

**EPH Accommodation Review – Project Board  
MINUTES**

Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2013 – 2.00 till 4.00p.m.

**Attendees:** Paul Edmondson-Jones, Tracey Carter, Ian Floyd, Graham Terry, Alice Beckwith, Stewart Halliday, Debbie Mitchell, Steve Waddington, Ruth Lowman (minutes)

**Apologies:** Chris Weeks, Max Thomas

	<b>Item/Action</b>	<b>Action By</b>
1.	<p><b>Minutes of last meeting</b> The minutes of the last meeting were agreed.</p>	
2 & 3	<p><b>Project Highlight Report &amp; Key Risks</b></p> <p>Alice gave an update on the current situation with each of the three bidders:</p> <p><b>Bidder 1</b> – are very engaged and seem to know what they’re doing (which exposes some of our uncertainties). They are keen to get into York and to have a flagship home here. Their major concern is about the plans for the wider Burnholme site (however, we will not know full details of these plans for at least a year).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Tracey and Phillip Callow to meet with Bidder 1 in January, with the company who are doing the Burnholme work, to begin an early dialogue. Alice to check Tracey’s availability for this.</p> <p>There is also some concern about the secretary of state change of use permissions. Phillip Callow is meeting the Leader of the Diocese tonight.</p> <p>Bidder 1 has submitted a list of 14 things they need from us e.g. KPIs, payment mechanisms. The Board agreed that these requests are reasonable and that this info should go to all bidders. Debbie advised that all the info will not be available until the end of January.</p> <p><b>Bidder 2</b> – everything is going okay. Initially they thought the plan was not workable, but they are now very keen and are spending money on progressing their plans.</p> <p><b>Bidder 3</b> – has not produced a design and thinks that the spec is fundamentally unaffordable. They will not take feedback on board from the planning consultant. The care provider is very good and has a lot of experience. Bidder 3 has a cost of £130 per bed per week which is higher than we anticipated. Also, they will not bid based on a 1:6 ratio as they believe it to be unsafe. The Board discussed current ratios in our EPHs. Industry standards are between 1:6 and 1:7. Dementia Care Matters says it should be 1:5.</p> <p>Bidder 3 has given us six points to agree before they continue with the project. The main one is asking CYC to underwrite the risk that more than 50% of staff transfer.</p> <p>Bidder 3 also raised the issue of inflation on the 15 year contract. They would</p>	<b>AB &amp; TC</b>

	Item/Action	Action By
	<p>like confirmation of this.</p> <p>The Board discussed the political implications if Bidder 3 pulls out. It was agreed that this can be managed.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice to go back to all 3 bidders to say that we have had a number of enquiries re affordability and to request compliant and variant bids <u>if</u> they feel the compliant bid is unaffordable (the core bid is one which meets the full specification and the variant bid is one which meets our financial requirements). To bidder 3 Alice will also communicate that we can't meet their demands and that we can't confirm at this stage whether we can do anything re TUPE. If they stay in the process, we will have the conversation with them again about not liking their housing design. Alice to ask bidder 3 for a decision by Monday.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice to speak to Tim Atkins on the Community Stadium team, as they have gone through a similar process with bidders.</p> <p>In light of the decision to request two versions of the bid, the Board decided to offer bidders a six week extension. This will mean taking the decision to Full Council in October (later than originally planned).</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice to offer bidders a six week extension and to give Paul a revised timetable.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice and Paul to discuss briefing Tracy Simpson-Laing about the changes to the timescales.</p> <p><b>Affordability</b> Debbie explained that there is approx £1.3 million gap in funding for the programme at the moment. Ian stated that we can't change the affordability now because this would result in a non-compliant tender.</p> <p>In light of the concerns raised about affordability, the Board discussed whether the project is still deliverable. A decision was made that it is too early to pull out at this stage, but that we need to more actively look into a Plan B.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Graham to re-appraise the options to identify what the best Plan B is. This should be completed for mid-March ready for when bids are submitted. The Board will then re-visit the discussion on whether to continue with the current course of action.</p> <p><b>Site Surveys</b> Ian is having conversations with the companies who undertook the surveys to try to persuade them to provide warranties. If this is not possible, we will have to accept the risk of continuing without warranties. There are a couple of surveys outstanding that still need to be done.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice to initiate the outstanding surveys.</p>	<p><b>AB</b></p> <p><b>AB</b></p> <p><b>AB</b></p> <p><b>AB &amp; PEJ</b></p> <p><b>GT</b></p> <p><b>AB</b></p>

	Item/Action	Action By
	<p><b>Resources</b> The Board discussed whether the programme is resourced appropriately. Alice identified that there is a gap re commercial expertise.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Alice and Paul to discuss separately at the end of this meeting.</p>	<b>AB &amp; PEJ</b>
4.	<p><b>Service Development Programme</b> Graham explained the costs attached to this programme of work. One-off capital investment of around £11k is needed before April for Windsor House, in order to carry out much needed painting and lighting works. If the six other homes go through the same process this will cost £75k to £80k in total. Paul confirmed that standards in the homes are currently not acceptable. Graham will look into the possibility of using Yorcraft to do the painting, which may bring costs down. Steve highlighted that Yorcraft staff will need appropriate health and safety knowledge to work in that environment.</p> <p>The maintenance budget for the homes is overspent. Alice suggested using money from the EPH programme to cover the costs for now, and transferring it back at a later date.</p> <p><b>Action</b> – Graham to put a programme together with timescales in the next week or two, to show to Kersten.</p>	<b>GT</b>
5.	<p><b>AOB</b> <b>EPH Wider Reference Group</b> Graham gave an update that this group have met and are still on board. They are realistic about the compromises that may need to be made.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Date of next Project Board</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2014</li> </ul>	

Note – all EPH Accommodation Review project documents and papers are accessible to Project Board members in the following shared folder - [L:\GROUP\EPH\\_Accommodation\\_Review](L:\GROUP\EPH_Accommodation_Review)