

Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board Agenda

Date: Wednesday, 12th May, 2010
Time: 4.15 pm
Venue: West Committee Room - Municipal Buildings, Earle Street,
Crewe, CW1 2BJ

The agenda is divided into 2 parts. Part 1 is taken in the presence of the public and press. Part 2 items will be considered in the absence of the public and press for the reasons indicated on the agenda and at the foot of each report.

PART 1 – MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH THE PUBLIC AND PRESS PRESENT

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declarations of Interest

To provide an opportunity for Members and Officers to declare any personal and/or prejudicial interests in any item on the agenda

3. Public Speaking Time/Open Session

Members of the public wishing to address the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board on reports contained within the agenda for the meeting shall be given the opportunity to do so subject to:

- 1 the opportunity being extended to one person to speak in support of each agenda item and one person to speak against each agenda item when called to do so by the Chairman;
- 2 an indication of the desire to speak on the agenda item being made by the person just prior to the meeting and the name supplied to the Democratic Services Officer in attendance, the first person registering to have precedence in the event of more than one person wishing to speak either for or against the agenda item;

For any apologies or requests for further information

Contact: Rachel Graves

Tel: 01270 686473

E-Mail: rachel.graves@cheshireeast.gov.uk

- 3 each person addressing the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board being limited to three minutes speech;
 - 4 an opportunity being provided for an expression of a contrary view, even though no prior notice has been given, when a member of the public has spoken for or against the item;
 - 5 in the event of the person having registered to speak on an agenda item not wishing to take up their right to speak on the agenda item because it was deferred, that person will automatically be given the right to speak on the agenda item at the next meeting of the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board;
 - 6 the Chairman of the meeting having discretion to rule that a person wishing to address the meeting shall not be heard if, in his/her opinion, that issue or the organisation or the person wishing to make representation on that issue has received an adequate hearing.
-
4. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting** (Pages 1 – 2)

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2010.
 5. **Round 3 Extra Care Housing Update** (Pages 3 – 14)

To receive an update on the Round 3 Extra Care Housing Schemes.
 6. **Extra Care Housing Survey Results** (Pages 15 – 22)

To receive the results of the residents survey commissioned by Advantage.
 7. **Lessons Learned** (Pages 23 – 30)

To receive a report outlining the lessons learned in Round 3 to be taken forward for Round 5.
 8. **Delegation and Roles** (Pages 31 – 38)

To inform Members of the roles and responsibilities of the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board, Cabinet/Executive , the Project Director, Joint Officer Group, Project Development Team and the Project Team.
 9. **Financial Update** (Pages 39 – 42)

To receive a summary of the financial position for Round 3 and Round 5.
 10. **Update on HCA Submission** (Pages 43 – 62)

To receive an update on the progress of the Round 5 submission to the HCA.

11. **Draft Project Plan Round 5** (Pages 63 - 70)

To receive a draft project plan for the Round 5 submission.

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the **Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board**
held on Tuesday, 2nd March, 2010 at Meeting Room 1 - Dalton House, Dalton
Way, Mddlewich, CW10 0HU

PRESENT

Councillor R Domleo (Chairman)
Councillor B Dowding (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors P Mason, L Ford and H Manley

Officers

Chris Chapman, Borough Solicitor
N Keegan, Strategic Commissioning Manager, Cheshire East Council
Sophie Middleton, Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing

8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor F Keegan.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

10 PUBLIC SPEAKING TIME/OPEN SESSION

There were no members of the public present.

11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on held on 21 December 2009 be
approved as a correct record.

On the advice of the Borough Solicitor, the following three items were
deferred. At the end of the meeting informal consideration was given to
these items which resulted in Members requesting a number of reports to be
brought to the next meeting.

12 COMPETITIVE DIALOGUE PROCESS

Item deferred.

13 UPDATE ON HCA SUBMISSION

Item deferred.

14 SCHEME OF DELEGATION

Item deferred.

15 FUTURE MEETINGS

RESOLVED:

That the future meeting dates be approved as follows:

12 May 2010
5 July 2010
7 September 2010
2 November 2010.

The meeting commenced at 4.15 pm and concluded at 4.20 pm

Councillor R Domleo (Chairman)

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

Date of Meeting: 12 May 2010
Report of: Sophie Middleton, Contract Manager– PFI Extra Care Housing
Subject/Title: Round 3 Update

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The attached report summarises the current position in the Round 3 Extra Care Housing Schemes in the Cheshire East and Cheshire West & Chester Council areas.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to note the contents of the report.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 This report will act as a basis for all Round 3 Update reports to JECHMB.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 Cheshire East Council: Crewe West, Wilmslow North, Middlewich
 4.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council: Central & Westminster, Winsford South & West

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Cheshire East Council
 Crewe West - Councillors Roy Cartlidge, Robert Parker and Jaqueline Weatherill
 Wilmslow North – Councillors Jim Crockatt, Don Stockton and Paul Whiteley
 Middlewich – Councillors Paul Edwards, Simon McGrory and Michael Parsons
- 5.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council
 Central & Westminster – Councillors Justin Madders, Derek Batemen, Lynn Clare
 Winsford South & West – Councillors Bob Barton, Malcolm Gaskill, Charlie Parkinson

6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change - Health

- 6.1 None.

7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

7.1 None.

8.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

8.1 None.

9.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

9.1 None.

10.0 Risk Management

10.1 None.

11.0 Background and Options

11.1 The Round 3 Extra Care Housing Schemes all opened in 2009. JECHMB will be receiving regular operational updates on the schemes.

12.0 Overview of Year One and Term One Issues

12.1 Not applicable

13.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Sophie Middleton
Designation: Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing
Tel No: 01625 504344
Email: sophie.middleton@cheshireeast.gov.uk



PFI Extra Care Housing

Date: 12 May 2010

Report of: Sophie Middleton / Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing

Subject: Round 3 Extra Care Housing Update

1 General

The main PFI Contract was signed by Cheshire County Council and Avantage in October 2007. This covered the design and build phase of the project and the operational phase – housing, events and facilities management. Five PFI Extra Care Schemes opened during 2009 – Handforth in January, Ellesmere Port and Middlewich in April, Winsford in June and Crewe in August containing a total of 433 apartments.

| Council | Town | Scheme | No of Apartments | Of which Social Rented |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Cheshire East | Handforth | Oakmere | 53 | 32 |
| | Middlewich | Willowmere | 71 | 35 |
| | Crewe | Beechmere | 132 | 75 |
| Cheshire West & Chester | Ellesmere Port | Hollymere | 71 | 41 |
| | Winsford | Hazelmere | 106 | 57 |
| TOTAL | | | 433 | 240 |

Applications from prospective residents are received by Avantage and a Social Care Assessment and a Financial Assessment are carried out before their application is referred to the Allocations Panel. The Allocations Panel decides whether or not the applicant meets the criteria laid out in the Allocations Policy and, if they do, the applicant's name is put on a waiting list. If a suitable apartment is available, Avantage offer the applicant that apartment.

Ideally, the Authorities and their partners are seeking to create a balanced community within each ECH scheme based on the "thirds model" – i.e. one-third Low Care, one-third Medium Care and one-third High Care needs. When each potential resident is assessed by their Care Manager or Social Worker, they are assigned a care band. The apartments have also been assigned a care band.

There is also a mix of tenure types – approximately 50% of the apartments in each scheme are designated Social Rented, 25% shared ownership and 25% for leasehold sale. Shared Ownership Apartments are part of a shared equity



scheme where the resident part owns the apartment and pays rent on the part still owned by Advantage. The proportion of the apartment owned by the resident may be increased in agreed steps, e.g. from 50% to 75% with the result that the rent will decrease. It is possible for a resident to purchase the lease for the apartment outright through this method over a number of years. Residents purchasing a leasehold apartment purchase a 99-year lease.

The latest allocations summary, which shows the number of apartments in each scheme in each care band, and the tenure assigned to them, is shown in Appendix 1.

In April 2010, it was agreed that Advantage would temporarily convert some of the Outright Sales Apartments to Social Rented Apartments. Advantage proposed this as the recession has meant that sales have been slower than anticipated. The advantage to the Authorities is that filling the apartments will increase the number of people in the schemes and therefore improve the viability of the restaurants and increase potential savings on the care contracts, etc. Although no care bands have been assigned to the transferred apartments, both CEC and CWAC are taking the opportunity to work towards the thirds model. The apartments were released as follows:

| Cheshire East | | Cheshire West & Chester | |
|---------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Oakmere | 5 | Hollymere | 8 |
| Willowmere | 7 | Hazelmere | 17 |
| Beechmere | 20 | | |
| TOTAL | 32 | TOTAL | 25 |



2 Contract Management and Monitoring

Three contracts are in place to deal with the housing/facilities management, the provision of care and the restaurant service.

2.1 PFI Contract

- (a) Parties
The Authorities/Avantage
- (b) Description
This is a 30-year contract (from Jan 2009) which deals with Building, Building Management, Housing and Facilities Management. It is a self-monitored, performance-based contract.
- (c) General Contract Management
The Authorities' Contract Manager works with Avantage to ensure that the facilities are available and performance is maintained throughout the length of the contract by:
 - Receiving and reviewing daily and monthly reports from Avantage
 - Visiting the schemes both on a regular basis and unannounced
 - Attending Residents' Meetings to gain an understanding of what is important to residents
 - Auditing specific parts of the contract, e.g. making sure that "back office" systems and reporting work are contract compliant.

The Authorities pay a monthly 'Unitary Charge' to Avantage to maintain the facilities and services that they provide. If there are unresolved problems with availability or performance, deductions are made from this Unitary Charge.

Avantage reports on a monthly basis on 94 Performance Measures reported as 40 KPIs. They also report on the availability of 698 zones, measured against 51 specific criteria. For example, a zone might be declared 'unavailable' if a window will not open or close, or if there is no safe access to a zone, if the heating does not work or if any of the fixtures and fittings are broken. There are specific timescales for the rectification of unavailability, e.g. for a window that will not open – 3 days, but a window that will not close -12 hours.



(d) Contract Monitoring

(i) Reporting by Advantage

There have been issues with the reports received from Advantage including the accuracy of the information in them and the lack of detail reported. There has been recognition by Advantage that their progress in improving the reports has been slow and recently more resources and effort have been put into reporting. The reports are now close to the standard that the Authority has requested and it is anticipated that they will achieve that standard within the next couple of months. Due to the issues with the reporting, deductions have been made from the Unitary Charge.

(ii) Defects Period

There has been a 12-month Defects Period for each scheme during which any repairs and problems with the building have been referred back to the original contractor (i.e. the builders, flooring and carpet fitters, glaziers, etc.). Oakmere, Willowmere and Hollymere are now at the end of that period and all repairs are the responsibility of Advantage. Oakmere reached the end of the defects period in January 2010 and the repairs process has been running smoothly since the handover.

Generally, across all schemes, defects include:

- Corridor handrails warping
- Carpets lifting
- Flooring bubbling in kitchens and bathrooms
- Cracking in Walls – especially around lift shafts. These are normal in timber framed buildings and most have been dealt with as they occurred. The remaining minor cracks will be dealt with at the end of the defects period.

(iii) Doors – Communal and Apartment

After the opening of the first two schemes, it was recognised that the doors from the communal areas to the private residents' areas were too heavy for some of the residents to open. All of these doors on all schemes were replaced by Advantage with automated doors and this has successfully resolved the problem.

There is also a problem with the weight of the apartment front doors meaning that frailer residents are unable to open them unassisted. These doors are heavy because



they are fire proof for 60 minutes. Avantage and the Authorities are actively pursuing an affordable solution to this problem. In the meantime, Housing 21 carers are assisting residents in and out of their apartments.

