

Outline Business Case



A. PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION

Project Name:	New Uses of Registered Providers
Project ID (if known):	1254
Capital Ref (if applicable):	
Committee Chair:	Cllr Tony Dyer
Sponsor (usually lead Director):	John Smith: Executive Director for Growth & Regeneration
Project Executive (usually lead Head of Service):	Fiona Lester: Director Homes and Landlord Services
Lead Directorate:	Housing and Landlord Services
Associated service areas:	Housing and Landlord Services
Any 'critical services' affected	
Report lead author(s):	Louise Davidson, Head of Housing Delivery

B. ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT

Alignment to the Corporate Strategy's 5 key principles:	<input type="checkbox"/> Development and delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Sustainability <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equality and Inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Resilience <input type="checkbox"/> World-class employment <input type="checkbox"/> No direct alignment
Alignment to the 7 the Corporate Strategy Theme(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Children and young people <input type="checkbox"/> Economy and skills <input type="checkbox"/> Environment and sustainability <input type="checkbox"/> Health, care and wellbeing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Homes and communities <input type="checkbox"/> Transport and connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective development organisation <input type="checkbox"/> No direct alignment
Primary Capital investment principle (Capital Strategy):	<input type="checkbox"/> Invest to grow <input type="checkbox"/> Invest to maintain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Invest to save <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> N/A – not capital
Project category:	<input type="checkbox"/> Saving delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Compliance / Statutory <input type="checkbox"/> Risk reduction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost avoidance <input type="checkbox"/> Improved service/ City outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Enabling <input type="checkbox"/> Urgent
Contribution to One City Climate Strategy, One City Ecological Emergency Strategy and Corporate Strategy.	N/A
Portfolio Prioritisation Position:	Top 5 Programme
Council MTFP Budget saving delivery –	<p>Saving ID: N/A</p> <p>Deliver Specialised Supported Housing (SSH) and Temporary Social Housing (TSH)</p> <p>The establishment of a Council owned Registered Provider (RP) is expected to deliver cost avoidance of up to £11m per annum, by enabling the delivery of more general needs social housing</p>

	<p>Specialised Supported Housing (SSH) and Temporary Social Housing (TSH).</p> <p>Establishing a Council owned RP will also enable the Council to have greater flexibility in pivoting to evolving needs and priorities, as the RP can deliver a variety of housing that includes TSH, SSH and general needs social housing.</p> <p>SSH</p> <p>It is anticipated that a Council owned RP will enable more citizens aged 18-64 with eligible needs to be offered SSH accommodation with the necessary support package rather than residential care, that could result in cost avoidance of up to £6m per year.</p> <p>TSH:</p> <p>It is expected that up to £5m in cost avoidance will be delivered per year by minimising subsidy loss resulting from Emergency Accommodation Temporary Accommodation.</p> <p>Cost avoidance for both SSH and TSH are not yet baselined. This project will result in cost avoidance for forecast overspending on the subsidy loss budget and residential care, so savings cannot be removed from either budget.</p>
--	---

C. LIFECYCLE STAGE

What lifecycle stages have you already completed/ had approved?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandate <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Outline Case <input type="checkbox"/> Outline Business Case <input type="checkbox"/> Full Business Case (in delivery) <input type="checkbox"/> None of the above <input type="checkbox"/> Other [<i>Please specify</i>]
---	--

D. DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document status:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final		
Document owner:	Louise Davidson		
Version	Author(s)	Description	Date
V1	Louise Davidson Head of Housing Delivery	First draft	11/10/24
V2	Louise Davidson Head of Housing Delivery	FINAL SIGNED OFF VERSION, signed off by Corporate Leadership Board and Tackling Homelessness Programme Board	12/11/24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: DECISION REQUIRED

Decisions requested for OBC sign-off (inc. any resource and/or funding requests):

1. Authorises development of a Full Business Case for a fully owned private Council Registered Provider
2. Approves the finances required to develop a Full Business Case for a wholly own private Council Registered Provider
3. Authorises the Executive Director Growth and Regeneration, in consultation with the Committee Chair for Housing Delivery and Homes, subject to securing the necessary funding (from whatever source), to take all necessary steps to develop Full Business Case with associated workstreams of the Council Owned Registered Provider, including procuring all necessary goods, services and work contracts, and other agreements, notwithstanding that any of these may (whether by value or otherwise) comprise a key decision.

The Service Area Lead prioritising availability to support the progress of the next phase of work is Louise Davidson, Head of Housing Delivery

Are we currently formally committed to proceeding with this proposal?

Yes No

If yes – please provide detail of the nature of commitment, to whom & relevant date/s:

Recommended tolerances for sign-off:

The tolerances listed in the table indicate the amount of movement in anticipated cost and dates to complete the next gateway (Full Business Case) that is acceptable before formal escalation is required / the project moves into exception.

Tolerance areas	Suggested tolerance	Escalation board / officer
Time +/- amounts of time on target completion for next gateway	+/- 4 weeks	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith
Cost +/- amounts of planned budget to get to next gateway	+/- £0	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith

Has a [business case on a page](#) been produced and appended Yes No

Project context summary/ Strategic Case:

The project aims to deliver more general needs social housing, Temporary Social Housing (TSH) and Specialised Supported Housing (SSH), resulting in full year effect cost avoidance up to £11m/annum, through establishing a Council owned Registered Provider (RP- a provider of social housing registered with the Social Housing Regulator).

Establishing a Council owned RP will also enable the Council to have greater flexibility in pivoting to evolving needs and priorities, as the RP can deliver a variety of housing that includes TSH, SSH and general needs social housing.

Project context

TSH

Temporary Social Housing is low cost rental accommodation made available to a person who is homeless (within the meaning of the Housing Act 1996) either by a private Registered Provider under an assured shorthold tenancy agreement or by a local authority under a licence. TSH delivered through a Registered Provider is exempt from the usual rent setting requirements as set out in the Rent Standard.

