

## **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
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and Revised Project Structure</b>	
	<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"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• SW – wouldn't necessarily put houses together with an EPH as could be confusing</li> <li>• GT – want a Community Village not 2 separate projects.</li> </ul>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes from 27 March 2013</b>	
	Agreed as an accurate record.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Programme Highlight report</b>	
	<p><u>Procurement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision to stay with what was previously agreed</li> <li>• TC questioned why Addleshaw Goddard were so involved now that we had brought in Zara Carter and Emma Kerr to work on the project.</li> <li>• GT felt that Addleshaw Goddard's expertise was still required albeit on a smaller scale</li> <li>• PQQ has been taken as far as it can then it will be passed to Addleshaw Goddard for checking etc</li> <li>• Project costs summary CW/ZC/EK to meet to make sure utilising the resource appropriately going forward.</li> <li>• ZC/EK to start to consider process for core and variant bids.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>ZC/EK</b></p> <p><b>ZC</b></p>

	<p><u>Design &amp; Build</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spend on quotes for site investigation £8.5k and archaeological survey (£15k) agreed.</li> </ul> <p><u>Key Programme Issues &amp; 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"> <li>We can't afford to 'over-do' the quality message</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Would aspire to Gold Award but not specify it.</li> </ul> <p>Issue 4 – Anticipated value of capital receipt for Lowfield housing –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Options paper to next Board.</li> <li>Clarify what's in Local Plan for Lowfield – 13 acres (6 village/7 Greenfield)</li> </ul> <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><b>CW</b></p> <p><b>IA</b></p> <p><b>SW</b></p> <p><b>SW</b></p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Financial Model</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invite Debbie Mitchell to the next Board meeting to provide a 'walk-through' of the model to increase the Board's understanding.</li> </ul>	<b>CW</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4 June Cabinet report</b>	
	<p>Following comments on the initial draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised draft of report to be ready to share with TSL by Fri 3 May</li> <li>Remove paras 7-11 and para 20.</li> <li>Need to re-set the story of why we are doing this project – rationale and business case. Also bring to next Board.</li> <li>Include Annex on demographics/ageing population/increase in dementia, etc.</li> <li>Burnholme site – PC to provide the wording on location of EPH site</li> </ul>	<b>CW</b>

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