(iv) Events

Avantage's contract states that they will develop a comprehensive programme of Events and Activities to appeal to all residents and visitors. Some aspects of this programme have been extremely successful, whilst others have been less so. The main criticisms have been the variety of events arranged and the frequency.

Avantage have been working with Housing 21 and third sector partners to improve their events and activities programmes and this has partly addressed the criticisms made. The events programme for April at Hazelmere is attached as Appendix 2.

A one-day workshop will take place on Wednesday 05 May at which strategic discussions will be held on improving the nature and variety of activities and events at the PFI Schemes. This workshop will be attended by a number of senior managers from CEC, CWAC, Avantage, Housing 21 and Cheshire East and Cheshire West Catering.

2.2 Care Contract

(a) Parties

The Authorities/Housing 21

(b) Description

This is a five year contract (from 01 August 2008) which covers assessed care needs and 24-hour emergency support.

(c) Contract Management

The Authorities' Contract Manager works with Housing 21 to make the most of the resource that they provide.

Housing 21 do not have formal reporting routes but are supplying 4-weekly reports on actual care provided and emergency responses and resolution.



(d) Contract Monitoring

(i) Review of Care Contract

The Care Contract should be reviewed annually on 01 August. The process was started in January and will be concluded at the end of July. The 2010 review will include looking at the way the invoices are calculated and how the care band system works.

2.3 Catering Service Level Agreement

(a) Parties

Originally a Service Level Agreement (SLA) between CCC Adult Services and CBS Catering, this has now devolved to the Catering Services and Adult Services Departments of each Authority.

(b) Description

Open-ended SLA covering the running of the scheme restaurants.

(c) Contract Management

Regular meetings are held to discuss any catering issues.

(d) Contract Monitoring

(i) Review of Catering Service

The catering service operates the restaurants at each of the schemes. The ECH Core Team are working with both catering teams to improve the service provided and reduce the subsidy necessary to keep this important part of ECH afloat.

Avantage has just conducted a full Customer Survey on all aspects of living in the Extra Care Schemes. A summary of this survey is reported elsewhere. A meeting will take place within the next few weeks with all partners to discuss actions and responses to residents on areas where they expressed dissatisfaction.



3 Future Reporting

The Authorities' Contract Manager reports on a monthly basis to the Project Development Group and Joint Officer Group. It is proposed that Members should receive an update from the Contract Manager at alternate meetings (i.e. every two months).

Appendix 1: Summary Allocations at 21 April 2010

| 21/04/2010 | Oakmere Handforth (SCD 09 Jan 09) | | | Hollymere Ellesmere Port (SCD 24 April 09) | | | Willowmere Middlewich (SCD 23 April 09) | | | Hazelmere Winsford (SCD 29 June 09) | | | Beechmere Crewe (SCD 31 Jul 09) | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|-----|--|--------|-----|---|--------|-----|---|--------|-----|---------------------------------------|--------|-----|
| | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | Low |
| Rented | 11 | 11 | 10 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Allocated | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 18 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 21 | 34 |
| Available | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | -9 |
| No. Moved In | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 18 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 24 | 14 | 20 | 24 |
| Rented Allocated | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 99% | | |
| Rented Occupied | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 100% | | | 77% | | |
| Rented Waiting List | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shared Ownership | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Allocated | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Available | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 8 | -4 |
| No. Moved In | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Shared Ownership Allocated | 60% | | | 43% | | | 83% | | | 42% | | | 52% | | |
| Shared Ownership Occupied | 50% | | | 29% | | | 67% | | | 21% | | | 36% | | |
| Shared Ownership Waiting List | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outright Sale | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 |
| Allocated | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Available | 3 | 1 | -1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 7 |
| No. Moved In | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Outright Sale Allocated | 64% | | | 44% | | | 25% | | | 30% | | | 16% | | |
| Outright Sale Occupied | 45% | | | 19% | | | 13% | | | 7% | | | 16% | | |
| Outright Sale Waiting List | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix 2: April's Events at Hazelmere

| Sunday | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday | Saturday |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| VH Village Hall CR Craft Room RS Residents Lounge L Library/IT Suite CL Communal Lounge | R Restaurant | | | 1 2pm Egg Hunt & Bonnett Parade VH 4pm Computer Club IT 7pm Linedancing VH | 2 Good Friday Hot Cross Buns available - Restaurant 3pm Easter Chocolate Bingo VH £2 - 5 games | 3 |
| 4 Easter Sunday 10am Orchard Christian Fellowship Sunday Service 3pm Board Games RL | 5 Easter Monday Hot Cross Buns available - Restaurant 3pm Bingo - VH Restaurant - 8am-6pm | 6 11am Coffee Morning RL 2pm Needles & Pins CR 4pm Indoor Bowling VH | 7 10-2 crystal budz 2pm Craft Club - £1 2pm Grand National Horse Draw - VH 4pm Thai Chi £2 Residents £3 Non Residents VH | 8 11am Indoor Bowling VH 4pm Computer Club IT Restaurant - 8am-6pm 7pm Linedancing VH | 9 11am Book Club L 2pm Chairobics £2R £3 NonR VH 3pm T & Biscuits CL | 10 Grand National - RL 6pm Indoor Bowling VH |
| 11 10am Orchard Christian Fellowship Sunday Service | 12 11am Indoor Bowling VH 3pm Quiz CL Restaurant - 8am-6pm | 13 10am T & Toast RL 2pm Salvation Army Market Stall VH 2pm Needles & Pins CR 6pm Indoor Bowling VH | 14 11am Board Games - CL 2pm Craft Club - £1 4pm Thai Chi £2 Residents £3 Non Residents VH | 15 10am Exercise to Music 2pm Young@Hearts VH Restaurant - 8am-6pm 7pm Linedancing VH | 16 10am T & Crumpet RL 11am Indoor Bowling VH 2pm Chairobics £2R £3 NonR VH 3pm Bingo - VH | 17 6pm Indoor Bowling VH |
| 18 10am Orchard Christian Fellowship Sunday Service 3pm Board Games RL | 19 10am Bridge - VH 3pm Bingo - VH Restaurant - 8am-6pm | 20 11am Coffee Morning RL 2pm Needles & Pins CR 6pm Indoor Bowling VH | 21 2pm Craft Club - £1 4pm Thai Chi £2 Residents £3 Non Residents VH 7pm Singalong Hour Free to R. 50p NonR. VH | 22 10am Exercise to Music 2pm Young@Hearts VH 4pm Computer Club IT Restaurant - 8am-6pm 7pm Linedancing VH | 23 St Georges Day 11am Book Club L 2pm Chairobics £2R £3 NonR VH 3pm Res Mtg/Coffee RL | 24 7.30pm Bingo Evening - Resident Lead Event. VH |
| 25 10am Orchard Christian Fellowship Sunday Service | 26 11am Indoor Bowling VH 3pm Quiz CL Restaurant - 8am-6pm | 27 10am T & Toast RL 2pm Needles & Pins CR 6pm Indoor Bowling VH | 28 11am Board Games - CL 2pm Craft Club - £1 4pm Thai Chi £2 Residents £3 Non Residents VH | 29 10am Exercise to Music 2pm Young@Hearts VH 4pm Computer Club IT Restaurant - 8am-6pm 7pm Linedancing VH | 30 11am Cake Break! 2pm Chairobics £2R £3 NonR VH 3pm Bingo - VH 8pm Evening Of Jazz with Jazzworks | |
| RESIDENTS ONLY EVENT IS IN THE PLANNING STAGES - PLEASE SEE NOTICE BOARD FOR UPDATES EVENT OPEN TO RESIDENTS AND NON RESIDENTS MONTHLY SOCIAL EVENT | | | | | <h1>April</h1> | |

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Date of Meeting: | 12 May 2010 |
| Report of: | Sophie Middleton, Contract Manager– PFI Extra Care Housing |
| Subject/Title: | Avantage Annual Customer Survey 2010 |

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The final report from Avantage following their Customer Survey carried out in the first few months of 2010 has been received by the Authorities and a summary is attached to this report. Members are asked to note the results of the survey. Further work will be carried out with Avantage, Housing 21 and CBS Catering on areas identified in the survey as less than satisfactory and the results of this will be reported to the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board in due course.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to note the results of the survey.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 The first Annual Survey by Avantage was the first comprehensive gathering of residents' views on Extra Care Housing. Although a generally high satisfaction rate was achieved, there is further work to be done on areas of weakness.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 Cheshire East Council: Crewe West, Wilmslow North, Middlewich
- 4.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council: Central & Westminster, Winsford South & West

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Cheshire East Council
Crewe West - Councillors Roy Cartlidge, Robert Parker and Jaqueline Weatherill
Wilmslow North – Councillors Jim Crockatt, Don Stockton and Paul Whiteley
Middlewich – Councillors Paul Edwards, Simon McGrory and Michael Parsons

- 5.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council
Central & Westminster – Councillors Justin Madders, Derek Batemen,
Lynn Clare
Winsford South & West – Councillors Bob Barton, Malcolm Gaskill,
Charlie Parkinson

**6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change
- Health**

- 6.1 Results of the survey will feed into the production of an Extra Care
Housing Strategy.

**7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the
Borough Treasurer)**

- 7.1 None.

**8.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the
Borough Treasurer)**

- 8.1 None.

9.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

- 9.1 None.

10.0 Risk Management

- 10.1 None.

11.0 Background and Options

- 11.1 Avantage are contracted to carry out an Annual Customer Satisfaction
Survey covering all aspects of living in Extra Care, i.e. housing, care
and restaurants. The first survey was carried out in January/February
2010 and the results were reported back to the Council in April.
Further work is planned on areas where residents expressed
dissatisfaction.

12.0 Overview of Year One and Term One Issues

- 12.1 None.

13.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by
contacting the report writer:

Name: Sophie Middleton
Designation: Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing
Tel No: 01625 504344
Email: sophie.middleton@cheshireeast.gov.uk



Summary of Avantage Customer Satisfaction Survey 2009/2010

The survey was conducted during January and February 2010. 239 questionnaires were sent out to residents and 158 were returned – a 66% return rate.

Satisfaction Rates across All Five Schemes

92.7% of respondents were either very or fairly satisfied with the overall service.

| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Quality of apartment | 75.2% | 22.8% | 98.0% |
| Quality of communal areas | 81.8% | 16.8% | 98.6% |
| Security and safety | 80.8% | 15.8% | 96.6% |
| Value for money | 65.2% | 27.5% | 92.7% |
| Local area | 51.7% | 38.5% | 90.2% |
| Satisfaction with support | 66.9% | 27.2% | 94.1% |
| Satisfaction with alarm call system | 69.6% | 23.2% | 92.8% |
| Satisfaction with site officer/handyman | 67.6% | 27.3% | 94.9% |
| Satisfaction with activities | 49.6% | 40.2% | 89.8% |
| Satisfaction with helpdesk | 80.9% | 17.0% | 97.9% |
| Satisfaction with consultation/involvement | 45.7% | 36.4% | 82.1% |

With PFI Extra Care Housing Schemes, the care and catering facilities are provided under separate contracting arrangements. These were also part of the survey.

