

Item No: 6	Classification: Open	Date: April 21 2008	Meeting Name: Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Report Title:		Call-in: Disposal of various Council owned properties (Executive April 8 2008)	
Ward(s) or Group affected:		All	
From:		Head of Overview & Scrutiny	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That overview & scrutiny committee considers a call-in request relating to the decision taken by the executive on April 8 2008 in respect of the disposal of various council owned properties.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On April 8 2008 the executive considered a report on the disposal of various council owned properties. The open report is attached as an appendix. The closed report, not for publication by virtue of category 3 of paragraph 10.4 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules, and closed minutes are included in the closed agenda.
3. The executive received a deputation from the tenants/users of 39b Consort Road. The deputation requested a postponement of the consideration of the disposal of 39b Consort Road. The deputation spokesperson Mr Paul Kelly reported that the group had not received the letters sent by the council notifying them of the proposed disposal or informing them of the executive meeting due to consider the disposal and therefore did not have adequate time to prepare their case. Mr Kelly reported that there were a large number of interested parties/users of 39b Consort Road who would have wanted to make representations to the executive had adequate notice of the meeting been given. Correspondence from Mr Kelly to the Chair and Vice-Chair of this committee is attached as an appendix.
4. The executive agreed:
 - a) That the deputy chief executive be authorised to dispose of the council's interest in various properties either at auction or by an alternative method of sale, as detailed in the schedule attached as appendix B ("the Properties") of the report, and conditional upon the same being declared surplus to council requirements;
 - b) That the deputy chief executive be authorised to set the level of reserve below which each of the Properties will not be sold prior to any sale at auction;
 - c) That the capital receipts from the sale of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Properties be recycled and used in accordance with the provisions of the capital finance regulations. The remaining receipts will be added to the corporate resource pool;

- d) That in accordance with point 14 of the report, a further period of time, (three months from the date of this meeting) is afforded to interested parties to agree the terms of any sale with the council in accordance with the executive resolution dated 15th May 2007;
 - e) That prior to any auction sale, the council recover from the purchaser the Council's professional fees amounting to 2% of the purchase price for each of the Properties;
 - f) That in accordance with point 12 of the report, a further period of time (three months from the date of this meeting) is afforded to the tenants of 39b Consort Road to agree the terms of any sale with the council.
5. On April 16 2008 the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee - Councillor Fiona Colley - and three members of the Committee (Councillors John Friary, Barrie Hargrove and Veronica Ward) requested call-in of the decision on the following grounds:

"We request to call-in this decision due to concerns that the Executive did not take the decision in accordance with the principles of decision making as set out in the constitution. We have particular concerns with regard to the lack of consultation about these decisions and that these decisions do not maintain the link between strategy and implementation

39B Consort Road – Spike Surplus

We have particular concerns about the decision to dispose of 39A Consort Rd, currently occupied by a community project. The tenants claim not to have been consulted and options other than sale at auction do not seem to have been fully appraised (as required in the Medium Term Financial Strategy).

The Executive does not appear to have considered the potential impact of this decision on the Southwark 2016 (Community Strategy) commitment to "Encourage and support self help and community-led activities that help create safer, stronger communities and improve quality of life and community cohesion" or on the Corporate Plan target to increase the percentage of residents who have given two or more hours' unpaid help to one or more groups, organisations or clubs in the past year.

1 – 99 Athenlay Road, 151 – 161 Gordon Rd – Pre Fab sites

The decision to dispose of these sites appears to mark the abandonment of the Pre fabs project referred to in the housing strategy as one of the ways in which the council will meet its Corporate Plan and Community Strategy targets for new affordable homes, particularly larger family size affordable homes.

The Q3 2008 performance statistics highlight the council's performance at Amber against its target of building 750 new affordable homes per annum. It is unclear how the abandonment of this project will affect the council's ability to meet this target. The report also fails to explain why this project has failed or how the council intends to rehouse the remaining pre fab tenants on Ivydale Road if it is unable to provide the new affordable homes they have been promised.