1. On 31 March 2024, 117,450 households in England were in Temporary Accommodation (TA: under Housing Law, if a person or family becomes homeless and urgently needs a home, the council may provide temporary accommodation while helping them find long-term housing) which is an increase of 12.3% from 31 March 2023. Households with children increased by 14.7% to 74,530, and single households increased by 8.5% to 42,920. Compared to the previous quarter, the number of households in temporary accommodation had increased by 4.3% (Accredited Official Statistics - Statutory homelessness in England: January to March 2024, published 08 August 2024).
2. Many local authorities are feeling the impact of this locally and Bristol is no different. In Bristol, demand has continued to grow and there are now around 1,600 households in TA (up from around 900 in Q1 of 2021/22).
3. We know that the experience of living in temporary accommodation negatively impacts some families and individuals who need to use it, to varying degrees. It can be a traumatic experience, leading to negative impacts on mental health, employment, education, and personal relationships.
4. The council has a statutory duty to house people who are legally homeless and vulnerable. Due to a lack of affordable housing, much of that accommodation is secured via expensive spot purchased accommodation from the private rental sector. The council claims some of the cost back via Housing Benefit, but this is capped by central government, linked to Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rates set in 2011, so the amount that the council pays above the cap results in a loss to the council, known as subsidy loss.
5. At the start of 2024, the annual TA subsidy loss for 2024/25 was estimated to total over £18.5m if no steps were taken to reduce this cost. Long-term, the solution to high numbers of households in TA is to increase the number of general needs affordable housing available so we are working with our Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Registered Provider (RP) partners to identify opportunities to increase our housing stock at pace. In the short-term we are looking to reduce our dependence on expensive private-rented TA to reduce our subsidy loss.
6. It is estimated that up c.740 TA family units could be recommissioned as TSH with a monthly saving of c.£1080 for each unit, after support costs which the council would be liable to pay, resulting in full year effect cost avoidance up to £5m/annum.

SSH

Specialised Supported Housing: is a sub-category of supported housing that is exempt from usual social rent setting requirements as set out in the Rent Standard (these are requirements for registered providers in England in relation to social rent setting) and the Government's Policy statement on rents for social housing.

1. The Council has a statutory duty to house and provide support for citizens aged 18-64 with eligible needs. The Council has a long-term commitment to these citizens most of whom will require support and housing over 40-50 years, so any cost avoidance achieved will have a long-lasting benefit to the Council.
2. At present the delivery of support and housing is put out for tender and providers who offer these combined services bid for contracts. This can leave the council in a commercially challenging position with a limited number of providers meaning that providers can stipulate (and charge for) a higher level of support than is required for citizens. With constrained options the council is often put into

a position of paying for citizens to enter residential care that entails a greater level of care than is needed and significantly higher costs than SSH.

3. Care in the community can enable citizens with eligible needs to be more integrated with the wider community and have a greater sense of independence than residential care. Seeking the deinstitutionalisation of care for citizens from residential homes to SSH also aligns closely with several key acts of government legislation on care in the community since the 1980s.
4. Where support and housing can be decoupled, as in SSH, the council can enable the support levels that citizens require to be delivered, rather than being subject to what providers set for commercial reasons. A good example of this is Addison Apartments in Sea Mills. The existing provider demanded an above inflation increase, Adult Services declined, and the provider served notice. However as the housing is controlled by BCC, Adult Services were able to recommission the care separately, the same staff were kept on, a significant saving was made and there was no disruption to the service the tenants received.
5. Having a Council owned RP will enable Adult Services to commission the tenancy-based accommodation required for delivering SSH. SSH can only be delivered through an RP, initial scoping indicates existing RPs are unable to meet demand for SSH hence the importance of the Council having its own RP to increase capacity across the city.
6. Where citizens with eligible needs are placed in SSH rather than residential care there is an average saving of c.£700 per week. With 330 citizens requiring support it is anticipated that half of these could be offered SSH instead of residential care with a cost avoidance of £6m per annum.
7. The majority of citizens with eligible needs (c.60%) may be able to use existing housing stock for SSH, from General Needs or the Private Market. For citizens with the most complex needs (c.20%) and those with lower but still significant needs (c.20%) new housing may need to be built or existing housing stock acquired and then considerably altered to meet each citizen's needs. This will require capital funding.

Flexibility to pivot to Council need

A Council owned RP is not restricted in delivering only one type of housing. The ability of a Council owned RP to deliver TSH, SSH and general needs social housing means that if Council needs and priorities change there is an in-built ability within the RP to pivot to meet that need. As the RP would be wholly owned by the Council, Bristol City Council will be able to direct the company to pivot as required.

Council owned Registered Providers across England

There are at least 5 wholly Council owned Registered Provider companies across England. The primary focus of most of these RPs is to address the housing crisis experienced by many Councils. Of particular note is Nottingham City Homes Registered Provider (NCHRP) which is being used to deliver several types of housing from Temporary Accommodation through to Specialised Supported Housing. Further to this NCHRP only owns a small percentage of their housing stock as it leases the majority from the private market. Ealing Borough Council cites that their own RP, Broadway Living RP, gives them greater flexibility than their HRA to creatively manage their housing assets. Additionally, Newham Borough Council's RP, Local Space, has been able to acquire sizable public and private loans which demonstrates the ability of Council owned RPs to raise funds outside of the Council. Taken altogether these examples highlight how a Council owned RP could give BCC significant flexibility in meeting a wide range of housing needs in the City, using both owned and leasehold properties, whilst not being solely reliant on BCC funds to achieve its aims. See Appendix I for full details.

Proposal

1. Set up a wholly owned Registered Provider to increase capacity for Specialised Supported Housing in Bristol, enabling citizens aged 18-64 with eligible needs to be cared for outside of residential care and provide cost avoidance for BCC's Adult Services of up to £6m per annum (subject to full business case).
2. Through a wholly Council owned Registered Provider, recommission TA placements delivered through our Emergency Accommodation Framework as TSH delivering Full Year Effect cost avoidance of up to £5m in subsidy loss (subject to full business case).

3. Minimise Housing Benefit Subsidy loss and establish an efficient means of providing Specialised Supported Housing for Bristol citizens.
4. Look at in-year cost avoidance opportunities to work with existing RPs to commission provision through their exempt rent status to gain further RP Temporary Social Housing leases that reduce subsidy loss.