The responses to questions on catering were as follows:

| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Opening times | 49.6% | 45.4% | 95.0% |
| Quality of food | 59.6% | 34.8% | 94.4% |
| Value for money | 75.2% | 19.9% | 95.1% |
| Helpfulness of staff | 88.2% | 9.0% | 97.2% |

Residents rated care services as the most important service to them within the schemes and rated the care components as follows:



| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Cleaning | 53.8% | 35.9% | 89.7% |
| Shopping | 51.7% | 34.5% | 86.2% |
| Dressing | 67.6% | 18.9% | 86.5% |
| Bathing | 72.0% | 18.0% | 90.0% |
| Preparing meals | 52.9% | 32.4% | 85.3% |
| Getting in and out of bed | 68.2% | 9.1% | 77.3% |
| Help using the toilet | 47.1% | 17.6% | 64.7% |
| Help with laundry | 57.1% | 38.8% | 95.9% |
| Help with medication | 74.3% | 11.4% | 85.7% |
| Response to emergency call systems | 76.4% | 15.3% | 91.7% |

Satisfaction Rates by scheme and council area are appended to this report.

On the questionnaire, residents were also able to make comments on individual services and these will be used to improve services in the schemes and as part of the lessons learned exercise to inform Round 5 procurement.

Lynn Glendenning
Commissioning Manager

29 April 2010

Appendix 1: Cheshire East Schemes

| Measure | Overall | | | Beechmere | | | Oakmere | | | Willowmere | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|
| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
| Overall satisfaction with Avantage | 63.1% | 31.0% | 94.1% | 78.8% | 21.2% | 100% | 54.2% | 37.5% | 91.7% | 51.9% | 37.0% | 88.9% |
| Avantage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quality of apartment | 72.9% | 24.7% | 97.6% | 84.8% | 15.2% | 100% | 68.0% | 28.0% | 96.0% | 63.0% | 33.3% | 96.3% |
| Quality of communal areas | 82.7% | 14.8% | 97.5% | 81.3% | 18.8% | 100% | 80.0% | 12.0% | 92.0% | 87.5% | 12.5% | 100% |
| Security and safety | 78.3% | 16.9% | 95.2% | 93.5% | 6.5% | 100% | 73.1% | 23.1% | 96.2% | 65.4% | 23.1% | 88.5% |
| Value for money | 67.1% | 23.7% | 90.8% | 77.4% | 16.1% | 93.5% | 69.6% | 13.0% | 82.6% | 50.0% | 45.5% | 95.5% |
| Local area | 52.5% | 37.5% | 90.0% | 46.7% | 50.0% | 96.7% | 56.0% | 32.0% | 88.0% | 56.0% | 28.0% | 84.0% |
| Satisfaction with support | 63.5% | 28.4% | 91.9% | 74.1% | 25.9% | 100% | 52.2% | 34.8% | 87.0% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 87.5% |
| Satisfaction with alarm call system | 62.9% | 27.1% | 90.0% | 77.3% | 13.6% | 90.9% | 60.0% | 36.0% | 96.0% | 52.2% | 30.4% | 82.6% |
| Satisfaction with site officer/handyman | 60.5% | 31.6% | 92.1% | 85.2% | 11.1% | 96.3% | 50.0% | 41.7% | 91.7% | 44.0% | 44.0% | 88.0% |
| Satisfaction with activities | 49.3% | 35.8% | 85.1% | 64.0% | 28.0% | 92.0% | 40.9% | 31.8% | 72.7% | 40.0% | 50.0% | 90.0% |
| Satisfaction with helpdesk | 83.5% | 15.2% | 98.7% | 89.3% | 10.7% | 100% | 73.1% | 23.1% | 96.2% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 100% |
| Satisfaction with consultation/involvement | 41.0% | 37.2% | 78.2% | 50.0% | 23.3% | 73.3% | 34.8% | 52.2% | 87.0% | 36.0% | 40.0% | 76.0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Measure | Overall | | | Beechmere | | | Oakmere | | | Willowmere | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|
| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
| Cheshire East Catering (Restaurants) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opening times | 54.3% | 39.5% | 93.8% | 48.4% | 48.4% | 96.8% | 41.7% | 50.0% | 91.7% | 73.1% | 19.2% | 92.3% |
| Quality of food | 51.9% | 40.7% | 92.6% | 61.3% | 29.0% | 90.3% | 33.3% | 58.3% | 91.6% | 57.7% | 38.5% | 96.2% |
| Value for money | 74.7% | 19.0% | 93.7% | 71.0% | 19.4% | 90.4% | 65.2% | 26.1% | 91.3% | 88.0% | 12.0% | 100% |
| Helpfulness of staff | 85.4% | 12.2% | 97.6% | 90.3% | 3.2% | 93.5% | 73.1% | 26.9% | 100% | 92.0% | 8.0% | 100% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Housing 21 (Care Provider) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cleaning | 53.1% | 34.7% | 87.8% | 76.2% | 14.3% | 90.5% | 35.7% | 42.9% | 78.6% | 35.7% | 57.1% | 92.8% |
| Shopping | 38.9% | 44.4% | 83.3% | 71.4% | 28.6% | 100% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100% | 0% | 57.1% | 57.1% |
| Dressing | 65.2% | 21.7% | 86.9% | 71.4% | 28.6% | 100% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 87.5% | 62.5% | 12.5% | 75.0% |
| Bathing | 67.7% | 22.6% | 90.3% | 71.4% | 28.6% | 100% | 66.7% | 25.0% | 91.7% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 83.4% |
| Preparing meals | 61.9% | 28.6% | 90.5% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 100% | 60.0% | 40.0% | 100% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 66.7% |
| Getting in and out of bed | 71.4% | 7.1% | 78.5% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 100% | 75.0% | 0% | 75.0% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% |
| Help using the toilet | 50.0% | 10.0% | 60.0% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 66.6% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% | 50.0% | 0% | 50.0% |
| Help with laundry | 51.9% | 40.7% | 92.6% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 100% | 37.5% | 62.5% | 100% | 45.5% | 36.4% | 81.9% |
| Help with medication | 68.2% | 13.6% | 81.8% | 72.7% | 18.2% | 90.9% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% | 62.5% | 12.5% | 75.0% |
| Response to emergency call systems | 71.7% | 19.6% | 91.3% | 86.7% | 13.3% | 100% | 75.0% | 18.8% | 93.8% | 53.3% | 26.7% | 80.0% |

Appendix 2: Cheshire West & Chester Schemes

| Measure | Overall | | | Hazelmere | | | Hollymere | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|
| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
| Overall satisfaction with Avantage | 62.1% | 28.8% | 90.9% | 75.0% | 22.2% | 97.2% | 46.7% | 36.7% | 83.4% |
| Avantage | | | | | | | | | |
| Quality of apartment | 78.1% | 20.3% | 98.5% | 88.6% | 11.4% | 100% | 65.5% | 31.0% | 96.5% |
| Quality of communal areas | 80.6% | 19.4% | 100% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 100% | 69.0% | 31.0% | 100% |
| Security and safety | 84.1% | 14.3% | 98.4% | 91.4% | 8.6% | 100% | 75.0% | 21.4% | 96.4% |
| Value for money | 62.9% | 32.3% | 95.2% | 73.5% | 26.5% | 100% | 50.0% | 39.3% | 89.3% |
| Local area | 50.8% | 39.7% | 90.5% | 54.3% | 40.0% | 94.3% | 46.4% | 39.3% | 85.7% |
| Satisfaction with support | 71.0% | 25.8% | 96.8% | 85.7% | 11.4% | 97.1% | 51.9% | 44.4% | 96.3% |
| Satisfaction with alarm call system | 78.2% | 18.2% | 96.4% | 83.9% | 16.1% | 100% | 70.8% | 20.8% | 91.6% |
| Satisfaction with site officer/handyman | 76.2% | 22.2% | 98.4% | 91.2% | 8.8% | 100% | 58.6% | 37.9% | 96.5% |
| Satisfaction with activities | 50.0% | 45.0% | 95.0% | 57.1% | 37.1% | 94.2% | 40.0% | 56.0% | 96.0% |
| Satisfaction with helpdesk | 77.4% | 19.4% | 96.8% | 85.7% | 14.3% | 100% | 66.7% | 25.9% | 92.6% |
| Satisfaction with consultation/involvement | 51.6% | 35.5% | 87.1% | 61.1% | 30.6% | 91.7% | 38.5% | 42.3% | 80.8% |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| Measure | Overall | | | Hazelmere | | | Hollymere | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-------|
| | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total | Very Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Total |
| Cheshire East Catering (Restaurants) | | | | | | | | | |
| Opening times | 43.3% | 53.3% | 96.6% | 51.5% | 45.5% | 97.0% | 33.3% | 63.0% | 96.3% |
| Quality of food | 70.0% | 26.7% | 96.7% | 90.6% | 9.4% | 100% | 46.4% | 46.4% | 92.8% |
| Value for money | 75.8% | 21.0% | 96.8% | 90.9% | 9.1% | 100% | 58.6% | 34.5% | 93.1% |
| Helpfulness of staff | 91.9% | 4.8% | 96.7% | 97.0% | 0% | 97.0% | 86.2% | 10.3% | 96.5% |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Housing 21 (Care Provider) | | | | | | | | | |
| Cleaning | 55.2% | 37.9% | 93.1% | 56.3% | 37.5% | 93.8% | 53.8% | 38.5% | 92.3% |
| Shopping | 72.7% | 18.2% | 90.9% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 100% | 80.0% | 0% | 80.0% |
| Dressing | 71.4% | 14.3% | 85.7% | 77.8% | 0% | 77.8% | 60.0% | 40.0% | 100% |
| Bathing | 78.9% | 10.5% | 89.4% | 83.3% | 0% | 83.3% | 71.4% | 28.6% | 100% |
| Preparing meals | 38.5% | 38.5% | 77.0% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 71.5% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 83.3% |
| Getting in and out of bed | 62.5% | 12.5% | 75.0% | 66.7% | 0% | 66.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 100% |
| Help using the toilet | 42.9% | 28.6% | 71.5% | 50.0% | 0% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 100% |
| Help with laundry | 63.7% | 36.3% | 100% | 58.3% | 41.7% | 100% | 70.0% | 30.0% | 100% |
| Help with medication | 84.6% | 7.7% | 92.3% | 75.0% | 12.5% | 87.5% | 100% | 0% | 100% |
| Response to emergency call systems | 84.6% | 7.7% | 92.3% | 84.6% | 7.7% | 92.3% | 84.6% | 7.7% | 92.3% |

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Date of Meeting: | 12 May 2010 |
| Report of: | Sophie Middleton/Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing |
| Subject/Title: | Lessons Learned from Round 3 – Initial Report |

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The attached table of information has been submitted by Gleeds, CEC and CWAC's Technical Advisors for Round 3. It sets out the feedback obtained from the Lessons Learned workshop run to review the Round 3 Extra Care PFI Schemes. Much of this feedback will be used to inform Round 5 procurement and evaluation.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are requested to note this report.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 The planning for Round 5 schemes will be informed by the lessons that have been learnt from the operational Round 3 schemes. Information provided by the technical advisers is key to this process..

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 Cheshire East Council: Poynton, Sandbach East and Rode
- 4.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council: Blacon, Sutton and Manor

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Cheshire East Council
Poynton – Councillors Chris Beard, Howard Murray, Roger West
Sandbach East and Rode – Councillors Elsie Alcock, Rhoda Bailey, Andrew Barratt
- 5.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council
Blacon – Councillors Reggie Jones, Marie Nelson, Alex Tate
Sutton and Manor – Councillors Kimberley Anderson, Bob Crompton, Paul Donovan

**6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change
- Health**

- 6.1 Some of the lessons learned from the Round 3 Extra Care Housing Schemes will inform the Extra Care Housing Strategy.

