

Ref:

Called in

Yes/No

THE THANET DISTRICT COUNCIL

RECORD OF DECISION OF CABINET

Cabinet Member

Councillor Helen Whitehead

Relevant Portfolio:

Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Housing and Community Services

Date of Decision:

29 April 2021

Subject:

Procurement of Works at Royal Crescent, Ramsgate

Key Decision

Yes

In Forward Plan

Yes

Brief summary of matter:

Cabinet considered a report recommending that the council enter into a new contract for works to two buildings within its housing stock, subject to the approval of the required budget by full council.

The proposed works are a 3 phase programme of structural works and passive fire works at 4-15 and 19-23 Royal Crescent, Ramsgate.

The value of the estimated value of the contract is detailed in the report and exceeds £250,000.

Decision made:

Cabinet agreed the following:

1. The letting of the contract for the structural works and passive fire safety works at Royal Crescent, Ramsgate, as detailed in this report, subject to the approval of the required budget by full council;
2. The slippage of £800k from the current 2020/21 HRA capital programme against expenditure on this project during the financial year 2021/22;
3. Recommending to full council that the additional budget requirement of £1.978m be allocated to the HRA capital programme, from the HRA Major Repairs Reserve for the financial years 2022/23 and 2023/24;
4. The proposed options for the recharging of apportioned costs to leaseholders, as set out in section 6 of the cabinet report.

Reasons for decision:

4-15 and 19-23 Royal Crescent, Ramsgate are grade 2 listed buildings considered to be of significant heritage value. Both buildings are in need of repair.

The approval of the additional budget that is required to complete the works as part of

the Housing Revenue Account capital programme is a decision for full council.

The report identified the high cost of the works and the corresponding recharges to leaseholders and therefore some protections were agreed for leaseholders as set out in the report. This includes options to defer payment and an intent for the council to refer the final level of recharges to the First Tier Tribunal for an independent ruling.

Alternatives considered and why rejected:

Alternatives considered were:

1. Not completing the works. This option was not agreed as the works are considered to be essential.
2. Reducing or capping the recharges to leaseholders. This option was not agreed as legal advice obtained by the council indicated that any arbitrary cap on recharges would not be legal and that the council is under a duty to balance the needs of leaseholders and tenants.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by any executive Member who has been consulted and of any dispensation granted by the Standards Committee:

None

Author of Officer report:

Bob Porter, Director of Housing and Planning

Background papers

Procurement of Works at Royal Crescent
Annex 1_ Royal Crescent Cabinet Report.docx - Google Docs

Statement if decision is an urgent one and therefore not subject to call-in:

None

Last date for call in: 11 May 2021