

EPH Modernisation Programme Board

26 April 2013

Present: Tracey Carter, Ian Floyd, Kevin Hall (Chair), Melanie Hopewell (Minutes), Graham Terry, Steve Waddington, Chris Weeks.

Apologies: Stewart Halliday.

Item		Action
1	Introduction and Revised Project Structure	
	<p>General discussion acknowledging recent CMT discussions and increased profile/priority rating for the EPH project corporately. The revised project structure and this Board's new membership reflects this. Other discussion points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GT decision had been to go to consortium to build EPH and houses which would give a capital receipt from the sale of the houses • SW – wouldn't necessarily put houses together with an EPH as could be confusing • GT – want a Community Village not 2 separate projects. 	
2	Minutes from 27 March 2013	
	Agreed as an accurate record.	
3	Programme Highlight report	
	<p><u>Procurement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision to stay with what was previously agreed • TC questioned why Addleshaw Goddard were so involved now that we had brought in Zara Carter and Emma Kerr to work on the project. • GT felt that Addleshaw Goddard's expertise was still required albeit on a smaller scale • PQQ has been taken as far as it can then it will be passed to Addleshaw Goddard for checking etc • Project costs summary CW/ZC/EK to meet to make sure utilising the resource appropriately going forward. • ZC/EK to start to consider process for core and variant bids. • As soon as possible, map out the Competitive Dialogue process/timeline and plan/book in diaries Programme Board dates as will be required at key stages. 	<p>ZC/EK</p> <p>ZC</p>

	<p><u>Design & Build</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spend on quotes for site investigation £8.5k and archaeological survey (£15k) agreed. <p><u>Key Programme Issues & Risks</u></p> <p>Issue 1 – Need a business case – why are we doing it and bring to Board for information/understanding. Reset the story using headlines from the July 2011 report</p> <p>Issue 2 – Link to wider Burnholme project. Need to be sure of financial viability before public engagement – PC to be clear in his report about the development of the site and make sure that there is a list of what else will be on the site ie GP practice/Community Hub etc. CW to follow up on the progress with the Secretary of State application (make sure it is known that the playing field has not been used for a number of years).</p> <p>Issue 3 – University of Stirling Dementia Design Award – incorporate within our specification as a requirement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can't afford to 'over-do' the quality message • Language we use will be very important – eg modern/fit-for-purpose rather than state-of-the-art. Stick with the same language for the life of the project. • Would aspire to Gold Award but not specify it. <p>Issue 4 – Anticipated value of capital receipt for Lowfield housing –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options paper to next Board. • Clarify what's in Local Plan for Lowfield – 13 acres (6 village/7 Greenfield) <p>Issue 6 – Housing Requirements – SW to liaise with PLS, and ensure he is comfortable with what is going into the Technical Brief document.</p>	<p>CW</p> <p>IA</p> <p>SW</p> <p>SW</p>
4	Financial Model	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invite Debbie Mitchell to the next Board meeting to provide a 'walk-through' of the model to increase the Board's understanding. 	CW
5	4 June Cabinet report	
	<p>Following comments on the initial draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised draft of report to be ready to share with TSL by Fri 3 May • Remove paras 7-11 and para 20. • Need to re-set the story of why we are doing this project – rationale and business case. Also bring to next Board. • Include Annex on demographics/ageing population/increase in dementia, etc. • Burnholme site – PC to provide the wording on location of EPH site 	CW

	<p>and link to/plans for wider Burnholme project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TC/DM to prepare Finance wording for the report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Keep very high level, using the key messages/figures from the Member briefing slides. – Include a figure re: affordability, and some supporting narrative, spelling out the risks should tender prices come back too high. – Mention option of developer funding the build, but higher costs. – Incurring significant borrowing costs. – Include reference to minimal sunk costs for aborted Fordlands – Update on £ already in capital programme and seek endorsement to incur the costs to get us to tender stage. 	
6	Project Resources	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alice Beckwith joining the project for 70/80% of her time • Zara Carter will be full time for the duration of the project. • Ian Asher looking to procure Technical Advice support for the procurement/CD in particular • Ann Ferguson – looking to procure a dementia specialist to support EPH staff development / culture change process (and to input to procurement process) 	
7	AOB	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring a paper to next Board detailing the responsibilities of the Programme Board, Project Team, etc. • Agreed that GT will now chair Project Team but that TC will attend until post-Cabinet report and issue of PQQ/OJEU notice. 	<p>AB/CW</p> <p>GT/TC</p>