[New Uses of Registered Providers Financial Sheet](#)

Total Project Financial Summary - for Option 4 Council owned RP					
	<i>£'000s</i>	2024/2025	2025/2026	Total	
<i>Total new/ chargeable costs</i>	£	227	£	39	£ 267
<i>One -off contingency (tolerance)</i>	£	-	£	-	£ -
<i>Total opportunity/ non-chargeable costs</i>	£	10	£	7	£ 17
One-off costs	£	237	£	46	£ 284
<i>Ongoing costs (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£	-	£ -
<i>Gross savings (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£	-	£ -
Ongoing	£	-	£	-	£ -
Net total	£	237	£	46	£ 284
Cumulative net total	£	237	£	284	

Any key changes since Mandate approval:

As some of the TSH may be delivered through existing RPs this Outline Business Case proposes making SSH a core part of the Council owned RP's business plan in stage 1 rather than stage 2 to deliver full year effect cost avoidance of up to £6m.

Further modelling of TSH suggests that recommissioning TA could have full year effect cost avoidance of up to £5m rather than £9m.

(Economic case) Recommended option(s) to develop into a Full Business Case:

Out of six options considered (see Economic Case for full details of these options) this report recommends the establishment of a wholly Council owned private Registered Provider to

1. reduce subsidy loss from TA placements by up to £5m per annum
2. increase SSH capacity and minimise the number of citizens with eligible needs being cared for in residential homes, reducing Adult Services costs by up to £6m per year.

Current anticipated cost/benefit profile for preferred option (to be refined at FBC stage)

	Value	Supporting commentary
Confidence level	60%	The savings model for TSH has been rigorously tested with several teams.

The savings for SSH conservatively assumes only 50% of citizens with eligible needs are moved from residential homes to SSH. It may prove possible to achieve a higher percentage, hence the high confidence level.

Current Funding: Already allocated to FBC & outline Business Plan

Costs already allocated **£214,138**

Council Owned RP Project Manager (for 5 months)	34,138
Council Owned RP External Legal advice	75,000
Council Owned RP External Finance advice	30,000
Council Owned RP GH/ Business Planning resource	50,000
Council Owned RP External Tax Advice	25,000

Additional funding required for development of Full Business Case & outline Business Plan for RP: £69,430

BCC Procurement	3,250
BCC Housing Delivery	16,905
BCC Legal	15,820
BCC Revenue and Benefits	8,655
BCC Finances	16,800

Anticipated key measurable (non-financial) benefits associated with preferred option:

1. Meet the housing and support needs of homeless families and vulnerable adults and young people, helping to ensure BCC complies with its various statutory duties to the citizens of Bristol. This will be measured by:
 - TSH: hours of increased support for homeless households delivered by TSH vs TA
 - SSH: Monitoring the required and actual support delivered for citizen with eligible needs through TSH
2. Increase the availability of provision which meets BCC’s high aspirations for young people in BCC’s care, delivering in line with the assessed needs to achieve agreed outcomes.
3. Increase the capacity in the affordable housing sector around supporting housing for people with complex needs and temporary accommodation.
 - The numbers of TSH and SSH housing units available for BCC use should increase compared to 2024/25 levels
4. Widen the range of affordable housing options in the city.

Estimated timescale to deliver preferred option:

5. Baseline completion date based on estimated start date: 30/09/2024
6. Baseline completion date: 30/09/2026

How current key risks with the AS-IS will be addressed by this solution:

1. **TSH:** The current way of delivering TA is resulting in an unsustainable subsidy loss for BCC. At the start of 2024 the annual TA subsidy loss for 2024/25 was estimated to total over £18.5m. The recommended option of a Council owned RP will reduce BCC's subsidy loss levels by up to £5m per annum through recommissioning TA placements as TSH.
2. **SSH:** 330 citizens with eligible needs are currently in residential care which costs on average 35% more than SSH. If 50% of these citizens were offered SSH this would result in cost avoidance for Adult Services of up to £6m per annum.

Relevant learning from previous work to increase delivery confidence of preferred option

1. A risk workshop was conducted consulting a wide range of stakeholders, learnings from previous projects were shared and mitigations found for each risk identified.
2. A key learning from the establishment of other Council owned companies has been that senior stakeholders did not always have sufficient information to make strategic decisions. We have taken the time to meet with Senior BCC staff (political and administrative) in the Shareholder Group Board and a subsequent sub-committee meeting to ensure senior staff are fully briefed on both the project's high level aims and sufficient detail to make the strategic decisions for this project.
3. Learning from previous Council owned companies means there will be planning for exit scenarios and other contingencies to always ensure that the council remains able to appropriately mitigate the risk of the project/company failing to achieve the stated outcome.

Total spend to date - New costs	£88,241
Total spend to date -Opportunity Costs	

New costs to deliver Full Business Case (FBC) & outline Business plan:	£283,568
Opportunity costs to deliver FBC & outline Business plan:	0
Costs already approved	£214,138
Funding required:	£69,430
Funding source(s):	Flexible Use of Capital Receipts (FUCR)
Est. timescale for FBC & outline Business Plan to return for sign-off:	May 2025

Outline Business Case (OBC)

1. Strategic Case & Project Overview

Strategic Case and summary of the project

This project proposes to:

- Set up a wholly owned Registered Provider and recommission TA placements delivered through our Emergency Accommodation Framework as TSH, delivering potential Full Year Effect cost avoidance of up to £5m. The current method of delivering TA is resulting in an unsustainable subsidy loss projected at the start of 2024 to be £18.5m for 2024/25. The recommended option of a Council owned RP will help reduce BCC's subsidy loss levels by up to £5m. Further financial modelling of TSH suggests that recommissioning TA could have full year cost avoidance of up to £5m rather than £9m which was projected at the Mandate stage. Having a Council owned RP will also give the Council more direct control over the recommissioning of TA which is important as existing RPs have their own business agenda that may limit the opportunities to recommission TA through them.
- Increase SSH capacity to deliver Adult Services, to achieve Full Year Effect cost avoidance of £6m per year. This will be delivered in phase 1 rather than phrase 2 (as originally outlined in the Mandate) as SSH will provide a consistent financial basis for the Business Plan for the Council owned RP. Recommissioning of TA as TSH can be also done the by the Council owned RP when existing RPs are unable to deliver TSH.