Possible alternative courses of action include not disposing of the sites, extending the lease of 39A Consort Rd and resurrecting the pre-fabs project. These options and others can be explored at the call-in meeting.

We do not believe this decision is outside the policy framework.”

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

6. Requests for call-in should normally only be made if there is evidence that the decision was not taken in accordance with the principles of decision making as set out in the Constitution:
 - Proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the outcome);
 - Due consultation and the taking of professional advice from Officers;
 - Respect for human rights;
 - Presumption in favour of openness;
 - Clarity of aims and desired outcomes;
 - The link between strategy and implementation must be maintained;

Decision making generally should have reference to the policy framework and be in accordance with the budget.

7. The Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules require the Committee to consider any call-in request and in particular whether or not the decision might be contrary to the policy framework or not wholly in accordance with the budget. Advice should be sought from appropriate Chief Officers including the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Finance Officer.
8. If, having considered the decision and all relevant advice, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee is still concerned about it, then it may either:
 - refer it back to the decision-making body *[or officer to whom responsibility for that decision was delegated]* for reconsideration, setting out in writing the nature of its concerns; or
 - refer the matter to Council Assembly if the decision is deemed to be outside the policy and budget framework.

9. The executive member with relevant portfolio responsibilities has been advised of this meeting.

LEGAL & FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10. Rule 18.6 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules requires a call-in to be requested by the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee plus three members of the Committee; the call-in request has been validly made in accordance with this rule.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held at	Contact
Executive agenda & minutes	Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB	Everton Roberts Constitutional Team 020 7525 7232

Audit Trail

Lead Officer	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	
Report Author	Peter Roberts, Scrutiny Project Manager	
Version	Final	
Dated	16/04/08	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	Yes	-
Executive Member	No	-

APPENDIX

From: spike surplus
Sent: 11 April 2008 17:59
To: Colley, Fiona
Cc: Olan Trust; Salmon, Jane
Subject: Urgent - Scrutiny Call-in Request

Dear Councillor Colley,

1. At the Council Executive meeting on 8 April 2008, the Executive considered a proposal to dispose of various council owned properties (Item 10 - 'Disposal of various Council-owned properties'). One of these properties was The Spike Surplus Scheme, 39b Consort Road, SE15 2PR.
2. Decision was made to proceed with the disposal of the properties by way of auction; the properties included the premises we lease, where our community project has been operating for a decade.
3. I write to you as Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on behalf of the Project's Management Committee, in the hope that you and your fellow committee members would consider calling-in the above decision.
4. We consider that the decision was incorrectly made as we were not informed in any way about the impending decision until 15:30 on the day of meeting (less than four hours prior to its commencement).
5. As a result, the Executive was not in possession of the full facts of the case, since we had not been given any time to prepare or make representations which otherwise would've had a reasonable chance of persuading the Executive into a more in-depth consideration of our premises.
6. As the decision has serious repercussions for the future of our project, and our positions, we consider the lack of consultation and the resultant lack of an opportunity to put our case is a breach of the human rights of ourselves and our organisation - namely the right to a fair hearing in any decision by a public body that determines our rights.
7. We appreciate that, as with all 'interested parties' involved with properties being disposed-of by the Council, we have three months to discuss with officers potential for purchasing the site. However, this unfortunately does not meet the need for us to be consulted and our opinions taken into account before, and not after, the fundamental decision (i.e. to sell the premises, and declare the premises is surplus to requirements, and effectively refuse renewal of our lease) is taken.
8. The decision was made against the background of an officers' report from the Head of Regeneration, which set-out the principles of disposing of 'surplus' assets, and the best practice and regulatory framework surrounding this. The report was generic to all of the sites included in the proposal, and utterly failed to address the issues it

raised in relation to our premises. With any amount of time to prepare, we would have been able to ensure that the Executive were fully informed on these points.

