

RMBC Evaluation Criteria for Assets of Community Value – Doncaster Gate, Former Hospital & Offices, Rotherham, S65 1DJ

DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED:	14 NOVEMBER 2013	DATE DECISION TO BE MADE BY: (8 WEEKS FROM RECEIPT OF APPLICATION)	9 JANUARY 2014
NOMINATED ASSET AND ADDRESS:	FORMER DONCASTER GATE HOSPITAL & COUNCIL OFFICES, DONCASTER GATE, ROTHERHAM, SOUTH YORKSHIRE, S65 1DJ		
NOMINATING ORGANISATION:	ROTHERHAM DISTRICT CIVIC SOCIETY, 43 SCHOLES LANE, SCHOLES, ROTHERHAM		

When a nomination for an asset of community value is received, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council will consider the nomination using a staged process.

STAGE 1

Part A, B and C criteria for assessing whether the nominating group is eligible to nominate and if the application has been completed in full in order to make a decision on listing (in accordance with that set out in the Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012). Each section relates to the nominating organisations completed nomination form and contains a reference to the relevant legislation.

PART A – Who can nominate an Asset of Community Value (criteria specified in the Asset of Community Value Regulations 2012)	CHECKLIST
A1. Is the nominating organisation an eligible body to nominate? (Section 5 of the Regulations)	Pass/Fail PASS – Charity
A2. If the nominating is not constituted has it supplied the name and home addresses of a minimum of 21 members registered to vote in the nominating area?	PASS - The nominating group have 68 individual members who are registered to vote locally within the borough of Rotherham. Each of these names and addresses has been provided as part of the completed application form.
A3. Has a site identification plan which identifies the extent of the boundary been supplied as part of the completed application?	PASS - site identification plan supplied as part of the completed application

IF 'YES' TO ALL OF PART A, MOVE TO PART B

IF 'NO' TO ONE OR MORE OF PART A, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS (PROCESS TO BE CONFIRMED)

PART B – Information on the nominated property	CHECKLIST
B1. Is the description of the property and the property address completed on the nomination form?	Pass/Fail PASS
B2. Has the property owners name and address been supplied on the completed on the nomination form?	PASS
B3. Is the nominated asset outside of one of the categories that cannot be assets of community value? (Schedule 1 of the Regulations)	PASS

IF ‘YES’ TO ALL OF PART B, MOVE TO PART C

IF ‘NO’ TO ONE OR MORE OF PART B, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS (PROCESS TO BE CONFIRMED)

PART C – A local connection to the property/land being nominated	CHECKLIST
C1. Does the nominating body have a local connection to the asset nominated? (Section 4 of the Regulations)	Pass/Fail PASS – The application form states that the nominating group have NO local connection to the asset being nominated. However, the nominating group have 68 individual members who are registered to vote locally within the borough of Rotherham. Each individual names and addresses have been provided as part of the application form. Therefore, it is considered that the nominating group has a local connection to the asset nominated. Therefore move to Stage 2 of the evaluation criteria form.

IF ‘YES’ TO PART C, MOVE TO STAGE 2

IF ‘NO’ TO ONE OR MORE OF PART B, FOLLOW PROCESS FOR UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS (PROCESS TO BE CONFIRMED)

STAGE 2

Stage 2 criteria for assessing whether an asset is of community value has been developed by Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council based on Part 5, Chapter 3, Section 88 of the Localism Act 2011.

Section 88 of the Localism Act states that the asset will be considered to be one of community value if:

- a) its actual current use furthers the social wellbeing and interests of the local community, or a use in the recent past has done so. *(the legislation does not provide for a specific period, but as a general rule use in the past five years is considered to be relevant)*
- b) that use is not an ancillary one; and
- c) for land in current community use it is realistic to think that there will continue to be a use which furthers social wellbeing and interests, or for land that has been in community use in the recent past, it is realistic to think that there will be community use within the next five years (in either case, whether or not that use is exactly the same as the present or past); and
- d) it does not fall within one of the exemptions (see Stage 1 B3).