There are wider opportunities associated with this work beyond the above priorities, and we expect this work to also enable us to:

1. Meet the housing and support needs of homeless families and vulnerable adults and young people, helping to ensure BCC complies with its various statutory duties to the citizens of Bristol. This will be measured by:
 - TSH: hours of increased support for homeless households delivered by TSH vs TA
 - SSH: Monitoring the required and actual support delivered for citizen with eligible needs through TSH
2. Increase the availability of provision which meets BCC's high aspirations for young people in BCC's care, delivering in line with the assessed needs to achieve agreed outcomes.
3. Increase the capacity in the affordable housing sector around supporting housing for people with complex needs and temporary accommodation.
 - The numbers of TSH and SSH housing units available for BCC use should increase compared to 2024/25 levels
4. Widen the range of affordable housing options in the city.

The project is in strategic alignment with BCC's priorities regarding HC1 Housing supply: by providing more supported and extra-care housing for those who need it, for homeless households through TSH and citizens with eligible needs through SSH.

Changes since Mandate approval stage

As some of the TSH may be delivered through existing RPs this OBC proposes making SSH a core part of the Council owned RP's business plan in stage 1 rather than stage 2 to deliver full year effect cost avoidance of up to £6m.

Further modelling of TSH suggests that recommissioning TA could have full year effect cost avoidance of up to £5m rather than £9m.

Target benefits

The draft benefits contract can be found in [New Uses of Registered Providers Financial Sheet](#)

Description	Type (financial, non-financial)	Metric / KPI & Target	Benefit Owner	Assumption(s)
Reduction in TA subsidy loss through TSH	Financial	£5m/annum	Paul Sylvester Housing Options	
Reduction in Adult Service support housing costs through SSH	Financial	£6m/annum	Transformation and Commissioning Lead Adult Social Care	
Increase support for homeless households through TSH	Non-Financial	Minimum 3 hr support per week for each TSH household	Paul Sylvester Housing Options	

2. Economic Case

Options Appraisal- evaluation of the shortlist

There are six potential options that have been investigated to address the Council's strategic objectives for a TSH and SSH intervention approach. The preferred option, option 4, is outlined in the Strategic Partner's [Options Appraisal Report](#) which proposes BCC establishes a new Registered Provider as a dedicated provider of TSH, SSH and general needs social housing.

The preferred option involves the Council establishing a new Registered Provider that is regulated by the Regulator of Social Housing. The Council would become the sole shareholder and invests equity and provides loans to the RP enabling it to acquire a stock of suitable properties for general needs social housing, TSH and SSH.

The company would acquire suitable homes to deliver social housing, temporary social housing, and specialised supported housing within the City. Rents would be recouped from tenants at LHA rates or Housing benefit where appropriate. As the homes would be let on suitable tenancies, at an affordable rate, the Council would be able to discharge its main housing duty. The Registered Provider would provide appropriate care, support and supervision to residents.

Below summarises the options explored, full details can be found in the [Options Appraisal Report](#) . Whilst option 4 is the preferred option for this project, option 5 is also being actively pursued, though the scale of opportunity for this option may be limited by existing RP capacity.

No.	Option	Explanation
Option 1	BCC's General Fund, or Housing Revenue Account, acquires homes for additional social housing, Temporary Supported Housing and Specialist Supported Housing	In this option the Council's general fund and Housing Revenue Account are coordinated to deliver new homes to meet the TA demand. A number of homes are bought specifically for TSH and SSH, while general needs social housing provision is increased to move people from TA to Council Housing tenancies.
Option 2	BCC uses a new or existing Wholly Owned Company as a dedicated PRS vehicle which acquires homes to house people currently in TSH, SSH and TA and discharge their housing duty.	Through Option 2 the wholly owned company would be established as a subsidiary of the Council. The new entity would acquire homes that would be let out to people currently in TA on Assured Shorthold Tenancies. The Council would discharge its main housing duty as suitable accommodation has been provided.
Option 3	BCC uses a new or existing Wholly Owned Company as a dedicated provider of TA which acquires homes to replace existing temporary accommodation.	Under this option a new entity would be established as a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council. This new entity would have a dedicated remit to acquire and operate units for TA within the City. The entity would be providing a service to the Council and would likely operate under Teckal rules.
Option 4	BCC establishes a new Registered Provider as a dedicated provider of general needs social housing, TSH and SSH	Option 4 involves the Council establishing a new Registered Provider that is wholly owned by the Council. The Registered Provider would be used to deliver new homes at (or below) social rent levels within Bristol. The RP would also provide TSH and SSH through a nominations agreement from Housing for the Council.
Option 5	BCC works in deeper partnerships with Registered Providers to increase the amount of supported accommodation for Temporary Supported Housing and Specialist Supported Housing	Through this option the Council works in deeper partnership with locally operating Registered providers and charities to increase the overall supply of affordable housing with a particular focus on temporary supported housing and specialist supported housing. Through an overall increase in suitable provision the Council's cost pressures will be reduced.
Option 6	BCC seeks to work with a private sector or other partners to agree long term leases (10 years to 40 years) or rent guarantee arrangements to replace existing temporary accommodation.	The Council work with a private sector partner or partners to secure long term lease deals or agreements that deliver a large increase in new low cost housing within Bristol. The Council would take a head lease or provide a rent guarantee that would enable a private sector partner to develop a scheme based on a guaranteed income from the Council. The private sector partner would build, own and operate the homes with an agreement with the Council. Rents could be set at low cost rents, with the private sector partner as the landlord allowing the Council to discharge its housing duty and reduce the overall cost of TA subsidy.

Options appraisal criteria for the below evaluation matrix

No	Objective	Criteria	Explanation	Weighting
1	Cost	Ability of the entity to recoup by Housing Benefit/Reduce Housing Benefit Subsidy Loss	Ensure the financial viability of the entity set up by the council to deliver TA/SH which gives the Council confidence that this is a long term and stable solution to the challenge.	30% The primary objective of the structure is to reduce the cost of TA/SH for the Council.
2	Cost	Overall Impact on BCC Finances	Reduce Council incurred cost of TA/SH on a long-term basis	20% As a structure set up and managed by the Council, the viability of the TA/SH delivery structure will directly impact the Council's cash flow.
3	Increase Provision	Ability to purchase homes	Increase the amount of affordable housing, Temporary Supported Housing and Special Supported Housing Accommodation available within Bristol	20% The assessment of future needs for TA/SH showed that it is likely to be critical to increase the amount of accommodation provided to meet local needs.
4	Quality Units	Control over units purchased	Provide higher quality homes and better care, support and supervision than currently provided from the market	10% This is a criterion that will support the good delivery of the TA/TSH/ SSH structure but does not directly influence the primary objective of the structure.
5	Effective property management	Control over housing operation	Provide higher quality management of homes than currently provided from the market	10% This is a criterion that will support the good delivery of the TA/SH structure but does not directly influence the primary objective of the structure.
6	Ease of implementation	Ease of Implementation	The new arrangements can be implemented as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible.	10% This is a criterion that will support the good delivery of the TA/SH structure but does not directly influence the primary objective of the structure.

