

OFFICER DECISION RECORD

For staff restructures, please also complete an RA1 form to update the HR Portal. This is attached at Annex 2.

Decision Ref. No:

2016/4/PH/HallgateCentre

Box 1

DIRECTORATE: Adults Health and Wellbeing

DATE: 26/07/16

Contact Name: Helen Conroy

Tel. No.: 734571

Subject Matter: lease for Hallgate Centre, Mexborough

Box 2

DECISION TAKEN:

That a 6 year lease is granted to Aspire (Alcohol and Drug Service and Rotherham Doncaster And South Humber FT Trust partnership) for the Hallgate Centre Mexborough, for the purpose of delivery of a Drug and Alcohol service, on terms permitting both parties a mutual break option on the service of 6 months' notice.

Box 3

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

Give relevant background information

The premises will be used 2 days per week as a drug and alcohol service hub, with the remaining 3 days per week available for local community activity, to be developed as need arises in conjunction with Aspire who will be the lease holders.

DMBC awarded the contract to deliver Drugs and Alcohol Services to the new Aspire Service (ADS and RDaSH partnership) late last year; RDaSH were to relocate the service to Mexborough Health Centre; however due to the somewhat sensitive nature of the service and following consultation between local Mexborough residents, Mexborough Health Centre Patient Participation panel members, local councillors and the mayor it was proposed that the Aspire service continued to operate from the Hallgate Centre as the Mexborough hub 2 days a week. Heads of terms have been quoted on the basis of RDaSH paying a market rent circa £13,000pa and being responsible for the payment of all outgoings. Based on previous years costs it is estimated that business rates will be approx. £5,040pa (the ADS (Alcohol & Drug service) may be able to obtain charity relief) however DMBC total outgoings were circa £28,700 which included the usual utility costs, maintenance and repairs but also staff

indemnity costs, cleaning etc. RDaSH have identified a shortfall in funding and Adults health and Wellbeing /Public Health propose to contribute 50% of the commissioners running costs in occupying this property from the Public Health Budget.

Box 4

OPTIONS CONSIDERED & REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION:

If other options were considered, please specify and give reasons for recommended option

As an alternative to the Hallgate Centre, the option of delivery from the Mexborough Health Centre was considered.

Following consultation between local Mexborough residents, Mexborough Health Centre Patient Participation panel members, local councillors and the mayor, the Hallgate Centre is the preferred option of all parties.

Box 5

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 provides the Council with the general power of competence, meaning that “a local authority has power to do anything that individuals generally may do.”

Under s.123 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council may dispose of land by way of a short term lease of less than 7 years as it sees fit.

Name: Adam Bottomley **Signature:** _____ **Date:** 26.07.16
Signature of Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services (or representative)

Box 6

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

This proposal is to share some unexpected running costs between Rdash & Doncaster’s Public Health department. The costs are £13,000 for rent and approximately £28,700 for utility costs, maintenance and repairs, staff indemnity and cleaning.

The Substance misuse contract was re tendered and 2016/17 is the first year of the contract award. The contract value is £6.164m and it was assumed that the Hallgate Centre, Mexborough would be incorporated within this financial envelope. These costs

to be shared equate to approx. £42,000 of which £21,000 will be Doncaster's Public health amount

This £21,000 will have to be met from the existing budget line which would result in a £21,000 overspend against this line. This overspend could be offset by a potential performance related underspend.

It should be noted that following a successful retender process savings of approximately £450k have been achieved over the 4 year life of the full substance misuse contract.

The 2017/18 and 2018/19 financial years are provisionally showing a budget shortfall of approximately £495k & £529k respectively. Careful contract management and efficiency opportunities will need to be explored to produce a balanced budget.

Name: Nick Cameron Signature: _____ Date: 26.07.16
Signature of Assistant Director of Finance & Performance
(or representative)

Box 7
HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

None

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
Signature of Assistant Director of Human Resources and Communications (or representative)

Box 8
PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS:

None

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
Signature of Assistant Director of Finance & Performance
(or representative)

Box 9
ICT IMPLICATIONS:

None

Name: _____ **Signature:** _____ **Date:** _____

**Signature of Assistant Director of Customer Services and ICT
(or representative)**

Box 10

ASSET IMPLICATIONS:

Details of the lease as negotiated are included within the main body of this Officer Decision Record

Name: Gillian Fairbrother (Assets Manager, Project Co-ordinator)

Signature: By email

Date: 5th August, 2016

**Signature of Assistant Director of Trading Services and Assets
(or representative)**

Box 11

RISK IMPLICATIONS:

To be completed by the report author

As a result of higher market rental and running costs at the Hallgate Centre (as compared to what it would cost to use the Mexborough Health Centre), the council is exposed to a financial liability that will lead to a cost pressure on the Public Health Allocation budget of approximately £20k.

The initial risk rating is 10 = Likelihood 5 (very likely) x Impact 2 (moderate).

However if as part of financial planning processes an allocated budget is formally identified from the Public Health Allocation the residual risk rating is 6 = likelihood 4 (likely) x impact 2 (moderate)

(Explain the impact of not taking this decision and in the case of capital schemes, any risks associated with the delivery of the project)

Box 12

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS:**To be completed by the report author**

Group work and one to one consultation was done with Mexborough service users as part of the needs assessment process prior to tendering the treatment and recovery service, in line with a draft whole system specification. No differential or negative impacts on groups with protected characteristics were found to arise as a result of transition to the newly specified model, and a due regard statement was completed

Name: Helen Conroy Signature: _____ Date: **26.07.16** _____
(Report author)

Box 13**CONSULTATION****Officers**

(In addition to Finance, Legal and Human Resource implications and Procurement implications where necessary, please list below any other teams consulted on this decision, together with their comments)

Consultation on the treatment service model was undertaken with professionals and service users prior to tendering, and specific consultation regarding the potential ongoing use of the Hallgate Centre premises was undertaken with local Mexborough residents, Mexborough Health Centre Patient Participation panel members, local councillors and the mayor in March 2016.

Members

Under the Scheme of delegation, officers are responsible for day to day operational matters as well as implementing decisions that have been taken by Council, Cabinet, Committee or individual Cabinet members. Further consultation with Members is not ordinarily required. However, where an ODR relates to a matter which has significant policy, service or operational implications or is known to be politically sensitive, the officer shall first consult with the appropriate Cabinet Member before exercising the delegated powers. In appropriate cases, officers will also need to consult with the Chair of Council, Committee Chairs or the Chair of an Overview and Scrutiny Panel as required. Officers shall also ensure that local Members are kept informed of matters affecting their Wards.

Please list any comments from Members below:

--

Box 14

INFORMATION NOT FOR PUBLICATION:

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____
Signature of FOI Lead Officer for service area where ODR originates

Box 15

Signed: Rupert Suckling _____ Date: 10.08.2016
Director

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Additional Signature of Chief Financial Officer or nominated
representative for Capital decisions.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Signature of Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member consulted on the above
decision (if required).

- This decision can be implemented immediately unless it relates to a Capital Scheme that requires the approval of Cabinet. All Cabinet decisions are subject to call in.
- A record of this decision should be kept by the relevant Director's PA for accountability and published on the Council's website.
- A copy of this decision should be sent to the originating Directorate's FOI Lead Officer to consider 'information not for publication' prior to being published on the Council's website.
- A PDF copy of the signed decision record should be e-mailed to the LA Democratic Services mailbox