7.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 7.1 In developing the business case for Round 5 it will be important to take account of the financial impact of the lessons learnt from Round 3, for example adapting the units to cater for individual's physical needs or being able to cover the costs of the catering facility. These factors are being built into the business case and plans for Round 5, and importantly in the viability assessment of the new scheme.

8.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

- 8.1 There will inevitably be some contractual changes as a result of the lessons learned during Round 3. There will also be an opportunity to improve some areas that have been questioned by the incumbent parties. Notwithstanding the success of Round 3, officers should not miss the change to develop the documentation. The fact that this procurement will be carried out under the competitive dialogue process will bring its own challenges.

9.0 Risk Management

- 9.1 None.

10.0 Background and Options

- 10.1 It was recognised early in the application process for Round 5 funding that learning the lessons from Round 3 would greatly enhance the Outline Business Case. This table has been submitted by the Councils' Technical Advisers, Gleeds, and was written following a meeting held in December 2009.
- 10.2 Since that meeting, further meetings have been held to explore some of the suggestions and criticisms in detail, concentrating on what actions can be taken to improve Round 3 as well as what lessons can be learned to inform Round 5. These results of these meetings will be reported to JECHMB in due course.

11.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Sophie Middleton
Designation: Contract Manager – PFI Extra Care Housing
Tel No: 01625 504344
Email: sophie.middleton@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Initial Listing of Lessons Learned from Round 3
(following a meeting held in December 2009)

| Comments Received on R3 Scheme | Actions To Be Taken on R5 |
|---|--|
| Design - Positive Areas | |
| Avoid institutional feel | <p>The ‘base’ documentation used to procure the R3 scheme has formed the basis of the R5 documentation drafted. This ensures the baseline expectations of bidders are set at a similar standard. There are some areas where this has moved on to keep pace with legislative and good practice changes – notably in the areas of sustainability.</p> <p>We are also aware that some of the positive aspects of the design borne out of the R3 scheme were as a result of the design development process that took place during dialogue. As many of these subjective aspects are difficult to capture in the Output Specification, it is intended to have a strategy in place for the same dialogue period on R5 to ensure similar quality is realised.</p> |
| Good wow factor | |
| Restaurants at all schemes good | |
| Design facilitates resident involvement | |
| Size of apartments good | |
| Dual access to en suite very good | |
| Design promotes independence | |
| Lots of good informal seating areas | |
| Progressive security very good | |
| Balcony areas good | |
| Interior designs well liked | |
| Kitchen windows on to “street” good | |
| Assisted bathrooms good (however see below) | |
| Automatic doors to communal areas good | |
| Games room good | |
| Design - Areas for Improvement | |
| Consider two craft rooms as take up generally very good | This could be considered however it is a cost issue. If, following submissions, there is affordability headroom then this will be considered for inclusion. |
| Location of assisted baths to be considered | This will be managed through the dialogue process. |
| Need to undertake better marketing within local community | More rigorous attention will be paid to the marketing strategy proposed by bidders, and a specific strategy will be requested. |

| Comments Received on R3 Scheme | Actions To Be Taken on R5 |
|--|--|
| No kitchens that are adapted (plus insufficient adaptations budget) | <p>Consideration is being given to two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-adaptation for a fixed number of kitchens (say 10%) for wheelchair users; or • A fit-out protocol between contractor and authority to enable final fit out of apartments to be done with reference to tenant needs (where an occupant has been identified). |
| Front doors too heavy | Sprinklers will be a requirement on the R5 scheme – this will allow lighter doors to be installed as a lower fire rating for the doors will be required. |
| Hob on/off indicator lacking i.e. don't know if hob is hot | Attention will be paid to the specification of the hobs proposed by bidders |
| Some apartments would benefit from baths | Showers will continue to be fitted as standard to meet the requirements of all users. The fit out protocol above could also be used to manage tenant preferences. |
| Position of sink in bathrooms too close to wc pan | The bathroom designs of bidders will be reviewed closely. |
| Need guest room in all developments | This could be considered however it is a cost issue. If, following submissions, there is affordability headroom then this will be considered for inclusion. |
| Need better management of allocations i.e. a greater proportion of high dependencies on ground floor | Once the preferred design is selected, the allocations protocol will be mapped onto the scheme. |
| Position of swipe readers for car parks poor | The final location of these will be scrutinised in the final designs. |
| Height of seating in some areas poor and seating should not be leather | The quality of finishes is being considered for a greater weighting in the evaluation to incentivise high quality finishing. |

| Comments Received on R3 Scheme | Actions To Be Taken on R5 |
|---|--|
| Voice privacy not good helpdesk to lounge | Consideration is being given to a small interview room to allow private conversations to take place near reception. This is however a cost issue. If, following submissions, there is affordability headroom then this will be considered for inclusion. |
| Acoustics in village hall | The quality of finishes is being considered for a greater weighting in the evaluation to incentivise high quality finishing. This will include finishes to better manage acoustics. |
| Craft room would benefit from oven | This will be included on the requirements. |
| Distance from entrance of restaurant to servery | The precise layout of the restaurant will be scrutinised in the final designs. |
| Consider losing a pamper bath for an additional assisted bath | Pamper baths were a 'bonus' feature on R3. Work will continue to establish the demand for a second assisted bathroom. |
| Carpets in restaurant | The quality of finishes is being considered for a greater weighting in the evaluation to incentivise high quality finishing. |
| Till space on servery poor for wheelchair users | The precise layout of the restaurant will be scrutinised in the final designs. |
| Quantities of equipment in kitchen needs reviewing | Review underway and specification may change. |
| Positioning of coffee machine in servery to be reviewed | The precise layout of the restaurant will be scrutinised in the final designs. |
| Need in/out door servery to kitchen | The precise layout of the restaurant will be scrutinised in the final designs. |
| Size of bath in assisted bath too small | This was specified as a standard size, but will be reviewed. |
| No hoist access | Hoist access was not fitted as standard in R3,, but will be considered in R5. |
| Treatment rooms too clinical | The quality of finishes is being considered for a greater weighting in the evaluation to incentivise high quality finishing. |
| One accessible toilet to be tracked | Included. |
| Review gym equipment | Further consultation will be undertaken on this to establish optimum mix. |

| Comments Received on R3 Scheme | Actions To Be Taken on R5 |
|---|--|
| Consider buggy store | This could be considered however it is a cost issue. If, following submissions, there is affordability headroom then this will be considered for inclusion. |
| More garden shade | It is expected that this will happen on R3 as plants/trees grow. More mature specimens to be used on R5. |
| Partnerships - Areas for Improvement | |
| Need more partners involved earlier | A similar stakeholder group to that used on R3 will be established for R5 – PCT and other partners invited on R3 but did not attend. Renewed efforts to be made on R5. |
| Get PCT onboard | |
| Allocations - Positive Areas | |
| Email panels good also round table – need to come up with hybrid of two | The allocations panel on R3 will also be used for R5. |
| Fast allocations | |
| Sales and shared ownership good | |
| Pets good | |
| Move in co-ordinators good | |
| Allocations - Areas for Improvement | |
| Consider extending 60 day period for high needs | Leaving accommodation open for a longer period is a cost issue, but efforts will be made to accommodate this. |
| Catering Contract - Areas for Improvement | |
| Earlier breakfast (from 8am) | These will be reviewed but they have a cost implication on a service already subsidised. |
| Later opening | |
| Setting realistic plan (including assumed losses in year 1) | |
| Flexibility in SLA | The use of Cheshire Business Services will be reviewed – a contract rather than SLA may be in place on R5. |
| Consider offering meal package to residents | These will be reviewed but they have a cost implication on a service already subsidised. |
| Local level care/catering meeting would be good | |

| Comments Received on R3 Scheme | Actions To Be Taken on R5 |
|--|--|
| Better advertising | More rigorous attention will be paid to the marketing strategy proposed by bidders, and a specific strategy will be requested. . |
| Internet access | |
| Service Delivery - Areas for Improvement | |
| Number of pendants insufficient | The telecare strategy 'emerged' through the R3 scheme and is under review for R5. |
| How do we get add ons | |
| Consider carving out telecare | |
| Need off site monitoring | |
| Contract monitoring need to be onboard earlier | |
| Reception opening times | Longer hours could be considered however it is a cost issue. If, following submissions, there is affordability headroom then this will be considered for inclusion. |
| OT referral system how we get adaptations through in a timely manner | The R3 scheme placed a massive demand on overstretched budgets due to the volume of people moving at once. To reduce this risk, a fund has been included in R5 to manage the peak demand in initial adaptations as people move into the new schemes. |
| Review adaptation policy/budget | |

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

Date of Meeting: 12 May 2010
Report of: Borough Solicitor
Subject/Title: Delegation and Roles

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 To outline the roles and responsibilities in relation to the Extra Care Housing PFI project ('the project').

2.0 Decision Requested

- 2.1 To note the report
- 2.2 To confirm the roles and responsibilities in relation to the Extra Care Housing PFI project
- 2.3 To agree the requirement for a full time Project Manager

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 To ensure that there is clarity about roles and responsibilities and decision-making for the project.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 No wards are affected.

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Not applicable

6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change - Health

- 6.1 Not applicable

7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 7.1 Not applicable

8.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 8.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the decisions outlined in this report.

9.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

- 9.1 It is important that there is clarity about decision-making. This report outlines the roles and responsibilities of the current arrangements.

10.0 Risk Management

- 10.1 Having robust governance arrangements should reduce risks associated with decision-making.
- 10.2 The project could be compromised by delay in decision-making. However, it is believed that the arrangements described in this report should allow decisions to be secured sufficiently quickly to allow the project to proceed.

11.0 Background and Options

- 11.1 A table appears at Appendix 1, which shows the respective responsibilities of the Councils and Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board.
- 11.2 Whilst it was not stated explicitly in the reports dealing with the setting up of the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board, Members will appreciate that all other decisions will fall to be made by officers, particularly the Project Director and Project Manager (taking direction from the Joint Extra Care Housing Officer Group and with support from lead officers for financial and legal issues and with further support from the external advisers).
- 11.3 The HCA has stated that it expects there to be a full time Project Manager and Lynn Glendenning has been earmarked for that role.
- 11.4 The responsibilities of the Project Director and Project Manager appear in Appendix 2. It is hoped that they are self-explanatory.
- 11.5 For information, a table appears at Appendix 3 showing the officers involved in the project.

12.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Andrew Leadbetter
Designation: Legal Services Manager
Tel No: 01270 866642
Email: andrew.leadbetter@cheshireeast.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

| JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD Round 5 – Procurement of New Provision | |
|--|--|
| RESERVED TO RESPECTIVE CABINET/EXECUTIVE | JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD |
| Decision to acquire a site (or secure an option on a site) including granting leases as appropriate. | Approval and review of inter authority arrangements |
| Approval of the project affordability at all stages | Provide overview of and all necessary procurement approvals other than those specifically reserved to the Authorities |
| Approval of Bidders to proceed to final stage | Approval of Outline Business Case and authorisation to submit |
| Approval of Preferred Bidder | Approval of list of Bidders to be invited to participate in the competitive dialogue procurement process |
| Award of and approval of execution of PFI contract | Recommendations to respective Cabinet/Executive in relation to procurement approvals as necessary |
| Certification of PFI Contract and costs indemnities | Appointment of external advisers (subject to Finance and Contract Procedure Rules of Lead Authority and provided appropriate budget identified by respective Councils) |
| Award of and approval of execution of Care and where appropriate Catering Contracts | |
| Changes to Terms of Reference | |
| Changes to Constitution | |
| Appointment of Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board Members | |
| It is possible for the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board to refer a matter to the respective Cabinet/Executive for decision. | |

APPENDIX 2

Duties of the Project Director and the Project Manager

Project Director

- Lead and manage the Extra Care Housing Round 5 PFI Procurement on behalf of Cheshire West and Chester and Cheshire East Councils to ensure contract close and delivery of the contract.
- Lead and manage the PFI contract for Extra Care Housing Round 3 developments on behalf of Cheshire West and Chester and Cheshire East Councils within allocated budget and workforce resources to deliver the Councils' key strategic aims.
- Effectively plan and manage the preparation, letting and control of Extra Care associated contracts for catering and care services to ensure contract compliance, effective service delivery and value for money.
- Inform, support and advise elected members of the Councils so that they can perform their executive, scrutiny and representational responsibilities and ensure that decisions are appropriately informed and services delivered in accordance with Council priorities.
- Attend and support the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board and other Council meetings as necessary to ensure members are appropriately advised and decisions are taken to meet Council priorities.
- Provide advice and support to the Director of People Services for Cheshire East Council and the Director of Adult Social Care and Health for Cheshire West and Chester Council
- Recruit, manage, motivate and develop employees in the Extra Care Project team in order to ensure all aspects of service delivery.
- Manage the Project budget in conjunction with the Project accountant.