The table below shows the scoring approach used for assessing the options against the criteria:

Score	Explanation	Score
Addresses Fully / Well	Criterion is addressed fully by the approach	3

Addresses Partially / Moderately	Criterion is partially addressed by the approach	2
Does Not Address / Poorly	The approach failed to address the criterion	1

Each option will be assessed for each criterion and a score of 1 to 3 assigned. These scores are then multiplied by their weighting to assign a weighted score for the criteria. Finally, the weighted scores are summed to establish the ranking of the options and to identify the preferred option to be taken forward. In order to summarise the results, the key features of the preferred option are identified at the end of this section. The completed options appraisal is set out in the table below.

Evaluation Matrix

BCC Objectives	Weight	Option 1 BCC General Fund and HRA Direct Delivery	Option 2 Establish PRS Company	Option 3 Establish Company for TA	Option 4 Establish Registered Provider for General Need Social Rent / TSH & SSH	Option 5 Deeper partnership with Registered Providers	Option 6 Long Lease deals
1) Ability to maximise LHA rates	20%	1 (20)	2(40)	2(40)	3(60)	3(60)	2(40)
2) Overall impact on BCC Council Finances	30%	2 (40)	2(60)	2(60)	3(90)	2(60)	3(90)
3) Increase Provision of TA/ TSH / SSH (20%)	20%	1(20)	2(40)	2(40)	3(60)	1(20)	2(40)
4) Improve Quality of Housing Provision (10%)	10%	2(20)	2(20)	2(20)	2(20)	2(20)	2(20)
5) Enables effective management of homes (10%)	10%	2(20)	1(10)	1(10)	2(20)	2(20)	2(20)
6) Ease of Implementation (10%)	10%	3(30)	2(20)	2(20)	1(10)	1(10)	2 (20)
Total Weighted Score	/300	150/300	190/300	190/300	250/300	220/300	230/300
Total Score % in meeting project aims:		5%	60%	60%	83%	73%	77%
Ranking		5	4	4	1	3	2
Impact Assessments:							
Environmental impact		Negative	N/A	N/A	Negative	Negative	Negative
Equalities Impact		Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive
PIA		Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Preferred option(s) details

PRIMARY Preferred Option: Option 4
Establish Registered Provider for General Need Social Rent / TSH & SSH
Would the delivery of this option be different to what was described in the Mandate / approved Budget (as applicable)?
The substance of the project brief has not changed but the timing of deliverables is different. The delivery of SSH has been moved from phase 2 to phase 1 to be delivered alongside TSH.
Supporting narrative why this is the preferred option:

SECONDARY Option: Option 6
Long Lease deals
Would the delivery of this option be different to what was described in the Mandate / approved Budget (as applicable)?
Yes: this option is unviable in meeting project aims This option does not involve establishing a Council owned RP which will affect the ability of this option to deliver SSH, which makes it unviable for achieving the project's aims.
Details of this option are outlined below but as it is not a viable option the financial profile is not completed.
Supporting narrative why this is the secondary preferred option:

- The Council owned RP can be established with the appropriate objectives and structure to deliver the required accommodation in Bristol including increasing TSH and SSH provision.
- The Council owned RP will enable the Council to move tenants from Temporary Accommodation to suitable affordable accommodation on suitable tenancy agreements allowing the Council to discharge its main housing duty.
- As a Registered Provider it is enabled to recoup housing benefit exempt accommodation rates allowing it to address the key most expensive housing subsidy costs for the Council arising from TA. This enables it to have the most significant long-term effect on the Council's finances.
- For citizens with eligible needs, it is estimated that providing SSH accommodation instead of residential care will save around 35%. Added to this where possible care in the community is preferable to institutional care for citizen's wellbeing.

Financial profile (£'000s)

[New Uses of Registered Providers Financial Sheet](#)

- The approach uses the Council's covenant strength to deliver new homes at a low-cost rate.
- It allows the Council to deliver a large quantum of homes which allows it to effectively plan its budgets and manage overspends.
- The approach effectively leverages private sector finance to deliver against a key housing issue.
- The availability of a number of operators in the market enables the Council to investigate a number of approaches and ensures a degree of competition enabling the Council to choose a deal that meets its requirements.
- Contrary to previous similar offers aimed at delivering regeneration schemes with an economic development or place making focus, the option focuses on delivering housing which the Council can be more confident over long term demands.
- If structured effectively the Council will not be the direct landlord to the tenants enabling the Council to discharge its housing duty and rent levels to be collected at current Local Housing Allowance rates.

Financial profile (£'000s)

This is not a viable option, so a financial profile has not been completed

Total Project Financial Summary - for Option 4 Council owned RP					
	1		2		Total
£'000s	2024/2025		2025/2026		
	£		£		£
<i>Total new/ chargeable costs</i>	227		39		267
<i>One -off contingency (tolerance)</i>	£	-	£	-	£
<i>Total opportunity/ non-chargeable costs</i>	10		7		17
	£		£		£
One-off costs	237		46		284
<i>Ongoing costs (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£	-	£
<i>Gross savings (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£	-	£
Ongoing	£	-	£	-	£
	£		£		£
Net total	237		46		284
	£		£		
Cumulative net total	237		284		

Confidence level in financials (one off and ongoing implications) and justification

60%.
Robust financial modelling means we are confident that the project can deliver the savings outlined.