9. The Executive were presented by officers a report that made the assumption that our premises were surplus, and no reference was made to, and no consideration given to the value of the current project and usage of the site.
10. No consideration was given to a granting a new lease or amending the lease (perhaps on more commercial terms) if best value from the site was an issue.
11. No consideration given to the planning history of the site as a community facility for over a century (previously used as a workhouse, a reception centre for homeless men, a childrens recycled resources centre, and then the current project).
12. No consideration was given to adjourning the matter in the case of our premises to allow time for proper preparation and information.

Background to the decision

13. We have a current lease of the premises.
14. Mohammed Lias of Southwark property division claimed to have sent a letter to us concerning the Executive meeting, by recorded delivery dated 27th February 2008. Upon further discussions with Mr Lias, it transpired that he nor his colleagues have any record of sending such letter. Mr Lias now claims a letter was sent unregistered. We have a secure mail box facility, and nothing was received at the premises.
15. The first we heard of the meeting was at 15.30 on 11 April when Mr Lias contacted miss Malcomson by phone to ask if she knew of the meeting that evening.
16. Both Miss Malcomson and the project team were shocked, as the last time Miss Malcomson had spoken to Mr Lias in February. He made no mention of any intention for the disposal of property; instead they discussed meeting with Russell Proffitt (head of regeneration) about the future development of the Spike Surplus Scheme. We had previously been told of rumours that the Council had considered the site as a potential social housing site, but that it was considered unsuitable for housing due to restricted access.
17. With under four hours notice, we managed to gather together around 60 of those interested in saving the premises from sale and protecting the future of the project, outside the Town Hall, this group included the project team, some of our constituent projects, and local residents that we had contacted hurriedly that evening. (Indeed, several attendees could not fit into the committee room to observe the proceedings.)
18. We were told to nominate a spokesperson who would be given five minutes to make a case to the executive, to dissuade them from authorising the sale. This we duly did.

19. The spokesperson requested a postponement of any discussion of the Schemes future on the grounds that it is an essential community resource and time had not been given for us to prepare our case, inform our constituent projects, users, and local residents, or even our ward councillors, or seek legal advice, given the public and private nature of the decision.
20. None of the members of Executive were familiar with the Spike Surplus Scheme, or any of the excellent work that has been carried out over the last decade, and we only had 5 minutes to explain, with no preparation time.

Background to our project

21. The Spike Surplus Scheme is a vibrant community hub of cultural and artistic activity with an emphasis on sustainable living within an urban environment as a guiding principle. We are local people who are passionate about the welfare of our local community.
22. We have a thriving community garden incorporating a wildlife garden to encourage local biodiversity and disabled access raised beds for growing vegetable. We hold weekly community gardening days enabling those in the local area without access to a garden to come together to learn and exchange skills and grow food.
23. With more than a two-year waiting list for Council allotments, this is an essential outlet for green fingers. We undertake permaculture design courses. We currently have funding from Scarman's Trust and UnLtd to provide these services for free to local residents. These have been hugely successful inspiring further community gardens London (and Country!)-wide. We also run an intense programme of specialised courses to help people live more sustainable and healthy lifestyles (such as composting, good diet advice, traditional crafts using garden materials).
24. There is a popular community high quality recording studio and rehearsal space encouraging and empowering local talent (especially popular with local young people). All equipment for the studio has been donated by local residents and groups. There is no other space of its type in the borough, which enables young people to rehearse and record affordably (the scheme is operated on a donation basis). The scheme provides free inductions and specialised instruction for sound engineering.
25. One of key elements of the project is 'The Dojo', a community room which houses a thriving centre of physical and mental wellbeing with a weekly healing drop-in clinic as well as other classes throughout the week including martial arts, dance, yoga and alternative therapies.
26. There is a wood workshop available for members of the community to use. This space has facilitated the training of carpenters, cabinetmakers and sculptors.
27. We have continued the work of the Scrap Scheme (the Childrens' Scrap Scheme was commenced by the previous occupants run until a decade ago, hence the name

'Spike Surplus Scheme') by promoting recycling and re-use, and making old materials useful for other groups and projects. We have functioning solar energy and intend to develop this part of the project as an example of sustainable living to all the community who use the space.

