

## Appendix 2

### Business Case for a UKSPF funded inter-agency office for the residents of Eastwood

#### Introduction

There is a cost to the residents of Eastwood for receiving public services which is unacceptable in a community where income and opportunity is lowest. Since the Health Centre on Nottingham Road, closed in 2015 by NHS Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group due to issues within the building. Services such as District Nurses and specialist clinics are disbursed to other towns which include Ilkeston, Kimberley and Heanor. Those seeking Job Centre + services for benefits and work may also at times need to travel to Ilkeston or Ripley. Those with a car have the expense and carbon emissions to get there those without will have to pay up to £6.00 to travel by public transport. Both Health and DWP partners truly wish to see a platform for local service delivery and health in particular have been working tirelessly to bring services back into Eastwood. There is a rationale for some Council services to be delivered via the office and the voluntary sector would use it for dementia carers workshops and peer support.

The lack of health access points beyond GP services created the momentum for Durban House. Since the change of direction for Durban House, and the closure of the CIC, the Chief Communities Officer has led multi-agency discussions to find a solution to the above needs. Health partners have been particularly exercised about the need to find a community based location. Partners had been looking into various spaces around Eastwood and nothing came to light until the former insurance brokers at 47 Nottingham Hoard came to market. A joint effort by Estates, Regeneration, Capital Works and Community Services has scoped the following business case.

#### Operational Asks

There is a need to have a main meeting space / waiting area a confidential office for interviews and a clinical consultation room, small kitchenette, disabled toilet and accessible shower. The offices would need WIFI, telephony and modern electrical points. There would be some lockers for the safe storage of equipment. The “shop window” would have an LCD rolling display unit giving information about the services and other related matters – campaigns and so forth. There would be an intercom buzz in door.

The standard office layouts would be similar to the new rooms in reception at the Civic offices, albeit a bit smaller. The clinical consultation space would need the following modifications:

- Office would have a Clinical surface (i.e. no carpet, wipe able- germ resistant)
- Good quality lighting
- Desk/Table, 2 Chairs
- Power for camera and laptop (minimum 2 sockets)
- Secure storage

- Telephone Line
- Clinical Waste/General Waste
- Sink for handwashing (IPC)
- First aid provision

### **Refurbishment Costs**

Not all the quotations have been received at the time of this business case but based on a similar project the refurbishment and fit out costs for this property are estimated to be between £38,000 and £45,000.

### **Rental Costs**

The property was being marketed at £750 per calendar month but if the Council were prepared to pay in advance the rental would be reduced. With a further potential for some rent free period for betterment. Using a worst case scenario, the rent would be affordable probably less than £8,000 per annum. The Council have been offered a lease for three years with an option of a further two years in our favour. A break clause after two years or some rent free period in the three years would be an optimum agreement.

### **Operational Costs and Staffing**

It is intended that the building would be accessible by partners via a key safe and that there would be a common alarm that service users would have the code for. It is not intended that Broxtowe pays for any of the service delivery costs from other agencies, including their salaries. The intention is that the timetable would have at least two services operating there at a time, (or one service with at least two members of staff) so that there is no issue of lone workers. This could include a statutory service and a volunteer organisation. If the Borough Council employees are required to deliver services from there this would create an unknown unquantifiable cost and this business case would need revisiting. There is support from the Housing Department to deliver some face to face services in Eastwood at CEDARS.

### **Running costs**

Based on the previous operational use of the building which was open 6 days the following costs have been derived:

- Electricity at £90 to £100 per month – supplier British Gas
- Gas at £90 to £100 per month – supplier British Gas
- Water at £25 to £30 per month – supplier Water Plus
- Business Rates at £125 per month
- ICT Services at £90
- Alarm, cleaning and caretaking at £150
- Maintenance costs at £500 per month.

It is hoped there would be some savings using more energy efficient M&E but in total the building would require an annual operational budget of £7,580.