Confidence level in financials (one off and ongoing implications) and justification

This is not a viable option, so a financial profile has not been completed

Risk profile of option
<p>Overall risk level: Medium</p> <p>Key risks associated with option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium: setting up a Council owned RP requires meeting the standards for establishing an RP set out by the Regulator of Social Housing. Whilst there is a negative C3 judgement against BCC the regulator may be less inclined to accept an application for a Council owned RP. • High: changing from TA to TSH requires buy in from private landlords and TA providers. A compelling business case is being set out to incentivise TA providers to transition to TSH. • Medium: To increase SSH capacity citizens with complex eligible needs (around 20-40%), may require new housing to be built or existing housing stock acquired and then significantly altered to meet each citizen's needs. Building of this nature is inherently more complex but learning from existing projects can be used to ensure risks are avoided.
Commercial Case:

Risk profile of option
<p>Overall risk level: High</p> <p>Key risks associated with option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High- This option does not involve establishing a Council owned RP which will prevent the delivery of more which makes this option unviable. • High- The long-term nature of the leases introduces a significant degree of uncertainty. • High- There will be a challenge for BCC to have the sustained resources & expertise required to effectively manage the commercial relationship with private partners over duration of longer leases that could be up to 40 years in length.
Commercial Case:

Establishing a Council owned RP with the Housing Regulator comprises of 2 stages which likely take for the Preliminary stage, 4-6months, and Detailed Stage, 9months.

BCC is for many TA providers the primary or sole client, so we have significant commercial leverage to negotiate with TA providers in the transition to TSH.

For the majority of citizens with eligible needs (c.60%) the existing housing stock, from General Needs or Private Rental Sector, with smaller levels of alteration be sufficient to meet their needs. For citizens with complex needs (c.20-40%) new housing may need to be built or existing housing stock acquired and then significantly altered to meet each citizen’s needs. This will require capital funding.

Contingency options to mitigate risks and raise confidence level

There is a TA block contract due for renewal with c. 130 units. This provides a good opportunity to test the ability of BCC to negotiate the transition of TA providers to TSH.

Discuss with the Regulator of Social Housing at an early stage what implication the C3 negative judgement may have on establishing a Council owned RP and jointly find ways to mitigate any risks or issues.

Any residual shortfall against committed savings?

Not Applicable

No prior committed savings for project

Indicative timeline (Key milestones) for the Full Business Case stage

The Council work with a private sector partner or partners to secure long term lease deals or agreements that deliver a large increase in new low-cost housing within Bristol. The Council would take a head lease or provide a rent guarantee that would enable a private sector partner to develop a scheme based on a guaranteed income from the Council. The private sector partner would build, own and operate the homes with an agreement with the Council. Rents could be set at low-cost rents, with the private sector partner as the landlord allowing the Council to discharge its housing duty and reduce the overall cost of TA subsidy.

Contingency options to mitigate risks and raise confidence level

Initial scoping indicates that existing RPs are at capacity so there are very limited contingencies that can be used for SSH.

The proposed commercial relationship for TA/TSH requires a sustained commitment to employing the commercial specialists required to negotiate the agreement initially, and then to dedicate the resources required to effectively manage the relationship over the long term.

Any residual shortfall against committed savings?

Not Applicable

No prior committed savings for project

Key milestones for the Full Business Case stage

Company structure & subsidy advice	Jan-Feb 25
Application Document Preparation	Jan-Mar 25
Full Business Case & Outline Business plan prep	Feb-Apr 25
Approval & Governance	Apr-May 25
Key lesson learned from similar projects/initiatives that will be applied to increase delivery confidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A risk workshop was conducted consulting a wide range of stakeholders, learnings from previous projects were shared and mitigations found for each risk identified. • A key learning from the establishment of other Council owned companies has been that senior stakeholders did not always have sufficient information to make strategic decisions. We have taken the time to meet with Senior BCC staff (political and administrative) in the Shareholder Group Board and a subsequent sub-committee meeting to ensure senior staff are fully briefed on both the project's high level aims and sufficient detail to make the strategic decisions for this project. • Learning from previous Council owned companies means there will be planning for exit scenarios and other contingencies to always ensure that the council remains able to appropriately mitigate the risk of the project/company failing to achieve the stated outcome. 	
Summary Impact assessment:	
Equalities - Positive Data Protection (Privacy) Impact - Neutral Environmental Impact Assessment – Negative	

Initial scoping with private sector partners	Jan-Mar 25
Full Business case preparation	Feb-Apr 25
Key lesson learned from similar projects/initiatives that will be applied to increase delivery confidence	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building significant amounts of housing stock can bring risks and issues particularly around lead times for planning consent. We would seek to sequence planning consent and building scheduling to maximise the speed of cost avoidance. 	
Summary Impact assessment:	
Equalities - Positive Data Protection (Privacy) Impact - Neutral Environmental Impact Assessment – Negative	

3. Financial Case- Affordability/ Fundability

FBC & outline Business Plan development stage:

Total Costs required		24/25	25/26	Total costs/ total funding needed
Total one-off costs required to deliver FBC & outline Business Plan		£237,341	£46,227	£283,568
Funding Source (incl. capital ref / budget holder/ cost centre if known)	Funding Approval status	24/25	25/26	Total Amount per funding source
Council Owned RP Project Manager (for 5 months)	<i>In Project Budget Approved</i>	20,483	13655	34,138
Council Owned RP External Legal advice	<i>In Project Budget Approved</i>	75,000		75,000
Council Owned RP External Finance advice	<i>In Project Budget Approved</i>	30,000		30,000
Council Owned RP GHL resource	<i>In Project Budget Approved</i>	50,000		50,000
Council Owned RP External Tax Advice	<i>In Project Budget Approved</i>	25,000		25,000
BCC Procurement	Needs approval	1,950	£1,300	3,250
BCC Housing Delivery	Needs approval	10,143	6,762	16,905
BCC Legal	Needs approval	9,492	£6,328	15,820
BCC Revenue and Benefit	Needs approval	5,193	3,642	8,655
BCC Finances	Needs approval	10,080	6,720	16,800

Total funding identified	£214,138
Shortfall for FBC stage (if applicable)	£69,430
<p>Shortfall commentary: The costs for developing the Full Business Case and outline Business Plan within BCC were not previously know. As details of the requirements emerged for FBC & outline Business Case development, it has now been possible as to scope these costs</p>	

Total funding identified	£tbc
Shortfall for delivery stage (if applicable)	£tbc
Shortfall commentary: N/A	