28. We have many plans for the development of the space. We are working towards equipping the space to run creative play schemes during school holidays, utilising the diverse areas available, and for beyond we are working with architects to see how the site can be further ecologically developed.
29. Many other initiatives operate from the premises, including a community printing press 'HomeBrew Press', all the services provided on or from the site are provided freely to local residents, or on a donation basis where more significant costs are involved.
30. Considering the nature of our organisation, and our commitment to providing facilities and skills to the local community where possible for free, consideration of renegotiation of our lease (even if on more commercial terms than at present) would seem appropriate.
31. Either way, giving us three months to come up with a purchasing proposal when we have no idea of even the asking price, is highly unrealistic.
32. Therefore we feel that the Executive decision should be called-in under section 18 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules.
33. We are fully committed to the space and the community. This is demonstrated by the decade of hard work, renovation and upgrading of the site, and provision of an extensive range of services to the community. We are keen to continue to work in partnership with the Council.
34. We will forward under separate cover a copy of the relevant reports, and our submissions about the how the sale of the premises does not support and in fact detracts from the principles of best consideration for 'surplus' assets as set-out in the report to committee.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Kelly
Spike Surplus Scheme

APPENDIX

Item No. 10	Classification: Open	Date: 08 April 2008	MEETING NAME: Executive
Report title:		Disposal of various Council owned properties	
Wards affected:		College, Grange, Nunhead, Peckham Rye, The Lane	
From:		Deputy Chief Executive	

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That the Executive authorise the Deputy Chief Executive to dispose of the council's interest in various properties either at auction or by an alternative method of sale, as detailed in the schedule attached in appendix B ("the Properties"), and conditional upon the same being declared surplus to council requirements.
2. That the Executive authorise the Deputy Chief Executive to set the level of reserve below which each of the Properties will not be sold prior to any sale at auction.
3. That the Executive authorise that the capital receipts from the sale of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Properties is recycled and used in accordance with the provisions of the capital finance regulations. The remaining receipts will be added to the corporate resource pool.
4. The Executive resolves that in accordance with point 14 below, a further period of time, three months from the date of this meeting, is afforded to interested parties to agree the terms of any sale with the Council in accordance with the Executive resolution dated 15th May 2007.
5. That the Executive authorise, prior to any auction sale, the recovery from the purchaser of the Council's professional fees amounting to 2% of the purchase price for each of the Properties.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

6. The Properties are either held in the General Fund or in the Housing Revenue Account, see appendix B attached. The Properties to be sold require substantial capital investment or could not be economically occupied for Council use
7. Authority to sell is delegated to the Head of Property in individual cases where sale prices are below £500,000. It is considered that in the majority of the cases the sale price of each of the Properties identified in this report will exceed this limit and therefore Executive approval is required.

8. All the Properties considered for disposal have been declared surplus to requirements by the relevant director, or are in the process of being so declared. In the event that a surplus declaration is not forthcoming such properties will be withdrawn from sale. Each one is identified in bold in the attached ordnance survey extracts contained within appendix C.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

9. In accordance with the principles and policy of good asset management laid down by government together with local authority regulations, Councils are required to dispose of surplus property assets subject to best consideration requirements.
10. The sale of these Council assets will assist the Council in complying with the above regulations and will realise significant contributions for the Councils capital programme.
11. The Properties are likely to be offered for sale at auction, the earliest date being June 08, however if the Head of Property considers that another method of sale will yield a higher capital receipt then he will use an alternative means of sale.
12. The Tenants of 39b Consort Road will be afforded the opportunity to make an offer for the freehold interest, in advance of a sale at auction, subject to the Council's legal obligation to seek best consideration.
13. The disposal of the Properties will ensure they are brought back into beneficial use through private developers or owner/occupiers, relieving the council from its obligation to do so. In addition it will alleviate the Council of the costs of security, ongoing management and maintenance.
14. On the 15th May 2007 Executive agreed in principle to support the development of the site at 91 – 99 Athenlay Road for a self build scheme subject to Housing Corporation funding and disposal at market value and for a report to come back to Executive with details of the scheme. Housing Regeneration has been trying to identify a suitable self build organisation to develop the site as well as secure grant. To date grant funding for such a scheme has not been identified, and the possibility remains slim.
15. Executive approved the terms of a sale to Wandle Housing Association in connection with 151-161 Gordon Road, SE15 on the 08th November 2005. Wandle have sought to renegotiate the terms of the sale on a number of occasions and has failed to meet the agreed timetable for completion of this matter.
16. On the 16th October 2007 Executive resolved to sell the freehold of 265-267 Old Kent Road, SE15 to the current leaseholder and tenant. Despite affording the freeholder ample opportunity to complete on the sale he has been unable to make an offer that satisfies the Council's requirements both in terms of timing and price.

