

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL – RECORD OF DECISION

DECISION TAKEN BY:

Peter Oakford, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services

DECISION NO:

25/00026

For publication

Key decision: YES

Key Decision criteria: The decision will result in savings or expenditure which is significant having regard to the budget for the service or function (currently defined by the Council as in excess of £1,000,000).

Title: Disposal of surplus land at Broomhill Bank school (North), Puddledock Lane and Rowhill Road, Hextable BR8 7RP

Decision: The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services to agree to:

1. the disposal of surplus land at Broomhill Bank School (North), Hextable BR8 7RP; and
2. delegate authority to the Director of Infrastructure, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance, Corporate and Traded Services, to finalise the terms of the disposal and execution of all necessary or desirable documentation required to implement the above.

Reason(s) for decision:

The land is surplus to the Council's operational requirements and due to the projected value will require a Key Decision as per Kent County Council's (KCC's) constitution.

The sale of the property will result in a capital receipt which will be reinvested back into the Council's Capital Programme.

Cabinet Committee recommendations and other consultation:

The proposed decision was discussed and considered by the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee on 5 March 2025, where the proposed decision was ENDORSED.

The views of the Local Member were sought and reported to both the Policy and Resources Cabinet Committee meeting and Cabinet Member taking the decision.

In addition, due to the close proximity of Wilmington constituency boundary, contact was also made with the neighbouring Local Member Avtar Sandhu MBE (Conservative).

Any alternatives considered and rejected:

The Council has an overarching duty under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to secure not less than best consideration in respect of property disposals. It also has a fiduciary duty to the taxpayers of Kent.

As the site is not required for the former use, other options were considered:

- **Reuse the site** - *no other services have a requirement* for the land and the remaining buildings are too dilapidated to bring back into beneficial use.
- **Continue to hold the site vacant in case of a future requirement** - *not considered practical* due to on-going holding costs, risk and the opportunity cost associated with the capital receipt.
- **Let the property as part of the Tenanted Estate to generate an income** - *not considered feasible* due to the poor condition of the buildings and the opportunity cost associated with the capital receipt.
- **Disposal of the asset** - to reduce the revenue holding costs and deliver a capital receipt *recommended*.

Any interest declared when the decision was taken and any dispensation granted by the Proper Officer: None.



Signed

20 March 2025

Date