Project Manager

- Direct, plan and manage the procurement of the Extra Care Housing Round 5 PFI Contract to ensure contract close and delivery of the contract in conjunction with the Project Director.
- Manage the project team and external advisers to ensure the efficient procurement of contracts.
- Act as principal contact with Bidders in the PFI Contract to ensure that they provide relevant information and are apprised of the Councils' requirements.

- Supervise the Project Assistant in the role of secretary to the PFI Project Development Group and Joint Officer Group and attend meetings as necessary.
- Inform, support and advise elected members of the Councils so that they can perform their executive, scrutiny and representational responsibilities.
- Manage and monitor the revenue and capital budgets, with support from Finance, reporting at regular intervals to the Joint Officer Group and Joint Board.

APPENDIX 3**ECH PFI Team**

| Project Team role | Name | Organisation | Position |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Officers | | | |
| Project Director | Nuala Keegan | Cheshire East Council | Strategic Commissioning Manager |
| Project Manager | Lynn Glendenning | Cheshire East Council | Commissioning Manager |
| Project Accountant | Lisa Quinn | Cheshire East Council | Borough Treasurer & Head of Assets |
| Project Legal Officer | Andrew Leadbetter | Cheshire East Council | Legal Services Manager |
| Advisers | | | |
| Finance | Grant Thornton | Current advisers have been appointed for the period up to the submission of the OBC. New advisers will need to be appointed once the OBC has been submitted. | |
| Technical | Gleeds | | |
| Legal | | | |
| Project Management | Gleeds | | |

ECH Joint Officer Group Members

| Cheshire East Council | | Cheshire West & Chester Council | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Phil Lloyd (Chair) | Head of Services for Adults | | |
| Lisa Quinn / Christine Mann | Borough Treasurer/ Head of Finance | Maggie Sheppard | Accounting Manager |
| Chris Chapman | Borough Solicitor | Simon Goacher | Head of Legal Services |
| Arthur Pritchard | Assets Manager | Noel O'Neill | Head of Facilities & Asset Management |
| Nuala Keegan | Strategic Commissioning Manager | Stephen Wilds | Interim Director of Adult Social Care |
| Lynn Glendenning | Project Manager | Mick Howarth | Head of Social Care Provision |
| Sophie Middleton | PFI Contract Manager | | |
| Louise Gibson | Project Assistant | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

Date of meeting: 12 May 2010
Report of: Borough Treasurer and Head of Assets
Title: Finance Update

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.0 This paper provides an update on the financial arrangements surrounding the shared Round 3 and Round 5 Extra Care Housing Schemes, which is managed by Cheshire East Borough Council on behalf of Cheshire West and Chester Council and Cheshire East Borough Council.
- 1.1 In respect of the Round 3 scheme, which is already in operation at five sites across the Cheshire area, this report provides an update on the income and expenditure during 2009/10, the resulting net position compared with the anticipated position and finally, linking to other reports on this agenda, experience financially from Round 3 that helps to inform the business case for Round 5.
- 1.2 In respect of the Round 5 scheme, this report updates on the implementation costs during 2009/10.

2.0 Decisions Requested

That the Board note:

- 2.1 The income and expenditure position on the Round 3 scheme during 2009/10 compared with anticipated position at this stage in the thirty year scheme.
- 2.2 The implementation costs incurred to date.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 The Extra Care Housing Schemes have a significant financial impact on both Councils and Members should review and note the financial position at regular intervals.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 No wards are affected.

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Not applicable.

6.0 Policy Implications including – Climate Change – Health

6.1 Not applicable.

7.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond

7.1 Both Round 3 and Round 5 remain within budget, although issues have arisen in both, such as higher than anticipated catering deficits and higher project management costs that will require tight financial control to remain in budget.

8.0 Legal Implications

8.1 None.

9.0 Risk Assessment

9.1 Risks surround the level of external project management required to secure Round 5 to the satisfaction of the Government and longer term risks surround the financial model under pinning Round 3, with small on-going changes in interest or inflation levels impacting on the longer term balance and viability of the scheme. Close scrutiny will be required to help mitigate these two risks.

10.0 Background and Options

Round 3

10.1 During 2009/10 revenue expenditure was incurred by both Councils operating the Round 3 scheme, primarily on staffing, transport, premises, catering and set up costs across the five sites in Cheshire, two within Cheshire West and Chester and three within Cheshire East. The costs have been absorbed by each Council and reflected within Adult Services. The only items that were in excess of what was anticipated were the catering arrangements costing £222,000 and set up arrangements costing £110,000.

10.2 The other main element of Round 3 is the payments to Advantage Ltd for the management of the sites and the offsetting grants received via PFI credits. In the original business case a profile of net credits and payments was approved over the 30 year life of the project, with a net credit of £827,000 anticipated at 31 March 2010. Due to the phasing and timing of grant payments, a net credit of £1,481,000 at this time will result in a surplus of £654,000 being reported. Whilst there is a surplus at this stage this is mainly a timing issue, which will help in part to offset the lower levels of interest being generated on the project at this time (4.5% assumed against nearer 1% being achieved).

10.3 During the early part of 2009/10 a mini review of the various assumptions built into the financial model that results in the thirty year profile was undertaken, in conjunction with the Councils' advisers, Grant Thornton. This review included assessing how the changes to the financial conditions following banking difficulties had and might impact, looking forward, on the long term viability of the scheme. Whilst dramatic short term impacts have been experienced on inflation and interest assumptions, over the longer term the various

assumptions were still considered prudent and achievable, and the scheme remains in balance. Continued scrutiny of the model will be undertaken annually and it is suggested that a formal review, including external advice be undertaken every three years. This will ensure that there are no major surprises towards the end of the scheme's life in approximately thirty years time. Should this arrangement be accepted the first formal review will be in the latter part of 2011/12.

- 10.4 Whilst the costs incurred during 2009/10 were not significant there have been a number of lessons which have resulted in increased costs to the scheme, and these costs have and are being factored into the business case development for the Round 5 scheme. There are two main financial impacts, set up costs as new residents move in, the costs being higher than originally anticipated, taking account, for example, an individual's specific needs and disabilities and secondly higher than anticipated losses on the catering provision, not helped in part due to the delay getting all the units occupied, particularly the owned and shared ownership units.

Round 5

- 10.5 The Round 5 scheme continues to be refined, following feedback from the Housing and Communities Agency and other Government Advisers, with the Government providing a steer that they are looking for the two Councils to develop two hundred PFI units at a cost of £66.1m. During 2009/10 the Council incurred set up costs (mostly on professional advice) of £254,000. Approximately £25,000 was incurred helping to complete and open the remaining Round 3 schemes, with £229,000 incurred on Round 5. Much of this expenditure surrounds the planning issues at the various sites and is higher than originally planned because of either planning issues that have arisen or because of changes to the sites, for example the substitution of Sandbach as a scheme.
- 10.6 The Round 5 scheme has a budget of £1.2m for Project Management costs, of which 20% has already been incurred, which is higher than anticipated, which will require tight control during the latter stages of the development in order to remain in budget.

11.0 Access to Information

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Dominic Oakeshott

Designation: People Finance Lead

Tel No: 01270 686232

Email: Dominic.Oakeshott@cheshireeast.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

Date of Meeting: 12 May 2010
Report of: Project Director/Strategic Commissioning Manager
Subject/Title: Update on HCA submission
Portfolio Holder: Cllr Roland Domleo

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 This report provides a status report on the discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency regarding the Outline Business Case and the upcoming work and resource implications.

2.0 Decision Requested

- 2.1 To receive the report and note the actions required to progress the final Outline Business Case for Extra Care Housing Round 5.
- 2.2 To note that the Joint Officer Group believes that there is a requirement for additional input to the Project Team in order to meet the HCA deadline, which is likely to require some external advice (and consequent cost) whether directly supporting the project or assisting to cover other displaced work.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 To allow the Councils' interest in Extra Care Housing to proceed to the next stage. Progressing to the next stage and submitting a final OBC is the only way the Councils can seek approval for the PFI credits the HCA will make available and consequently make any informed decision about affordability.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 Poynton and Sandbach East & Rode in Cheshire East.
- 4.2 Blacon and Sutton & Manor, (Ellesmere Port) in Cheshire West and Chester.

5.0 Local Ward Members

- 5.1 Poynton – Cllr Roger West, Cllr Chris Beard, Cllr Howard Murray
Sandbach East & Rode – Cllr Elsie Alcock, Cllr Rhoda Bailey,
Cllr Andrew Barrett
- 5.2 Blacon – Cllr Reggie Jones, Cllr Marie Nelson, Cllr Alex Tate

Sutton & Manor (Ellesmere Port) – Cllr Kimberley Anderson,
Cllr Bob Crompton, Cllr Paul Donovan

**6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change
- Health**

- 6.1 To assist in addressing the significant demographic shift toward the over 65 population in Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester

7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

- 7.1 There is a separate report dealing with the financial elements of the Outline Business Case.

8.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

- 8.1 The Outline Business Case was submitted some time ago and the current discussions with the HCA seek to develop and improve it. A resubmission will take place.
- 8.2 This report describes a number of outstanding requirements in section 11, which will need legal input (supported by our external project advisers who have close contact with the HCA and can assist in properly placing the matters in context).
- 8.3 At this stage it is too early to procure external legal resource for the whole project, although this will be a priority once the HCA has given its formal response to the Outline Business Case. In the meantime, it may be necessary to utilise some short-term external support, e.g. the Inter Authority Agreement may benefit from an external 'sense check' before being presented to the Board in June.. These agreements are difficult to draft in such a way as to provide absolute certainty and solicitors with experience in this field..
- 8.4 The Board has power to authorise the submission of the Outline Business Case, but project affordability is reserved to the respective councils.

9.0 Risk Management

- 9.1 The provision of additional information and involvement in active dialogue with the Homes and Communities Agency does not commit the Councils at this stage. However Members will need to consider the requirement for additional work and its associated costs in preparation for the submission of the Outline Business Case. Where possible support will come from existing officers, with the requirement to fund backfill arrangements, but for certain areas, such as Finance and Legal, where priorities such as the Closure of the Accounts, mean that additional capacity over the coming weeks will have to be resourced from outside the Council, with the additional costs being met by the already stretched project management budget. The costs are not yet known and will be

estimated over the coming days. It could be necessary for both Council's to recast and increase the project management budget, placing more pressure on the overall OBC.

