

AGENDA ITEM No. ⁴

REPORT

To: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY) SUB-COMMITTEE	Subject: ARRANGEMENTS FOR DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY - ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION	
From: DIRECTORS OF ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT		
Date: 13 January 1998	Ref: TG/IG	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Council has previously considered a series of reports relating to arrangements for the disposal of property in so far as they relate to the marketing of properties, arrangements for submission of offers and the subsequent disposal of property.
- 1.2 Notwithstanding the foregoing, at the meeting of the Planning and Development (Buildings and Property) Sub-Committee on 6 January 1998, a situation arose where two of the offers received for the disposal of a particular property were for identical sums.
- 1.3 At the meeting, it was agreed that in order to assist the Sub-Committee to determine between competing bids where the financial consideration was identical, that a set of criteria be developed to aid the Sub-Committee in its deliberations.

2 Proposed Criteria

- 2.1 To assist the Sub-Committee in situations such as that described above, it is proposed in the first instance that the Directors of Planning and Development and Administration, as appropriate, ascertain whether there are any suspensive or prohibitive conditions attached to the offers which might qualify, detract from, or otherwise affect the integrity of any of the offers, ie where a bid is dependent upon a planning permission being granted or a particular planning requirement being waived or a particular service being provided, or for instance, the offer is subject to soil surveys/ground conditions report etc.
- 2.2 In the absence of such suspensive/prohibitive conditions it is proposed that the Director of Planning and Development consult with other Council departments, as appropriate, to ascertain whether there is any benefit in the intended usage by the bidder being used as a factor in determining between bids.
- 2.3 In the absence of any suspensive/prohibitive conditions or of benefits identified as a result of looking at intended uses by Council departments, it is proposed thereafter that identical offers be distinguished by way of a lot, in so far as the names of the bidders would be put in a receptacle and the first name drawn considered to be the successful bidder. This should be a most unlikely event and should only very rarely require to be used.

3 Recommendation

3.1 The Sub-Committee are asked to approve the criteria outlined in section 2 above.


Director of Administration


Director of Planning and Development

Should any Member require further information please contact Tom Gaffney at extension 2342.