17. On the 21st March 2006 Executive resolved to sell the freehold of 116-142 Woodland Road, SE19 to Metropolitan Housing Trust. After extensive negotiations Metropolitan have now withdrawn their offer for the site
18. The disposal of properties held for housing purposes is permitted by virtue of Section 32 of the Housing Act 1985, subject to the consent of the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government, where necessary. The disposal of the non-housing properties is permitted in accordance with the provisions of section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972.
19. There will be a loss of rental income as a result of the sale of 265-267 Old Kent Road. A budgetary adjustment will need to be made. It is considered prudent in terms of the Council's asset management strategy, to consider the disposal of these assets at this time.

Policy implications

20. As specified in appendix B the disposal of the Properties will generate substantial capital receipts, which will be used to provide capital funding in support of the Council's key priorities. This includes the provision, refurbishment and redevelopment of affordable housing. This assists the Council in meeting its commitment to regeneration and sustainability in housing as demonstrated through the 2005-2010 Southwark housing strategy.
21. The redevelopment or refurbishment of the Properties listed in appendix B will play an important part in delivering Southwark's neighbourhood renewal strategy.
22. The environmental improvements arising from the redevelopment or refurbishment of these properties will assist the Council in meeting its cleaner, greener and safer agenda.

Effect of proposed changes on those affected

23. The sale of the Properties will provide in many cases ideal development opportunities on what have been long neglected sites attracting antisocial behaviour as well affording a visual eyesore. Any redevelopment is likely to bring substantial environmental improvements for those that neighbour them.
24. There are no direct implications of the report's recommendations on the Council's managing diversity and equal opportunities policy.
25. The tenants of 39B Consort Road and 265-267 Old Kent Road have been advised that this report, recommending disposal at auction, is to be considered by Executive.

Consultation

26. This report relates to the disposal of council owned property assets requiring repair, refurbishment and major capital expenditure. Most of these matters are not considered to be contentious and therefore consultation is not appropriate at this time.
27. Any planning application to redevelop or change the use of any of the Properties will have to conform to the requirements of the Southwark Plan and will be subject to the statutory consultation process.

Resource implications

28. A minimum capital receipt will be generated from the sale of each of the Properties, which will equate to the reserve price to be set, prior to the auction. Refer to appendix B.
29. Where identified, 100% of the capital receipt from these disposals will be recycled.
30. In the event that the Properties are offered for sale at auction the Council's professional fees amounting to 2% of the purchase price for each property will be recovered from the purchasers in the form of a buyers premium.
31. There will be a loss of rental income to the Council resulting from the sale of 265-267 Old Kent Road.
32. The disposal of the Properties will be dealt with by the Council's property division. There are no additional resource implications resulting from the above recommendations.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Legal and Democratic Services - Legal Issues

33. The Executive will note from Appendix B that the following properties are held in the Council's Housing Revenue Account;

91- 99 Athenlay Road SE1
155 – 161 Gordon Road SE15
116 – 142 Woodland Road SE19 (“the Housing Land”)

and are held as land for housing purposes for the purpose of Part II of the Housing Act 1985 (“the 1985 Act”). Any disposal can only proceed in accordance with Section 32 of the 1985 Act, for which purposes the consent of the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government is required (“DCLG”). The DCLG has issued a number of general consents pursuant to the 1985 Act in the General Housing Consents 2005.