- 9.2 Members have been advised that currently the private sector has limited opportunities to develop the scale of extra care provision required to meet the anticipated demand in Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester. Equally the social housing sector would require government funding to advance programmes. Therefore continuation of discussions with the HCA about the potential for securing PFI credits needs to be considered in the context of the limited availability of alternative provision driving rising levels of residential and nursing home provision to meet demand and the consequent effect on care costs falling the both Councils.

11.0 Background

- 11.1 The Programme Director and officers of both Councils have been in active discussions with the HCA in response to their request for additional information in advance of the submission of a final Outline Business Case which will need to be approved by Members.
- 11.2 The additional information requested has related to the need for additional PFI credits to secure the delivery of 200 apartments for social rental. Officers of both Councils supported by technical and financial advisers have undertaken an options appraisal exercise to identify the optimum level of PFI credits required and to demonstrate value for money, affordability and deliverability. (Appendix 1).
- 11.3 Further consideration was required in relation to the Councils expectations for development works associated with the PFI funded elements of the programme (Appendix 2) and the status of planning requirements for each site. (Appendix 3).
- 11.4 The papers attached as Appendices to this report were submitted to the HCA on 5 March and the Programme Director and Project Manager were invited to meet HCA leads on 16 April. HCA leads confirmed their support for the Cheshire-wide programme and indicated that they were minded to support the PFI credit bid to a level sufficient to fund 200 units – officers consider this to be £66.1m. HCA noted the successful delivery of Cheshire's Round 3 programme but stated that due to increasing pressure on resources programmes now in development are subject to a significantly higher level of scrutiny to establish value for money and affordability.
- 11.5 Officers have subsequently received several observations and further requirements from the HCA. In summary these relate to

Governance and project management

- a requirement for Cheshire East, as lead Authority, to provide assurances about the nature of the Inter Authority Agreement which will commit both Councils to the identified sites, the financial

contributions and the governance arrangements necessary to deliver the programme.

- a requirement for the appointment of a full time Project Manager

Value for money and affordability

- submission of more detailed evidence demonstrating value for money
- confirmation of the Councils requirement for fully integrated mixed tenure developments, assurances of the deliverability of such a scheme in the prevailing market conditions and confirmation of the financial modelling

Procurement methodology and evaluation

- further evidence from market testing to demonstrate an appetite for the required number of development units, bidder perception and local interest
- the approach to variant bids

Planning issues

- final specification of the number and spread of units across four sites and details about the type of information to be provided to developers in respect of planning approvals at each site
- detailed procurement methodology, timetable, proposed bid evaluation and selection criteria which will be used during procurement to illustrate that PFI funded works will not be compromised by non PFI funded works
- clarity of the Councils position on S.106 agreements
- financial assumptions need to explicitly exclude the possibility of cross subsidy

- 11.6 In order to secure assessment by the Project Review Group in October it will be necessary for officers to have satisfied the additional requirements specified by the HCA and finalised the Outline Business Case by 28th May. This will enable the respective Cabinet/Executive to determine matters of affordability and Members of the Joint Extra Care Housing Management Board to review and sign off the final OBC prior to submission in mid June.
- 11.7 Members are asked to note the intensity of the workload for both officers and JECHMB over this period to achieve this timeframe, and other competing work priorities in some areas. It is proposed to direct senior manager time in Strategic Commissioning of the Lead Authority to this effect and this will require adjustment of other priority work areas accordingly. Within Finance and Legal, as noted above, because of other competing priorities, such as the Closure of the Council's accounts, it will not be possible to release the appropriate officer time, and resource the various tasks necessary with externally sourced expertise, with a subsequent impact on the project management budget. Members are invited to confirm their approval of these arrangements.

12.0 Access to Information

- 12.1 The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

Name: Nuala Keegan
Designation: Strategic Commissioning Manager, Services for Adults and
ECH Programme Director, Cheshire East Council
Tel No: 01270 371372
Email: Nuala.keegan@cheshireeast.gov.uk

Cheshire East and Cheshire West and Chester Councils**Round 5 Extra Care Housing PFI - Additional information****Background & Summary**

1. The Round 5 PFI Extra Care Housing Outline Business Case (OBC) will be a joint bid led by Cheshire East Council (CEC) on behalf of itself and Cheshire West and Chester Council (CWAC) (jointly referred to hereafter as “the Authority”)
2. In the draft OBC submitted by the then Cheshire County Council in April 2009, the Authority requested £59.9m of PFI Credits. Within this, the Authority was making an annual contribution of £135k.
3. As a result of the various changes, set out in this paper, and following discussions with the HCA, officers of the Authority have prepared this options paper which reflects a requirement to increase PFI Credits to £66.1m along with an annual contribution of £300k.
4. Subject to HCA’s response to this paper the Council will submit its Outline Business Case and will have secured outline planning consent on at least 3 of the 4 proposed sites.

Changes since draft OBC

5. There are a number of changes since the submission of the draft OBC that have led to an assessment of the affordability of the programme and the requirement for additional PFI Credits. Whilst all of these changes are set out below, it is important to note that the Authority would not be seeking to pass the full impact of these on to HCA, recognising that some of the delays are in part, within the control of the Authority.
6. The detail of the changes since the draft OBC are set out in detail in Appendix 1 are summarised in the table below:

| Item | Capital Increase (£total) | Revenue Increase (£pa) | Affordability Impact on UC (£pa) |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <p>Delays in the OBC preparation process, which has had implications on construction and lifecycle costs as a result of inflation. The primary causes of these delays have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the migration from two tier local government to two unitary authorities under Local Government Reorganisation; and delays in securing the required Outline Planning Consents for each of the sites, which has in itself included the replacement of the identified site in Macclesfield with another in Sandbach; | £1.741m | Nil | £135k |
| There has been a substantial deterioration in PFI funding terms since submission of the Draft OBC. The margins applied to Senior debt have been increased from 2.0% to 2.5% in response to current market conditions. | N/A | Nil | £125k |
| A further decline in market values since Draft OBC has eradicated the cross-subsidy assumed from sales units in the Draft OBC; | £497k | Nil | £46k |

| Item | Capital Increase (£total) | Revenue Increase (£pa) | Affordability Impact on UC (£pa) |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Housing management cost has been reduced from £1585 per unit to £975 per unit - this is based on a more robust benchmarking exercise for these costs. | Nil | (£121k) | (£121k) |
| Increase in inflation assumptions from RPI to RPI+0.5% for Lifecycle, Housing Management and Housing Maintenance Costs in line with continued market approach to bidding. | Nil | £215k | £215k |
| Revenue increases have however been offset by increased rent assumptions as a result of rental inflation. | Nil | (£74k) | (£74k) |
| Based on actual data from Cheshire's Round 3 scheme, the level of voids and service charges have been updated. | Nil | £10k | £10k |
| TOTAL | £2.238m | £30k | £336k |

7. Should the project proceed the impact of the above changes would be an adverse impact of £336k on the Unitary Charge . Given that this impact is driven by a combination of capital and revenue increases, the Authority would hope to bridge the affordability gap by:

- a. An increase in PFI credits for the project of £6.223m .

The Authority has explored the possibility of making some additional capital contributions to the scheme (the Authority is already funding the cost of the land for the sites) to meet the capital cost increases, but given the difficult budgetary position faced by both CE and CWAC and the fact that the Authority is making a significant additional revenue contribution to the scheme, further capital contributions are not deemed to be an option. For the avoidance of doubt, additional credits would only be applicable to items of a capital nature.

- b. Increasing the revenue contribution of the project by £165k per annum. This increase is to cover 2 elements. Due to the increased uncertainty over the long term future of the Supporting

People Grant, officers of the Authority now believe it may not be available to the project, therefore they must find the £150k contribution assumed. The remaining £15k increase to the Contribution is to meet the overall increase to the revenue elements of the scheme per table 6. The remainder of the £30k quoted has been met through final optimisation of the model.

Therefore the total Authority revenue contribution would increase from £135k to £300k p.a..

PFI Credits and Numbers of Units

8. The Scheme at the draft OBC stage was based upon an approximate 50:50 split of PFI units and for sale/shared ownership schemes, delivering 400 units overall.
9. The work undertaken in securing Outline Planning Consents has concluded the site capacities in each case as follows:

| Site | Overall Capacity |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Blacon, Chester | 63 Units |
| Ellesmere Port | 87 Units |
| Poynton | 73 Units |
| Sandbach | 107 Units |
| TOTAL | 330 Units |

10. Given the current market conditions, a reduction in sales units would be seen as advantageous in attracting high quality bidders, who through market testing have indicated an ability to deliver development units but a reluctance for this to be at the 50:50 level previously envisaged in the Draft OBC.
11. Based on the principle set out in paragraph 7, the Authority has run a series of sensitivities on the number of units that could be delivered under certain PFI Credit allocations.

| Site | PFI Units | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | PFI Credit of £59.9m | PFI Credit of £62.5m | PFI Credit of £64.0m | PFI Credit of £66.1m |
| Blacon, Chester | 32 | 35 | 37 | 38 |
| Ellesmere Port | 43 | 47 | 49 | 53 |
| Poynton | 36 | 39 | 41 | 44 |
| Sandbach | 52 | 57 | 59 | 65 |
| TOTAL | 163 Units | 178 Units | 186 Units | 200 Units |

12. At the same time, officers of the Authority have considered the impacts of reducing the overall size of development at each site. Key considerations have been as follows:

- a. Officers of the Authority do not believe a development of less than 60 units is economically viable in terms of the care and catering contracts that it will let at a later date (these are outside the PFI). Current evidence from Cheshire's Round 3 scheme indicates a greater than anticipated revenue cost to be borne by each Authority during 2009/10 on the smallest schemes;
- b. The sites at Blacon, Ellesmere Port and Poynton are incapable in planning terms of sub-division. A smaller development on these sites would lose 'opportunity value' and would necessitate increased garden areas in the final development, placing further pressure on affordability (both capital and revenue costs).
- c. The site at Sandbach could be sub-divided, however the site presents a significant opportunity for an Extra Care development in a prime location close to local amenities. Any reduction would again lose 'opportunity value'.

13. Based on these factors and the site capacities identified in paragraph 10 the opportunity for development units at each site would vary as follows (with the lower end being the minimum development to bring each site up to 60 units, the upper end being the total available development opportunity based on site capacity):

| Site | Development Units | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | PFI Credit of £59.9m | PFI Credit of £62.5m | PFI Credit of £64.0m | PFI Credit of £66.1m |
| Blacon, Chester | 28 to 31 units | 25 to 28 units | 23 to 26 units | 22 to 25 units |
| Ellesmere Port | 17 to 44 units | 13 to 40 units | 11 to 38 units | 7 to 34 units |
| Poynton | 24 to 37 units | 21 to 34 units | 19 to 32 units | 16 to 29 units |
| Sandbach | 8 to 55 units | 3 to 50 units | 1 to 48 units | -5 ¹ to 42 units |

14. As a proportion of the overall scheme in each of the 4 options, this means that the Development works constitute:

| | PFI Units | Development Units Range | Development as % of scheme |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| PFI Credit of £59.9m | 163 | 77 to 167 | 32% to 51% |
| PFI Credit of £62.5m | 178 | 62 to 152 | 26% to 46% |
| PFI Credit of £64.0m | 186 | 54 to 144 | 23% to 44% |
| PFI Credit of £66.1m | 200 | 40 to 130 | 17% ² to 39% |

15. Further market consultation is underway however initial discussions suggest that an 'entry level' of 32% development works is likely to cause many bidders to re-consider their interest in this scheme.