4. Management Case - Delivery of preferred option

Detailed Scope – what will and won't be impacted

	In Scope	
1	Processes, citizen interactions, business models, services to citizens	<p>Assessment of the potential to set up a wholly Council owned company.</p> <p>Business model for the new company.</p> <p>New co RP.</p> <p>Growing SSH capacity may require purchasing or building new housing stock for citizens with complex needs.</p>
2	Organisational structures/ services, roles, culture, and skills/capabilities.	<p>We will need to have the internal capability to manage the arrangement both for TSH and SSH.</p> <p>We will need to have a proposed company board structure etc.</p>
3	Technology systems /applications/ hardware, buildings/accommodation/land, equipment/machinery etc	No clear drivers for technology changes as a result of this work.
4	Information and data incl. data cleansing or/and data migration, and performance metrics	It is anticipated a new data sharing agreement will need to be put in place – but there are not significant concerns with the current arrangements.
5	Contracts, suppliers, leases and relevant leaseholders	<p>Transition through RP via Emergency Accommodation Framework.</p> <p>We will need to review how the new company can be 'asset holding' for the purposes of registering as an RP.</p> <p>To increase SSH capacity for citizens with complex needs (around 20-40%), new housing stock may need to be built or existing housing stock acquired and then significantly altered to meet each citizen's needs.</p>
5	Provision of General Needs housing with Care and Support	The intention of this project is to ensure that the needs of services areas are met across Emergency Accommodation and Adults Services housing needs through TSH and SSH respectively.

	Out of scope	Any risks/consequences associated with “Out of scope” items
1	Revenue and Benefits and RP protocol working group	Important related piece of work.
2	RP rent setting regimes	Existing BAU service engagement with RPs on the regime for setting rent levels.

Total Project Financial Summary - for Option 4 Council owned RP				
	£'000s	1 2024/2025	2 2025/2026	Total
<i>Total new / chargeable costs</i>	£	227	£ 39	£ 267
<i>One -off contingency (tolerance)</i>	£	-	£ -	£ -
<i>Total opportunity / non-chargeable costs</i>	£	10	£ 7	£ 17
One-off costs	£	237	£ 46	£ 284
<i>Ongoing costs (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£ -	£ -
<i>Gross savings (incl. contingency)</i>	£	-	£ -	£ -
Ongoing	£	-	£ -	£ -
Net total	£	237	£ 46	£ 284
Cumulative net total	£	237	£ 284	

Scope – deliverables/objectives for next stage

	Specific	Measurable	Achievable	Relevant/Realistic	Timebound
1	Determine preferred company structure	A business structure for an RP selected	31Ten report (August 2024) indicates this is possible	Required for establishing an RP	Feb-25
2	Prepare Full Business Case	Create FBC for an RP	31Ten report (August 2024) indicates this is possible	Required for establishing an RP	Feb-Apr 25
3	Prepare outline Business Plan	Create outline business plan for an RP	31Ten report (August 2024) indicates this is possible	Required for establishing an RP	Feb-May 25
4	Set up a wholly owned Registered Provider to deliver TSH & SSH Full Year Effect cost	Reduction in TA subsidy loss through TSH Reduction in Adult Service support	<u>Altair report</u> (April 2024) and 31Ten report (August 2024) indicate that forming an RP could take up 09/2026 but may be deliverable earlier.	Required to minimise subsidy loss for TA through TSH Acquire further SSH capacity	Sept 26

avoidance of up to £11m.	housing costs through SSH			
--------------------------	---------------------------	--	--	--

Plan to FBC & outline Business Plan

Activity	Support Resources Required	Estimated Timescale	Start Date	End Date
Determine preferred company structure	Legal and commercial advice	2 months	Jan-25	Feb-25
Detailed procurement and subsidy control advice on lending and investment based on the preferred company structure	Legal and commercial advice	2 months	Jan-25	Feb-25
Full Business Case Preparation	Commercial and business planning advice	3 months	02/25	04/25
Outline Business plan preparation	Commercial and business planning advice	3 months	02/25	04/25
BCC Approval & Governance including appointments to the board	Commercial and business planning advice	2 months	04/25	05/25

Dependencies, Constraints, Assumptions, risks

- Any impact on Supported Housing has Interdependencies with Adult and Children's Services, including their associated programmes. This is being managed through regular updated to the Supported Housing Delivery Board that has a representative from each service.
- Emergency Accommodation Framework – as the model for an RP develops, it is anticipated that this framework will be the mechanism for commissioning new placements.
- As we develop plans for a new company, the existing Shareholder liaison structures will be used at the appropriate point.
- A risk for the project is that TA providers may not be willing to transition to TSH as this may have implications for their management & maintenance teams. A number of approaches are being taken to mitigate this risk.
- Full details of risks, issues and mitigations can be found in the New Uses of Registered Providers RAID Log (ID 1254).

Resources required to progress to Full Business Case and outline Business Plan

Role/ Spend	What they will do	Cost
Already budgeted for		£214,138
Project Manager	Produce detailed plan to co-ordinate development of the Outline Business Case Manage the delivery of activities in the plan Establish Project Board & begin regular project reporting	34,138

External Legal advice Consultancy	Provide expert legal advice on the formation of a Council owned RP	75,000
External Finance advice	Provide expert financial advice on the formation of a Council owned RP	30,000
GHL/Business Planning resource	Provide expert GHL/Business Planning advice on the formation of a Council owned RP	50,000
External Tax Advice	Provide expert tax advice on the formation of a Council owned RP	25,000
Shortfall		£69,430
BCC Procurement	Procurement support @£650/day via Constellia. Costs discussed with Procurement Business Partner	3,250
BCC Housing Delivery	Based on current involvement in the Project as Senior Suppliers: Head of Housing Delivery and Strategy & Enabling Manager for 1 day per week each for 21 weeks, for both roles. Day rates are as follows Head of Housing Delivery £417 and Strategy & Enabling Manager £388.	16,905
BCC Legal	Non- core work for legal services team member for 1 day per week for 20 weeks. Costs discussed with Team Manager Legal Services and Head of Legal Service.	15,820
BCC Revenue and Benefit	Provide internal Revenue and Benefits advice on the formation of a Council owned RP. 3 Revenues and Benefits colleagues contributing 30 days work. Costs discussed with Benefits Technical Manager.	8,655
BCC Finances	Finance Manager costs based on 1 day per week for 21 weeks. Costs discussed with Finance Manager.	16,800

Governance

i. Core project roles and TOR

Project Role	Name	Job Title
Sponsor	John Smith	Executive Director Growth and Regen
Project Executive	Fiona Lester	Director Homes and Landlord Services
Project User(s)	Paul Sylvester	Head of Housing Options
Project Supplier(s)	Louise Davidson	Head of Housing Delivery
Project Assurance	Delivery Business Partner	Delivery Business Partner
Project Manager	Project Manager	Project Manager

Project Board meeting regularly? Yes

Project Board Terms of Reference agreed and relevant? Yes

ii. Project tolerances and controls

Tolerances indicate the amount of movement that is acceptable in a range of areas (e.g. cost or timescales) before escalation is required.