*Were the project unable to generate any income from other service providers it would be a net cost to the Council of £14,780 per annum.*

### Income Assumptions

Research for Durban House for those same community facilities has suggested that some of the clinics and counselling sessions would pay a sessional rate of around £12.00 (three to four hours). There are a number of Nottingham University Hospitals – NHS Trust services and Nottinghamshire Healthcare Foundation Trust services that are peripatetic and the PICS or its successor run health services from the three Eastwood surgeries, mostly in Church Street, but room capacity is at a premium. An example of the peripatetic service is the Greater Nottingham Diabetic Eye Screening Programme. They would require the clinical rooms up to 2 days per week, 8:30 till 4pm and pay up to £115.00 per day.

The DWP do not appear to have access to any operational funding to contribute. DWP will not be able to pay for the sessions themselves, but their private or charity based partners will rent rooms and or table space. There has been a number of discussions with DWP to secure a peripatetic out-reach service at the office. Discussions with NHS are also positive but they are unlikely to be able to provide capital.

There are three rooms and its therefore hypothetically possible to generate income from all three but a safer scenario would be to suggest a maximum of two rooms are in use to scope for use by non-paying partners or Borough Council services. Table One below shows that with 2 days clinical hire the facility would be self-sufficient and with three days of full clinical hire it would make a small surplus. A limited shift towards more free use would also be possible based on 3 days' clinical use.

*Table One Specimen Income Schedule*

Day	Main Room	Private Room	Clinical Room
	Room One	Room Two	Room Three
Mon AM	£12	Free Use	
Mon PM	Free Use	£12	£115
Tue AM	Free Use	£12	
Tue PM	Free Use	£12	£115
Wed AM	£12	Free Use	£12
Wed PM	£12	£12	
Thur AM	£12	Free Use	£12
Thur PM	Free Use	Free Use	£12
Fri AM	Free Use	£12	
Fri PM	Free Use	Free Use	£115
Weekly	£48	£60	£381
X48 Wks	£2,304	£2,880	£18,288

Day	Main Room	Private Room	Clinical Room
	Room One	Room Two	Room Three
Annual Income			£23,472
Annual Income Less Operational costs			£15,892
Annual Income Minus Rent			£8,692

### Capital Financing of the refurbishment & UKSPF Subsidy

The UKSPF year three action plan had a budget of £12,000 to support the above. The funding identified was capital only although there is flexibility as the Council will comfortably meet its 20% spend target of capital. There is a possibility of diverting around the same amount again from another three projects, to create a £52,800 mixture of capital and revenue. The actual figures could be synthesised. A number of partners such as DWP Programmes, Job Centre Plus, NHS Trusts and a several voluntary groups (most notably the former Trustees of the Durban House Community Group) are in support.

This Project Budget would be conceived as follows:

UKSPF Project	Amount to be transferred	Revenue / Capital	Notes – Rationale
Skills Quest Eastwood DWP	£12,000	C	Always allocated to this project
Broxtowe LEA	£20,000	C	Not enough time to find a second Airbnb
CIO Eastwood	£13,000	R	Budget to advance pay the rent for this project
Brown Signs	£5,300	C	One sign location may not be possible
Grant Underspend	£2,500	R	

### Refit Costs for the Property

Capital works have been investigating different contractor costs for various items to make the property fit for purpose. These range from around £10,000 up to £55,000. Recently clarity an allocation of UKSPF next financial year has been determined by EMCCA. This would probably mean a full year's rent could be guaranteed for 2025/26 and a small pump priming grant. This could allow for £10,000 in 2025/26. Any surpluses could be used to track the success of this initiative as a pilot.

Officers remain confident that the property can be re-fitted for £40,000 which would leave enough for a one-year pre-payment of rent this financial year. If the landlord would accept a break after 2 years, (or some betterment rent free) with a further three years offer this project would only need to generate annual £8,000 income to be cost neutral to the Council.

**Risk Analysis**

**Potential risks:** Underutilization - funding shortfalls - operational challenges  
(Booking Managers)

Development of a tracking system to measure the results must be instituted early into the exercise;

Landlord does not agree to best terms or all modifications;

Delay to the contractor starting could put UKSPF at risk;

**Mitigations:**

Early engagement with all parties.