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHETHER THE USAGE CURRENTLY OR IN THE RECENT PAST FURTHERS SOCIAL WELLBEING AND INTERESTS OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY			CHECKLIST
D1. Does the nominated property currently further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community? (this could be different from its current or past use).	Evidence provided by nominee:	The nominating organisation has stated on the nomination application form that they believe that the façade of the building should be retained in a development that may include community/heritage uses. This is the only evidence which has been provided in relation to D1.	Pass/Fail
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.):	<p>The building was vacated by Rotherham Council in January 2012 (i.e. two years ago). Before then it was used to host Rotherham Council support services. It was vacated by the health service in 2009.</p> <p>The property does not meet the requirements of this criteria.</p> <p>English Heritage declined to recommend Doncaster Gate Hospital buildings as a listed building in 2009.</p>	FAIL

D2. Could the nominated property in the future further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community? (this could be different from its current or past use).	Evidence provided by nominee:	The nominating organisation has stated that they believe that the façade of the building should be retained in a development that may include community/heritage uses. This is the only evidence which has been provided in relation to D1.	Pass/Fail FAIL
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.):	<p>The nominating group have only mentioned the original front façade of the building and not the entire building as identified on the application form and identification plan. The nominating organisation has not provided any future viable scheme(s) for the listing of the building as an asset of Community Value on their nomination form other than for “community/heritage uses”.</p> <p>The property has been marketed for sale for a period of approximately 18 months with no viable schemes or offers having being received for the continued future use or alternative use for the building. No viable scheme has been presented to the Council which could in the foreseeable future further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community. The continued retention of the building is therefore no longer a viable option and would not further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community in the future.</p>	

		It could cost up to £4m to put the building into a useable condition and secure its future use. There have been no plans put forward that show the funding and plans could be put in place.	FAIL
--	--	---	-------------

OTHER SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE NOMINATING GROUP			CHECKLIST
D3. Why do you feel that the property is an asset of community value?	Evidence provided by nominee:	The nominating organisation has stated; a) That the property was built in 1890 by public subscription. b) It is a well known feature of the town centre. c) It contains a war memorial and a number of features of local interest.	Pass/Fail
	Evidence gained from other relevant sources (owner, Ward member etc.):	The property is acknowledged as being a longstanding feature of Rotherham town centre which includes a war memorial. However, this is insufficient in itself to warrant the listing of the asset on the successful register. Since the original date of construction the site has been comprehensively redeveloped and the building itself has been subject to a series of works of reconfiguration as both a hospital and latterly as office accommodation. Thus the original character of the internal elements of the building has been lost.	FAIL

		<p>From a planning perspective English Heritage declined a previous opportunity to list the building as it was not considered of adequate architectural interest.</p> <p>The application does not present a viable economic justification which provides a future sustainable use of the entire building.</p>	FAIL
--	--	---	-------------

IF THE NOMINATION PASSES STAGE 2 PARTS D1, D2 AND D3 THE PROPERTY WILL BE LISTED ON THE SUCCESSFUL REGISTER AS AN ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE.

IF THE NOMINATION FAILS STAGE 2 PARTS D1, D2 AND D3 THE PROPERTY WILL BE LISTED ON THE UNSUCCESSFUL REGISTER AND NOT LISTED AS AN ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE.

RECOMMENDATION:	Not to list Doncaster Gate as an Asset of Community Value
REASON FOR DECISION:	The nomination application form does not provide sufficient evidence in support of the nominated asset, furthering the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community either currently or in the future (as evidenced above). Therefore the application to nominate the property as an Asset of Community Value is unsuccessful and will be registered on the unsuccessful register.
RECOMMENDATION MADE BY:	David Stimpson (Estates Manager)
DATE:	10 December 2013