34. Consent E3.1 of the General Consent for the Disposal of Part II Land 2005 provides that a local authority may dispose of any land held for the purposes of Part II, for the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained, provided that any dwelling-house included in the disposal is;
- (a) vacant;
 - (b) will not be used as housing accommodation and
 - (c) will be demolished.

Appendix B of this report includes a description of the Housing Land. It appears that the Athenlay Road land may contain a dwelling-house. It appears that the dwelling-house is vacant and therefore provided that it will not be used as housing accommodation and will be demolished then the proposed disposal of this land will fall within Consent E3.1as will the Gordon Road and Woodland Road land. Provided that the surplus declaration for the Athenlay Road land is obtained prior to the disposal at auction or other alternative method of sale and that the best consideration is reasonably obtained for the Housing Land (and in this respect, in setting the reserve the Deputy Chief Executive will need to be satisfied that it does; if not then the specific consent of the DCLG must be obtained prior to the disposal and Council Assembly must agree an application to the DCLG for the disposal of housing land), the Executive may approve recommendations 1 and 2.

35. The remainder of the Properties set out in Appendix B are non-housing land, the disposal of which is governed by the provisions of Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the 1972 Act") which states that except with the consent of the DCLG, a local authority shall not dispose of land under Section 123 of the 1972 Act, otherwise than by way of a short tenancy, for a consideration less than the best than can reasonably be obtained. In setting the reserve, the Deputy Chief Executive will need to ensure that the reserve represents the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained.

Finance Director

36. This report recommends the disposal of a number of properties at auction, or by an alternative method. Individual amounts are shown for each of the properties in Appendix B of the closed version of this report and disposal will generate capital receipts estimated to be in the region of:
- £Xm from HRA properties, of which 100% will be recycled into Housing Investment Initiatives Programme within the borough and integrated into the authority's capital allowance.
 - £Xm from General Fund properties, of which 100% will be added into the corporate resource pool to support the council's capital programme
37. One of the properties is currently attracting a rental income which will be lost, to the HRA ,on disposal .This should be noted but is not significant enough to affect the disposal decision.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Property Division files	Property Division. Chiltern House Portland St, SE17 2ES	Paul Davies 020 7525 5529

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	Audit trail
Appendix B	Schedule of properties "the Properties"
Appendix C	Ordnance Survey extracts

APPENDIX A

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Eleanor Kelly- Deputy Chief Executive	
Report Author	Paul Davies – Property Division	
Version	Final	
Dated	31 March 2008	
Key Decision?	Yes	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Legal and Democratic Services	Yes	Yes
Finance Director	Yes	Yes
Executive Member	Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services	Mar 08	

2008/2009

DISPOSAL AT AUCTION PROGRAMME

ESTIMATED VALUES

ADDRESS	DESCRIPTION	SURPLUS DECLARATION DATE	OCCUPATIONAL STATUS	CAPITAL RECYCLING/HOLDING ACCOUNT	COMMENT	WARD
91-99 Athenlay Road, SE15	Land containing post war pre fabricated dwellings	Awaited	Vacant	HRA	Residential development opportunity.	Peckham Rye
39B Consort Road, SE15	Former workshops and yard site adjacent railway lines	Corporate Property Holding Account	Subject to a lease.	100% of receipt available for the Council's capital programme General Fund	Development opportunity	Nunhead
155-161 Gordon Road, SE15	Land formerly containing post war pre fabricated dwellings	05 July 2006	Vacant	HRA	Residential development opportunity.	The Lane

265-267 Old Kent Road, SE15	Double retail unit with self contained residential upper parts.	03 August 2006	Subject to a lease	HRA		The Grange
116-142 Woodland Road, SE19	Triangular site. Formerly occupied by a post war 'pre fab' and domestic garages	23 February 2006	Vacant	HRA	Development opportunity	College