid 225mm brickwork with only a 100mm thick brick extension, which houses a kitchen on the ground floor and bathroom at first floor level. There is an original natural slate roof, which is in good condition. The property is suffering from rising and penetrating damp and needs to be treated for an infestation of common furniture beetle.
3. It has been estimated that a budget of circa £50,000 would be needed for the works, to include rebuilding the kitchen/bathroom and therefore, under the baseline refurbishment costs agreed by Members, a report indicating the options is required.

#### **Options -**

4. Option 1. To sell the property on the open market and to use the funds to help meet the shortfall in decent homes funding.
5. Option 2. To retain it and carryout the refurbishment works necessary and re-let to those on the waiting list.
6. Option 3. To reach an agreement with an RSL or Co-operative Homes, so that the property is retained within the social housing sector. Owing to the small size and cost of the repairs needed, it is unlikely that an organization of this type would find it financially viable and previous proposals submitted (for other properties) were not financially acceptable to the Council. The Allocations Team have advised that we have no need for further short life accommodation, such as that provided by Co-op Homes, as we are reducing our use of temporary accommodation. The Council cannot make a permanent nomination to it, so there is no real advantage from a corporate/social housing viewpoint. In order to judge interest, officers are currently consulting with RSL's about possible transfers of this type of property where the Council would hold nomination rights.

#### **Proposals -**

7. Owing to the extent of the works needed and the small size of the property, the proposal is to adopt Option 1. That is to place it on the open market.

#### **Legal implications -**

8. As the property is classed as HRA Land, if the Council sells to an individual or social landlord the specific consent of the Secretary of State would not be required as the proposed disposal would be covered by the General Consents (para A3 or A5) found in s.32 of the Housing Act 1985. This assumes that any disposal is for market

value and complies with rules on who can bid and whether the property must be used by the proposed purchaser as his/her principal home.

9. If the Council planned to sell to a developer then Secretary of State approval may be required.
10. Before the sale of any property, in accordance with the Constitution, a further report will be submitted to the Executive Board outlining the proposed use for the building and the terms of the disposal.

#### **Financial implications -**

11. The financial implications are set out in the exempt from publication Appendix 1 attached and show the indicative effects on revenue and capital of the various options over a five year period.
12. Option1, an open market sale would result in the loss of the potential rent but a capital receipt of circa £230,000 would be generated which would help with the decent homes funding shortfall.
13. Option 2. Retain and refurbish to decent homes standard, would maintain a revenue income but would result in Capital costs of circa £55,000 including fees.
14. Option 3. RSL or Co-operative Homes, previous discussions and proposals have resulted in a high indirect “subsidy” which has not been to the Council’s advantage and therefore not acceptable. The high initial investment needed does not make it an attractive proposition for organizations of this type.
15. The current rent is shown on the exempt from publication financial summary Appendix 1.

**Recommendation:** That Option 1 be adopted - to market the property generally and to submit a further report with offers received and the proposed use for the building.

#### **Appendices -**

Appendix 1 - exempt from publication financial summary.

**Name and contact details of author:** Chris Pyle, tel; 335411, extn 3611,  
Email: [cpyle@oxford.gov.uk](mailto:cpyle@oxford.gov.uk)



**Background papers:** None

