

EPH Modernisation Programme Board

15 August 2013

Present: Paul Edmondson-Jones (Chair), Ian Floyd, Stewart Halliday, Graham Terry, Chris Weeks, Alice Beckwith, Zara Carter, Max Thomas, Melanie Hopewell (Minutes)

Apologies: Steve Waddington, Tracey Carter, Kevin Hall

Item		Action
1	Minutes from last meeting	
	The minutes from the meeting held on 27 June 2013 were agreed	
2	Highlight Report	
	<p><u>St Aelred's playing field</u> Change of use of land – the paperwork is not yet complete so will have to wait until the New Year for a decision from the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Potential impact if permission not granted would mean the use of the Burnholme site would have to be looked at again</p>	
	<p><u>Fordlands Capital receipt</u> It is unlikely we will be able to realise the £800k due to the site being redesignated as flood plain since the first valuation was carried out.</p> <p>Discussion took place about whether there was any potential to lift the site above the flood plain (approx 1.8m) which could restore the value of the land.</p>	
	<p><u>Internal legal capacity</u> The lack of consistent legal input and advice is causing some difficulty – managing the locum is taking up valuable time from other areas of work; because of the hours we are offering we are not getting the calibre of candidates that we need. IF to take this forward.</p> <p>AB will provide a forecast of the peaks and troughs within the resource plan where legal will be required.</p> <p>There was an acceptance by the Board that Addleshaw Goddard would continue to be utilised until issues around resourcing were resolved.</p>	<p>IF</p> <p>AB</p>
3	Results of PQQ Evaluation	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were 6 responses, one of which was non compliant 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 5 submissions were evaluated <p>Board decision: To take through three submissions</p> <p>AB: Action to ask Addleshaw Goddard to put their verbal advice regarding the process in writing for the record.</p>	AB
4	Evaluation model	
	<p>ZC went through her report and asked the Board to review and approve that criteria and weightings as detailed in her report.</p> <p>Board agreed to approve Tier 2 weightings as written with no changes.</p>	
5	Burnholme/St Aelreds - development area and site access	
	<p>Board are asked to consider the recommendations contained within the report and approve the following recommendations::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To note the progress and future activities to be undertaken to obtain Secretary of State's approval for the development To approve the development area for the care home will be in accordance with Annex B that should provide future opportunity to develop the remainder of the site To approve the development of the care home access route through the Burnholme College site <p>Board agreed the recommendations within the report as above.</p>	
6	Service development programme for existing EPHs/staff - funding	
	<p>Report to request Board approval to commit @ £80k of the EPH Project £500k budget to the funding of a service development programme in the current EPHs over the next 3 years.</p> <p>GT advised there would be a saving arising from a reconfiguration of the current EPHs to provide more dementia places which are in demand therefore avoiding placing residents in more expensive private sector homes.</p> <p>IF requested EPH budget be a standing item on the agenda for this Board. CW to provide updated figures for the next Project Board to enable decisions to be made on budget spend</p>	CW
	AB/IF to discuss procurement/legal issues outside of this meeting.	IF/AB
7	AOB	
	<p>JRHT involvement as "critical friend" for the project was carried in the Press today.</p>	