¹ This site has 65 PFI units, 5 more than is required for the minimum size development.

² This percentage sees the 5 'surplus' PFI units on Sandbach reallocated to other sites, and would therefore see Sandbach 'capped' at a development of 60 PFI units, and the additional PFI units that would have gone on that site allocated to other sites to reduce the development requirements.

Something under 25% may be considered viable depending on the locations and flexibility granted. This therefore points towards the options involving PFI credits of or above £64.0m. It is also considered highly unlikely that an overall level of development approximating 50% will be deliverable as originally assumed in the draft OBC.

16. Officers of the Authority have also considered the removal of one site from the scheme. The procurement/management costs of this PFI project are currently being shared by each of CE and CWAC on the basis of PFI units delivered (CE 54% and CWAC 46% based on the unit splits identified in paragraph 12 above). Removing a site would distort this split, and neither Council is likely to fund a significantly greater proportion of costs.
17. A completed affordability proforma for each of these options can be found in Appendix A.

Value for Money

18. Appendix B provides an updated CLG proforma for the capital costs underlying the financial calculations in this paper. This demonstrates that the construction costs on a per unit basis (inclusive of proportional communal accommodation costs) still represent value for money against the top end of the 'Possibly Acceptable' HCA comparator range of £158,215 (all at June 2007 prices) save the 163 unit option:

| Option | Cost per Unit |
|-----------|---------------|
| 163 Units | £160,838 |
| 179 Units | £156,584 |
| 186 Units | £154,677 |
| 200 Units | £151,695 |

Readiness to Deliver

19. The Authority has a full team in place ready to deliver this project, many of whom were previously involved in the Round 3 housing scheme now delivering highly successfully. The market consultation has demonstrated a high level of confidence in the Authority team to deliver this project based on its track record. The Authority has addressed the comments made by HCA on previous iterations of the OBC and once the final level of available Credits is known, the

Authority would anticipate re-submitting its completed Outline Business Case with final Member approval, as soon as possible.

Conclusions

20. Officers of the Authority have carefully looked at all of the options to help meet the affordability gap on this project, and have identified the need for a significant additional revenue contribution in order to try and allow the project to proceed. It is hoped that HCA will be able to secure the future of the project by increasing PFI Credits. Should HCA wish to discuss any of the issues in this paper further, we would be more than pleased to do so either remotely or in person. We will contact you shortly after issue of this paper to confirm your requirements but should you have any queries in the meantime please do not hesitate to contact:

Nuala Keegan

Project Director – Extra Care R5/ Strategic Commissioning Manager

Adults Services, Cheshire East Council
nuala.keegan@cheshireeast.gov.uk

01270 371372

4 March 2010

Cheshire Extra Care PFI – Round 5 Development Works

Background

Cheshire East and Cheshire West & Chester Borough Councils (together “the Authorities”) are working jointly to procure a second extra care PFI project on a pan Cheshire basis. The project was initiated by Cheshire County Council prior to Local Government Reorganisation, the body that procured the first extra care PFI, which is now operational.

The second proposed extra care PFI project is very similar in nature to the first successfully delivered scheme, this scheme delivering extra care facilities on four sites across the Authorities. Each site will offer a range of 1 bed plus and 2 bed apartments, clustered around communal accommodation. The Authorities are keen that each development offers a range of tenure options in accordance with guidance on sustainable communities. This paper sets out how the Authorities propose to achieve this.

Anecdotal evidence from the Round 3 scheme suggests that sales problems have largely been caused by stagnation in the housing market rather than a lack of demand for extra care housing.

The Authorities’ Requirements

The Authorities are seeking proposals that:

- Deliver an overall minimum of 60 Units of accommodation on an individual site, as this ensures the Authorities can effectively procure care and catering services (both of which will be outside the PFI project).
- Maximise opportunities to provide mixed tenure on each site. The development opportunity should be considered in terms of both private sales and low cost home ownership.

The Sites

The four sites are as follows:

| Site | Overall Capacity | Minimum PFI Requirement ³ | Minimum Development Requirement ⁴ | Total Potential Development Opportunity |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| Blacon, Chester | 63 Units | 32 to 38 Units | 22 to 28 Units | 25 to 31 Units |

³ This range will be firmed up once the affordability position has been finalised with HCA (see affordability paper). This will then allow the remaining two columns to also be finalised.

⁴ Based on minimum of 60 units per site.

| Site | Overall Capacity | Minimum PFI Requirement³ | Minimum Development Requirement⁴ | Total Potential Development Opportunity |
|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Ellesmere Port | 87 Units | 43 to 53 Units | 7 to 17 units | 34 to 44 Units |
| Poynton | 73 Units | 36 to 44 Units | 16 to 24 units | 29 to 37 Units |
| Sandbach | 107 Units | 52 to 65 Units | 0 to 8 units | 42 to 55 Units |
| TOTAL | 330 Units | 163 to 200 Units | 45 to 77 Units | 130 to 167 Units |

The overall capacity of each site, along with its deliverability for an extra care solution, has been proven via an Outline Planning Consent secured by the Authorities (3 out of 4 now having Outline Consent).

Each site will be transferred to the successful provider on a 99 year lease.

Financial Assumptions to Date

The Authorities have assumed that the PFI element of the project is entirely self-sufficient and no cross-subsidy is required from development opportunities to fund the PFI arrangements. This includes communal areas, albeit it is recognised that some elements of communal accommodation (restaurant, lounge, etc.) will require scaling upwards to reflect increased numbers of units brought about by development properties.

Procurement Methodology

The proposed procurement methodology is largely consistent with the first extra care PFI in Cheshire, albeit it has been amended to reflect changes in the PFI funding market.

- The project will be procured under a single OJEU, which will cite both the PFI and development works within the CPV codes. These will not be separate lots;
- Bidders will be invited to submit design proposals that allow them to best manage the risks of the project. Whilst the Authorities would prefer each site to be designed as a single integrated facility, it is recognised that some parties may prefer to design separable elements of accommodation to manage development risks;
- No obligation will be placed on bidders to deliver the full extent of the development opportunity. As highlighted above, the Authorities will require a minimum development of 60 units on each site. In the event that the provider is unable to achieve this number on a given site(s) through private sale/low cost home ownership, then the Authorities will consider additional social rented or intermediate rent units (outside of the PFI arrangement);

- The evaluation criteria will clearly incentivise bidders to deliver the best overall solution. These will focus on the PFI element of the overall proposals, but will recognise the benefits that may come through larger mixed tenure communities (increased amenity in communal areas, etc.) subject to the provisions of the following paragraph.
- Development works will be covered under a separate Development Agreement alongside the PFI Project Agreement, recognising funder preference for complete separability. To the extent that proposals delivered within the PFI Project Agreement are funded by development works proceeds (and again noting the financial assumptions made by the Authorities to date), these will only be considered in the evaluation process if bidders have fully underwritten the funds being delivered into the PFI financial model and they are not subject of development viability tests, etc. The manner in which this risk will be managed will be left entirely for bidders to propose such that they can resolve funder issues.
- Any development proceeds over and above underwritten sums will be shared via an overage agreement.

Market Sounding

Informal market testing on the Cheshire programme and formal market testing on similar schemes across the country has shown that developers are still willing to consider taking on some sales risk despite the current economic climate. The original proposal for Cheshire's R5 scheme was for 50% of units to be non-rented. This extent of development is considered to be too high by the market, with most seeking arrangements with a development content of no more than 25% to 30%.

Cheshire Extra Care Housing PFI Project (Round 5)

Planning Strategy Paper

This paper sets out the proposed planning strategy for the Cheshire Extra Care Housing PFI. Given the planning complexities around the sites proposed, the approach proposed is predicated on a 'belt and braces' approach to gaining the maximum certainty for bidding organisations on the deliverability of the scheme.

In summary, the strategy seeks to establish the planning parameters at the outset through securing Outline Planning Consent for each of the 4 developments. These consents will of course be public documents, but nonetheless the Authority will communicate these to guide bidders on individual site imperatives but otherwise maintain the freedom to work within these parameters, in consultation with planning teams, as they develop their solutions.

In the context of this paper, the term Authority is intended to refer to both Cheshire East and Cheshire West & Chester Councils, who are working collaboratively to deliver this scheme. The 4 developments are split equally as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cheshire East | Poynton Sandbach |
| Cheshire West & Chester | Blacon, Chester Ellesmere Port |

The Sites

The Authority has identified specific sites for this project.

At the OBC stage, the following processes have been followed to fully validate these site selections:

- Re-confirm work undertaken at Expression of Interest stage to establish housing needs across the County, thereby identifying 'hotspots';
- Identify sites within the 'hotspot' areas that could be considered as part of the PFI project;
- Undertake an assessment of each site to ascertain suitability, based on:
 - Context within the Council's wider development plans;
 - Location and proximity to amenities (particularly relevant to extra care);
 - Condition (based on known data at this stage), including requirements for demolition of existing buildings, remediation works, etc.

- Considerations affecting availability of the site, including any statutory consents that might be required (loss/substitution of playing fields, etc.)
 - Potential capacity, linked to an assessment of potential tenure mix to compliment the local demographics.
- Undertake consultation with Ward Members, Parish Councils and key stakeholders on the suitability of sites;
- Based on the outcomes of the above two points, establish the preferred sites for the project.

Proposed Deliverables

OBC Stage

During the preparation of the Outline Business Case, the Authority has developed reference schemes for each of the 4 sites, and used these reference schemes to secure an Outline Planning Consent. As a formal planning consent, this process has fully tested:

- That the sites are acceptable in terms of residential use (and more specifically extra care use);
- The policy framework which will form the basis for consideration of future planning applications on that site (and recognising that it is possible that future applications will be under Reserved Matters or a fresh Planning Application). This captures all relevant Council design guidance (including guidance produced by others that the Council considers a requirement of its own);
- The requirements of the planning authority for supporting information that would be required as part of a planning application (for example, flood risk assessments, ecological studies, contamination surveys, etc.);
- The basis on which any planning gains or contributions will be levied;
- Access, highways and parking;
- Massing (both land take and maximum permissible development height);
- Public opinion of the development, including that of immediate site neighbours.

A site pack will be assembled, collecting together all of the available Title and site data available including the Outline Consent. Where appropriate, commentary will be provided to accompany the Outline Consent where the resolutions reached in achieving the consent require explanation to Bidders.

Procurement Stages – Dialogue Phase

There are a number of steps that the Authority would take through the dialogue stages of the procurement process to ensure bidders are not incurring design fees unnecessarily.

These include:

- All shortlisted bidders will be fully briefed on the Planning Consents achieved, ensuring each bidder is aware of the circumstances and reasons for any position reached. Furthermore, it will be made clear to Bidders that, whilst this consent is in place, they are not bound by the designs and can develop their own design solutions. Where the Outline Planning process identified 'non-negotiable' outcomes, these will be clearly flagged as such, enabling any revised designs to account for these.;
- The Authority's requirements will be clearly stated in the ISDS documentation and Output Specification. These will be cross referenced with the Planning Consent as appropriate to ensure there is absolute clarity on what is required. Meetings will be held with the Authority project team through the dialogue phases to ensure designs are developing satisfactorily;
- All shortlisted bidders will be given significant levels of access to relevant multi-disciplinary teams, comprising officers from: planning, highways, conservation, and other specialists where relevant to that site, to ensure that their designs can be consulted upon as the design develops.

In addition to the above, the Authority will:

- Work with bidders to procure warranted site surveys to assist bidders in the development of their design solutions;
- Liaise separately with the relevant planning teams to ensure that any potential planning issues are accounted for in the evaluation process;
- Consult with stakeholder groups throughout the process to ensure designs are developing satisfactorily.