Tolerance areas	Project level tolerance	Escalation route	Control & tracking document(s)
Time +/- amounts of time on target completion	+/- 4 weeks	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith	Project Plan Milestone Plan on PM3
Cost +/- amounts of planned budget	Zero tolerance against cost	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith	Project Plan Financial tracking on PM3
Quality Defining quality targets in terms of ranges	Zero tolerance against quality	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith	Highlight Report
Scope Permitted variation of the scope of a project solution	Zero tolerance against scope	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith	Project Plan Business Case
Benefits +/- amounts of planned benefit delivery	Zero tolerance on savings	Tackling Homelessness Programme Board, John Smith	Business Case Highlight Report
Risk Limit on aggregated value of threats and any individual threat (e.g. threat to operational service versus threat to organisation)	Risks that will significantly impact other tolerances	Risks that will impact any other tolerances will need to go to programme board, corporate risks to CLB	RAID Log in PM3 Project Plan

5. Detail of key stakeholder engagement

Key stakeholder/s	Date(s) of key engagement	Nature of engagement
Cllr Tony Dyer Paul Martin (BCC Interim CEO) Tony Kirkham (BCC Interim Director of Finance)	28/10/2024	Shareholder Group meeting 2/9/24 updating the board, followed by meeting on 28/10/2024 to discuss proposed Council owned RP
John Smith (Exec Director: Growth & Regeneration)	Many	Biweekly meeting with John Smith & Fiona Lester to update on project

Fiona Lester (Director Homes & Landlord services)		Monthly update at Tackling Homelessness Programme Board
---	--	---

6. Outline Business Case sign-off

Decision making authority	Corporate Leadership Board and Tackling Homelessness Programme Board
Date seeking approval	12/11/2024

APPENDICES

A. Required commentary and recommended consultation for OBC

1. Change portfolio

Recommended for consultation ahead of submission:	Commentary (if any)	Date	Version Reviewed
Executive Director Meeting (EDM)		23/10/2024	V1
Professional Views	Commentary	Date	
Finance Manager	<p><u>General commentary:</u> The Outline Business Case is seeking approval for funding in order to develop the full business case and outline Business Plan in relation to establishing the Council's own Registered Provider, as part of the Tackling Homelessness programme designed to reduce Temporary Accommodation Subsidy Loss.</p> <p>The total sums requested are £ 283,568, of which £214,138 has already been approved via the mandate based on the advice provided by Goram Homes.</p> <p>An additional £69,430 is being requested which will be used for internal staff resource and external consultants in the areas of Legal, Finance, Revs and Bens, Procurement and Housing Delivery team members.</p> <p><u>Confirmation of funding source(s):</u> Flexible Use of Capital Receipts</p>	17/10/2024	
PMO Operations Manager	<p>My role is to comment on the resourcing elements of this business case.</p> <p>Decision-makers should feel confident in these elements.</p> <p>Estimates of time and cost are based on expert contributions from consultants and internal specialist teams such as Procurement and Legal.</p> <p>Rates used in calculating cost are in line with current guidance on internal day rates.</p> <p>A task-level plan identifying the sized work required from each resource; at what point and in what sequence will add considerably to confidence in delivery.</p>	10/10/2024	

	That level of planning, which I would expect to be one of the priority tasks post-approval, might lead to an understanding that more effort and budget is needed to deliver the plan.		
Enterprise Architecture View Enterprise Architect lead	As this will be an arm's length organisation, consideration must given to what the information technology needs and requirements and the impact this will have on information security and governance.	14/10/2024	
Information Governance View Head of Information assurance	Information Governance (Data Protection) will need to be involved to support with any data sharing arrangements. If any IT/Digital implications come to light there may be requirement for Information Security support.	09/10/2024	
Citizens' Services Head of Citizen Services	Citizens may present at the Citizen Service Point or may call the contact centre (Citizen Service Centre), it would therefore be prudent to engage with Citizen Services once the proposal has been agreed. Digital Services: There are no direct implications for the Digital Services team – early engagement will be required if web content needs to be updated.	07/10/2024	V00_01
HR Business Partner	There are no HR implications evident	11/10/2024	
Change Services View Senior Project Manager	The ambitious timeline and significant risks pose a challenge to delivering on time and achieving the level of benefits identified in the document. The board must consider the implications of the risks set out against the preferred option. Controls have been set out in the OBC, however risks will need individual controls/mitigations and to be actively monitored. Overall the approach outlined in the document seems robust and I would recommend proceeding if the board are willing to accept the level of risk.	07/10/2024	
Legal View Team Manager/Solicitor	The procurement process must be conducted in line with the 2015 Procurement Regulations/Procurement Act 2023 and the Councils own procurement rules. Legal services will advise and assist officers with regard to the conduct of the procurement process and the resulting contractual arrangements. Specialist legal advice will be required in respect of the proposals.	11/10/2024	

<p>Commissioning & Procurement View</p> <p>G&R Procurement Business Partner</p>	<p>There are a couple of procurement implications to this business case.</p> <p>Firstly, in the development of this OBC (and potentially FBC if the project proceeds), any requirements for services (e.g if any external professional services are required to advice on the process) must be procured in line with both the councils procurement rules, and the public contract regulations 2015, soon to be replace by the Procurement Act 2023 (est implementation date is Feb 25).</p> <p>Secondly, should the council proceed to setup its own RP, consideration will be needed as to how the new RP will undertake procurements. It is normally the case that RPs similarly have to abide to the Public Contract Regulations.</p> <p>Another point of note is that the council's emergency accommodation framework is currently setup so that only BCC and South Glos can make call-offs through it. Procurement & legal advice would be needed as to whether this can be varied so that additional providers (such as the proposed new RP) can call-off contracts.</p>	07/10/2024	
<p>Data and Insight</p>	<p>No data and insight requirements at present.</p>	11/10/2024	