In relation to the final point, it is expected that the Authority will adopt some of the principles to date only adopted on HRA regeneration schemes, namely at appropriate points in the procurement process, public exhibitions may be arranged on a site by site basis. These will be conducted such that they do not affect the integrity of the competitive process.

Through the ISDS stage, it is expected that Bidders will need to advance their proposals to RIBA Stage C. This is sufficient to allow the Council at ISDS evaluation stage to:

- Understand designs and the commercial proposals (construction and maintenance costs, construction programmes, etc) that underpin them.
- Identify any planning showstoppers (albeit this is unlikely given bidders will have been given access to planners throughout the design development period).

This level is also consistent with market expectations for the ISDS stage in a bidding process.

Procurement Stages – Closing Dialogue

The Authority will not take any submission to Final Tender that has potential planning concerns.

Prior to closing Dialogue, it is expected that Bidders will be required to advance their proposals to RIBA Stage D in order to be ready to put in planning applications shortly after a Preferred Bidder is appointed. This is consistent with emerging good practice in respect of Competitive Dialogue, as this level will allow all major commercial issues in respect of price and risk to be closed out before Dialogue is closed.

Private Sector Expectations

The Authority proposes to share the approach outlined in this paper with the market as part of the OBC consultation process. This will ensure that the final strategy is one that is recognised and embraced by the market, thereby ensuring there is no impact on the number of OJEU respondents and competitive process that follows.

CHESHIRE EAST COUNCIL

REPORT TO: JOINT EXTRA CARE HOUSING MANAGEMENT BOARD

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Date of Meeting: | 12 May 2010 |
| Report of: | Sophie Middleton, Contract Manager– PFI Extra Care Housing |
| Subject/Title: | Draft Project Plan Round 5 |

1.0 Report Summary

- 1.1 The draft project plan and the key dates are attached to this report. The plan starts at the production of the outline business case in May 2010 and goes through to financial close in January 2013.

2.0 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are asked to note the project plan and key dates.

3.0 Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 This gives Members a detailed timetable for Round 5.

4.0 Wards Affected

- 4.1 Cheshire East Council: Poynton, Sandbach East and Rode
- 4.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council: Blacon, Sutton and Manor

5.0 Local Ward Members

5.1 Cheshire East Council

Poynton – Councillors Chris Beard, Howard Murray, Roger West
Sandbach East and Rode – Councillors Elsie Alcock, Rhoda Bailey, Andrew Barratt

5.2 Cheshire West & Chester Council

Blacon – Councillors Reggie Jones, Marie Nelson, Alex Tate
Sutton and Manor – Councillors Kimberley Anderson, Bob Crompton, Paul Donovan

6.0 Policy Implications including - Climate change - Health

- 6.1 None

7.0 Financial Implications for Transition Costs (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

7.1 None.

8.0 Financial Implications 2009/10 and beyond (Authorised by the Borough Treasurer)

8.1 None.

9.0 Legal Implications (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

9.1 None.

10.0 Risk Management

10.1 None.

11.0 Background and Options

11.1 Draft project timetable for the delivery of the Round 5 Extra Care Housing.

12.0 Overview of Year One and Term One Issues

12.1 None.

13.0 *Access to Information*

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer:

| | |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Lynn Glendenning |
| Designation: | Project Manager – Extra Care Housing |
| Tel No: | 01270 375349 |
| Email: | lynn.glendenning@cheshireeast.gov.uk |

ECH PFI Round 5 Project – Key Dates

The key stages of the procurement programme are shown in the table below. However a more detailed project timetable is attached.

The project timetable has been structured to follow the Competitive Dialogue process.

- The aim will be to shortlist to 3 Participants as quickly as possible, a decision which has been taken in direct response to Bidders concerns about bid costs.

| Stage | Key Dates |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Member Approval | 15 th June 2010 |
| Submit OBC | 21st June 2010 |
| PRG Approvals | October 2010 |
| OJEU & PQQ assessments | October 2010 to January 2011 |
| Issue of ISOS, reduced selection of bidders | January 2011 to May 2011 |
| Issue of ISDS, evaluation and potential further reduction of bidders | June 2011 to February 2012 |
| Close Dialogue & Call for Final Tenders | 13 th February 2012 |
| Council Business Case approvals | February 2012 – April 2012 |
| Select Provisional PB | April 2012 |
| PRG Final Business Case submission and Approvals | May 2012 to June 2012 |
| Announce PB | June 2012 |
| Fine tune contracts and award contract | June 2012 to August 2012 |
| Submit Planning Applications | July 2012 |
| Potential Start on site | October 2012 |
| Financial Close | January 2013 |

This page is intentionally left blank

| ID | Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|
| 1 | Outline Business Case | 85 days? | Tue 15/06/10 | Mon 11/10/10 |
| 2 | Member Approval OBC | 1 day? | Tue 15/06/10 | Tue 15/06/10 |
| 3 | Submit OBC | 0 days | Mon 21/06/10 | Mon 21/06/10 |
| 4 | CLG/PUK/PRG Approvals | 13 wks | Tue 22/06/10 | Mon 20/09/10 |
| 5 | PRG Approvals | 0 days | Mon 11/10/10 | Mon 11/10/10 |
| 6 | OJEU and PQQ | 100 days | Tue 31/08/10 | Mon 17/01/11 |
| 7 | Draft Descriptive Document | 6 wks | Tue 31/08/10 | Mon 11/10/10 |
| 8 | Draft PQQ | 4 wks | Tue 14/09/10 | Mon 11/10/10 |
| 9 | Draft OJEU | 4 wks | Tue 31/08/10 | Mon 27/09/10 |
| 10 | Issue OJEU | 0 days | Mon 25/10/10 | Mon 25/10/10 |
| 11 | PQQ Bids Returned | 0 days | Mon 22/11/10 | Mon 22/11/10 |
| 12 | PQQ Assessment | 3 wks | Tue 23/11/10 | Mon 13/12/10 |
| 13 | Agree Longlist for CD | 0 days | Mon 13/12/10 | Mon 13/12/10 |
| 14 | Approvals | 5 wks | Tue 14/12/10 | Mon 17/01/11 |
| 15 | Competitive Dialogue | 445 days | Tue 21/09/10 | Mon 04/06/12 |
| 16 | Preparation | 25 days | Tue 21/09/10 | Mon 25/10/10 |
| 17 | Prepare ISOS document | 5 wks | Tue 21/09/10 | Mon 25/10/10 |
| 18 | Open Competitive Dialogue | 0 days | Mon 17/01/11 | Mon 17/01/11 |
| 19 | ISOS | 95 days | Mon 24/01/11 | Mon 06/06/11 |
| 20 | Issue ISOS | 0 days | Mon 24/01/11 | Mon 24/01/11 |
| 21 | Dialogue | 2 wks | Tue 25/01/11 | Mon 07/02/11 |
| 22 | ISOS Submissions due | 0 wks | Mon 07/03/11 | Mon 07/03/11 |
| 23 | Review of ISOS submissions | 5 wks | Tue 08/03/11 | Mon 11/04/11 |
| 24 | Clarifications | 3 wks | Tue 29/03/11 | Mon 18/04/11 |
| 25 | Continued Dialogue | 3 wks | Tue 05/04/11 | Mon 25/04/11 |
| 26 | Evaluation | 2 wks | Tue 26/04/11 | Mon 09/05/11 |
| 27 | Agree Shortlist for ISDS | 0 days | Mon 09/05/11 | Mon 09/05/11 |
| 28 | Approvals | 4 wks | Tue 10/05/11 | Mon 06/06/11 |
| 29 | ISDS | 155 days | Tue 05/04/11 | Mon 07/11/11 |
| 30 | Prepare ISDS | 7 wks | Tue 05/04/11 | Mon 23/05/11 |
| 31 | Issue ISDS | 2 days | Tue 07/06/11 | Wed 08/06/11 |
| 32 | continued Dialogue | 14 wks | Tue 07/06/11 | Mon 12/09/11 |
| 33 | ISDS Submissions due | 0 days | Mon 19/09/11 | Mon 19/09/11 |
| 34 | Initial Review and Clarifications | 4 wks | Tue 20/09/11 | Mon 17/10/11 |
| 35 | Evaluation | 4 wks | Tue 11/10/11 | Mon 07/11/11 |
| 36 | Potential further deselection | 0 days | Mon 07/11/11 | Mon 07/11/11 |
| 37 | Continued Dialogue | 105 days | Tue 08/11/11 | Mon 02/04/12 |
| 38 | Continued Dialogue & Clarifications | 9 wks | Tue 08/11/11 | Mon 09/01/12 |
| 39 | Continued Evaluation | 3 wks | Tue 10/01/12 | Mon 30/01/12 |
| 40 | Close CD & Call for Final Tenders | 45 days | Tue 31/01/12 | Mon 02/04/12 |
| 41 | Finalise Final Tender Documents | 2 wks | Tue 31/01/12 | Mon 13/02/12 |

| Cheshire Round 5 PROCUREMENT PROGRAMME | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| ID | Task Name | Duration | Start | Finish | |
| 42 | Close Dialogue | 0 days | Mon 13/02/12 | Mon 13/02/12 | |
| 43 | Issue Final Tender Documents | 0 days | Mon 13/02/12 | Mon 13/02/12 | |
| 44 | Final Tender completed | 0 days | Mon 20/02/12 | Mon 20/02/12 | |
| 45 | Final Evaluation | 6 wks | Tue 21/02/12 | Mon 02/04/12 | |
| 46 | Select Provisional PB | 0 days | Mon 02/04/12 | Mon 02/04/12 | |
| 47 | Final Business Case | 75 days | Tue 21/02/12 | Mon 04/06/12 | |
| 48 | Draft FBC | 6 wks | Tue 21/02/12 | Mon 02/04/12 | |
| 49 | council Approvals | 4 wks | Tue 03/04/12 | Mon 30/04/12 | |
| 50 | Approvals | 20 days | Mon 07/05/12 | Mon 04/06/12 | |
| 51 | Submit FBC | 0 days | Mon 07/05/12 | Mon 07/05/12 | |
| 52 | Approvals | 4 wks | Tue 08/05/12 | Mon 04/06/12 | |
| 53 | Fine Tuning | 155 days | Mon 04/06/12 | Mon 07/01/13 | |
| 54 | Announce PB | 0 days | Mon 04/06/12 | Mon 04/06/12 | |
| 55 | Alcatel Period | 10 days | Tue 05/06/12 | Mon 18/06/12 | |
| 56 | Finalise Contract Details | 8 wks | Tue 19/06/12 | Mon 13/08/12 | |
| 57 | Planning | 135 days | Mon 02/07/12 | Mon 07/01/13 | |
| 58 | Submit Planning Applications | 0 days | Mon 02/07/12 | Mon 02/07/12 | |
| 59 | Planning Applications Determined | 0 days | Mon 01/10/12 | Mon 01/10/12 | |
| 60 | Publication of Consent | 0 days | Mon 08/10/12 | Mon 08/10/12 | |
| 61 | Commercial Close | 0 days | Mon 01/10/12 | Mon 01/10/12 | |
| 62 | Potential Start on site | 0 days | Wed 31/10/12 | Wed 31/10/12 | |
| 63 | Judicial Review Expires | 0 days | Mon 07/01/13 | Mon 07/01/13 | |
| 64 | Financial Close | 0 days | Mon 07/01/13 | Mon 07/01/13 | |

17 Prepare ISOS document

63 Judicial Review Expires

Assumes that Council will not accept JR risk

This page is intentionally left blank